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Elsie Marion Cornish (1870-1946) was a prominent Adelaide interwar garden designer who greatly contributed to Adelaide’s landscape design culture. Cornish’s known landscape designs typically followed many of the precepts of the English Arts and Crafts garden style. This was a style of garden that was popular amongst the wealthy Adelaide social elite and that indicated the beginning of a shift away from the informal garden designs that had typically predominated in Adelaide during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Cornish began her landscape design career very late in life at the age of forty-six. Largely self-educated, Cornish drew upon a variety of resources to achieve that education. These included:

- a thorough basic understanding of the theory and practice of horticulture and garden design, developed during her childhood;
- practical professional expertise developed while employed as a ‘jobbing’ gardener;
- a complex understanding of landscape and garden design developed through study of the accessible period literature; and,
- when necessary, advice from prominent Adelaide architects Walter Hervey Bagot and Guy St John Makin via both personal and professional relationships.

Cornish’s known design portfolio was comprised of twelve garden commissions. A description of each commission was developed from a variety of sources. The key elements of those designs, both built and planting schemes were examined in detail to provide a detailed picture of Cornish’s design approach and philosophy.

A comparative and contextual base from which to undertake the analysis of Cornish’s gardens was developed from an examination of the design styles and characteristics including the key built and plant components of a number of landscape designers or allied professionals from the period. These included the highly respected interstate landscape designers Edna Walling, Olive Mellor and Jocelyn Brown, and locally, Herbert S. Hartshorne, Russell S. Ellis and Mary A. Parkhouse. A review of the writings of a selective group of local influential horticulturists was also undertaken.

From the examination of Cornish’s gardens a detailed picture of her main built and planting design elements was constructed using a framework of key sub-headings. From that framework a detailed contextual and comparative analysis of her work was undertaken in relation to:

- the period garden literature that she had access to to provide herself with an education in garden design;
- her interstate contemporaries, Walling, Mellor and Brown, who’s design work is held in high regard; and,
- a comparative profile of her local contemporaries.
It was concluded that Cornish was a talented South Australian landscape designer who, mostly worked within Adelaide and its immediate surroundings, in an English Arts and Crafts garden style that was interpreted for Australian conditions and the needs of her clientele. Overlaid upon her stylistic designs was a philosophical understanding of the interconnection between house and garden and for the need for the space to be designed as an intertwined whole. While Cornish's influence was considerable within the socioeconomic group from which her clientele emanated this was reduced but still relevant within the wider community. In terms of Australian garden design historiography, Cornish is as important as other landscape designers of the period, including Edna Walling, Olive Mellor and Jocelyn Brown and deserves a similar degree of recognition and understanding of her work as has been attributed to those designers.
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Chapter One - Introduction

1.1 Relevance of this Thesis

In January 1997 the Australian Heritage Commission published the South Australian section of the nation-wide study into Theoretical Frameworks for Designed Landscapes in Australia. Two of the principal aims of this study were to ‘provide a summary of the history and attributes of designed landscapes in Australia’ and to ‘foster the study of gardens and landscape history’.\(^1\) As a result of this study a number of detailed conclusions and recommendations were made about South Australian gardens and designed landscapes, those pertinent to this thesis included:

- that ‘there is an extensive amount of as yet un-identified designed landscapes in SA’;
- that there is a ‘dearth of knowledge and apprehensiveness to investigate and understand ‘landscapes’; and,
- that what research into gardens and designed landscapes had been conducted was small in comparison with the other states and territories.\(^2\)

Prior to the commissioning of Designed Landscapes in South Australia, R.O. Beames and J.A.E Whitehill had undertaken a survey of some of South Australia’s historic gardens with assistance from the National Trust of South Australia and the Australian Heritage Commission. As a part of that survey the identification of Elsie Marion Cornish as co-designer of the garden at ‘Broadlees’ was made.\(^3\) Jones in his research for Designed Landscapes in South Australia, uncovered further references to gardens designed by Cornish and, recognising her potential relevance as a pivotal Adelaide garden designer during the interwar period, recommended, as a part of that study, the need for further detailed research so as to assess that potential.\(^4\)

While the garden historiography of South Australia is limited, four consequential pieces of research to contribute to that historiography included Roma Hodgkinson’s doctoral thesis The Adelaide Suburban Garden, 1836-1920: A Social and Economic Analysis; Pauline Payne’s doctoral thesis Dr Richard Schomburk and Adelaide Botanic Garden, 1865-1891; Elizabeth Caldicott’s masters thesis Mitcham’s Front Gardens A Study of Changing Garden Styles and Practices in Post War Suburban Adelaide; and, David Jones and Pauline Payne’s Gardens in South Australia 1840-1940: Guidelines for Design and Conservation.

Although the primary focus of Hodgkinson’s thesis was the economic and social aspects of the Adelaide suburban garden, it was necessary for Hodgkinson to ascertain the prevalent design styles for the Adelaide suburban garden between 1836–1920 and to determine the dominant influences upon those styles. Hodgkinson came to the determination that ‘virtually all aspects of garden design in Adelaide – from the large gardens of the wealthy early settlers to the tiny front yards of early...

\(^1\) David Jones, Designed Landscapes of South Australia Theoretical Frameworks for designed Landscapes in Australia South Australian Report, Adelaide, School of Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design The University of Adelaide, 1997, p. 3.

\(^2\) Jones, Designed Landscapes of South Australia, p. 68.


\(^4\) Jones, Designed Landscapes, p. 40.
middle class settlers, can be traced back to John Loudon' and that 'the evolution of
garden design for the rest of the community can be seen essentially as the translation
of the Loudonesque style to the Adelaide environment'. John Claudius Loudon
(1783-1843) was the originator (some argue that he only defined rather than
originated) of the 'informal' style of garden design generally referred to as
Gardenesque; the Gardenesque style was considered one of the three forms of
Landscape Gardening. In essence the Gardenesque style was similar to the
Picturesque Landscapé Gardening. Gardenesque; subject and
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Gardens in South Australia 1840-1940: Guidelines for Design and Conservation is a
stylistic sourcebook for those wishing to conserve and/or design a garden typical of a
particular period, usually as broadly indicated by particular house styles, regional
variation, various historical events such as mine development, and particular housing
developments such as the suburb of Colonel Light Gardens in the 1920s-1930s.
Payne and Jones provided a series of fourteen case studies that exemplified the key
characteristics of the period as encapsulated by each case study. The key
characteristics included: design, circulation, garden furniture, materials and planting
design that was generally comprised of planting lists. Direction to limited primary
and secondary resources enabled the reader to obtain further information about each

---

6 Richard Aitken and Michael Looker (eds), The Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens, South
8 Aitken and Looker, p. 248.
9 Aitken and Looker, p. 248.
10 Elizabeth Margaret Caldicott, 'Mitcham's Front Gardens A Study of Changing Garden Styles and
period if desired. Stylistically there was a preponderance of informally designed suburban and smaller country gardens.\textsuperscript{11}

A variety of research had also been conducted upon a number of individuals that have had an impact on the designed landscape within South Australia. Some of these individuals included: Charles Robinette (1841-1921) horticulturist and groto builder;\textsuperscript{12} George William Francis (1800-1865) first Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden;\textsuperscript{13} Richard Moritz Schomburgk (1811-1891) second Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden;\textsuperscript{14} John Ednie Brown (1848-1899) South Australian Conservator of Forests;\textsuperscript{15} Walter Hervey Bagot (1880-1963) architect and patron of Cornish; Robin Sinclair Hill (1931-) landscape designer and Allan Dale Correy (1931-) landscape architect.\textsuperscript{16} Of these individuals, only Bagot was contemporary with Cornish; the other individuals practised either during the nineteenth or mid to late twentieth centuries. Research into Bagot’s designed landscapes has dealt in detail with his landscape design philosophy, personal gardens and the Master Plan for the University of Adelaide campus.\textsuperscript{17} However, his ledger books record that he did at the very least undertake elements of the built components, of the gardens for a number of members of the prominent Adelaide Verco family.\textsuperscript{18} As Cornish’s patron, he was responsible for facilitating various aspects of her career. Unfortunately, due to the lack of documentary resources, it has not been possible to fully identify or establish the true synthesis of that professional relationship.\textsuperscript{19} It is possible that Cornish and Bagot were Adelaide’s version of the Jekyll-Lutyens partnership.


\textsuperscript{18} W. H. Bagot, ‘Ledger Records 1929-1946’, business ledger books, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, BRG 18/7-16.

\textsuperscript{19} See Section 3.1 and Chapter Seven - Conclusion for further details about Bagot and Cornish’s professional relationship and Cornish’s garden commissions. The lack of documentary resources is due to the loss of nearly all of Cornish’s personal and professional records after her death and the loss of a number of Bagot’s professional records during a fire at his office. Contemporaries of Cornish clearly recollected in interviews with Dr David Jones that Cornish’s house was literally filled with her books, papers and work related materials, to a point where it was difficult to easily move about the house. After her death her brother was apparently responsible for clearing out these materials so as to make the house saleable. While it was possible that some of these records were kept or in the base of books sold, the general consensus seems to have been that most of these papers where thrown away. David Jones, personal communication.
Research into Cornish’s contribution to the garden component of Adelaide’s designed landscapes is therefore pertinent for a number of reasons:

- The period that Cornish’s career encompasses, 1916-1946, coincides almost exactly with the interwar period, a period where Adelaide’s designed landscape historiography is particularly incomplete.
- Cornish designed gardens for a component of society for which there has been exceedingly little analytical research. This lack of research has meant that an apparent redirection in the style of gardens during this period has been not fully realised.
- Cornish’s relevance as a landscape designer, in the same regard as other Australian landscape designers and landscape architects, such as Edna Walling, Jocelyn Brown or Olive Mellor, has not been fully considered or understood.

1.2 Aims and Objectives – Principal Questions

The aims and objectives of this thesis were to conduct a historiographical study of Elsie Marion Cornish and her body of landscape design work so as to determine her contribution as a garden designer, the impact she had upon the garden design culture of Adelaide, and what her relevance was within both a local and national context. In order to interpret and understand Cornish’s contribution and relevance to the garden design culture of Adelaide in particular and, to a lesser extent, Australia it is necessary to undertake a contextual and comparative analysis between her work and that of a number of selected landscape designers or individuals who were in a position to direct landscape design during the interwar period.

To facilitate the achievement of the above aims and objectives, three principal questions are posed.
1. Who was Cornish and where is she positioned within Australian garden design historiography?
2. What was Cornish’s contribution to Adelaide’s landscape design culture?
3. What impact and influence did Cornish have?

1.3 Methodology

The accumulation of pertinent data for the development of this thesis was mainly acquired through ‘unobtrusive’ methods; that is methods that do not intrude upon people. This style of data collection tends ‘to assess actual behaviour as opposed to self-reported behaviour’ and in the context of this thesis included:

- extensive literature searches both written and pictorial;
- topic specific searches of archival records and photographic collections held by various relevant organisations and institutions; and,
- site visits to those gardens that Cornish designed and that still exist albeit often in a modified form.

These methods of data collection are elaborated upon later.

---

The only ‘obtrusive’ technique employed was the conduction of a limited number of personal interviews with individuals whose families had employed Cornish to undertake a variety of garden design commissions. Dr David Jones had identified some of these individuals through the course of his research while others came to light through the course of my own research. These interviews were conducted face to face, over the telephone and through letters with notes being taken throughout. In some cases the interviewees had access to collections of family photographs that they were willing to share.

The research was based on both theoretical and empirical data and was conducted primarily around an ‘ethnographic-inductive design’. Kellehearn describes this as an attempt to ‘understand the commonsense meanings and experiences of the participants of a social system’, it is ‘an attempt to understand the social system from ‘the insider’s ‘point of view’ and ‘from a study of this system...one attempts to develop an explanation about the development, maintenance and salience of certain social processes’. In this instance the gardens themselves and particularly those designed by Cornish are viewed as the ‘social system’ and ‘social processes’; Cornish and her contemporaries are the participants.

As this thesis also seeks to include a biographical component, a number of qualitative historiographical and genealogical research techniques were also employed. Research into Cornish’s background required a thorough study of and search through many of the genealogical or family history resources held at the State Library of South Australia, Births, Deaths and Marriages Office, the Probate registry and St Jude’s Cemetery, Brighton. A comprehensive guide for this type of research has been compiled by the State Library of South Australia as a fact sheet entitled Family History Starter Guide.

A number of selective literature searches were conducted to elucidate and build the various components of this thesis. A background literature search was initially undertaken so as to provide a personal insight into Adelaide’s garden design culture and to ascertain possible areas were potential further research was warranted so as to develop the idea for this thesis. From this approach an extensive literature search of the contemporary local and interstate popular gardening literature was conducted to ascertain prevalent design themes, key elements, designers and plants, of the gardens during the interwar period. In the case of the local literature, this also had the double purpose of potentially uncovering further garden commissions undertaken by Cornish. A literature review of modern texts about the contemporary Australian landscape designers Walling, Mellor and Brown was necessary to supplement the body of written work by those designers within the popular contemporary gardening literature. This also allowed their contextual position within the Australian landscape design historiography to be outlined as had been determined by erudite professionals within the landscape architectural community and allied fields. A further literature review of the gardening texts by local, interstate and international authors, that were available to Cornish, was also necessary so as to provide a background knowledge

---

22 Kellehearn, pp. 8-11, 21.
about possible sources of information that had been potentially influential in
directing her design style.

As the accumulation of information into Cornish’s career grew, it allowed for further
topic specific research to be undertaken at a variety of archival facilities within
Adelaide. Some examples of this included The Advertiser Pictorial Library for
pictorial records of The University of Adelaide Embankment Garden, The Pioneer
Women’s Memorial Garden and The Royal Adelaide Show Model Garden
Competition; The Adelaide City Council Archive for documentary evidence about
the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden; Adelaide University Archive for the
employment records of Cornish and both the archival and South Australiana
databases at the State Library of South Australia.

Site visits to the existing gardens or garden remnants that had been designed by
Cornish facilitated a better understanding of Cornish’s work as a designer as well as
enabling a more complete documentation of those gardens than was possible from
period photographs alone. Unfortunately, this was not possible in all instances as
many of these gardens are still privately owned and the current owners were not
willing to permit access to their gardens.

1.4 Thesis Structure

To answer the principal questions, this thesis was constructed into seven chapters of
which the Introduction and Conclusion form the first and last. Chapter Two details
Cornish’s background history and through a series of well considered and factually
based suppositions outlines her most likely education, introduction to garden design
and the early influences that led her towards a career as a garden designer as well as
the acquisition of the appropriate knowledge to facilitate such a career.

Chapter Three addresses Cornish’s known garden commissions: a description of each
garden is outlined. To create a more detailed picture of Cornish’s design approach
and philosophy, the key built and planting scheme elements of those designs have
been identified and examined in detail. The significance of a series of personal and
professional relationships that had a bearing upon Cornish throughout the course of
her career as a garden designer were also profiled. Suggestions for further potential
garden commissions, but for which there is unfortunately inconclusive proof at this
point in time, have also been made.

Chapters Four and Five provide a contextual and comparative background for the
analysis of Cornish’s work to be undertaken at both national and local levels.
Chapter Four profiles the work of three highly regarded and respected contemporary
landscape designers in Melbourne and Sydney: Edna Walling, Olive Mellor and
Jocelyn Brown. A general overview of each designer’s garden design style and
characteristics has been provided as well as a detailed examination of the key built
and plant components of their designs. The rationale behind their selection is
addressed.

While a study of Walling, Mellor and Brown’s garden designs provide an Australian
context for garden design during this period, it was not necessarily truly
representative of the situation within Adelaide. As such an examination and brief
overview of garden design, locally, was also necessary to provide a local context upon which to conduct a comparison of Cornish’s designs. To provide a balanced overview the work of both a number of prominent horticulturists who contributed to the popular media as well as a number of garden designers or architects that undertook garden design commissions have been assessed in a similar manner to that of Cornish’s interstate contemporaries. Both of these groups tended to typify either an informal or formal approach to garden design depending on their professional inclination towards a horticultural or architectural focus and are the subject matter of Chapter Five.

A detailed analysis of Cornish’s garden designs both as a general overview and broken down into their significant built and plant components is conducted in Chapter Six. These have then been analysed in context with and in comparison to

- the period garden literature to which she had access to provide herself with an education in garden design;
- her interstate contemporaries, Walling, Mellor and Brown; and,
- the selective profile of her local contemporaries.

The conclusions that have been drawn about Cornish as a result of this analysis are detailed in the conclusion, Chapter Seven, where a determination about Cornish’s abilities as a garden designer, her contribution to garden design in Adelaide, her influence and impact and her position within Australian garden design historiography are made.
Chapter Two - Cornish’s Background

2.1 Early Years

Elsie Marion Cornish was born on the 7th January 1870 in the South Australian district of New Glenelg and was the third of eight children born to Samuel Cornish and Agnes Maria Cornish, née Kirkpatrick.1 Cornish spent most of her childhood years living on Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg, with the exceptions of less than a year spent living on Hindley Street, in the City of Adelaide in 1872, and a further period of about one year spent abroad in 1875.2

It was during the overseas journey, upon the ship the ‘St Vincent’ that Cornish’s eldest sister passed away at the age of nine; the first of two of the eight Cornish children to pass away during childhood.3

The Cornish family moved from Glenelg to 178 Childers Street, North Adelaide, either late in 1886 or early 1887. The move was seemingly facilitated by Samuel Cornish’s establishment of his own business in 1885 as a financial, shipping and general agent in premises on Waymouth Street in the city. Prior to the establishment of his own business, Samuel Cornish had undertaken similar work for Harold Brothers based on Todd Street, Port Adelaide. After Samuel Cornish’s death in 1888 the Cornish family moved, for the final time, to 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide; this house would remain Cornish’s home until her own death on 19th October 1946.4

Any details pertaining to Cornish’s education are extremely limited. As basic primary education became a mandatory requirement for all children in South Australia in 1875 Cornish would have received education to at least this level.5 Whether or not Cornish received further or advanced education is unknown although the composition of and references to other literary works within her only known piece of writing suggests this was more than likely. A large number of advanced schools for girls operated during this period, unfortunately only the largest and most successful have had any level of detailed research conducted upon them and Cornish’s name does not appear within these school attendance lists. However, this does not mean that she did not attend one of the many advanced schools for girls that

---

1 Samuel and Agnes Cornish’s other children included Harriet Anne Ethel born on the 4th January 1866; Agnes Lillian born on the 27th June 1868; Arthur Bruce born on the 27th September 1971; Katie Glen born on the 20th March 1874; Florence Hilda born on the 6 August 1876; Alan Tremayne born on the 2nd February 1879 and Samuel Raymond Baron born on the 5 August 1884. ‘South Australian birth registrations 1842 to 1906’ [electronic resource], Adelaide, South Australian Genealogy and Heraldry Society and Macbeth Genealogical Services, 1998.
3 Katie Glen died during infancy passing away at the age of nine months. Katie Glen Cornish, St Jude’s Cemetery, Brighton Road, Brighton South Australia, [grave stone].
have as yet to be researched. A further possibility and a popular option, especially for larger families with a predominance of girls, such as the Cornish family, would be to employ a Governess to provide home tuition. While the content taught to girls either within these advanced schools or by a Governess generally related to refinement and finishing; religion, domestic and social arts being at the top of the curriculum, some did include such subjects as mathematics, botany, Latin, natural sciences and geography, etc. At the very least, such educational possibilities would have established a foundation upon which an intellectually minded young woman could have built.  

Figure 2.1a Elsie Marion Cornish as a young child circa mid 1870s.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish.)

Cornish’s obituary records that she ‘began her gardening career about 1916 in a small way, but gradually developed an interest in landscape gardening...and soon built up a wide private connection in this field.’ This would seem to suggest that Cornish began her career as a ‘jobbing’ gardener before increasing the scope of her business to include the design and subsequent layout of those gardens that she worked upon.

In 1916 Cornish at 46 years old was somewhat advanced in age to begin a career. So why did she wait until 1916 to begin her career? And why did she choose the field of gardening, one that would subsequently lead her to a career as a garden designer? Without personal records it is impossible to accurately establish why she began working in 1916 and why she chose garden design, although it is possible to speculate. Her fathers’ death in 1888 left her mother a single parent with her

---


7 ‘Death of Miss Cornish’, The Advertiser 23 October 1946, p. 12.
youngest child aged four. Cornish, as the eldest surviving unmarried daughter, would most likely have been expected to assist in the care and education of her younger siblings as well as undertake a variety of household duties. Aged only 18 at this point in time it would still also have been realistic for Cornish to have harboured the prospect of marriage and even as the years passed and her marriage prospects waned, Cornish provided her widowed mother with a companion. It seems likely that through her mother Cornish would have enjoyed some degree of financial security the young family most likely supported to a large degree by their relatives. At this stage in Cornish’s life there was no need or probably even any expectation that she would need to contemplate the prospect of employment for either necessity or enjoyment.

By 1916 this scenario had completely changed. Her mother passed away in 1913 leaving Cornish and her only other unmarried female sibling, Florence, in possession of the family home and any further assets that Agnes Cornish may have possessed. Agnes Cornish was explicit in her will to ensure that her estate be left solely to any unmarried daughters so as to provide them with some degree of financial security. When Cornish’s sister Florence died in 1916 she continued the theme established by her mother, leaving Cornish as the sole beneficiary of her estate. With the death of her mother and sister and her now probably non-existent marriage prospects the burden of financial responsibility and security were entirely her own.

Why a career in gardening? Cornish’s interest in gardening and design was probably initiated very early in her life. Hodgkinson in her doctoral thesis The Adelaide Suburban Garden, 1836-1920: A Social and Economic Analysis researched in detail the societal aspects of the suburban garden, particularly the front garden and its role as a moral barometer. The front garden was a ‘powerful status symbol, demonstrating the owner’s standing in society’. The appearance of the front garden was directly

---

8 At the time of his death Samuel Cornish’s estate was sworn to be less than £700. 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide alone cost £750 to purchase suggesting that Agnes Cornish must have received some form of financial support from her relatives. This most likely came from the Kirkpatrick branch of the family including possibly Agnes’ sister Florence who had married into the wealthy Adelaide and Gawler based Duffield family. Samuel Cornish, ‘Last Will and Testament’, will, Probate Registry, n.d. Walkley, p. 1. ‘South Australian marriages, registrations 1842 to 1916’ [electronic resource], Adelaide, South Australian Genealogy and Heraldry Society and Macbeth Genealogical Services, 1998.


10 The value of Agnes Cornish’s estate was valued as not exceeding £1700. Agnes Maria Cornish, ‘Last Will and Testament’, will, Probate Registry, 20 July 1906.

11 The value of Florence’s estate was valued at not more than £998. This sum would have included her half ownership of 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide. What cash reserves this would have left Cornish is unclear but it would seem unlikely to have been much. Florence Hilda Cornish, ‘Last Will and Testament’, will, Probate Registry, 5 January 1914.

12 Cornish’s remaining three siblings were all married at this stage and it would be fair to suggest that it is unlikely that Cornish at the age of 46 after living essentially an independent life would have wished to have been an imposition upon her sister and brothers families. Nor is it likely that she would have relished the loss of independence that such an imposition would have entailed. Cornish’s need to work to support herself was confirmed by Alison Brookman who stated that Cornish was ‘far from well off’ and that she had ‘very little to live on except for her professional work’ as a result she was quite frugal with her money. Louise Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’, personal communication, 20 June 2000.

13 Hodgkinson, p. 189.
linked to the moral character of the owner and acted as ‘his character reference’ if the front garden was well kept then it demonstrated ‘that he understood and practiced prudence, thrift and was always industrious, responsible and dependable.’ If the garden was slovenly then it demonstrated that the occupants of the home were ‘opposed to all the rules of order and cleanliness’. These moral codes were particularly applicable to those of the middle classes amongst which the Cornish family were definitely ranked. The linkage between moral values and gardening was carried further than the home and when basic education became mandatory there were strong campaigns to have it included in the school curriculum. A number of church groups also established floral societies and annual flower shows for the youngest members of their congregations believing that gardening would instil ‘habits of industry, carefulness, patience, neatness and order’ and ‘prevent them from lapsing into idleness, larrikinism and vandalism’ it would give them ‘a sense of social responsibility’. Establishing a set of moral values and an attitude towards gardening, that would be carried throughout life.

In 1887, at the age of 17, Cornish resided at 178 Childers Street, North Adelaide. At the same time the Brown family were in residence at 138 Childers Street and although this seems some distance apart the two families were only actually separated by two houses. John Ednie Brown (1848-1899) was the South Australian Conservator of Forests (1875-1890), he and his wife also had a number of small children the same age as the younger Cornish children suggesting the possibility at the very least of the two families being on familiar terms. Brown was both well versed in the ‘theoretical and practical knowledge of gardensque and picturesque theories in England, Scotland and North America’ and in a ‘position to execute such theories and ideas on a large scale’. Contact with such an erudite individual would have provided Cornish with a more sophisticated level of exposure and insight into the possibilities of the garden and garden design than previously learned throughout her childhood.

By 1916 there had already been more than two decades of considered debate throughout a number of Australian newspapers and journals about the potential for women to ‘take up horticulture’. Many provided encouragement believing that women were well suited to a career in gardening, and in 1899 Burnley Horticultural College in Victoria admitted female students for the first time. Locally, Cornish
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14 Hodkinson, p. 199.
15 Hodkinson, p. 199.
16 Hodkinson, p. 199.
17 When Cornish’s youngest brother the Reverend Samuel Cornish married into the prominent Kyffin Thomas family his wife Florence Gwenth, known as Gwen, was considered to have married beneath herself. Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
19 Sands and McDougall’s South Australian Directory for 1887, p. 44.
22 Up until 1914 women students were only allowed to undertake the theoretical components of the course. Olive Mellor’s successful argument and resourcefulness in 1914 to be allowed full admittance to the course created the opportunity for those that followed to also have access to the complete course. This included such prominent Australian women Garden Designers as Edna Walling and
would have felt enabled to undertake a career in gardening by the success of Coralie Caley Smith. In 1910 Coralie Hill married Fred Smith a seed merchant and nurseryman and joined him in the running of the Specialty Farm or Aldgate Nursery in the Adelaide Hills, almost immediately taking over the 'practical routine work'. Fred Caley Smith passed away in 1913 and Coralie Caley Smith decided to continue operations at the nursery rather than sell her husband’s life work vastly increasing upon her knowledge of horticulture as a result. Further, she undertook the training and employment of three female gardeners stating of their abilities that ‘girls for everything else, except deep cultivation, are infinitely preferable to boys’.

The starting point of Cornish’s career was propitious. With significant numbers of men enlisting to fight in the First World War the ranks of horticulturists and gardeners were depleted providing opportunities for woman to fill these vacancies. Coupled with the seemingly more apparent acceptability of woman gardeners; a diminishing male workforce; her respectable level of horticultural knowledge and practice gained both as a child and through self-education; and family contacts willing to initially employ her, Cornish was enabled in the establishment of her career. The most logical conclusion for a woman of Cornish’s capabilities and need for self-sufficiency appears to have been a career in gardening and garden design.

![Figure 2.1b Elsie Cornish ready for work, probably at 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide.](image)

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish.)


24 White, p. 271. Although possible it is highly unlikely that Cornish was one of the three girls employed by Caley Smith. An image depicting two of the female gardeners clearly shows that Cornish was not either of them, it also shows that they were ‘girls’ or young women and not a mature woman as Cornish would have been at that stage. It is also unlikely that if employed by Caley Smith that she would refer to a woman of Cornish’s years as a girl.

25 Aitken and Looker, p. 629.
2.2 An Education in Horticulture and Design

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there was a vast array of gardening books and journals that Cornish would have had access to to develop a significant knowledge of both horticulture and garden design. While many of these works originated overseas, especially England, there were also Australian and South Australian works that specifically dealt with local conditions. Whilst it is not possible to know exactly which books and journals Cornish used in the acquirement of her knowledge it is possible to detail a number of pertinent works that she would have had access to.

2.2.1 South Australian Sources

Within a local context, there were a number of sources upon which Cornish would have drawn to gain her early horticultural and, to a lesser extent, garden design knowledge. By the 1880s there had been a proliferation of nursery catalogues provided by the many nurseries that flourished in South Australia. While these extensive, elaborate and often illustrated publications mostly contained lists of plants and their most popular cultivars; information pertaining to the cultivation of many of the plants listed as well as extensive planting calendars were also often provided.26

In 1875 Albert Molineux (1832-1909) started the monthly gardening journal the Garden and the Field that provided its subscribers with a variety of horticultural notes mostly pertaining to the cultivation of garden plants and vegetables as well as, to a lesser extent, a variety of related horticultural issues. In 1863 the weekly newspaper The Observer began its garden and agricultural pages, again providing a range of advice on horticultural and allied issues.27 A more detailed account of the type of content of the garden pages from The Observer is covered in Section 5.3.

Two South Australian gardening books were published during the nineteenth century, George McEwin’s The South Australian Vigneron and Gardeners’ Manual and Ernst B. Heyne’s The Fruit, Flower and Vegetable Garden later enlarged and retitled The Amateur Gardener.28

Of these two books The Amateur Gardener was probably the most pertinent to Cornish, and while the content of Heyne’s book was largely horticulturally based, this enlarged edition that was published in 1881 provided a greater content on the flower garden and shrubbery. Limited design advice was contained within its pages, Heyne explaining the generalness of the direction ‘as the situation, the taste of the owner, and many other circumstances must be considered’ in the design of the garden.29 Heyne’s directions for the layout of a garden was in line with and a general advocacy for a modified form of the landscape and gardensque styles of gardening; in that he used their overarching principles but simplified them to be more easily accommodated within the significantly smaller Adelaide garden.30 Carpet bedding and ribbon styles of planting, including a selection of the most appropriate patterns
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26 Hodkinson, pp. 258-265.
28 Hodkinson, pp. 303-305.
30 Heyne, pp. 11, 89-166
and plants to use was slightly more comprehensively detailed; as Heyne was worried that ‘some of our amateurs may not be quite au fait’ with the system that had recently been used to great effect at the Adelaide Botanic Garden.\textsuperscript{31} An extensive gardening calendar and large planting lists and cultivation notes were included.\textsuperscript{32} Interestingly, in reference to the use of evergreen trees and shrubs, Heyne made specific mention of Australian natives stating that ‘many of the native plants of Australia deserve more attention than they have generally received’. A selection of natives was included within the list of evergreen trees and shrubs specified for use in the garden.\textsuperscript{33}

The meticulous nature of the introductory chapter of Heyne’s book would have been a valuable resource for Cornish providing detailed practical information of a how-to nature within a local context, enabling the reader to undertake comprehensive site preparation. A selection of topics included the South Australian climate; soil types; soil preparation; manure; compost; drainage; irrigation; mulching; watering; staking and slugs.\textsuperscript{34}

Cornish could have had access to a further early source of horticultural information through membership of the Gardeners’ Mutual Improvement Society that was established during the 1870s. Apparently a large proportion of the membership joined so as to be able to gain access to the Society’s horticultural and circulating library that was established in 1878. The library contained a number of donated reference books, that could be used within the library and many British journals and periodicals to which the Society subscribed and that could be borrowed.\textsuperscript{35}

In addition to the above written sources there were two main and widely accessible corporeal avenues that would have widened Cornish’s knowledge base. During the second half of the nineteenth century there was a proliferation of various horticultural and floricultural society shows offering a wide variety of displays. Floricultural shows were particularly popular and were also often viewed as ‘socially acceptable meeting places’ especially for the young, providing a social aspect as well as a horticultural one.\textsuperscript{36}

The second avenue was the Adelaide Botanic Garden ‘from which many new ideas could be absorbed by the visiting public’.\textsuperscript{37} The Botanic Gardens, developed in a landscape style, was a valuable resource for the public of Adelaide as ‘it rejected a purely economic approach’ and allowed for ‘the ornamental aspect of gardening’ to be ‘fully appreciated’.\textsuperscript{38} It became so influential ‘that it was cited as a model to demonstrate the design and planting of shrubs and flowers in the home garden’.\textsuperscript{39} Through its first four directors, the Botanic Garden physically introduced a range of trends in Adelaide garden design including ribbon borders; lawn; an integrated use of a variety of plant materials, in concert to create a more floriferous garden; the use of

\textsuperscript{31} Heyne pp. 94-6.
\textsuperscript{32} Heyne, pp. 11, 89-166
\textsuperscript{33} Heyne, pp. 97-8.
\textsuperscript{34} Heyne pp. 1-15.
\textsuperscript{35} Hodgkinson, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{36} Hodgkinson, p. 278.
\textsuperscript{37} Hodgkinson, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{38} Hodgkinson, p. 286.
\textsuperscript{39} Hodgkinson, p. 289.
palms; and various specific flower fashions such as the dahlia, fuchsia and pelargonium. This influence also extended into the Adelaide Park Lands and Municipal grounds with greater emphasis being placed upon their beautification.40

2.2.2 Australian and International Sources

In lieu of any specific knowledge about Cornish’s own library of gardening and garden design books, a selection from two pertinent Adelaide collections of period gardening and garden design books have been used to establish a representative collection of relevant literary materials that Cornish would have had access to. These include the garden library of Chief Justice and Lieutenant Governor Sir Samuel James Way and the collection of the State Library of South Australia. Both of these sources were selected, as they were readily accessible to the public.

The garden library of Way was donated to the Barr Smith Library at the University of Adelaide after his death in 1916, most of the books passing into the University Library collection circa 1917.41 Each of the books donated by Way contained a bookplate designating each book as being *ex libris* of Sir Samuel James Way. They were also stamped with a ‘Library of the University of Adelaide’ identification stamp, with the date that each book entered the collection added by hand, in ink, within the middle of the stamp. Way’s residence ‘Montefiore’ was located at the end of Palmer Place, North Adelaide, and was noted for its large beautiful grounds laid out in the Gardenesque style.42 Cornish would have been familiar with this garden and may possibly have had access to Way’s collection of gardening and garden design books before they were donated to the University; she certainly would have been able to access them once they were a part of the University collection.

Similarly to the University Library, the State Library of South Australia used a stamp identification system upon their books entering within the stamp, by hand, in ink the date that the book entered the collection. Beyond these two library collections, Cornish would also have likely had access to the Libraries of the Waite sisters and Bagot. As both of these collections remained private it is not possible to accurately determine their contents. However, it is known that the Waite’s definitely possessed copies of some of Jekyll’s books and that the Bagot library was extensive and diverse in its collection.43

The information presented within the contents of these books ranged across a diverse knowledge of design and horticulture that was covered in differing degrees of detail. The various authors of these works also provided some elements of philosophy and history. From a design perspective, these works presented Cornish with the two

---

40 Hodgkinson, pp. 279-295.
41 Way was a prominent South Australian and amongst his many interests and activities he became the South Australian Chief Justice in 1876 as well as the Vice Chancellor of the University of Adelaide from 1876-1883 and then its Chancellor until his death in 1916. His gardening books formed only a minority of the 15000 volumes, that he left to the University of Adelaide Library. Percival Serle, ‘Australian Dictionary of Biography’, Project Gutenberg of Australia <http://gutenberg.net.au/dictbio/0-dict-biogWa.html> (Accessed 26 January 2006).
prominent styles of garden design during the period: the informal and the formal as well as the spectrum of possibilities anywhere in between.

2.2.2.1 Books from the State Library of South Australia
Although the State Library of South Australia contained numerous volumes of gardening and garden design books, only those that could be considered to have potential relevance to Cornish and that were in the collection sufficiently early enough within her career have been considered. Of particular relevance were those books that dealt primarily with the design of either small or suburban gardens. With the exception of Agar below, the important aspects of these works and their influence upon Cornish are considered in context with the analysis of her designs in Chapter Six.

North American Landscape Architect Madeline Agar’s Garden Design in Theory and Practice entered the public collection in March 1917 and of all of the literature reviewed, outside of the design style presented, is the most comprehensive and valuable work that Cornish could have consulted in lieu of undertaking formal landscape architectural training. This text would have been pivotal in providing Cornish with the requisite information to undertake a career in design; its influence upon Walling is also obvious throughout the text. In Section 3, entitled Preparation of the Design, Agar comprehensively deals with the practical and technical aspects involved in undertaking comprehensive site analysis. Exacting instructions, calculations and worked examples were provided so as to enable the reader to survey a site using triangulation and determine levels using either a straight edge and spirit level or dummy and then accurately plot this information onto the plan.

The section is continued with an itemised list of the essential draughting tools, Agar describing each implement, its purpose and how to properly use it, including a description of various drawing techniques. The various requisite components of a plan such as the scale, title and compass, etc, were detailed, with instructions on the best methods for their execution and placement upon the plan. This was followed by instructions on the use of watercolours to provide colour detail and finishing touches such as the signature block and decorative ruled framing of the plan. Information on staging the work and dealing with and what to present the client, such as the acceptance of concept plans before undertaking detailed design and how to estimate costs was also addressed. Only after all of these preliminary considerations had been appropriately considered did Agar allow for the detailed ‘working out of the design’.

In Section 4, entitled Structural, Agar detailed the basic structural components of the garden including: paths, edging, terraces, stairs, walls, treillage, garden furniture and drainage. The fundamental design principles related to these aspects of the garden were covered, followed by advice in relation to materials, construction, dimensions, proportions, etc. Thereafter the elemental constituents of the garden were related before Agar moved onto what she considered to be The Component Parts of a
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Garden, in Section 5, that related to the design of: The Approach, Kitchen Garden and Orchard, Water, The Rose Garden, Rock and Wall Gardens, Wild Garden, Iris Garden, Other Specialised Gardens and Recreation Grounds and Public Parks.48

Section 6, titled Planting, covered: The Use of Flowers, Preparation of Planting Plans, Shrubbery and Tree Planting, Avenues, Hedges, Grass, Boundaries and Privacy. Agar was explicit in that her work was about design not horticultural considerations and as such this section is a dissemination on colour, texture, scale and form; plant grouping for harmony and contrast; and the appropriate placement within the garden of various plant materials for both aesthetic and practical requirements.49

While most of the design information presented by Agar was specific to larger gardens than those designed by Cornish, the basic premise of the information was still readily applicable. Agar did however; include a small section on Small Gardens finding that such a garden presented ‘characteristic difficulties’.50 These difficulties included the dominance of the boundary fence, the house and neighbouring houses, the often disproportion of the width to length of the block, and the ‘usually nondescript style’ of the house that ‘in no way’ provided ‘a source of inspiration’.51 Agar’s suggested treatment for such sites was to compartmentalise the garden with approximately two thirds of the garden being reserved near the house for pleasure gardens and the remaining third for the utility area. Such gardens were to be simply treated, and designed in a geometrical manner with broad paths and expanses of lawn. It was the ‘severe line’ and inescapability of the boundary fence that determined the geometrical manner of the design; Agar stating that ‘the wise designer accepts it as a characteristic feature and makes use of it’.52 In small gardens Agar believed that the planting scheme deserved ‘special attention’ and advocated the use of a ‘well-thought-out colour scheme’ as this would distract the viewer from the poor surroundings.53 However, she was careful to state that the design of the garden was still more important than the planting scheme in the same way that the use of more colour could not ‘atone for bad drawing in a picture’.54 The influence of Agar and other pertinent works held by the State Library of South Australia are more fully explored in Chapter Six.

2.2.2.2 Books from Sir Samuel Way’s collection Bequeathed to the Barr Smith Library

Those volumes of Way’s collection of gardening books, that contained a design component, presented the spectrum of views that pertained primarily to the school of thought surrounding the informal style of garden design, with the exception of only a few volumes.55 The design of Way’s own garden confirmed an obvious predisposition for this style of gardening. Included amongst the titles were three Australian works: Australian Plants Suitable for Gardens, Parks, Timber Reserves,
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etc by WR Guilfoyle; *The Flower Garden in Australia* by Mrs Rolf Boldrewood, and; *The Principles of Gardening for Australia* by C. Bogue Luffman.

Guilfoyle’s book contained little practical design advice of relevance to Cornish; rather the work is a treaty for the planting of Australian native plants within the garden and throughout the wider landscape. Guilfoyle’s opinion of Australian native plants was that ‘Taken as a whole, no vegetation on the face of the earth, ..., is so varied and beautiful as that of Australia.’\(^5\) He felt that part of the reason that natives were overlooked as a garden plant was that we failed to stop and admire them due to their plentifulness and the perception that they could be difficult to grow. As a result Guilfoyle was worried that many native plants would become extinct as bushland was cleared. Their difficulty of growth was attributed to the poor collection techniques employed when they were taken from the bush and transplanted into the garden. To mitigate plant losses exact instructions on how to transplant specimens from the bush were given; an action, that would be considered somewhat at odds with conservation management practices today.\(^5\) From Cornish’s perspective, this work provided invaluable lists of native plants suitable for cultivation in the home garden. Guilfoyle provided a description of the plant, its height, flower colour and habitat type; numerous illustrations were also included.\(^5\)

*The Flower Garden in Australia* was an experiential text compiled by Mrs Rolf Boldrewood, the pen name of Margaret Maria Browne. Essentially a series of garden calenders and plant lists, it provided Cornish with a list of plants that had been found to grow readily in Australian conditions. Boldrewood’s plant lists also specified colour of leaf and flower, texture, form, contrast potential, suggested best use, eg carpet bedding, herbaceous border, etc; as well as providing basic horticultural notes and recommended cultivars. A variety of natives, succulents and ornamental grasses were included amongst the more usual types of plants. The design advice although limited appears to be of an informal nature the garden composed from ‘Lawns, shrubberies, walks, and flower-beds’, the flowerbeds were to be long and broad, which allowed for a mixed planting. Ribbon borders and carpet bedding were considered ‘most attractive’ so long as the designs were ‘well carried out and the colours artistically blended’.\(^5\)

From a design perspective the most valuable of these Australian works was C. Bogue Luffman’s *The Principles of Gardening for Australia*. Luffman was the principal at the Burnley School of Horticulture between 1897 and 1908 and was responsible for the admittance of women to the student body.\(^6\) While Luffmann personally favoured gardens in the informal mode, ‘personally I like best those gardens which come nearest to the finest expression of nature’, he realised and advocated that as a gardener he could not adhere to a single style.\(^6\) Luffman believed that the climate and the architectural style of the house were the ‘two great governing factors in all
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garden schemes'. The first two chapters of the book outlined the basic styles of domestic architecture and the fundamental garden design components that he considered the most suitable for each particular architectural style. The architecture of the house needed to be reflected within the garden. But whether the design of the garden was based on 'a few trees and shrubs to perfect its shape and interest at all seasons', or a myriad of architectural features that could assist in finishing the house and garden, Luffman pleaded that we put 'shape, strength, character, protection and permanence into our work'. To that effect a study of the climate and its effects upon garden, house and individual were essential if the design of the garden were to be successful. The chapters on the practical work of making a garden, the selection and arrangement of permanent plants and garden management would have been relevant to Cornish in her role as gardener.

Three other salient points from Luffman that appear to have guided Cornish were:

- the importance of the gardener and architect working together;
- a redirection in focus from expenditure of money and effort in making show piece gardens that the public appreciated but which in reality provided little actual useable space for the occupants; 'The garden is to be seen from within, not from without, hence the architect and gardener should be in no way anxious to show their handiwork to the passing crowd.' and;
- 'Those who would garden well must study architecture, landscape painting, history, and climate, as it affects man, buildings, and plants. Even romance will help a little, for it is story and atmosphere which we long to fling around every home.'

As previously stated, the degree of any formal schooling or study that Cornish may have undertaken is unknown. However, she did have two family members who did have formal training and who may have been able to provide her with guidance in relation to the study of art and architecture. Lawrence Hotham Howie (1876-1963) was a student, teacher and finally the Principal of the South Australian School of Arts and Crafts and Guy St John Makin (1879-1970) was an architect, both were Cornish’s cousins and it appears that these branches of the family were reasonably close to the Cornish family. Although older than both of her cousins, the age difference was not great; Howie and Makin were respectively six and nine years her
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junior. The professional relationship between Cornish and Makin is discussed in Chapter Three.

The influence of the British Arts and Crafts movement in Adelaide was significant and extended across most artistic pursuits within Adelaide including domestic and church architecture and interiors, painting, hard and soft furnishings and the decorative arts. The period of this influence was extensive beginning in the late nineteenth century and continuing well into the 1930s. The School of Design as the South Australian School of Arts and Crafts was known before 1916, ran a number of part-time design courses that ‘were frequently a middle-class recreational pursuit’. This was probably partially explained by the interest in and directed focus towards the teaching of the crafts. Combined with an emphasis on design and drawing as it was, ‘the belief that all art and design derives from sound drawing’, a number of the artists who studied at the School were able to produce a range of designs for the variety of crafts produced at the School: Howie was one of those artists. Howie attended the School of Design as a student, and then teacher between 1890 and 1915, and was the Principal between 1920 and 1941. Through Howie, Cornish would have been exposed to art theory and the Arts and Crafts discourse, may have had access to the resources acquired by and magazine produced by The School of Design Art Club, as well as possible conversation and debate with the Art Club’s membership that was unusually drawn from both the staff and student bodies.

The remainder of the relevant works owned by Way fall into two broad categories with some blurring between the categories; these include design and planting. From the perspective of design, those works that related to the informal school of design did not directly influence Cornish’s design style per se. However, some of the ideas related in those works do appear within her gardens. These ideas are explored in Chapter Six.

Those books that primarily dealt with planting were more influential, especially the works of Gertrude Jekyll. Way’s collection of Jekyll included: Home and Garden, Wood and Garden and Colour in the Flower Garden. Combined with the two further volumes Gardens for Small Country Houses and Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens, probably possessed by the Waite sisters, Cornish’s exposure to the ideas of this one particular designer was substantial. Jekyll’s writings on colour in relation to the perspective of an artist and her descriptions of her own craft projects would have been in sympathy with Cornish’s exposure to the Arts and Crafts movement in Adelaide through Howie. Cornish’s use of colour in the garden, wall and rock
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gardens and a number of the architectural features used at ‘Broadlees’ can be directly attributed to a study of Jekyll’s works; see Chapters Three and Six. The influence of Jekyll and the other pertinent works from Way’s garden library are more fully explored in Chapter Six.
Chapter Three – Cornish’s Gardens

3.1 Introduction

In her thirty-year career as a landscape designer, Cornish can be conclusively associated, to varying degrees, with the design and construction of twelve Adelaide Gardens. These include:

- ‘Holmfield’, South Terrace, Adelaide,
- ‘Broadlees’, Waverley Ridge Road, Crafers,
- Wilcox residence, Brougham Place, North Adelaide,
- Darling residence, Palmer Place, North Adelaide,
- Seven Model Gardens at the Royal Adelaide Show, Goodwood Road, Wayville,
- University of Adelaide, Lower Grounds, North Terrace, Adelaide,
- ‘Eringa’, Northgate Street, Unley Park,
- ‘Glannant’, Dequetteville Terrace, Kent Town,
- ‘Stangate’, Fenchurch Road, Aldgate,
- ‘Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’, King William Road, Adelaide,
- Darian Smith residence, Barnard Street, North Adelaide, and
- Cornish’s own garden, Palmer Place, North Adelaide.

Interestingly, the majority of these known commissions were undertaken during the late 1920s and early 1930s. The exceptions being ‘Stangate’, ‘Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’, and the Darian Smith residence; these three gardens date from the late 1930s and early 1940s, with the University Lower Grounds and Cornish’s own garden both evolving over a period of decades. This leaves a ten-year gap between the acknowledged beginning of her career as a landscape designer and her first known garden commission.1 There is also a perceived reduction in the number of garden commissions in the last ten years of her career. This later circumstance can partially be explained to some extent by Cornish’s age and other commitments, such as the annual Flower Day event.2 In addition to Cornish’s known commissions, there are a number of gardens that her contemporaries possibly thought she might have been involved with, but were uncertain about. Cornish had both professional and social relationships with at least two well-known and respected Adelaide architects, and family connections to the Adelaide social elite. Some of her known work flowed directly from these sources. Cornish’s abilities as a landscape designer were highly regarded. Some individuals of Adelaide society considered her to be the only person practising in this field in Adelaide, though this was blatantly not the case.3 Her obituary in The Advertiser records her as being ‘responsible for the design and care
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1 ‘Death of Miss Elsie Cornish’, p. 12.
2 Cornish was a part of the organising committee for the annual National Flower Day event held on the 19th-20th April 1938 and 13th-14th April 1939. Cornish prepared a non-competitive miniature garden depicting the dormouse from AA Milne for the 1938 event and her contemporary Herbert S Hartshorne designed the Public Service Association scheme that was laid out to cover the whole of Victoria Square in 1939. The Event was suspended during the Second World War and appears to have been held intermittently throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s. It is most likely that this Event was instigated as a result of the popularity and success of the floral schemes and decorations created during the State’s centenary celebrations in 1936. Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 443 of 1938, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 3619 of 1938.
3 Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
of many of the city’s most beautiful gardens. Therefore, it would be logical to assume that there is a high probability of there being a significant number of other undocumented garden commissions, undertaken by Cornish, within the Adelaide and Adelaide Hills areas.

Cornish had a long-standing social and professional association with prominent Adelaide architect, Walter Hervey Bagot; although exactly how this relationship originated is unclear. It seems most likely that the Bagot and Cornish families first developed a social relationship through their association with Christ Church, Palmer Place, North Adelaide. The Bagot’s resided in nearby Kingston Terrace, North Adelaide and Cornish at 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide. Both Cornish and Bagot’s mother Lucy Josephine née Ayers and sister Margaret regularly attended services and were involved with a variety of charitable works at this church. The beginnings of a professional relationship between Bagot and Cornish might also have begun to transpire as a direct result of their individual involvements with the Church; Cornish, through her work on the Church grounds, and Bagot, through his position as the Church Architect. The social and professional relationship between Bagot and Cornish was further strengthened and enhanced through the marriage of Cornish’s youngest brother, the Reverend Samuel Raymond Baron Cornish to Florence Gwyneth Kyffin Thomas. Gwen Cornish provided Bagot with advice and guidance for one of his trips to Italy and joined the Bagot party in Florence. This tentative professional relationship developed into a more definitive one. Bagot was known for ‘his quiet advocacy for the work of Elsie Cornish’, and his sister, Margaret Bagot distinctly remembered the two working together and believed that Bagot would have recommended her to many of his clients. Of Cornish’s known garden commissions, Bagot was architecturally involved with three and was either probably or directly responsible for Cornish actually attaining two of those commissions; the former at ‘Broadlees’ and the later, the University of Adelaide’s, Lower Grounds. Bagot was a highly respected architect and member of Adelaide society and although some of his referrals towards Cornish could be considered to be gentlemanly philanthropy, he would not have supported her work or recommended her to his clients if he did not

4 ‘Death of Miss Elsie Cornish’, p. 12.
5 Dr David Jones, conducted a number of interviews with both Bagot’s wife and sister during the late 1990s, neither woman could recall how Cornish and Bagot met.
genuinely respect and believe that she possessed a talent for landscape design, and perhaps similar shared design affinities.

Cornish was distantly related to prominent Adelaide architect Guy St John Makin through her mother and seems to have also had a social relationship with both Makin and his wife Louisa. Both acted as witness signatories to her will.\(^1\) It would have been unusual for Cornish to have involved people in such a personal transaction if she was not closely associated with them. It is also just as unlikely that both Guy and Louisa Makin would have agreed to being signatories without there being some form of friendship between themselves and Cornish. The relationship between the Cornish and Makin families seems to extend back to their respective parents.\(^1\) The extent of any formal professional relationship between Cornish and Makin, like that between Cornish and Bagot is unknown. However, Makin was responsible for the design and construction of one of the houses for which Cornish was commissioned for the design of the garden; that of the Darian Smith residence at 117 Barnard Street, North Adelaide. Although it is possible that Makin recommended Cornish to renowned Adelaide photographer Douglas Darian Smith, it is more probable that Darian Smith was already aware of Cornish’s work from his various photographic commissions. Darian Smith respected Cornish’s work as a garden designer.\(^1\) It is probable, at the very least, that the Makins’ recommended Cornish’s work socially to their peers, even if there was not a professional association between Makin and Cornish.

Although not considered a part of the Adelaide social elite, Cornish was extremely well connected to it through family, social and professional associations. Some of her earliest known commissions were a direct result of family connections and included ‘Holmfield’ for the Reid’s, ‘Eringa’ for Sir Sidney and Lady Kidman, and ‘Glamant’ for the Harvey’s. These early commissions, allowed Cornish the opportunity to develop her career and hone her skills in relative safety. More importantly these gardens were an advertisement to the rest of Adelaide’s social elite exhibiting her design style and quality of workmanship. After her involvement with the garden at ‘Broadlees’ the Waite sisters lent their continual support to Cornish throughout the rest of her career, particularly with the use of succulent plants within her planting schemes.\(^1\) The combined support of the Waite sisters and Bagot’s wife, Helen Bagot née Bakewell, poses the possibility that a number of probable commissions were undertaken at properties along Waverley Ridge Road, in Crafers conceivably enabled through family connections and in surrounding localities in the Adelaide Hills.\(^1\)

Lady Zara Hore-Ruthven, later Lady Gowrie, the garden-loving wife of the South Australian Governor (1928-1934), highly regarded Cornish’s abilities as a Landscape Gardener. She expressed this point in a letter to Adelaide Miethke ‘What Luck that


\(^{13}\) ‘The Late Mr, Samuel Cornish’, The Observer 29 October 1887, pp. 33-4.

\(^{14}\) Louise Bird, ‘Interview with Pamela Savage’, personal communication, 8 November 2001. Pamela Savage, D. Darian Smith’s daughter, stated that her father held Cornish’s abilities as a garden designer in high regard.

\(^{15}\) David Jones, ‘Interview with Margaret Bagot’, personal communication, 14 July 1998.

we have an Elsie Cornish in S (sic) Australia." It is probable that Cornish advised Lady Hore-Ruthven on the modifications that she undertook within the gardens at the Government House Domain in Adelaide. Of particular note is the alternating row of Jacaranda, *Jacaranda mimosifolia*, and Illawarra Flame trees, *Brachychiton acerifolius*, along the western boundary of the Domain. Cornish replicated this pattern within the planting scheme for the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden. Although no longer residing in Adelaide during the problematic construction of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, Lady Hore-Ruthven, by now Lady Gowrie, lent Cornish her full support writing of the garden after a visit to Adelaide:

*I really am thrilled with the Women’s Pioneer garden I think it will be a gem when finished. I like the proportions so much and all the thought and imagination which is being so perfectly fulfilled.*

It was Lady Hore-Ruthven who conceived the idea for a Model Gardens Competition at the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society Show in Wayville. Cornish subsequently regularly competed and was a strong advocate for the rights of the exhibitors, a position she undertook with Lady Hore-Ruthven’s support, and was responsible for many improvements to the Model Competition site. The popularity of the Competition with visitors to the annual Show and its strong coverage in the popular press gave Cornish and her designs wide exposure within the Adelaide community.

The significant social and professional support that Cornish received as a landscape designer would have translated into numerous garden commissions. In addition to her twelve known commissions there are a number that have not been included within this document due to either a lack of conclusive evidence to link Cornish to the gardens, or because of insufficient documentation of the garden. Through her known garden commissions, Cornish can be inextricably linked to other architects and architectural firms, landscape professionals and other members of Adelaide society; all proffer the possibility of further commissions.

Some of these possibilities include:
- either a complete or partial garden for Lady Duncan, 170 Greenhill Road, Parkside;21
- unknown aspects of the garden at ‘Five Oaks’, Waverley Ridge Road, Crafers;
- unknown aspects of the garden at ‘The Chestnuts’, Waverley Ridge Road, Crafers;22
- aspects of the grounds at Christ Church, Palmer Place, North Adelaide;23
- possibility of advice, if not involvement in Bishops Court, Palmer Place, North Adelaide;

19 Gowrie, ‘Adelaide Laetitia Miethke’.
20 See Section 3.6.1
22 Jones, Interview with Helen Bagot.
involvement in a variety of gardens in the Adelaide Hills in Crafers, Stirling and Aldgate;
- a possible sunken garden at 14 Robe Terrace, Medindie;
- any number of unknown gardens for clients and friends of the Bagot’s;
- any number of unknown gardens for clients or friends of the Makins’;
- any number of unknown recommendations from Lady Hore-Ruthven and a probable involvement with the modifications to the gardens at Government House, Adelaide, between 1928-1932;
- possibility of unknown commissions through architect E. McMichael;
- recommendations from the Harvey’s, Reid’s, Duffield’s and Kidman’s;
- recommendations from her sister-in-law Gwen Cornish, née Kyffin Thomas; and,
- support and recommendations from her father’s business associates and other well connected family members.

Cornish’s garden designs contextually correspond with the framework of interwar garden designs that were undertaken throughout Australia during this period; especially those undertaken by an increasing number of professional women practitioners. Cornish appears to have been strongly influenced by a range of Arts and Crafts and Edwardian garden ideas and ideals, especially the works of Gertrude Jekyll, adapting them to suit the Adelaide climate. Bagot, through his close working relationship with Cornish was probably instrumental in fostering that understanding. The Italianophile, Bagot ‘believed that the simplicity of Italian domestic architecture and of English Georgian offered the best model for SA’s Mediterranean climate.’

He also had a rich ‘understanding of the need to design a seamless building and garden, and how to craft a garden appropriate for this style.’ Many of the houses associated with Cornish’s known garden commissions can be classified as possessing Neo-Georgian stylistic characteristics. While many of her garden designs demonstrated Bagot’s firm beliefs and influence that often saw an integration of these ideas into her work.

The following chapter is a detailed examination of Cornish’s known garden commissions and includes for each garden:
- a brief history and description;
- the identification of key design elements; and,
- the identification and relevance of the planting scheme to the design.

Contextual and subjective analysis of Cornish’s garden designs and a more comprehensive examination of the external influences upon her work are detailed in Chapter Six.

---

3.2 ‘Holmfield’

3.2.1 ‘Holmfield’ History and Description

The garden at ‘Holmfield’ was one of Cornish’s earliest commissions and was owned by her relatives, Mr and Mrs Sidney Reid. The Reid’s house was a blue-stone villa and garden occupying an acre on the east side of St John Lane off South Terrace, Adelaide. It is unclear how much of this garden Cornish designed. Surviving photographs of the now-demolished site solely focus on the house, outbuildings and tennis court, making it difficult to assess Cornish’s influence.27 Joan Hopkins, daughter of the Reids, clearly remembers Cornish being employed by her parents to undertake regular garden maintenance circa 1930.28 However, it is probable that Cornish began working in this garden well before 1930, her relatives being instrumental in assisting her to establish her career.

A photograph taken of the front of the house in 1888 clearly shows a semi-circular dirt carriage drive, with a row of mostly mature, mixed specimen trees planted along its southern side. Further mature trees are visible behind the house.29 See Figure 3.2.1a. The only design work that Joan Hopkins can accurately remember Cornish undertaking was the construction of a circular seat of unspecified design around a large magnolia, Magnolia grandiflora, in the front of the garden. The magnolia, Magnolia grandiflora, still exists behind the first row of town houses on South Terrace; however, the seat has been removed.

Figure 3.2.1a ‘Holmfield’, 1888.
(Source: State Library of South Australia B 21532)

26 Sidney Reid was the son of wealthy merchant Malcolm Reid. Mrs Sidney Reid was the daughter of Sir Sidney and Lady Kidman, owners of ‘Eringa’, where Cornish designed and built a sunken garden and paved area adjacent to the Portico.
27 The house, outbuildings, tennis court and most of the garden, with the exception of a number of mature trees, were raised to accommodate the construction of 32 town houses, circa 1980s.
28 Bird, ‘Interview with Joan Hopkins’, 1 May 2000. Louise Bird, ‘Interview with Joan Hopkins’, personal communication, 19 June 2000. Joan Hopkins currently owns ‘Dulwich House’, Dulwich, where she and her husband Neil have developed a 0.4 hectare garden over the last 60 years. The plan and pictures of this garden show no obvious influence of Cornish on its design; however, this is not unexpected, as Joan Hopkins attributes much of their gardens design to her husband. Wendy Joyner and Cas Middlemas, ‘An Adelaide Garden: Dulwich House’, Australian Garden History 15, 5, 2004, pp. 9-14.
29 ‘South Terrace, Holmfield’ [photograph], State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 21532.
Images taken of the front of the house in 1972 indicate that both the house and garden had been extensively modified at some point during the early twentieth century. The magnolia, *Magnolia grandiflora*, is only peripherally visible, making it impossible to determine if the seat still remained at this time. There was a large mature tree and shrub border along the western boundary of the property. The drive and remaining front garden had been converted to an expanse of lawn. The trees that originally bordered the drive were removed, as had many of the mature specimens originally visible at the rear of the house. A number of potted hydrangeas, *Hydrangea* spp, were arranged against the eastern half of the front façade and a small shrub border planted in front of the verandah on the western half.\(^{30}\) See Figure 3.2.1b.

The image of the derelict tennis court indicated the planting of tree and shrub borders around each side. There was also what possibly appears to be a short pergola-like structure attached to the fence mid-way along one of the longer flanks of the court. Climbers grown on the open frame wire and galvanised pipe structure would have provided shelter from under which to view the game.\(^{31}\) See Figure 3.2.1c.

\(^{30}\) 'South Terrace' [photograph], State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 27163. 'South Terrace' [photograph], State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 27164.

\(^{31}\) 'South Terrace, North Side' [photograph], State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 27169.
Although it is impossible to conclusively prove at this stage that Cornish was responsible for the modifications to the front garden or the planting of the tennis court surrounds, some elements are indicative of her other gardens. The tree and shrub border and adjoining expanse of lawn were reminiscent of similar plantings at the Darling residence and fulfilled the same purpose - the creation of privacy and seclusion. The pot design is typical of those used in her other gardens, and while the hydrangeas, Hydrangea spp, are a period-typical planting for south-facing gardens, Cornish regularly used these plants in her designs. It would also seem likely that she was responsible for the planting of the tennis court surrounds and possibly the construction of the pergola-like structure.

3.3 ‘Broadlees’

3.3.1 ‘Broadlees’ History and Description

The garden at ‘Broadlees’ was developed in three distinct phases: the first, 1900-24 during the ownership of Sir George Brookman; the second, 1924-56 during the ownership of the Misses Waite; and the third, post-1956. It was at the beginning of this second phase of development that Cornish designed this garden in collaboration with Eva Waite and the Waite’s Head Gardener, Ken Mosel. Located on the side of a hill, this garden was primarily composed of slopes and terraces, the flattest space being retained for the Bagot-designed Neo-Georgian house, built for the Waite sisters during the mid 1920s.

The first phase of ‘Broadlees’ development laid the foundation for the future garden. Brookman undertook considerable earthworks that enabled the construction of a number of paths and planted most of the perimeter trees that would later form the background for Cornish’s terrace gardens. Brookman also constructed the broad path, which traversed the slope from ridge to valley and built a small stone bridge at its base. Cross-paths and flights of stone stairs connected the house site with the slope to the northeast, the future site of the main terrace gardens. The drive and an access path leading from the drive to a garden shed were also constructed during this period.

Brookman’s original intention for the garden is unclear. He did, however, plant a substantial collection of trees, including the alternating row of lime, Tilia spp, and silver birch, Betula pendula, that lined the top section of the broad path. Brookman was responsible for planting the tulip trees, Liriodendron tulipifera, Canadian redwood, Sequoia sempervirens, Lambert cypress, Cupressus macrocarpa, and oaks, Quercus spp. There is some debate as to whether the blue cedars, Cedrus atlantica ‘Glaucua’, and Cryptomeria spp, also date from this period; possibly they were planted during the Waite’s ownership of the property. Brookman planted the site of

32 ‘Broadlees’ is located on Waverley Ridge Road, Crafers.
the future terrace gardens as an orchard; of this original planting only a row of persimmon trees, *Diospyros* spp, located below the second terrace were retained.36

The Waite sisters, Lily and Eva, purchased ‘Broadlees’ on the 27th May 1924, with the assistance of their benefactor, Sir Walter Young.37 Of the two sisters Eva was the one who was passionate about gardening and landscape design. Walter Bagot, a personal friend of the sisters and principal architect of the prominent Adelaide firm Woods Bagot, was commissioned to design the house, buildings and associated works during 1924-5.38 Wells attributed the influence of William Hardy Wilson’s *Early Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania (Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania)* to Bagot’s design for the house.39 While this might be true, Bagot was already a strong proponent for designs modelled on domestic Italian and English Georgian architecture, coalescing and publishing his ideas well before Wilson’s book was published in 1924.40 The house itself was completed in 1926.41

It is likely that Cornish and Eva Waite would have begun to plan and design the main terrace and house gardens while the house was being built. The Waite sisters employed Ken Mosel (1903-1971) some time during this period; Mosel was definitely in their employ by 1926, as the sisters presented him with a copy of Jekyll and Weavers’ *Gardens for Small Country Houses* as a Christmas gift in that year.42 Beames and Whitehill describe this garden as ‘*the only one in South Australia which is known to have been based on the design principles of Gertrude Jekyll.*’43 Eva Waite particularly admired Jekyll’s work and both *Wall and Water Gardens* and *Some English Gardens* have been attributed as providing inspiration for the ‘Broadlees’ garden.44 Further external influences for the garden included a tour of English gardens by the Waite sisters, between February 1923 and January 1925, the most inspirational being those designed by Jekyll and John Morant’s ‘Brockenhurst’, the latter of which the sisters visited.45 While it is unknown if Cornish ever had the opportunity to physically visit these gardens herself, she did have access to the same

---

36 Beames and Whitehill, p. 11, Wells, ‘Broadlees, Waverley Ridge, Crafers’, pp. 1, 5. Cedric Wells, great-nephew by marriage, and owner of ‘Broadlees’ after 1954, in his unpublished history of the house and garden, dates the *Cedrus atlantica* ‘Glauca’ and *Cryptomeria* spp from after the Brookman period, whilst Beames and Whitehill place the *Cedrus atlantica* ‘Glauca’ and *Cryptomeria* spp during the Brookman period.

37 The Misses Waite had left to tour England in February 1923, shortly after the death of their mother late in 1922. Upon her death the family home ‘Urrbrae’ passed to the University of Adelaide at their fathers bequest, he having passed away 8 months prior. The Waites returned to Adelaide early in 1925 and rented the property ‘The Chestnuts’ across the road from ‘Broadlees’, until it was complete. Wells, ‘Broadlees, Waverley Ridge, Crafers’, p. 1.

38 This included the main house, lodge, garage, back drive, completion of front drive, etc. Wells, ‘Broadlees, Waverley Ridge, Crafers’, pp. 1-2.


41 Beames and Whitehill, p. 11.

42 Shirley Forester, Ken Mosel’s daughter, in an interview with Dr David Jones, January 1999, mentioned both this book as well as Brunnings’ *Australian Home Gardener* as being influential upon her father. David Jones, ‘Interview with Shirley Forester’, personal communication’ January 1999.

43 Beames and Whitehill, p. 12.

44 Beames and Whitehill, pp. 12, 14.

literature as Eva Waite. She also would have developed a clear understanding and appreciation of the gardens visited by the Waites through their photographs, as well as through the pictorial records of numerous English gardens as recorded and published by The Studio in the early part of the twentieth century.

The two main areas of development were the terraces to the northeast of the house and the lawns and terraces immediately surrounding the house, the two separated by the broad path. The gravel drive from Waverley Ridge Road was cut into the slope and ran through a wooded area above the main terrace garden before opening out into a forecourt at the front of the house. The drive then continued through tall masonry piers with adjoining walls to the back of the house and the garage beyond before rejoining Waverley Ridge Road to the west of the main entrance. The broad path, cut below the drive, ran from a garden shed, along the back of the main terrace garden, down the slope past the eastern façade of the house and into the valley below. Traversing back up the slope, the broad path branched to the west, wrapping around the lawns to the south of the house before apparently terminating at the western wing.

The main terrace garden sited to the northeast of the house was carved out of what appears to have been a naturally flatter section of the slope, divided primarily into two main terraces. Each terrace was planted to a dominant theme - the upper terrace as a rose garden and the lower terrace as a perennial garden. See figure 3.3.1a. The fortuitous planting along the top section of the broad path of alternating lime, *Tilia* sp, and silver birch, *Betula pendula*, formed an immediate background for the planting schemes below. The modest planting on the slope immediately below the terraces was enhanced with further small trees. A stand of native vegetation to the east of the terrace garden was screened with a row of Italian poplar, *Populus nigra 'Italica*', and large shrubs.

The upper boundary of the terrace garden was curved to follow the natural contour of the site, giving the rose garden a segmented shape. The upper bank of the rose garden was stabilised and supported with a double dry-stone Carey Gully sandstone wall, into which a stepped-cascade and pond were centrally set. A paved path connected the rose garden to the broad path, the path diverging to run along the back of the garden at the foot of the dry-stone sandstone wall, as well as along the front edge of the terrace. A further principal path, perpendicular to those at the front and back of the terrace, divided the rose garden in half and was aligned to the stepped cascade and pool and staircase to the perennial garden below. Smaller subsidiary paths further divided the rose garden, creating four main symmetrical and geometrically shaped rose beds, each edged with rock. See figures 3.3.2.2a & 3.3.2.2b. A wooden pergola/colonnade possibly simplified from a design in *Arts and Crafts Gardens*, extended along the front of the terrace. See figures 3.3.1a & 3.3.2.2a.

---

46 The wall extends from the house and tapers at its base, connecting to the adjoining steep slope.
48 Beames and Whitehill, pp. 11-2. Phillips, 'Broadlees'.
49 Figure 258 in Jekyll and Weaver, p. 195.
Access to the perennial terrace was gained from; the rose terrace, via the main staircase set into the dry-stone Carey Gully sandstone retaining wall; or from a path from the house terraces that crossed the broad path, dropping to the level of the terrace via a short staircase before diverging into three main paths. The first of these paths, a lawn path below the perennial garden, was aligned to the house terraces and was accessed via a further set of stairs, it ran the length of the terrace and into the shrubs that edged the eastern side of the perennial garden. The second path wrapped around the western side and along the back of the perennial garden, at the foot of the dry-stone retaining wall. The third path branched from the second, dividing the terrace into approximate halves. See figure 3.3.1a. A crazy-paved area perpendicular to the other paths and aligned to the staircase from the rose garden further divided the perennial garden and was terminated by a bench seat set into a hedge alcove; a birdbath formed a feature within this area. As a result of the path system, the perennial garden contained four rectangular garden beds; the dry-stone retaining wall divided into two sections by the staircase contributed a further two elevated spaces for planting. 51 See figure 3.3.2.3a.

![The Terrace Garden during construction circa 1927.](image)

(Source: C. B. Wells courtesy of Dr David Jones)

The gardens immediately surrounding the house were, due to the constraints imposed by the topography, either minimal or terraced. The only significant levelled space around the house accommodated the drive; this space was slightly widened to create a small forecourt that allowed for both the suitable display of the building’s front façade and provided temporary parking for guests. See figure 3.3.1b. A climber-clad masonry wall built from the same materials as the house divided the forecourt; an opening, the width of the drive, allowed vehicular access to the rear of the house,

garage and lodge beyond. The climber was trained to form a concave arch above the opening between the piers; the foot of both sides of the wall were planted with a variety of wall shrubs and planted urns adorned the top of each pier. The planting at the foot of the wall continued along the front of the house and to the side of the forecourt; a clipped cypress hedge, Cupressus spp, backed and edged the garden bed to the side of the forecourt. Another clipped cypress arch, Cupressus spp, physically connected the house and forecourt garden beds, creating an entrance to the eastern façade of the house and the terrace gardens beyond. The clipped cypress arch, Cupressus spp, was later modified to replicate a buttressed pier either side of the path; a clipped ball nestled on top of each pier completed the design. See figures 3.3.3.3a & 3.3.3.3b.

Figure 3.3.1b The front northern forecourt and bowed eastern façade gardens, to the left, unplanted circa 1927.

(Source C. B. Wells courtesy of Dr David Jones)

The ground adjacent to the bowed eastern façade of the house rapidly drops away, leaving only sufficient space for the narrow garden bed that hugged the bowed façade and a hedge-lined basket-weave brick path to the loggia at the southeast corner of the house. See figure 3.3.1b. The steepness of the slope and the dominance of the architecture would have suggested the design and construction of the house terraces, which consisted of a series of asymmetrically situated landings, staircases and garden features to mirror the formality of the house. The first landing, at the southeast corner of the house, formed a junction between the brick path, loggia and upper lawn, and eventually provided access to the broad path below. From this landing, a brick staircase - a miniature version of the main brick staircase that would eventually be built at the lower campus of the University of Adelaide - descended to a stone-flagged landing below. A further set of stone steps, perpendicular to those

before, descended to the next stone-flagged landing, upon which a sundial was centrally positioned towards the rear. Another stone staircase, again perpendicular to that proceeding, completed the descent to the broad path below. A series of Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, were planted along the stairs and landings denoting a zigzag progression down the slope. See figure 3.3.2.5b.

Set into the slope, next to the last stone staircase, was the main feature of this space: an elaborate pond and fountain, backed with both mortared and dry-stone Carey Gully sandstone walls and with a small cherubesque statue that formed its central feature. The landing at the bottom of the brick staircase overlooked the fountain. Cornish and Waite used the planting scheme to enhance the formality of the space, planting Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens* and a low rosemary hedge, *Rosmarinus officinalis*, along the sides of the fountain. Cornish and Waite also placed terracotta pots and concrete planters containing either cactus, *Opuntia* spp, or clipped specimens at vantage points within the design. See figure 3.3.2.5a.

To the south of the house were two terraced lawns. The upper lawn was relatively flat and was retained with a stone batter. The western boundary of the upper lawn was enclosed with an elaborately clipped cypress hedge, *Cupressus* spp, the design of which was based on the hedging at 'Brockenhurst'. The 'Broadlees' hedge was composed of three large square clipped piers, each decoratively topped with a clipped coping and ball, located at either end and the middle of the hedge. Slightly shorter box-clipped sections linked the piers. An alcove was carved into each of these fill sections to accommodate a stone bench. A large urn was placed in front of the middle pier and was flanked by two smaller troughs of a similar design; each was filled with pink flowering geraniums, *Pelargonium* spp. The lower lawn terrace sloped down towards the broad path, which wrapped around the terrace and was edged with a low clipped rosemary hedge, *Rosmarinus officinalis*. This terrace could be accessed from the sundial landing. Wooded slopes surrounded the house on three sides. See figures 3.3.2.6a, 3.3.3.3d & 3.3.4a.

A rock garden was built into a section of the slope at the base of the gully. An informally shaped pond nestled into the base of the rock garden, the slope partially wrapping around the pool. The section of path associated with the rock garden and pond was crazy-paved with flagstones and divided the pond and rock garden from the seasonal creek that flowed past. See figures 3.3.2.7a & 3.3.6a.

The third phase of the garden’s development extended from 1956 to the present. The overall structure of the garden has been little changed since the 1950s. The most significant alterations occurred to the planting scheme to accommodate reduced maintenance resources. The majority of the perennials in the perennial terrace have been replaced with shrubs; the rose pergola/colonnade was removed and not replaced after its timbers rotted; a number of hedges have either died or been removed; and a

56 Phillips, 'Broadlees'.
number of garden features such as the bird bath have been damaged. Most of the water features are either inoperable or no longer function properly. 57

3.3.2 Significant Design Elements

3.3.2.1 Spatial Configuration

Cornish and Waite carved their garden from the woodland and orchard created by Brookman, who in turn carved his garden from the native bush; creating an inner framework of exotic trees and an outer framework of native vegetation. The contours of the site and the view to the south-east of the surrounding hills dictated the placement of each of the garden ‘rooms’, the number of which were relatively limited due to the constraints imposed by the sloping nature of the property. The most significant of these ‘rooms’ was the terrace garden, comprising the rose and perennial gardens to the northeast of the house. 58 3.3.1a & 3.3.3.4a.

Instead of imposing rigid geometry upon the terrace gardens, the natural contours of the site and the potential background feature created by the alternating row of lime, Tilia spp, and silver birch, Betula pendula, and the existing broad path were considered. These contours influenced the upper boundary of the rose garden, which was curved to accommodate these features, and effected the overall placement of the terrace garden. Instead of aligning the terrace garden symmetrically to the house, Cornish and Waite shifted it slightly to the north and skewed it slightly back towards the house, so as to take full advantage of the existing site features. See figure 3.3.1a. The main garden axis was centrally aligned, running through the middle of each of the terrace gardens. The stepped cascade, stairs, birdbath and hedge-backed seat formed points along the axis, including the end points, which divided the space into two equal parts; the mirroring of built and plant elements creating an overall symmetry within the garden. See figure 3.3.2.3b. The remaining garden ‘rooms’ created by Cornish and Waite, with the exception of the rock garden, wrapped around the house and either provided access to the gardens below or framed the house and the view of the surrounding hills to the south. 59

3.3.2.2 Rose Garden

Cornish and Waite kept the design of the rose garden relatively simple, restricted in part by the comparatively small size of the garden. They employed a series of simple formal elements to achieve a formally designed garden ‘room’, heightened by attention to and repetition of pattern and material. To accommodate the already constructed broad path and to fully utilise the rapidly maturing row of alternating lime, Tilia spp, and silver birch, Betula pendula, the rose garden was given a flattened semi-circular, segmented form. Cornish took advantage of the existing background and the sense of permanence that the trees provided, not only to this ‘room’ but also to the terrace garden as a whole. 60 See figure 3.3.2.2a.

The use of a double, stepped wall, constructed from Carey Gully sandstone, for the rear retaining wall was a clever way in which to meet both the functional and aesthetic requirements of this element without overly impacting on the size of the terrace. Although the height of a single retaining wall would not have been overly high, its height when combined with that of the mature trees juxtaposed against the relatively small size of the terrace would have made the rose garden seem more diminutive than it actually was. As a single wall, whether planted or not, would have added to the verticality of the space, making it seem smaller and more enclosed. The use of the double stepped wall immediately introduced a horizontal element part way down the incline and broke the dominance of the strong vertical element. It also allowed for the inclusion of another attractive feature, the stepped cascade and pool nestled at the base of the first wall. This feature further strengthened the intermediate layer of the rose garden, visually drawing the eye to this level, as well as forming a terminal point along the main axis of the terrace garden. See figure 3.3.2.2b.

To provide a degree of verticality at the front of the garden and to assist in balancing that at the rear, a rough-hewn timber pergola/colonnade was constructed along the front edge of the rose garden. The simplicity and lightness of the structure, when clad with climbing roses, provided a degree of privacy from the perennial garden below, without enclosing the rose garden or perceptually reducing its size. See figures 3.3.2.2a & 3.3.2.2c.

---

62 Phillips, 'Broadlees'.
The patterns and materials of the path system were as much of a feature of the rose garden as the roses themselves. The path at the foot of the retaining wall was paved with red brick, laid in a simple basket-weave pattern. Cornish outlined large squares within the paving with a creeper or grass, creating a second diamond pattern in the path. These patterns were further modified around the foreground of the pool, where red bricks were laid in a semi-circle around the edge of the pool, in a herringbone pattern. The semi-circular form of the path and the change in pattern reflected and emphasised the circular form of the pool and its importance as a terminal point in the main garden axis. The path at the front of the terrace, and the main central path, linking the stepped cascade with the staircase, were paved with large format rectangular pavers, laid in a regular pattern and edged with red brick. The smaller secondary paths that divided the rose beds were also paved with red brick, laid in a basket weave pattern. The variety of pattern and material added colour and textural contrast to the design, while the simple repetition of materials and pavers created a degree of formality and unity within the design. See figures 3.3.2.2b & 3.3.2.2c.

The rose beds were created from simple geometrical forms, symmetrically sited to the main axis, each side a mirror image of the other. The two inner beds were essentially square. They did, however, have one corner cut from them to accommodate the staircase to the perennial garden. The two outer beds were designed to fill the remaining space of the terrace and had a segmented form. Each bed was outlined with the same rock used in the retaining wall; the repetition of

---

*Phillips, ‘Broadlees’.*
colour, material and texture furthered the unity of Cornish and Waite’s design.\textsuperscript{64} See figures 3.3.2.2a & 3.3.2.2c.

Figure 3.3.2.2c Pergola, top of the staircase, paving and bed form of the Rose Garden, looking north, \textit{circa} 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)

\textbf{3.3.2.3 Perennial Garden}

The simplicity of design used in the rose garden was repeated in the perennial garden. The garden was composed from six beds: the path system divided the terrace into four approximately rectangular, symmetrical beds, and the massed planting of the Carey Gully sandstone retaining wall contributed two vertical beds. See figures 3.3.1a & 3.3.2.3a. To augment the formality of the garden Cornish and Waite incorporated a number of formal elements along the central axis, including a decorative birdbath and paving feature. A formal stone bench backed with a hedge alcove terminated the axis. Asymmetrical placement of these elements created an aesthetic symmetry within the garden, rather than an actual physical symmetry, resulting in a congruent, balanced feeling within the garden ‘room’. Cornish and Waite achieved this balance by shifting the centre of the circular crazy-paved area with the centrally sited birdbath away from the physical centre of the perennial garden and towards the staircase - the aesthetic centre of the ‘room’, between the middle of the first two perennial beds. This effectively made these two beds the main planted feature; the two beds along the edge of the terrace and the two vertical beds became secondary adjunct background spaces, and Cornish and Waite appear to have devised their planting scheme to reflect this hierarchy.\textsuperscript{65} See figures 3.3.2.3a & 3.3.2.3b.

\textsuperscript{64} Phillips, ‘Broadlees’, Jones, ‘Broadlees’.

A stone staircase built into the dry-stone retaining wall connected the two terraces, forming a mid-point along the central axis. Cornish and Waite kept their design intentionally uncomplicated, allowing the staircase to blend into the terrace garden without being an overpowering feature. Built into the wall, only basic embellishments were used to denote their top and base, the steps made from large rough-hewn slabs of stone and a balustrading effect created by the planted wall. Low red brick piers marked the top of the staircase. Small low pots containing specimens of more unusual forms of cacti, possibly either Dinteranthus microspermums, Copiapoa tenuissima or Argyroderma delaeitii were positioned on either pier. The last three stairs sat past the wall; these stairs were edged with rectangular pieces of sandstone, Cornish maintaining continuity of materials throughout the construction of the retaining wall and its associated staircase. The base of the stairs were denoted with low, roughly square sandstone piers, adorned with decorative concrete pots, slightly larger than those above, and planted with Aloe spp. See figure 3.3.2.3b.

The pergola/colonnade at the front of the rose garden had a significant impact on the overall feeling of the perennial garden. Cornish and Waite have used this feature to achieve a number of effects, including:

- the creation of a link between the two spaces;
- a means to enclose the ‘room’, creating a more private space; and,
- a way of creating an intermediate horizontal plane to break the verticality of the site.

---

As with the Rose Garden, the paving in the Perennial Garden added to the formality of Cornish and Waite’s design. The materials and patterns reflected those of the rose garden, creating a link between the two spaces. The path at the foot of the Carey Gully sandstone retaining wall was paved with large-format square pavers, arranged in a diamond pattern, the joints planted to emphasise this pattern. The path between the two sets of perennial beds was paved with large-format rectangular pavers laid in a regular pattern. The square and rectangular pavers were second-hand concrete pavers recycled from pavement reconstruction works in Rundle Street in Adelaide. The crazy-paved circular feature created the only interruption along their respective lengths. A semi-circular segment of crazy paving was laid under and in front of the wooden bench seat, replicating the circular form of the main paving feature and the pond above in the Rose Garden. The joints of the crazy-paved areas were planted. The mixture of paving patterns and the soft hues of the pavers created colour and textural variety, providing interest within the ‘room’ when the garden was out of season and created a foil to the planting scheme when in season. See figures 3.3.2.3a & 3.3.2.3b.

3.3.2.4 House Planting
Cornish and Waite’s planting scheme both softened and added to the formality of Bagot’s design for the house. Bagot was responsible for the wall that divides the northern façade of the house, creating the entrance forecourt. He was also most likely responsible for the paving design of the red brick basket-weave path that followed the bowed eastern façade of the house, although Cornish and Waite’s input would have been considered. A large concrete urn adorned the top of each wall pier and was planted with an agave, *Agave* spp. See figure 3.3.1b.

3.3.2.5 House Terrace, Formal Pool & Slope
The sloped ground immediately adjacent to the eastern façade of the house was designed with an interesting juxtaposition of formal and informal elements. A series of terraces, staircases and a formal pool were sited between the massed planting of the natural slope on one side and the terraced lawn and batter on the other. The formal pool was aligned to the loggia, which formed the southeast corner of the house. The pool itself was remarkably similar to one illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver in *Arts and Crafts Gardens*, the design simply modified to harmonise with the requirements of the slope. The roughly rectangular pool was almost at ground level, two formed concrete steps provided an immediate foreground and separated the pool from the broad path. The pool itself was surrounded by small panels of neatly manicured lawn. Set into the centre rear of the pool was a raised round basin connected to the pool with a stepped cascade. Jet fountains were set into the upper step, as well as at either end of the main pool, creating a multi-directional play of water. A series of stepped and curved, mortared sandstone walls were used to retain part of the slope, creating an elaborate background and forming a plinth for a small cupidesque statue. Two curved, sloped panels of manicured lawn each planted with an Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, added to this effect. The slope above was retained with a straight, sandstone dry-stone wall. The elaborate nature of the pool and its surrounds was incongruous with the simple elegant formality achieved in the rest of the garden. See figure 3.3.2.5a.

![Figure 3.3.2.5a Formal pool nested between the zig-zag staircases and terraces and the shrubbery, circa 1930.](Image)

(Source: C. B. Wells courtesy of Dr David Jones)

---

69 Figure 200 in Jekyll & Weaver, p. 171.
The zig-zagging series of small terraces and staircases was more in keeping with the design of the rest of the garden and provided simple but elegant access from the loggia to the broad path below. The upper terraces and stairs were constructed from red brick, the material and patterns harmonising with the formal nature of the paving and stairs immediately connected to the house. Large terracotta pots placed on the brick balustrading denoted the top of each staircase. Part way down the slope, the materials changed - stone was used for the stairs and terraces, the terraces being crazy-paved. The change in materials and pattern reduced the overt feeling of formality and reflected the less formal nature of the garden at this point. A sundial centrally sited towards the back of the last terrace provided a focal point and direction to the longest run of stairs. In contrast, the slope on the opposite side of the pool was even more simply treated, the slope mass planted with a variety of shrubs. See figures 3.3.2.5a, 3.3.2.5b, 3.3.3.3e & 3.3.3.4a.

Figure 3.3.2.5b The gardens adjoining the southern and eastern façades of the house including the zig-zag staircases & terraces, batter & lawn terraces, circa 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)

3.3.2.6 Lawns & Batter
Cornish and Waite wrapped both open and enclosed spaces around the southern and western façades of the house; the divergence of the broad path to the west, on its return up the slope, neatly divided these spaces. The sloping ground immediately adjacent to the southern façade of the house was divided into two terraces. The upper terrace was levelled before declining into a sloped, dry-stone, retaining wall or batter; the second terrace retained a degree of its slope and was retained by a low retaining wall, which separated it from the path. The elaborately clipped hedge and stone benches, urn and troughs were used to create a formal feature on the upper

lawn, connecting this space more closely to the house and dividing it from the 'wilder' planting of the adjacent slope, while not interfering with the view of the hills to the south. The sloping ground to the west and south of the returning broad path were left wooded. See figures 3.3.2.5b & 3.3.2.6a.

Figure 3.3.2.6a The elaborately clipped hedge, stone benches, urn and troughs on the western boundary of the upper lawn terrace, circa 1950s.

(Source: Shirley Forester courtesy of Dr David Jones)

3.3.2.7 Rock Garden
The rock garden was developed on the existing slope; it appears as if only very minor additional rock has been incorporated into the design. Cornish and Waite achieved a reasonably natural looking site. An informally shaped pool was carved into the base of the slope, the back of the pool actually cutting into the rock face. Two carefully positioned stones created a small alcove, which would channel seasonal run-off and create a small waterfall for periods of the year. Additional rock was used to line the rear sides of the pool; the rock appears to have been concreted into position, and was the only section of rockwork not to follow the natural strata lines of the site. The base of the slope and foreground of the pool were crazy-paved with flagstones, creating a path and defining a line between the fabricated rock garden and pool and the natural seasonal creek below. See figures 3.3.2.7a & 3.3.3.6a.
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3.3.3 Planting Scheme
3.3.3.1 Rose Garden
The planting scheme for the rose garden contained two distinct elements: the stepped wall and the rose beds. Cornish and Waite selected an interesting blend of foliage forms and textures for the stepped wall. The top of the wall was planted with an unidentifiable mixture of clumping plants, their billowy forms softening the hard interface between wall and trees above. The narrow path created by the step in the wall was formally treated with clipped conical specimens; probably box, Buxus spp, planted at intervals along its length. Both vertical spaces were mass-planted with a mixture of either/or Aeonium spp, Echeveria spp and Sempervivum spp. The mixture of green, green-grey and purple foliage tones created a vivid contrast against the dark brown stone, the glossy succulent texture and rosette forms of the foliage studded the wall like a mass of flowers. The back of the pond was planted with a mixture of grasses or sedge-like plants, the pool with waterlilies, Nymphaea spp. It appears that Erigeron spp may have been planted on the stepped section of the wall, leading down to the pool. The foot of the wall was planted with unidentifiable small flowering specimens, although clumps of alyssum, Lobularia maritima, have escaped onto the path. Also unidentifiable is the small creeper or grass that Cornish used to outline the diamond pattern in the path against the wall. This simple yet perceptive use of the planting created layers of pattern whilst simultaneously softening the hardness of both the brick pavers and stone of the adjoining wall. See figures 3.3.2.2b & 3.3.3.1a.

It is impossible to determine the colour scheme selected for the rose beds; it can be readily assumed that a predetermined colour scheme was implemented following the

advice given by Jekyll, with blocks of similarly toned flowers being used rather than an unrelated mixture of colours. Bush roses were predominantly planted in the beds, with some standards included to create variation in scale and form and possibly to denote colour transitions. The pergola/colonnade was densely covered with climbing roses. See figures 3.3.2.2c & 3.3.3.1a.

Figure 3.3.3.1a Planting scheme of the rose beds, pergola and stepped wall, looking towards the eastern flank of the house, circa 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)

3.3.3.2 Perennial Garden

Cornish and Waite achieved an interesting juxtaposition between the permanent nature of the wall planting and the relative transience of the bed planting in the perennial garden. Their utilisation of texture, form and colour consolidated both schemes and created unity within the garden. The wall planting was a particularly good example of this style of planting, Cornish obviously followed Jekyll’s advice on composition - although it mainly provided a background to the perennial beds, it was also an integral garden component in its own right. The number of specimen types was limited, repetition allowing for the more easy attainment of unity within the scheme. Cornish and Waite relied mostly on plants with cascading forms, although there was a slight degree of verticality in the nature of their growth. A limited number of upright specimens were included. The foot of the sandstone wall was planted with a limited selection of plants with low rounded forms that spilled over onto the path. The natural plant forms created a progression of upward and downward movement along the wall length. Cornish selected a mixture of smaller-

---

leaved specimens, creating a soft feathery texture, which she contrasted against the hard roughness of the sandstone. Although it is impossible to accurately determine the colour scheme of the wall planting, black and white photographs tonally suggest grey foliage plants and lighter flower colours. The softness of the colour scheme harmonised with and gently contrasted against the brightness of the perennial borders and the dark brown of the stone. Cornish and Waite’s colour and textural choices prevented the potential foreshortening of terrace width and created a background to the perennial beds that both blended and contrasted with their planting schemes. Interestingly, whilst the composition of the wall planting is well considered, that at its foot appeared low, flat and almost unconnected to the either the wall or the adjacent perennial beds and would have benefited from the inclusion of some taller and more vertical forms, such as flag iris, *Iris germanica*, and snapdragons, *Antirrhinum majus*. See figure 3.3.2.3a.

The planting of the staircase walls varied only in that Cornish included some succulents in the scheme and allowed the plants to spill to a small degree onto the stairs, the plants were kept towards the edges to ensure safe access. Succulents were also planted in the pairs of pots at both the top and bottom of the stairs, the common use of succulents created a link between the two terraces. See figure 3.3.2.3.b.

Cornish and Waite achieved both contrast and harmony of form, texture and colour in the perennial borders, through the mixed planting and composition of a variety of perennials, annuals and bulbs. In the two main beds the tallest specimens were planted in the middle of the bed, progressively reducing in height, various specimens encouraged to spill over the stone edging and onto the path. The outer two beds, at the terrace edge, were treated more as a background, the taller specimens planted at the terrace edge. However, unlike the first bed where the succession of plant heights were seemingly carefully managed, in these beds the planting takes on a more stepped form, the planting obviously carried out in careful rows - not the groupings more commonly associated with the arrangement of perennial borders. Later images of the perennial border suggest that the arrangement of plants became freer and less regimented. See figures 3.3.2.3a & 3.3.3.2a.

There is a single known colour image, that most likely dates from the late 1940s or early 1950s, that depicts half of the perennial border in flower at ‘Broadlees’. Cornish and Waite appear to have taken their inspiration directly from Jekyll, copying with somewhat less success a section of her June Garden as described in Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden. The section of garden in question was a U-shaped border style planting at the rear of ‘The Hut’; Jekyll filling the central portion of the “U” with a path lined with an eighteen-inch-high rosemary hedge, *Rosmarinus officinalis*. Jekyll’s colour composition for the first arm of the “U”, starting at its top, consisted of a succession of, lilac, purple and white tones; transitioning to pale pink, yellow, white, blue, pale blue, yellow and white tones at its base; before progressing up the second arm with a succession of apricot, scarlet, orange and red-lead tones. See figure 3.3.3.2a.
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Although the wall planting is not well shown in the existing colour image, it seems likely that white, yellow, pink, lilac and possibly even some darker purple tones were included. Cornish and Waite planted the main perennial beds predominantly with white and yellow toned flowers, and to a lesser degree apricot and red-lead toned flowers; the composition of the main beds and the wall planting thus complemented each other. Cornish and Waite’s careful consideration of the perennial gardens colour scheme was particularly adroit, its composition uniting both adjoining and separate spaces. Although the colour scheme of the rose garden is unknown, the colour scheme of the perennial garden would have harmonised with most of the more probable rose colours, creating a link between the two adjoining spaces. Where Cornish and Waite have been most skilful, however, is the way in which the colour scheme of the perennial garden connected with the house and its adjoining spaces. The view to the west from the perennial garden was directed and framed by the careful placement of trees towards the eastern façade of the house. The soft apricot toning of the façade render and the bright orange and red-lead colours of the flowers against and around the house completed the colour succession as outlined by Jekyll and brought these two distinct spaces together.\[81\] See figures 3.3.3.2a & 3.3.3.3e.

---

A background for the bench seat was formed from a formal box-clipped alcove-shaped cypress hedge, *Cupressus* spp. The hedge contributed to the strength of the seat, in its role as the terminal point of the central axis. It also added a formal element to the informal nature of the planting. Joint plantings were included to assist in outlining the diamond pattern of the path at the foot of the wall and were included in the crazy-paved areas of the perennial garden. These plantings softened the hardness of the paving. See figure 3.3.2.3a.

A row of Italian poplars, *Populus nigra 'Italica'*, were planted in the remnants of the orchard to the immediate east of the rose garden, creating a formal screen between the garden and bush beyond. Large shrubs originally created a similar but less formal screen between bush and garden; however, as the bush has been cleared and houses built on the neighbouring properties, the row of Italian poplars, *Populus nigra 'Italica'*, were extended, effectively blocking the new buildings from view and retaining the original privacy of the garden. This screen also provided a division between 'wild' and formal garden spaces. See figure 3.3.2.2c.

### 3.3.3.3 House Planting

Cornish and Waite used a variety of planting techniques to soften and emphasise the architectural design of the house, especially along the northern and eastern façades. A number of simple topiary specimens and hedges complemented the architectural formality of the house and formed the basic structure of the house gardens. Pairs of conically-clipped box specimens, *Buxus* spp, were planted along the northern façade, accenting; the main entrance to the house; the entrance to the garden; and the opening in the wall that divides the forecourt from the drive. On the western side of the wall, single conically-clipped specimens of box, *Buxus* spp, were planted at intervals along the house wall. A medium-height box-clipped cypress hedge, *Cupressus* spp, was planted at the northeast corner of the house, dividing the forecourt from the garden. The later modification of the hedge arch into the buttressed pier form previously described increased the formality of the hedging and topiary work at the front of the house and was more congruous with the hedging on the upper lawn terrace. It was also more typical of the topiary and hedge forms that the Waite sisters experienced and were inspired by during their visit to 'Brockenhurst'. The hedge continued perpendicularly along the top of the slope, forming a background to the triangular garden bed on the eastern side of the drive; a low box-clipped box hedge, *Buxus* spp, edged the front of this bed. See figures 3.3.3.3a & 3.3.3.3b.

---
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The forecourt wall was planted with an ornamental grape, *Vitis* spp; these were planted at the base of each pier and then trained upwards to the top of the wall, where they were allowed to informally spill over the sides. The vines were also trained to form a formal swag between the piers and a series of formal swags along the house façade, where they were secured between the lower and upper storey windows. The base of each swag was aligned with the middle of each window. Cornish thus achieved both formal and informal effects with the one planting. The eastern side of the forecourt wall was further planted with climbing roses, *Rosa* spp, and a mixture of unidentifiable shrubs; massed annuals edged the bed. The western side of the wall was planted with a selection of wall shrubs including fuchsias, *Fuchsia* spp, and hydrangeas, *Hydrangea* spp. Fuchsias, *Fuchsia* spp, were also trained against the house walls and around the windows, the front of these beds were also planted with massed annuals. The planting scheme of the triangular bed is difficult to identify; however, it seems most likely that this bed was planted with a succession of seasonal colour. In some of the images that remain of the garden at this time, it appears that *Dahlia* spp hybrid cultivars were planted in this bed.\(^{85}\) See figures 3.3.3.3a, 3.3.3.3b & 3.3.3.3c.

Cornish and Waite used the planting scheme around the eastern façade of the house to emphasise the bowed feature wall, planting the narrow garden bed at the base of the wall with fuchsias, *Fuchsia* spp, trained to frame the windows and shutters. Massed annuals were planted at the foot of the fuchsias, *Fuchsia* spp, to spill over and onto the path, softening its hardness. The other side of the path was lined with a low box-clipped box hedge, *Buxus* spp, the hedge repeating the bowed shape of path and wall and physically providing a barrier to the adjacent slope. Finishing points to the hedge were created through the placement of square concrete pots, planted with conically-clipped box specimens, *Buxus* spp, at either end of the hedge. Adding to the formality of the planting scheme was the addition of three large terracotta pots, each containing a topiarised standard, possibly bay trees, *Laurus nobilis*, positioned

---

at regular intervals on the slope side of the hedge. Snow in summer, *Cerastium tomentosum*, cascaded from the top of the slope.\(^8^6\) See figures 3.3.3.3d & 3.3.3.3e.

- **Figure 3.3.3.3c** Partial planting scheme on the western side of the wall, conically clipped box specimens and house planting, with the forecourt beyond the archway, *circa* 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)

- **Figure 3.3.3.3d** Planting scheme of the eastern façade, *circa* 1930s.

(Source K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)

- **Figure 3.3.3.3e** Colour scheme of the eastern façade planting, *circa* 1950s.

(Source Shirley Forester courtesy of Dr David Jones)

The most significant element of the colour scheme for the house planting was the variety of foliage tones. The mid and darker greens of the various hedging plants and the fuchsia, *Fuchsia* spp, created a harmonious colour combination with the soft ochre of the render and the red brick paths. The autumn foliage of the grape, *Vitis* spp, contributed an element of refinement, as well as creating a spectacular seasonal effect. The contribution of seasonal flower effects, although important, had a softer, less spectacular impact on this section of the garden, refining the colour scheme and creating an important link between this section of the garden and the perennial garden, when in season.  

The scale and form of the planting scheme added to the formality of Bagot’s architecture yet also softened the building, framing without overpowering the views to the hills, the formal and wooded garden and the views of the house itself when viewed from the garden. See figures 3.3.3.3b & 3.3.3.3e.

### 3.3.3.4 House Terrace, Formal Pool & Slope

Cornish used simple, formal plant elements to frame and link the built elements of this section of the garden. Italian cypress pairs, *Cupressus sempervirens*, flanked the staircases and terraces, defining their zig zag course down the slope. Unusually for Adelaide at this time, these specimens were trimmed in a typical Italian style, the lower trunks clipped bare. Box-clipped rosemary hedges, *Rosmarinus officinalis*, flanked the lower staircase; topiarised balls of rosemary, *Rosmarinus officinalis*, were clipped to sit on the top of each hedge indicating the top and bottom of the staircase. Plantings of snow in summer, *Cerastium tomentosum*, softened the hardness of the brick staircases, cascading down each side and running along the junction of riser and runner. The succulent *Echeveria* spp formed the same function on the stone staircases and terraces, cascading down each side of the stairs and intermittently planted at the edges of the terraces. Cornish and Waite repeated and juxtaposed the various forms and colours of succulents and cacti throughout the garden, creating a unified plant theme. Large terracotta pots on the upper staircases were planted with a species of *Opuntia* cacti. See figures 3.3.2.5a, 3.3.2.5b, 3.3.3.3e & 3.3.3.4a.

![Figure 3.3.3.4a](image)

**Figure 3.3.3.4a**

Trimmed cypress, rosemary hedge and succulents on the sundial landing of the house terraces, circa 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)
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The planting scheme of the pool surrounds were treated much less formally than the
stairs and terraces, perhaps in an attempt to limit the incongruity of the pool’s
excessive formality. Informal rosemary hedges, Rosmarinus officinalis, framed the
sides and top of the area; this top hedge was later removed and replaced with
succulents such as pigface Lampranthus spp or Malephora spp, which cascaded over
the drystone retaining wall. Pairs of rosemary, Rosmarinus officinalis, or box, Buxus
spp, were planted on the platforms created by the elaborate wall that backed the pool,
adding definition to these spaces. A pair of Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens,
planted on the small, sloped lawn section of the garden completed the pool’s planting
scheme and created a link between this space and the adjoining terraces and stairs.
The remainder of the slope to the north of the pool was mass-planted with a variety
of shrubs, connecting this part of the garden with its overall surrounds. Once mature,
the shrubbery would have framed the lower sections of the house when viewed from
the terrace gardens below, and masked the formal pool from sight when viewed from
the upper sections of the broad path, which had a more informal, wooded
setting. See figure 3.3.2.5a.

### 3.3.3.5 Lawns & Batter

The house planting was continued against the southern façade and loggia; the
planting against the house is largely unidentifiable but would have had to be capable
of coping with a deeply shaded site. Cornish and Waite planted Hydrangea spp
hybrid cultivars around the base of the loggia and seem to have continued the
fuschias, Fuchsia spp, that were used elsewhere against this part of the house. The
two terraces were left as open spaces and were planted with lawn. The western
boundary of the upper lawn was enclosed by the formal, elaborately clipped cypress
hedge, Cupressus spp. The hedge reflected the formality of the adjoining architecture
and the adjacent house terraces, while separating this highly formal section of the
garden from the informal ‘wildness’ of the wooded planting on its other side. See
figures 3.3.2.6b & 3.3.2.6a.

The colour scheme of the upper terrace and the adjoining house planting does not
appear to have been as carefully composed as in the rest of the garden. Individual
elements worked well when viewed in isolation, but when viewed as a whole some
aspects clashed - particularly the combination of the bright pink geraniums,
Pelargonium spp, planted in the urn and troughs by the hedge, and the adjacent red-
lead and apricot fuschias, Fuchsia spp, against the house. See figure 3.3.2.6a.

The lower edge of the second terrace was bordered with a low, box-clipped rosemary
hedge, Rosmarinus officinalis. Small clipped rosemary balls, Rosmarinus officinalis,
were added at intervals along its length to provide continuity with the adjoining
hedging of the lower stone staircase of the house terrace garden and the hedging of
the upper lawn. This low hedge created a definitive boundary between the simple
open formality of the terraces and the ‘wildness’ of the wooded slope below. Cornish
and Waite’s planting scheme created a juxtaposition of open and enclosed spaces; the
openness of the lawn terraces created a platform from which to appreciate the
magnificent view of the surrounding hills to the southeast and the house itself, and

---
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the retention of the lower wooded slope both framed the view and integrated the
garden into the surrounding scenery. See figure 3.3.3.4a.

3.3.3.6 Rock Garden
Cornish and Waite tiered the rock garden’s planting scheme, increasing the size of
the plants contained within each successive tier. The planting around the immediate
pool surrounds were composed from a mixture of soft creeping and small tufted
grass-like forms, possibly including snow in summer, *Cerastium tomentosum*, and
pinks, *Dianthus* spp, amongst other unidentifiable specimens. In the second tier
Cornish retained the tufting grasses but incorporated the harder sword-like foliage of
iris, *Iris* spp, agave, *Agave americana*, and a number of more reed-like plants,
especially adjacent to the creek bed. The third tier contained bamboo, *Bambusa* ssp,
and a mixture of trees, tying the planting scheme back into the wooded slope above
and creating a background to the rock garden. Cornish and Waite planted a balanced
mixture of creeping and upright forms, choosing plants with a soft textural quality to
contrast with the rounded worn hardness of the rock. As the planting scheme visually
and physically subsumed the rock, the harder, more upright forms of the iris, *Iris* spp,
agave, *Agave americana*, and reeds provided a pleasing contrast to the softer, grass-
like and creeping textural forms of the plants - Cornish thus created unity within the
space through the repetition of contrasting forms and textures. The pool was planted
with water lilies, *Nymphaea* spp, further emphasising the contrast between fabricated
and natural watercourses. See figures 3.3.2.7a & 3.3.3.6a.

Figure 3.3.3.6a Rock Garden, *circa* 1930s.

(Source: K. P. Phillips courtesy of Dr David Jones)
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3.4 Wilcox Residence

3.4.1 Wilcox Garden History and Description

Cornish designed the terrace garden for Sidney Wilcox's North Adelaide home circa 1928. Interestingly, Wilcox also employed a female interior designer, the unusual happenstance of two women working on the same property described by The Observer as a 'striking tribute ... to the advance of women's home planning work in Adelaide'. The new house, designed by architect EH McMichael of the architectural firm McMichael and Harris and built by J Emmett & Sons Ltd in 1927, was described as 'an Australian home in the Italian manner' by one source and as Spanish-American by another. One of McMichael’s first commissions upon his return from an overseas tour, this house reflects his refreshed design style, fitting comfortably into the model of Italian and Spanish Mission-inspired Neo-Georgian homes built in Adelaide during this period.

At Wilcox’s bequest the property became St Ann’s College Incorporated, a residential college for women studying at The University of Adelaide, in 1942; a function which it still fulfils albeit now unisex.

The house is sited on the north-western corner of the block, occupying the most naturally level portion of the property on the corner of Melbourne Street (southern boundary) and Brougham Terrace (western boundary), North Adelaide. Cornish developed the majority of the remaining land into a series of formal terraced gardens, that extend along the front of the house and down to the Melbourne Street boundary. Cornish completed her garden design with the inclusion of a tennis court in the south-eastern corner, a ‘garden room’ in the north-eastern corner and relatively small garden plantings around the house. Relatively little is known about the garden ‘room’ in the north-eastern corner of the block, as there is significantly less documentation available for this area of the garden.

The terrace gardens were composed of three terraces, each developed to a predominant theme: the first as a rose garden, the second as a water garden, and the third as a ‘pleasance’. Flanking the western side of the terraces was a wide, raised, planted border. Building contractor, Walter Torode, constructed the retaining walls for each terrace and the raised border, using Mintaro slate. A wide rectangular
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96 ‘An Australian House in the Italian Manner’, Australian Homes and Gardens 1 April 1931, p. 28.
97 Page, p. 151.
98 Page, p. 151.
102 Walter Torode is noted as being the first builder to use reinforced concrete in Adelaide and was responsible for the design and construction of the arbor and the planting scheme of the Wattle Day League Garden in Park 21W of the South Parklands. It is likely that Wilcox requested that Torode undertake the construction of the retaining walls. Torode had previously built a two mile (approximately 3.2km) long embankment for Wilcox at ‘Brenda Park’, Morgan, on the River Murray, in 1905. The total cost of the slate and labour for the North Adelaide garden was £850. Walter Torode, ‘Recollections of Walter Torode’, typescript, 1931, State Library of South Australia, Archival
strip of lawn, containing a garden-house and flowerbeds, was juxtaposed between the eastern side of the first two terraces and the tennis court. See Figure 3.4.1a

Figure 3.4.1a Wilcox Residence Terrace Garden, 1931, looking northwards from the Melbourne Street flank.

(Source: Australian Homes and Gardens, 1st April 1931, p. 28)

A gravel drive separated the house from the terrace gardens, and the retaining wall of the first terrace was raised to create a low stepped wall along the southern edge of the drive. A concrete formwork staircase with Mintaro slate capped runners, the first in a series of three and butted mid-way along the length of the retaining wall, provided access from the drive to the rose terrace, as well as dividing a sloped garden bed at the foot of the wall. A flagged Mintaro slate crazy path traversed the width of the terrace, connecting the first staircase with the second, the path widening at its mid-point into a small paved circle to accommodate a stone figure and birdbath. Cornish created a series of geometrical rose beds cut from the lawn on either side of the path, each a mirror image of the other. Pillar roses were used to flank both the bottom and top of the first and second staircases. To enclose the eastern end of the terrace Cornish planted a rectangular rose bed. Concrete planters described as of ‘Italian design... made specially from Miss Cornish’s plan’ were symmetrically placed at intervals along the front edge of the terrace.


103 ‘An Australian House in the Italian Manner’, p. 28.
The second staircase led to the water terrace. Constructed in the same manner as the first, the staircase was butted against the retaining wall, dividing a garden bed planted at its foot. A small round, planted pot was placed either side of the last stair, on the low concrete formwork edging. At the base of the staircase, surrounded by lawn, was a large rectangular pond with cut-out corners. The pool was edged with slightly overhung rectangular pavers and contained a centrally positioned low jet fountain. Cornish planted a symmetrical grouping of four ‘stately’ Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, at either end of the pond. A small curved garden bed was carved from the lawn between each pairing of Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*. Unlike the first terrace, that was terminated on its eastern boundary by a low retaining wall marked with a rose bed, the second terrace continued at this point creating a sloped lawn path to the lawn and flowerbeds that flanked the tennis court. Two pairs of small clipped specimens, of which one was possibly box, *Buxus* spp., denoted the transition point from terrace to lawn. A second set of concrete planters, aligned with the first, were also positioned along the front edge of this terrace.\(^{106}\) See Figures 3.4.1a & 3.4.2.3a.

The third staircase led to the ‘Pleasance’ and was constructed in the same manner as the first two, it also divided a flowerbed at the foot of the retaining wall. Cornish clothed the western, southern and eastern boundaries of this terrace with dense tree and shrub borders, enclosing the space and creating privacy and seclusion from the street and the rest of the garden. The lawn terrace was planted with informal groupings of Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, through which a ‘wayward little path’,\(^ {107}\) constructed from stepping stones, traversed the length of the terrace.\(^ {108}\) See Figure 3.4.1a.

The raised border that flanked the western side of each terrace formed the western boundary of the garden. Cornish retained a row of mature olive trees, *Olea europaea*, already planted along the fence line, using them to create an informal hedge and a background for the remainder of the border, composed of flowering shrubs and to a lesser extent a mixture of perennials and annuals. A narrow flowerbed was planted at the foot of the retaining wall, stepping down each terrace.\(^ {109}\) See Figure 3.4.1a.

The sloped lawn between the terraces and tennis court could be accessed either from the water terrace or directly from the drive via a small staircase. Stepped, rectangular flowerbeds bordered the tennis court fence; a further two circular flowerbeds were cut into the lawn and were asymmetrically aligned to the ends of the first two terraces. A square rustic-style timber garden-house with a brushwood roof was

---


\(^{107}\) Leigh, ‘Beauty Inside and Out’, p. 54.


\(^{109}\) It appears from early photographs of the garden that the olives, *Olea europaea*, were probably retained from the original garden. John Gazard, ‘Brougham Place’ [photograph], 1927, State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 9244. Elsie Cornish, ‘Wilcox Residence Western Border’ [annotated photograph], circa 1930. This image was kindly lent by Cornish’s great nephew Dr Peter Cornish.
butted against the eastern retaining wall of the first terrace, a bench inside providing a vantage point from which to watch tennis. See Figures 3.4.1a & 3.4.2.6a.

There is little descriptive or pictorial record of the small ‘garden room’ in the northern corner of the property; what pictorial evidence there is suggests that the area was simply treated. The block plan drawn by McMichael and Harris depicts at least one mature tree on the site that was retained, although it does not specify its species. The area was probably left as a specimen-planted lawn, possibly with the inclusion of low level planting around the remnant tree.

Cornish treated the house planting simply, including a garden bed between the house and northern side of the driveway. The informal tree and shrub border softened the starkness of the cream-orange rendered masonry façade. On the patio simple lattice panels were attached to the wall, flanking the two windows that overlooked the terraces. Potted Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, positioned between the windows, softened the starkness of the remaining wall. A series of large square pots containing simply clipped specimens were placed at intervals along the western façade and also flanked the western stairs that led up to the patio. Two existing mature trees were retained in the narrow strip of garden between the western façade of the house and the property boundary with Brougham Terrace (to the western side of the allotment). Cornish planted a cypress hedge, *Cupressus spp.*, along this section of fence line and under-planted the trees with small garden beds.

Since becoming a part of St Ann’s College in 1942, the garden has undergone many changes. However, the basis of the garden’s original structure still remains, as do its dominant themes. The planting scheme has been significantly modified. A number of mature trees remain, including the informal olive hedge, *Olea europaea*. The rose beds on the rose terrace have been reconfigured and replanted, the birdbath and figure have been removed, as have the pots and planters, although some have been replaced with modern additions. The water terrace has been extensively modified – the pool has been filled in and all traces of the original planting scheme lost. The planting scheme of the ‘Pleasance’ has been significantly altered, including the removal of the Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, path and the eastern tree and shrub border. The enlargement of the tennis court has seen the removal of all the flower beds from the eastern lawn and the garden-house has been replaced with a modern structure that is now located at the eastern end of the ‘Pleasance’. Significant extensions to the house encroached over the garden ‘room’ in the north-eastern corner of the property. The specimen trees by the western façade of the house have been replaced with a golden elm, probably *Ulmus procera* ‘Louis van Houtte’, under-planted with acanthus, *Acanthus mollis*. The cypress hedge, *Cupressus spp.*, has been replaced by a brick wall.

---

113 Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, August 2001.
3.4.2 Design Elements

3.4.2.1 Spatial Configuration

The natural slope, the siting and architectural design of the house and the property’s location at the corner of two busy roads (Brougham Place and Melbourne Street) into the city must have immediately suggested to Cornish the need for a private enclosed terrace garden. By siting the house in the north-western corner of the block, the architect allowed Cornish to maximise the potential of her garden design. For the main garden, composed of terraces laid out in front of the house, Cornish combined asymmetrical components in the formation of a symmetrical space. The main garden axis, aligned to the main entrance of the house, was carried successively through each terrace, passing through the series of staircases and other features sited along its path. Cornish composed the design of each terrace symmetrically around this axis, although the slightly longer eastern end of each terrace created asymmetry within this component of her composition. Spatially, the symmetry is returned to the terrace garden by the western border, this component balancing the eastern end of the terraces. Cornish successfully combined all of the terrace garden components into a cohesive whole. As was typical of this type of garden design, Cornish successively reduced the formality of each terrace in progression from the house. She achieved this through the simplification of forms and composition, relying more on the planting scheme and its placement to achieve both formal and informal elements.114

Cornish created two very distinct but connected spatial elements within the pleasure garden, by juxtaposing the necessarily enclosed, private, inwards-looking retreat of the terrace garden against the comparative openness of the adjunct lawn tennis court and adjoining Eastern Lawn. The mature tree of the north-eastern ‘room’ further provided an enclosed boundary along the northern border of the tennis court and lawn. With these elements, Cornish created a balance of open and enclosed spaces within her garden design.115

3.4.2.2 Rose Terrace

Cornish designed the rose terrace as a formal ‘room’, the most formally designed space within the garden. Due to the ‘room’s’ comparatively small size, Cornish adopted simple forms that were repeatedly mirrored to create a series of simple symmetrical, geometrical beds. These gave the ‘room’ a cohesive, formal atmosphere without appearing fragmented. Each side of the rose garden was composed of two large L-shaped beds that wrapped around a central squat rectangular bed. The inner edge of the rectangular bed was concaved to accommodate a curved bed that emphasised the central circular paved feature of the path. See Figure 3.4.2.2a. The flagged Mintaro slate crazy path added a further formal element to the terrace that was in keeping with the simplicity of the design. Cornish achieved unity in her design through the repetition of curved forms in both path and rose beds. The paved circular device in the middle of the path provided a pause point and small incidence

---


115 Payne, ‘St Ann’s College’, p. 6.
along the main axis, enhanced by the sundial and figure, inviting the exploration of the terrace rather than its rapid traverse.\textsuperscript{116}

The rectangular planters had a dual purpose; their symmetrical placement at the top of each staircase and at intervals along the lower retaining walls created a formal element within the garden, highlighting the position of the stairs and the visual boundary of each terrace. Functionally, they indicated the physical edge of the unbalustraded terraces, and while their actual size was insufficient to prevent someone from falling, they did provide a constant visual reminder of the terrace edge.\textsuperscript{117} See Figure 3.4.2.3a.

Figure 3.4.2.2a Wilcox Residence Rose Terrace, 1950, looking southwards.
Note: The slate crazy path, sundial with figure and a number of the terrace planters and most of the roses had been removed at the time the image was taken. A variety of roses have since been replanted and the path reinstated.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens 1\textsuperscript{st} April 1950 p. 39)

\textsuperscript{116} 'Aerial Photograph of St Ann's College'. Leigh, 'Beauty Inside and Out', p. 54. Smith, 'In Residence at St Ann's', p. 39.
\textsuperscript{117} 'An Australian House in the Italian Manner', p. 28.
3.4.2.3 Water Terrace

Cornish used a limited number of formal elements in a simple symmetrical composition for her design of the water garden, achieving a formal yet tranquil ‘room’ that maintained the overall context of her design for the terrace gardens. The planting scheme was the main design component, creating both the formality and the tranquillity of the space, through the use of strong vertical elements juxtaposed against flat, horizontal spaces. The large rectangular pool with cut-out corners was a typical design of the period; sited at the foot of the staircase, it created an interlude along the central axis, inviting exploration. The still water reflected the vertical nature of the planting and the flat openness of the sky; the low-jet fountain provided an opportunity to break the reflection but added the tranquil sounds of playing water. The small round bowls placed at the bottom of the staircase were in keeping with the reduced formality of this terrace.\(^{118}\) See Figure 3.4.2.3a

![Figure 3.4.2.3a Wilcox Residence Water Terrace, 1931, looking westwards towards the Brougham Place fenceline. The trees from Brougham Gardens are clearly visible in the background.](image)

(Source: *Australian Homes and Gardens* 1st May 1931, p. 25)

3.4.2.4 'Pleasance'
Cornish designed the ‘Pleasance’, as Elizabeth Leigh described it in her article about the house and garden for The Observer, as the only ‘wild’ component of the Wilcox garden. The small size of the garden did, however, dictate the need for some formal elements to provide design continuity. Cornish relied on the planting scheme to create both the formal and informal elements within this space. Apart from the Mintaro slate dry-stone retaining wall and staircase, the only other built element on this terrace was the stepping stone path that traversed its length. The path provided direction and a degree of formality to the ‘room’; while the lightness of its design avoided overtly dominating the space. Due to the lack of detailed period images of the garden, it is impossible to determine if Cornish included any form of incidence, other than the dense borders into which the path ran, to adequately terminate it.

3.4.2.5 Western Border
In creating the raised Western Border to address the west-east slope of the site, it can be argued that Cornish opted for both the simplest and most difficult design solutions for the site. It is unlikely that Cornish’s design would have been overtly constrained by financial considerations - the cost of excavating and levelling the border to fit into the terraces would probably not have been prohibitive to Wilcox and would have immediately provided a symmetrical design. It would, however, have meant the creation of a retaining wall on the Brougham Place boundary and a loss of privacy from the street. While this could be easily rectified with suitable plantings, some form of built solution would have been necessary until the plants matured; a solution that could have potentially overwhelmed the garden. The raised border more easily accommodated the slope and allowed for the retention of the existing boundary planting, providing immediate privacy and a background for the garden. Although the immediate symmetry of the site was lost, this was not necessarily a negative feature. The creation of the slight asymmetry allowed for the incorporation of both asymmetrical and symmetrical elements, resulting in a potentially more complex and sophisticated design.

3.4.2.6 Eastern Lawn & Tennis Court
Cornish’s design and siting of the garden-house suggested that she intended this structure to be primarily functional. Although a minor focal point within the ‘room’, the lightness of its structure was subsumed by the more dominant elements of the surrounding gardens, becoming a mere incidence within the overall design. Climbing roses, Rosa spp, trailed over the structure, further corroborating this idea. Cornish’s design was uncomplicated and informal. She borrowed the basic design of the ‘Broadlees’ Rose Terrace pergola for its framework and mirrored the hipped roof of the house, albeit cladding it with much lighter brushwood. See Figures 3.4.1a, 3.4.2.6a. & 3.3.2.2a.

---

As can best be determined, Comish was responsible for the siting of the tennis court in the south-eastern corner of the garden. The block plans drawn up by McMichael make no attempt to accommodate a tennis court, although they do show proposed new fencing along the western (Brougham Place) and southern (Melbourne Street) boundaries and the retention of an existing specimen tree in the north-western corner of the block. In siting the tennis court in the south-eastern corner, Cornish minimised its impact upon the garden, obtaining the maximum space in which to configure her design. This resulted in a tennis court aligned slightly west of the generally recommended north-south alignment. The tennis court created a significant spatial element within the garden, providing the only open space of any consequence within Cornish's design, balancing the terrace gardens and creating a juxtaposition of open and enclosed spaces.123

![Figure 3.4.2.6a Wilcox Residence Eastern Lawn Garden-house, looking north-westerly.](Source: St Ann's College Inc, Archive Collection)

### 3.4.2.7 Northern 'Room'
Unfortunately, there is insufficient record of the design of the North garden 'room' from which to draw any conclusions about the key design elements of this space.

### 3.4.2.8 House Planting
The architect, McMichael, was responsible for the siting and design of the driveways and paving immediately connected to the house, although there is a possibility that Cornish might have suggested the gravel surfacing of the driveway adjacent to the terrace garden.124

---

123 McMichael, 'Proposed Residence for S. Wilcox Esq Brougham Place North Adelaide Block Plan'. 'Aerial Photograph of St Ann's College'. Payne, 'St Ann's College', p. 6.  
124 McMichael, 'Proposed Residence for S. Wilcox Esq Brougham Place North Adelaide Block Plan'.
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3.4.3 Planting Scheme

3.4.3.1 Rose Terrace
Cornish predominantly planted the rose beds with shrub roses, *Rosa* spp, although there is evidence to suggest that a row of standards might have been planted at the end of each ‘L’ shaped bed, creating a contrast in form. See Figure 3.4.3.4a. It is impossible to precisely determine her colour scheme from the black and white images of the garden, although the flowers do show up quite brilliantly in contrast to the foliage, suggesting lighter coloured flowers. The slight variation in flower contrast between beds suggests the uniform placement of colours in blocks, with colour transition occurring between beds. Pillar roses, *Rosa* spp, were used to denote the position of both sets of stairs on this terrace, the pillar shape replicating the more typical use of the formal, columnar form of Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, but at a more appropriate scale. See Figure 3.4.2.2a. Roses, *Rosa* spp, planted in the bed at the eastern end of the terrace formed an informal hedge that both partially concealed the summer-house from view but also created an end-point to the terrace, without overtly enclosing the space. 125 See Figure 3.4.2.6a.

Cornish’s use of lawn as the dominant surface covering for the terrace softened the geometric formality of the design, providing a soft, colour-enhancing contrast to the massed planting of roses, *Rosa* spp.126 The *Melaleuca* spp currently planted in the garden bed at the foot of the retaining wall were probably planted circa 1960s. While these now very mature trees create a significant amount of privacy within the garden, they effectively cut the garden off from the house. This is likely to be at odds with Cornish’s design intent; the formal design of the terrace garden, especially the geometric rose garden of the first terrace, implied the need for connection between house and garden.127

3.4.3.2 Water terrace
Cornish chose a deceptively simple planting scheme for the Water Terrace, using this element to great effect in the creation of strong formal elements but also creating a space that was resonant with tranquillity. Cornish achieved this by using the following planting techniques:
- the repetition of simple vertical forms juxtaposed against horizontal expanses,
- the formal placement of the plants,
- the provision of colour through foliage only, and,
- the repeated, massed use of a limited plant palate.128

The main plant element in this ‘room’ were the eight Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, symmetrically planted in double pairs either side of the pond. Their placement and strong vertical columnar form enhanced the formality of the terrace, and provided a softness and tactility not easily achieved with built elements. A further formal element was added through the small curved garden beds between each pairing of Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*. Cornish continued the
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128 Bird, site visit of the garden, August 2001.
vertical planting theme throughout the terrace, selecting to mass-plant a variegated strappy foliage specimen possibly Phormium spp in the garden beds at the foot of each retaining wall, by the pond, in the curved garden beds between the Italian cypresses, Cupressus sempervirens, and in the rectangular planters along the top of the terrace. A strong foliage contrast was provided by the planting of a single broad-leaved specimen either side of the staircase, creating a highlight that acted as a finishing point to the garden bed as well as denoting the staircase. The strong verticality of the terrace was juxtaposed against the vast flat expanse of sky, lawn and water; these elements providing contrast in scale, tone and texture. Cornish maintained design continuity in her plant selection for the pond, by using both vertical and horizontal plant elements. The corners were planted with grasses, probably Pennisetum spp, and the pond with water lilies, Nymphaea spp, and reeds including bullrush, Typha latifolia, and probably Isolepis nodosa. See Figure 3.4.2.3a.

The tranquillity and restfulness of the garden ‘room’ was furthered by the exclusive use of foliage plants. Cornish built the colour scheme around a variety of green tonings, ranging from the deep green of the Italian Cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, to the contrasting lightness of the variegated specimen chosen for the flower beds. Although green was the dominant colour of this terrace, the azure blue of the Adelaide summer sky reflected in the stillness of the pond and the darkness of the Mintaro slate retaining wall were also significant elements of the colour scheme in this area.

3.4.3.3 ‘Pleasance’

Cornish used her planting scheme to create the structure and atmosphere of the ‘Pleasance’, combining both formal and informal elements to achieve a degree of unifying formality within an informal structure. The enclosed, secluded environment of the terrace was created through dense tree and shrub plantings at either end of the terrace and the large informal shrub hedge along the southern boundary; these plantings formed the foundation of the terrace’s informal ambience. To terminate the main central axis, Cornish chose to plant a pair of large specimen trees opposite the last staircase, within the informal hedge. See Figure 3.4.2.2a. The pairing and size of these trees provided an appropriate end-point to the axis, while their rounded forms and soft textural qualities were in keeping with the informal ambience of the terrace. This juxtaposition of formal and informal was continued throughout the rest of the terrace. Cornish selected the formal fastigate forms of Italian cypresses, Cupressus sempervirens, as the main lawn specimen, but arranged their planting in an informal random pattern along its length. A specimen Eucalypt, probably either Corymbia citriodora (syn. Eucalyptus citriodora) or C. maculata (syn. Eucalyptus maculata), planted at the periphery of the Italian Cypresses, Cupressus sempervirens, created both a contrast in form to the Italian Cypresses, Cupressus sempervirens, and a link with the tree and shrub borders at either end of the terrace. See Figure 3.4.1a.

It is impossible to accurately determine the composition of the tree and shrub borders or the hedge. Poor-quality aerial photographs of the eastern border suggest the inclusion of a cypress, *Cupressus* spp, and a silky oak, *Grevillea robusta*. A further image of a portion of this border suggests the inclusion of a hibiscus, *Hibiscus syriacus*. See Figure 3.4.2.6a. The maturity of the current informal hedge of oleander, *Nerium oleander*, along the southern boundary suggests that this may have been Cornish’s original planting. A mixed selection of white and pink flowering forms provided a highlight to the deep green foliage of the Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, and balanced the colourful planting at the foot of the retaining wall.

Although the garden bed at the foot of the retaining wall was initially planted with massed nasturtiums, *Tropaeolum majus* cvs, Cornish intended for this bed and the wall to be planted with a range of annuals and perennials, including succulent plantings in the wall. Images of the garden confirm that this did actually happen. See Figures 3.4.1a and 3.4.3.3a. Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, planted either side of the stairs acted as a formal finishing point for each perennial garden and provided a link between the wall garden and the main terrace planting. The continuity of the use of Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, throughout the garden provided unity within both the ‘Pleasance’ and the terrace garden as a whole. The exact planting of the perennial and wall garden is impossible to determine; however, it is likely that it was composed from a mixture of period typical plants.

A list of period typical plants can be found in Appendices 5B-5C, 5E-5J.

---

Figure 3.4.3.3a The Mintaro slate retaining wall of the ‘Pleasance Terrace’ planted with a variety of succulent plants, *circa* 1945, looking north-easterly.

(Source: *South Australian Homes and Gardens* August 1945, p. 19.)

---

3.4.3.4 Western Border
Cornish retained a row of existing mature olives, *Olea europaea*, along the western boundary (Brougham Place) of the garden, incorporating them into the back of the Western Border as an informal hedge. The mature hedge provided immediate privacy from Brougham Terrace and created a softly coloured and finely textured background to the intended planting of the border, as well as the three terrace gardens. Cornish annotated a single image of this garden, specifically mentioning that the foreground of the border was planted with a selection of flowering shrubs and penstemons, *Penstemon* cvs, although it appears as if a selection of other perennials and annuals may have also been included in the planting. See Appendix 3A. Snow in summer, *Cerastium tomentosum*, was planted at intervals along the edge of the wall, Cornish no doubt intending it to spill over and down the slate. The soft grey foliage and white flowers of this plant would have created both a textural and colour contrast to the hardness and dark browns and greys of the Mintaro slate wall. The similarity of colourings between the snow in summer, *Cerastium tomentosum*, and olives, *Olea europaea*, would have provided colour continuity between the front and back of the border and acted as both a unifying element and a contrast to the border’s intermediate plantings. See Figure 3.4.3.4a. It is interesting to note that the olives, *Olea europaea*, did not continue the entire length of the boundary, terminating approximately halfway along the width of the rose terrace. Cornish would have relied on the mature trees planted in Brougham Gardens, to the west, to provide the background form and colour for this portion of the border when viewed from inside the garden. See Figure 3.4.2.3a

Cornish varied the planting at the foot of the retaining wall, changing her scheme to accommodate the theme of each terrace. It appears that geraniums, *Pelargonium* spp, were planted in a very narrow bed on the rose terrace. The bed at the foot of the wall on the water terrace was substantially wider than that of the rose terrace and was mass planted with the variegated strappy foliage plant, *Phormium* spp, used in the other garden beds, Cornish retained the continuity of the terraces' planting scheme. It is difficult to determine this aspect of the planting scheme for the 'Pleasance', although it does appear as if the dense tree and shrub planting at that end of the terrace generally subsumed the wall. See Figure 3.4.3.4a

---

3.4.3.5 Eastern Lawn & Tennis Court

In keeping with the open spaciousness of the lawn tennis court and the Eastern Lawn, Cornish used a low, limited planting scheme for this space, allowing the lawn to dominate. To enclose the southern and eastern sides of the tennis court and to create definitive garden boundaries, Cornish used formal box-clipped cypress hedges, probably Cupressus macrocarpa or Cupressus torulosa, both being typical hedge plants of the period. The only other planting features in this space were the stepped rectangular flowerbeds located against the western fence of the tennis court and the two circular beds cut into the eastern lawn. Cornish aligned the circular beds to the ends of the first two terraces, but slightly asymmetrically to each other. While it is difficult to determine Cornish’s intent for the rectangular beds, the circular beds were definitely designed for massed bedding; canna lilies Canna x generalis were used in at least one scheme for 1931. See Figure 3.4.1a. Later images of the garden confirm that bedding schemes were regularly altered and continued for a number of years, the beds being returned to lawn at some point during the garden’s stewardship by St Ann’s College.137 See Figure 3.4.2.6a.

3.4.3.6 Northern ‘Room’

It is impossible to draw many conclusions about the planting scheme of the Northern ‘Room’ due to the lack of pictorial evidence. Cornish did, however, retain a mature existing specimen tree from the original garden on this site.138

---

3.4.3.7 House Planting
Cornish used simple formal elements in the immediate vicinity of the house, planting the garden bed between the patio wall and driveway with shrubs. Cornish probably intended them to be clipped just below the top of the wall, creating a formal but colourful hedge. See Figure 3.4.2.6a. The planting was continued past the patio and against the house and was composed mostly of shrubs, although a number of trees were included, their height and the tracery of their limbs softening the starkness of the masonry wall. Large pots were positioned on the patio and against the western façade of the house. Cornish planted the patio with the naturally formally-shaped Italian cypress, Cypresus sempervirens, and the western façade with unidentifiable standardised specimens although box, Buxus spp, seems likely. See Figure 3.4.1a. The uncomplicated topiary forms provided a simple elegant formality appropriate to the architectural style of the house. The western façade was further softened by the retention of the mature trees in the little adjacent garden bed. The play of light and shadow created by these trees on the wall in the afternoon was a commented upon feature of the garden. Cornish completed the garden with a formal box-clipped cypress hedge, probably either Cupressus macrocarpa or Cupressus torulosa.

3.5 Darling Residence

3.5.1 Darling Garden History and Description
Cornish’s involvement with the Darling garden at 19 Palmer Place, North Adelaide, began circa 1928, the property purchased in that year by Norman Darling to provide a home for himself and his two spinster sisters, Gertrude and Grace. The Darling’s commissioned architectural firm of English, Soward and Jackman to undertake the extensive alterations to the original 1849 era house, resulting in the large neo-Georgian structure, still present today. Aquinas College purchased the property in 1969 after the death of the last of the three siblings, Gertrude, in May 1968; the garden has been progressively simplified since this date to accommodate the needs of the College. Despite this, the basic structure of the garden has been retained through the retention of some built forms and mature trees.

---

141 The design and description of this garden has been pieced together from a collection of photographs held by the Aquinas College Archive and site visits made in September 2001, 2002 & October 2004.
142 Joan Hopkins (née Reid), grand daughter of Sir Sidney and Lady Kidman, recalled that Cornish was responsible for the design of this garden. Cornish’s own home was only two houses from this property. Interestingly, Edna Walling designed a garden for Mrs Harold Darling in Melbourne at about the same time as Cornish was designing this garden in Adelaide. Trisha Dixon and Jennie Churchill, The Vision of Edna Walling, Hawthorne, Vic., Bloomsings Books, 1998, p. 141.
143 Norman, Gertrude and Grace Darling where three of six children of prominent South Australian John Darling. Initially involved in grain and milling industries, John Darling further increased the family wealth through investment in BHP, becoming chairman of the board. This position was also later held by his son Harold. It seems that the whole family, with the exception of Norman, Gertrude and Grace, moved to Melbourne early in the twentieth century for BHP commitments. ‘Pioneer’s Daughter Dies, The Advertiser 7 May 1968, p. 6.
The residence was comprised of a large two-storey house composed of two wings and a separate large garage that backed onto Jeffcott Street to the rear. The main wing, containing the family rooms was the modified original dwelling and was sited in the middle of the one-acre (approximately 4000m²) block. The other wing, primarily contained servants quarters and domestic facilities, comprised a narrow rectangular addition to the northwest of the main building. The two wings were linked by a large bowed structure. Unlike other residences on Palmer Place, English, Soward and Jackman oriented the house approximately north, siting the front of the house perpendicular to the street. Views to the east of St Peter’s Cathedral, and to the south over the city and Adelaide Hills beyond were captured with large windows and second storey balconies. Unfortunately these views were not readily visible from ground level.

Cornish created an English style garden with Italian overtones to complement the neo-Georgian architectural style of the house. She achieved this design strategy by dividing the garden into seven main areas, comprised of five ‘garden rooms’, a tennis court and a utilitarian service area. There is a natural clockwise progression through these spaces around the garden, from front to back. Whilst two of the ‘garden rooms’ tended to be more private contained spaces with complex planting schemes, the three other ‘rooms’ by necessity tended to be more open and simply treated, providing aesthetic interest when viewed from the main rooms of the house. The main entrance to the property was located on Palmer Place, the gravel drive running from the gates in an oblique ‘S’ past the front of the house, under the double columned portico and through to the gravel service yard beyond. See Figure 3.5.1.

Figure 3.5.1 Aerial photograph of the Darling Residence, circa mid 1950s.
(Source: Aquinas College Archive.)

146 How Cornish came to be commissioned for the design of this garden is unknown, other than the garden there is no known connection to either the Darlings or to English, Soward and Jackman. It is possible that either Walter Bagot or Guy & Louisa Makin could have facilitated introductions or that the women met whilst undertaking charitable works for Christ Church in North Adelaide.
A service yard occupied the north-west corner of the garden and was respectively bounded on the north, south and west by the property boundary, house and Jeffcott Street. The service yard was concealed from view by a masonry wall, retained from the original garden, and a wisteria-clad pergola, Wisteria floribunda. Although the functionality of this space was primarily utilitarian, it was softened with an unassuming planting scheme providing a not totally bland setting for the domestic wing of the house.

The drive, lined with a dwarf hedge and clipped cypress pillars, Cupressus spp, divided the front lawn from the rest of the garden and formed the southern boundary of the first ‘garden room’. This space was simple yet elegantly treated so as to enhance the architecture at the front of the building. Entered from the portico, this ‘room’ was composed of a large expanse of lawn, bordered by simple planting features. To the west was a wisteria-clad pergola, Wisteria floribunda, and accompanying garden bed, to the north was a dense tree and shrub border backed by the masonry wall that ran the length of this boundary, and to the east was a large clipped treillage hedge that divided this space from the next ‘garden room’.

The second ‘garden room’ was a small, secluded, perennial garden located in the northeast corner. Not quite square, it was divided into four asymmetrical beds by a cross-axial path and was dominated by a mature jacaranda, Jacaranda mimosifolia. Cornish created significant background plantings for the perennial beds by continuing the tree and shrub border along the northern boundary and planting a cypress hedge, Cupressus spp, in front of the low stone wall and wrought iron picket front fence that extended the width of the property boundary along Palmer Place. Access to the space was gained, through the hedge from the lawn garden, via a shaped treillage structure smothered with what was probably English ivy, Hedera helix, or from the drive, where the north-south axis of the path aligned with the main path of the sunken garden.

A roughly square, sunken garden was sited adjacent to the eastern façade of the house. The northern and southern sides of the lawn were bowed, creating a simple popular shape, emphasised by a centrally positioned pond of the same design. Cornish possibly drew her inspiration for the shape of the ‘room’ from the adjacent verandah that also had a centrally bowed section. Tree and shrub plantings flanked the sunken portion of this ‘room’ on its northern and southern sides, creating a small bosquet effect; crazy paths through the bosquets were axially aligned with the middle of each bow. Low mortared Carey Gully sandstone retaining walls supported level

---

148 English, Soward & Jackman, ‘Residence to be Erected on Palmer Place North Adelaide for Norman Darling Esq Plan “B”’. The masonry wall has been subsequently replaced with a brushwood fence.
151 A 1929 photograph of the property from Palmer Place shows the jacaranda already well established, dating from an earlier garden on this site. ‘Palmer Place’ [photograph], 1929, State Library of South Australia, South Australian Database, B 5137.
changes, with a set of three curved stairs cut into the bowed sections of the wall. A further set of three rectangular stairs set within low piers sat against the western wall, aligned to the main door on this side of the house. A formal paved path divided the house from the sunken garden and continued through the southern gardens, terminating at the garden-house sited against the southern boundary wall. Cornish used a restrained planting scheme within the sunken garden, using a juxtaposition of clipped and natural forms.

To the south of the sunken garden was a formal rose garden, a rectangular space composed of three long parallel rectangular rose beds, lawn paths and densely planted borders along its eastern and southern sides. The path from the house formed the western boundary of this ‘room’; the garden-house was designed in a formal manner complementary to the architectural style of the house and formed the only break in the tree and shrub border flanking the southern masonry wall. Cornish continued the cypress hedge, Cupressus spp, along the front fence, forming a background to the border planting in this part of the garden.

The last two garden ‘rooms’ were disparate but connected spaces, each flowing into the other and designed to balance the southern façade of the house that was in its detailing architecturally elaborate. The first ‘room’ was primarily composed of lawn and specimen tree plantings. The second contiguous space involved a little perennial garden divided into four asymmetrical quadrants by a cross-axial path. Both spaces were bordered along their southern sides by a formal path that started in front of the garden-house. Both the path and the tree and shrub border were terminated by the tennis court fence. Besides the specimen trees, the back lawn also contained a narrow rectangular rose bed that extended along the path from the house, a narrow gap by the house allowing access to the lawn. The junction of the paths in the perennial garden were slightly enlarged and decoratively marked with a small paved octagonal space, in the middle of which was probably either a sundial or birdbath. These paths aligned to the loggia under the main balcony, the southern border, the entrance to the tennis court and to a specimen tree planted in the middle of the lawn.

The tennis court was aligned on a roughly north-south axis and was located in the southwest corner of the block. It was accessible from the small perennial garden and directly from the house via a small service yard, at the rear of the domestic wing of the house. A tall cyclone wire fence was constructed along the eastern boundary, creating a protective barrier between the tennis court and the perennial garden. Large clipped olive hedges, Olea europaea, were planted along both the southern and western boundaries.

Planting around the house was kept extremely simple with the most elaborate planting at the rear of the house, where white or lightly coloured painted trellis panels of a large square pattern were affixed around the bay windows and planted with climbing roses, Rosa spp. A small garden bed sited at the foot of this wall

---

155 Aerial photographs indicate that there is something set in the middle of the paths, the images are not clear enough to indicate exactly what but either a sundial or birdbath would seem the most likely, based on Cornish’s other gardens and local popular period gardening literature.
completed the planting. Potted clipped specimens were also strategically placed around the house, especially at the northern and eastern façades.158

3.5.2 Significant Design Elements

3.5.2.1 Spatial Configuration
Cornish designed the garden as a series of linked, enclosed spaces as much through necessity as by design. When the architects sited the house to take advantage of the northerly aspect, they did so at the expense of the view creating unappealing visual aspects that the garden was left to rectify. The garden was inwards-looking, with features within each space drawing attention away from unattractive external elements and creating pleasant aspects for each of the main rooms. Cornish achieved this through both designed elements and the planting scheme, linking the garden to the house through the repetition of formal themes.159

3.5.2.2 Service Yard
Cornish treated the service yard simply, retaining the site’s functionality as required for the garage and the domestic wing of the house. From the limited sources that detail this space, it appears that Cornish retained the majority of the area as open space, softening the boundaries with minimalist formal planting.160

3.5.2.3 Front Lawn
Cornish’s design for this garden ‘room’ was deceptively simple, effectively dealing with the site’s faults while enhancing its limited features. The individual design elements of the ‘room’ met specific needs that collaboratively provided a formal cohesive setting for the building and an introduction to the rest of the garden. Cornish needed to achieve engaging vistas from the formal dining room and upstairs bedrooms while concealing the large expanse of brick wall and external plumbing of the adjoining property. See Figure 3.5.3.6. Cornish used the vertical patterns of the architecturally-dominant double-columned portico as the essence of her design.161
See Figure 3.5.2.3.

The wisteria-clad pergola, *Wisteria floribunda*, provided a formal architectural link between house and garden, Cornish using a smaller version of the columns from the portico to form the main structure. This feature, with its adjunct garden bed, fulfilled numerous functions within the space. The pergola provided a focal point of sufficient scale to balance the portico and created an enclosed and intimate vista from the first of two dining room windows; the adjoining garden bed fulfilled this function for the second window. Physically, the pergola divided this garden ‘room’ from the service yard.162

---

158 Head, p. 66.
In lining the driveway with cypress 'pillars', Cupressus spp, Cornish created both a physical and psychological division between the two spaces without enclosing either. The formal vertical forms of the 'pillars' highlighted and emphasised the vertical elements of the house and pergola, furthering the connection between house and garden. The dense tree and shrub border planted against the boundary wall concealed the vast brick wall and external plumbing of the neighbouring property, creating a background to the 'room' and providing appealing vistas from both the garden and the upper storey bedrooms.  

3.5.2.4 Perennial Garden  
Of the entire garden this particular 'room' is the least well-documented. Except for the jacaranda, Jacaranda mimosifolia, and hedge planting, none of the original design or planting scheme still exists. What evidence there is indicates that this space was most likely a perennial garden with asymmetrical, cross-axial paths dividing the space and creating the garden beds. The asymmetrical placement of the north-south path maintained the dominant vista that linked the three 'garden rooms' to the east of the house. A small remnant of path by the driveway indicated that it was crazy paved. Cornish correspondingly reducing the formality of the paving to harmonise with a portion of the garden not in direct connection with the house. It would seem probable that either a sundial or bird bath was sited at the junction of the paths. See Figure 3.5.1. The two hedges and the tree and shrub border provided background plantings for the perennial beds. The English ivy-clad treillage hedge, Hedera helix, designed with a castellated opening was an uncommon built feature for

---

164 This part of the garden is now used as a car park.
a garden in this period and divided the perennial garden from the front lawn creating a visual balance with the pergola. See Figure 3.5.3.4.

3.5.2.5 Sunken Garden
Cornish designed the sunken garden as a formal ‘room’ to enhance and complement the eastern façade of the house. She achieved this through the repetition of the bow-sided, rectangular balcony shape, drawing it into her design for the sunken portion of the garden and the pool. She also used level change to create interest within the space through the following methods:
- the use of low sandstone walls and stairs, and associated feature planting;
- colour and textural contrasts between the sandstone and plantings; and,
- a formal, open, sunken space in which to site the pool, juxtaposed against the informality of the adjoining bosquet-like plantings.

The pool formed the main focal point within the sunken garden. Cornish’s addition of a water feature created tranquillity, softening the space through reflection and plantings of waterlilies, *Nymphaea* spp. The adjoining bosquets both linked this room to its neighbours and provided a degree of enclosure and privacy within the sunken space; the crazy paths within the bosquets accentuated the juxtaposition of formality and informality within the ‘room’.

3.5.2.6 Rose Garden
Although the house was only marginally connected to the rose garden in a physical sense, visually it still had an imposing influence. As such, Cornish retained a formal, uncomplicated design approach for this ‘room’. However, the reduced physical presence of the house allowed Cornish a degree of freedom not available to her in the rest of the garden, with the exception of the perennial garden. Cornish has treated this ‘room’ somewhat traditionally, using the repetition of simple rectangular forms, the inclusion of a garden-house and possibly a seat to create the architectural framework for the space. The repetition of long symmetrical rectangular forms in the rose beds, *Rosa* spp, lawn paths and borders created spatial unity while the simplicity and formality of these structural elements allowed the planting scheme to take precedence within the design. See Figure 3.5.1.

Cornish sited the garden-house in the southwest corner of the ‘room’, using it to terminate the path from the house. The garden-house provided a definitive boundary to the space and created a link between the house and garden through the replication of balcony columns and roof tiles, of the house, within its design. See Figures 3.5.1 & 3.5.2.6. Practically, the garden-house provided a place of repose from which to appreciate the southern portions of the garden.

---

3.5.2.7 Back Lawn & Perennial Garden

The back lawn and perennial garden provided an interesting juxtaposition within this space, comprising a simple tree-planted lawn contiguous with a perennial garden formally composed around cross-axial paths. The southern façade of the house was the most architecturally elaborate, the large central bay window and a smaller counterpart to the east almost balancing the large balcony to the west and aesthetically dividing the façade in a 1:2 ratio. Cornish drew this division into her design for the associated garden spaces, creating a cohesive two-part ‘room’ that balanced and unified the house and garden, the whole bordered with formal paths, paved with randomly sized rectangular pavers laid in a simple pattern. The openness created by the lawn, juxtaposed against the small, enclosed, formal perennial garden sited in front of the large balcony, assisted in relieving the visual dominance of the balcony. The semi-formal lawn provided a simple setting for the house, allowing the adjoining architectural elements and specimen trees to dominate the space. A seat positioned beneath the large tree in the southwest corner of the lawn took advantage of the view across the lawn to the rose garden and the southern section of the bosque-like planting of the sunken garden. See Figures 3.5.1 & 3.5.3.6.

The small perennial garden at the rear of the house was a slightly more formal variant of the perennial garden in the front garden. Cornish again based her design around asymmetrical cross-axial paths, including a paved octagonal feature at their junction. Directly connected to the house, the paving was composed of randomly sized rectangular pavers laid in the same formal pattern as the paths that bordered the combined spaces. The design of the paving in the octagonal space suggests that either a birdbath or sundial was used as a central feature. The asymmetrical composition of the paths maintained the main east-west vista within the southern garden space. This small ‘room’ also provided intimate views for those inside the house.

---

3.5.2.8 Tennis Court
Cornish sited the tennis court in such a way as to minimise its physical impact upon the garden while allowing for the maximisation of garden spaces. Her siting of the tennis court also achieved the recommended north-south alignment of the playing surface.\(^{172}\)

3.5.3 Planting Scheme\(^{173}\)
3.5.3.1 Service Yard
The planting scheme in the service yard was limited to Italian cypress specimens, \textit{Cupressus sempervirens}, against the masonry boundary wall and possibly a small garden bed against the pergola that also contained cypress specimens, \textit{Cupressus} spp, and possibly herbs, flowers and vegetables. Two clipped, potted specimens were positioned against the house and were probably intended as replacements for the potted specimens in the main garden. The planting scheme of the service yard reflected the utilitarian feeling of the space’s functional nature.\(^{174}\) See Figures 3.5.1 & 3.5.3.6.

3.5.3.2 Front Lawn
Cornish carefully composed the planting scheme of the front lawn, creating a formal framework for the rest of the garden. The large expanse of lawn was the central feature of the space, creating a soft unifying platform from which to exhibit the front of the house. The formal vertical element of the portico and pergola columns was drawn directly into the garden through the repetition of clipped cypress ‘pillars’, \textit{Cupressus} spp, along the drive, creating a living link between the house and garden.\(^{175}\) See Figures 3.5.1 & 3.5.2.3.

Cornish used a dense planting of trees and shrubs along the boundary wall to conceal the expanse of brick wall and attached plumbing belonging to the neighbouring property. The colour, form and textural variation of the tree and shrub border created a background to the ‘room’ and a focal point when viewed from the house.\(^{176}\) See Figure 3.5.3.6.

The pergola was planted with wisteria, \textit{Wisteria floribunda}. The adjoining flowerbed was dominated by a flowering purple-leafed \textit{Prunus} spp, planted at its southern end. The textural variation and regimented rows depicted in an aerial image dated \textit{circa} 1950s of the garden suggests that the flowerbed was also planted with roses, \textit{Rosa} spp, and that the \textit{Prunus} spp, was under-planted with some form of low-growing, shade-tolerant creeper.\(^{177}\) See Figures 3.5.1 & 3.5.2.3.

\(^{173}\) The limited pictorial or documentary evidence of the garden and the loss of much of the original planting scheme makes it difficult to definitively identify Cornish’s intended planting scheme for this garden. See Appendix 6A for a list of plants used by Cornish in her garden designs.
3.5.3.3 Perennial Garden
Cornish continued the tree and shrub border into the perennial garden creating continuity along the northern boundary of the garden. The specific planting scheme of the perennial beds is unidentifiable in the circa 1950s aerial photographs and other photographs from the period. However, Cornish created significant background plantings for these beds, using a variety of colours, textures and forms to achieve both variation and continuity within the planting scheme. It is impossible to identify any specific colour scheme, the retention of the mature jacaranda, *Jacaranda mimosifolia*, possibly indicating a scheme dominated by blue.\textsuperscript{178}

3.5.3.4 Sunken Garden
The sunken garden involved a juxtaposition of formal and informal elements, highlighted by the planting scheme. The semi-formal nature of the bosquet-like plantings created a sense of enclosure and privacy, while providing a background for the sunken portion of the ‘room’. The tracery of branches augmented the architecture of the building when viewed from the street. See Figure 3.5.3.4. Cornish added formal clipped specimens of yew, *Taxus baccata*, and cypress, *Cupressus* spp, to define access points and to link the house and garden through the repetition of strong vertical elements of the columned balcony. The soft green of the hedge along the eastern, Palmer Place, boundary created a background to the ‘room’ and provided continuity to the planting scheme within the space.\textsuperscript{179}

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 3.5.3.4 View of Darling Residence from Palmer Place, circa mid 1950'.**

(Source: Aquinas College Archive.)


Cornish used restraint when planting the sunken portion of the garden, allowing the repose of the water feature surrounded by soft green lawn to dominate. The darker green mat of waterlilies, *Nymphaea* spp, that covered the pond provided a simple yet effective contrast to the lawn. A single tree planted in the north-west corner cast shade over part of the lawn, creating contrasts in light and shadow, and the starkness of the low masonry wall was relieved by iris, *Iris germanica*, planted along its foot.

3.5.3.5 Rose Garden

Even though there are only black and white period photographs of this space, it is apparent that the colour, texture and form of the massed planting was the principal feature of this ‘room’. The rose beds were the primary focal point; the repetition of their long rectangular forms creating a formal symmetrical element within the space. The dense planting of trees, shrubs and probably perennials along the southern boundary wall and the shrubs and perennials planted in front of the hedge along the front fence concealed the boundaries of the garden, while providing background colour and texture. These plantings created internal unity and continuity within the garden as a whole. Cornish’s selection of lawn paths as opposed to hard paving softened the space both physically and psychologically and accented the other plantings within the space. See Figure 3.5.1.

3.5.3.6 Back Lawn & Garden

Cornish used the planting scheme of the back lawn and adjoining perennial garden to counter-balance the elaborate architecture. The open tree-planted lawn created a sense of space, while the trees provided an element of height and scale. The soft textural planting of the perennial garden softened the starkness of the building. See Figure 3.5.3.6.

![Aerial View to the North of the Darling Residence, circa mid 1950s.](Source: Aquinas College Archive.)

---

The continuation of the tree and shrub border along the boundary wall provided continuity to the southern side of the garden and balanced a similar planting along the northern boundary wall. It also provided background texture and colour while physically concealing the wall, neighbouring buildings and the exact boundary of the garden.\footnote{183}

The rectangular rose bed adjoining the path sited along the eastern boundary of the space created a degree of continuity between the back lawn and rose garden. The rose bed created a physical connection, adding to the visual connection that existed between the two spaces.\footnote{184}

### 3.5.3.7 Tennis Court

Cornish created a simple yet formally-treated planting scheme for the tennis court, adding a formal box-clipped Olive hedge, \textit{Olea europaea}, along the western and southern boundaries, enclosing the tennis court within the garden. The tall hedge also provided privacy from Jeffcott Street, to the west.\footnote{185}

### 3.5.3.8 House planting

Cornish used minimal house planting in this garden, placing formally-clipped, unidentifiable specimens at vantage points around the northern and eastern façades of the building in order to mirror and emphasise the formal nature of the architecture. Cornish installed formally-shaped pots of either terra cotta or cast concrete along the northern façade, where the entrance to the house was located, slightly reducing the degree of formality along the eastern façade by using painted half wine barrels. See Figure 3.5.2.3.\footnote{186}

She added a small garden bed at the rear of the house to define the boundary of the back lawn and soften the starkness of the house walling. The garden bed balanced the planting along the southern boundary wall; the combined plantings framed the lawn. White trellis panels, supporting climbing roses, \textit{Rosa} spp, where attached to the building either side of the windows, effectively drawing the garden into the house.\footnote{187}

---

\footnote{183}{Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001, 2002, October 2004. 'Aquinas College'.}
\footnote{184}{Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001, 2002, October 2004. 'Aquinas College'.}
\footnote{185}{Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001, 2002, October 2004. 'Aquinas College'.}
\footnote{186}{Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001, 2002, October 2004. 'Aquinas College'.}
\footnote{187}{Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001, 2002, October 2004. 'Aquinas College'. Head, p. 66.}
3.6 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society Show
Model Gardens Competition

3.6.1 History of the Competition
The Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society Show\textsuperscript{188} (RAHSS) Model Gardens Competition was held in Adelaide every year between 1929-38. Inspired by the Chelsea Flower Show,\textsuperscript{189} it is likely that the idea for an Adelaide-based Model Gardens competition was conceived by Lady Zara Hore-Ruthven,\textsuperscript{190} the wife of the South Australian Governor.\textsuperscript{191} Sir Lancelot Stirling confirmed Lady Hore-Ruthven's involvement in his 1930 RAHSS annual Presidential address:

"Her Ladyship has been particularly helpful in the Floriculture Section and it is questionable whether any section of the Show attracted more attention than the Garden Display which resulted from the offer of Her Ladyship of a cup for the best Out-Door Display of Flowers.\textsuperscript{192}

The Competition was named after her Ladyship, and was known by the wordy title 'Lady Hore-Ruthven's Challenge Cup to be awarded for the best and most artistic display of flowers and plants staged by any grower'.

Lady Hore-Ruthven provided the silver cups and trophies awarded to competitors in the open division and, later, the amateur division of the Competition.\textsuperscript{193} The Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Incorporated matched her generosity with monetary awards from 1930 onwards, with £5 awarded for first place, £3 for second and £2 for third place.\textsuperscript{194} By 1935 these amounts had increased to £20, £10 and £5 respectively.\textsuperscript{195} Lady Hore-Ruthven remained a guiding force behind the Competition while she resided in Adelaide from 1928-34, using her vice-regal position to assist the Exhibitors' Committee\textsuperscript{196} to negotiate with the RAHSS Horticulture Committee for the improvement of site conditions. The Model Gardens Competition site was located off West Boulevard between the SAFU Stock Sales

\textsuperscript{188} Also commonly known as the Royal Adelaide Show.
\textsuperscript{189} The period media regularly drew comparison between Chelsea and the Model Gardens Competition and it may well have been a small way of bringing with Lady Hore-Ruthven some of the taste and familiarity from home, a desire which would have been well received by Adelaide society.
\textsuperscript{190} Floriculture Many Magnificent Blooms Lady Hore-Ruthen’s Prizes’, The Advertiser 20 September 1929, p. 22. The Observer 28 September 1929, p52.
\textsuperscript{191} The Hore-Ruthvens lived in Adelaide from 1928-1934 before Lord Hore-Ruthven took up the post of Governor of NSW and later served as the Governor General during the Second World War; During the latter period, the Hore-Ruthvens were known as Lord and Lady Gowrie.
\textsuperscript{193} Lancelot J. Stirling, ‘Presidential Address for the year ending December 1930’, minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc 5th February 1931, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/1.
\textsuperscript{195} Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 17th June 1930’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.
\textsuperscript{196} The Exhibitors Committee was established after the 1930 show.
Pavilion and the fruit pavilion see figure 3.6.1, which is a copy of a 1935 map from The Advertiser illustrating the layout of the Show Grounds.

Cornish, as an elected member of the Exhibitors’ Committee, was responsible for presenting the views of her fellow competitors to the RAHSS Horticultural Committee and was pivotal in negotiating improvements to the Model Gardens Competition site. Although the Exhibitors Committee failed in their ultimate goal of relocating the Model Gardens to the area behind the Grandstand, (the area annotated as Log Chopping in figure 3.6.1), they did negotiate many other improvements, some of which also improved the Showgrounds as a whole. The majority of these site improvements were made before the 1931 Royal Adelaide Show and included:

- painting of the Dairy Produce Hall;
- a four foot (approximately 1.2 m) high extension of the western boundary fence with lattice panels;
- the extension of the lattice enclosures adjoining the Dairy Produce Hall, western fence and Stock Sales Pavilion;
- plantings of Cupressus lambertiana ‘horizontalis’ spaced eight feet (approximately 2.4 m) apart along the north, south and western boundaries of the Model Gardens enclosure;
- the planting of small shrubs along the front of the display area; and,
- the expansion of European Ash, Fraxinus excelsior, plantings along Western Boulevard from the Home Industries Hall.

Further improvements carried out between the Royal Adelaide Shows of 1931 and 1932 included the installation of a ten-foot (approximately 3 m) high section of lattice to cover the Farmers’ Union sign and the planting of morning glory, Ipomoea spp, along the fences. Over successive years of the Competition, images of the Model Gardens demonstrate the effectiveness of these apparently simple improvements. The treillage and maturing cypress, Cupressus lambertiana ‘horizontalis’, in particular, created rudimentary backgrounds for the Model Gardens, alleviating the starkness of the surrounding buildings.

The other members of the Exhibitors Committee were Messrs Kemp and Willaston.

197 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc, ‘Meeting between Competitors of the 1930 Model Garden Competition and Lady Hore-Ruthven, the Chairman of the Grounds (Mr AE Hamilton) and the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society (Mr HJ Finnis) September 1930’, minutes, Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Inc Archive. Elsie Cornish, ‘The Secretary R.A.& H.S. Adelaide’, correspondence, 8 November 1930, Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Inc Archive. Zara Hore-Ruthven, ‘Dear Mr Finnis’, correspondence, 7 December 1930, Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Inc Archive. Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 19 February 1931’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.

198 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 19 February 1931’. See Figure 3.6.1. The Home Industries Hall is noted as Needlework and Cookery.

199 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 28 January 1932’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.
Figure 3.6.1 1935 Map of the Show Grounds. The ‘Model Gardens’ is located on the western side adjacent to the ‘railway line’.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Archive)

While site improvements occupied most of the Exhibitors’ Committee’s time, they were also able to affect more immediate changes to the Competition itself. A “points system” for the judging of entries was implemented in 1931, with points awarded across the following four categories:

- Variety of plants shown;
- Quality of plants;
- Layout; and,
- Artistic effect.

This was the order in which the categories were recorded in the minutes of the original meeting held between Exhibitors, the Chairman of the Grounds Committee (Mr AE Hamilton), the Secretary of the RAHSS (Mr HJ Finnis) and Lady Hore-Ruthven.\(^{201}\)

\(^{201}\) Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc, ‘Meeting between Competitors of the 1930 Model Garden Competition and Lady Hore-Ruthven, the Chairman of the Grounds (Mr AE Hamilton) and the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society (Mr HJ Finnis) September 1930’.
Cornish’s formal response to the RAHSS on the matters discussed at this meeting indicated a level of concern, particularly for amateur competitors who would not have had access to the same variety of plant materials as professional garden designers or nurserymen. Cornish suggested that the category for the “Variety of plants” be eliminated and that the design and artistic aspects be more heavily weighted than the quality of plants shown. Although her suggestions were not fully adopted, her comments caused the weighting of the variety and quality of plants to be adjusted to a total of 20 points each, design to 40 points and the “Artistic effect” category was renamed “Artistic arrangement of plants” and adjusted to 20 points.202

The Exhibitors’ Committee felt that a female judge should be included on the panel of judges and this suggestion was readily adopted. Eva Waite, owner and collaborative designer with Cornish of her Jekyll-inspired garden, and Mrs, later Lady Hudd carried out this role during the life of the Competition. Cornish suggested Mrs H Dutton and Mrs JJ Downer as other possibilities,203 and the Nurserymen’s Association of South Australia also suggested Mrs H Dutton and Miss Young.204 Other regular judges included E Hurcombe (1930-33, 1938), CHA Lienau (1933-38) and the Garden Editor of the South Australian Homes and Gardens magazine, Alfred J Quarrell (1930-2, 1935-7).205

The Exhibitors’ Committee also felt that the Competition name did not adequately reflect the nature of the competition, changing it to ‘Lady Hore-Ruthven’s Challenge Cup For Best and Most Artistic Display out of Doors (Model Gardens)’.206 Under the original scope of the Competition, any Exhibitor who won the Competition three times secured permanent ownership of the Cup - Kemp achieved this with his 1933 entry.207 As a result, Lady Hore-Ruthven donated another to the Competition and the

202 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc, ‘Meeting between Competitors of the 1930 Model Garden Competition and Lady Hore-Ruthven, the Chairman of the Grounds (Mr AE Hamilton) and the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society (Mr HJ Finnis) September 1930’. Cornish, ‘The Secretary R.A.&H.S. Adelaide’. ‘Kemp’s Third Win in Model Gardens Secures Lady Hore-Ruthven Challenge Cup’, The Chronicle 14 September 1933, p. 28. While Cornish’s views on plant materials may have been totally altruistic, her own 1930 model garden entry was sparsely planted in comparison to those of other competitors, possibly costing her second place. This was a mistake that she did not repeat in subsequent model garden entries.

203 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc, ‘Meeting between Competitors of the 1930 Model Garden Competition and Lady Hore-Ruthven, the Chairman of the Grounds (Mr AE Hamilton) and the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society (Mr HJ Finnis) September 1930’. Cornish, ‘The Secretary R.A.&H.S. Adelaide’.

204 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 16th June 1931’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.

205 A complete list of Judges can be found in Appendix 3B.

206 Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc, ‘Meeting between Competitors of the 1930 Model Garden Competition and Lady Hore-Ruthven, the Chairman of the Grounds (Mr AE Hamilton) and the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society (Mr HJ Finnis) September 1930’.

207 Kemp’s Third Win in Model Gardens Secures Lady Hore-Ruthven Challenge Cup’, p. 28. Herbert John (Jack) Kemp (1905-1963) was a second-generation South Australian horticulturist and nursery proprietor. His horticultural training was undertaken in France, the UK, and locally within the family nursery under the guidance of his father, horticulturist Herbert Kemp who established the family nursery circa 1899. Jack Kemp was an important local horticultural personality who expanded the family business and provided horticultural advice through his regular newspaper columns under the nom de plume Grevillea. Jack Kemp was also responsible for the establishment of the Kemp’s Nurseries garden design service. Aitken and Looker, p. 343. Kemp was an important regular professional competitor of the Model Garden Competition and although it seems that his entries were entered under the guise of Kemp’s Nurseries the local press always attributed all wins and places to
name of the Competition was changed again during 1934 to ‘Lady Hore-Ruthven's Perpetual Challenge Cup for Model Gardens’. This cup remained the property of the RAHSS and was inscribed each year with the winner’s name.\textsuperscript{208} A small replica of the cup was presented to the winner.\textsuperscript{209}

During the early years of the Model Gardens Competition, it became apparent that a second competition was required, aimed at amateur gardeners. The amateur competition began in 1932, Lady Hore-Ruthven again donated the main trophy\textsuperscript{210} and small replicas were presented each year to the winner.\textsuperscript{211} In correspondence with the RAHSS Horticulture Committee, Lady Hore-Ruthven also expressed the wish that the trophy only be awarded if ‘in the opinion of the Judges a certain number of marks are gained.’\textsuperscript{212} This was in response to the disappointing model gardens displayed in the amateur section of the 1933 Royal Adelaide Show.\textsuperscript{213} It is unclear if this threat was ever carried out; subsequent newspaper reports indicate that in general at least one model garden displayed in the amateur section achieved a score above fifty points.

The establishment of the Model Gardens amateur division had a number of effects on the Competition as a whole. The competitors for the Challenge Cup involved those considered to be of a professional standing in either the nursery or garden design industries, which ultimately improved the overall standard of this Competition. It also encouraged more entrants, as potential amateur competitors who had previously been loath to compete against professionals could now compete against others with a similar standing or interest in gardens.

The other constraints that competitors were required to observe were those of garden size and design materials. Between 1929 and 1933, competitors were allocated a space of 14 x 10 feet (4.3 x 3.1m) with the expectation that it would be used in its entirety. From 1934 this increased to 20 x 30 feet (6.1 x 9.14m). All materials and equipment were to be provided by the exhibitor, which could consist of nursery lines, pots in plants and cut flowers and floral work, with the exclusion of wreaths. The only exception was the provision of soil at cost by the RAHSS from the 1932 Royal Adelaide Show onwards.\textsuperscript{214}

---

\textsuperscript{208} This cup is today kept in the RAHSS Boardroom at the Royal Adelaide Showgrounds, Wayville.


\textsuperscript{210} 'Model Gardens Kemp's Nurseries Again Successful', p. 26.

\textsuperscript{211} Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 27th October 1931’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.

\textsuperscript{212} 'Model Gardens Kemp's Nurseries Again Successful', p. 26.

\textsuperscript{213} Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA Inc Horticulture Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 20th February 1934’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 188/2/12.

\textsuperscript{214} 'H. Kemp's Third Win in Model Gardens Secures Lady Hore-Ruthven Challenge Cup Popular Feature', The Advertiser 11 September 1933, p. 8.

The Model Gardens Competition was not held in 1939, possibly due to waning interest. During the Second World War no Royal Adelaide Shows were held. With material and building restrictions for many years after the War, a Model Gardens Competition would have been viewed as an extravagant waste of limited resources, and so the Competition ceased to operate.

During the Competition’s ten-year lifespan, Cornish designed and built seven entries, competing from 1929 to 1934 and again in 1936, in the professional division of the Competition. Of these seven entries there are pictorial records and basic descriptions for six; of her last entry very little is known. All entries submitted by Cornish placed her within the top three in judging. Unlike other regular competitors, Cornish was willing to experiment with her designs, which ranged from informal rockeries through to highly formal spaces - even though it became apparent after the first few years of competition that the judges held a bias towards rock gardens. Interestingly, most of Cornish’s regular competitors opted for the safety of rock gardens, the better examples of which were usually awarded first place.

3.6.2 Description of Cornish's Model Gardens

3.6.2.1 1929 Rock Garden

Cornish’s first model garden, in 1929, was a rock garden and was awarded first place. Comprised of a mixture of both formal and informal elements, the garden was small, simple and dominated by a central planted rockery cairn containing a small circular feature pool. See figure 3.6.3.4. Cornish added a basic variation to the overall rectangular shape of the garden by connecting a shortened front boundary to the sides by using concave curves. The front entrance was composed of a rustic timber gate and fence with a diamond pattern throughout. The side boundaries of the garden consisted of a single course of stone set on its side and Cypress hedges, *Cupressus* spp, although with the time span allowed for the creation of competition gardens they were inevitably still only closely-planted individual plants. The rear boundary of the garden was treated in the same manner; however, two courses of stone were used to add extra height. See figure 3.6.2.1a.

---

215 The annual Flower Day celebrations had become increasingly popular since their instigation for the State’s Centenary in 1936. Cornish was a member of the Organising Committee for this floral display. See footnote two from this chapter for further information about Flower Day.
217 ‘Floriculture Many Magnificent Blooms Lady Hore-Ruthven’s Prizes’, p. 22.
218 Probably either *Cupressus macrocarpa* (*Cupressus lambertiana* or *Cupressus lambertiana* ‘horizontalis’) or Bhutan cypress, *Cupressus torulosa*, both were commonly used for hedges during this period.
219 Elsie Cornish, ‘1929 Model Garden Entry – Rock Garden’ [photographic collection], 1929. This collection of photographs has been kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish.
The space between the cairn and boundary was crazy-paved with stone flags, with some planting evident between the paving joints. Potted Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, added a formal tone and were located in both the front and rear corners and along the right side. A rustic timber garden bench was located front left, balanced by a concrete pot in the corner diagonally opposite, planted with a large succulent *Aeonium* spp and cactus *Opuntia* spp. Of particular interest was the concrete planter at the front right - Cornish designed and cast these planters herself for the garden she designed for Sidney Wilcox. Two small pieces of sculpture were included in the rockery to the rear left of the pond – the first a cherub seated on a ball and positioned slightly in front of the second sculpture that depicted a little figure of Pan. See figure 3.6.2.1a.

![Figure 3.6.2.1a Cornish's 1929 Rock Garden entry.](image)

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)

### 3.6.2.2 1930 Bricks & Daffodils
Cornish’s third-placed 1930 model garden was described by *The Chronicle* as ‘...effective use of brickwork as a setting for daffodils...’. Jack Kemp, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, was awarded first place for their example of a rock garden, similar in design to Cornish’s rockery cairn entered the previous year, complete with a rockery cairn, feature pond and a border of rock set on edge as dominate design elements. Cornish’s entry, from a design perspective, was certainly better executed than the second-place sunken garden of Mrs G Wood. The paucity of Cornish’s plantings and her win of the previous year possibly affected her placing.

---

221 Cornish, ‘1929 Model Garden Entry – Rock Garden’.
222 ‘Model Gardens Variety of Design Prize to Rockery Design’, p. 22.
The garden was comprised of two parts: a large principal square space containing a central circular garden bed and a smaller adjunct rectangular space. The larger square section was bounded on all sides by a low brick wall, comprised of a double wall at the front and back, approximately five courses high, and a single wall approximately two courses high along both sides. Cornish constructed square brick piers approximately ten courses high at each corner and at either side of the entrances located in the middle of the back and front walls, which added both structural strength and design aesthetic. The main features of the design were a circular garden bed and a centrally positioned sundial - the bed was edged with slightly sunken bricks and a raised garden bed was created between an internal double brick wall. A circular brick-paved path surrounded the central garden bed, separating it from the internal wall. Further raised planting spaces were created in between the double brick walls at the front and back of the space, in the middle of the piers and between the internal wall and the low outer wall along the sides of the space, resulting in planting on four different planes. See figure 3.6.2.2a.

Figure 3.6.2.2a Cornish's 1930 'Bricks & Daffodils' entry.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)

The smaller rectangular space was comprised of a curved brick path that led from the main garden. The foot of the brick wall was planted with cyclamen, *cyclamen* spp in mounded garden beds. A statue of Pan sat in the far corner, raised on a small mound of rough-cut lichen-covered stone, backed with a large shrub possibly bamboo, *Bambusa* spp. The remaining space was planted with lawn. See figure 3.6.2.2b.

---

224 Elsie Cornish, '1930 Model Garden Entry – Bricks & Daffodils' [photographic collection], 1930. This collection of photographs has been kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish. ‘Skilled Gardeners’, pp. 22, 24.

3.6.2.3 1931 ‘Springtide’

Only two entries were received for the 1931 Competition; a rock garden from Jack Kemp, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, and Cornish’s ‘Springtide’ comprising of a formal pond and terrace. The judges decided to award both exhibitors equal first place. With only a close-up photographic image of Kemp’s entry available, it is difficult to assess if the judges’ determination was valid. The Chronicle described the two gardens as differing ‘so essentially in type that it was almost impossible to compare them on a common basis.’ Cornish’s garden was well-considered, the design strong and the planting well-executed. If the design of Kemp’s garden was of the same calibre of the entry from the previous year then it is difficult to understand how Cornish’s superior design could not have won outright. See figures 3.6.2.1a & 3.6.2.1b.

---

Figure 3.6.2.2b Cornish in the rectangular section of her 1930 entry.

(Source: Australian Homes and Gardens October 1930, p. 22.)

---

227 Elsie Cornish, ‘1931 Model Garden Entry – Springtide’ [photographic collection], 1931. This collection of photographs was kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish. Elsie inscribed the back of five of the photographs from her 1931 design, detailing both the colour and planting schemes, the fish and reflections cast from the pool and comments about the popularity of the exhibit with the crowds. See Appendix 3C. An image of only a small part of Kemp’s Nurseries garden can be found in ‘Show Gardens in Exhibition’, South Australian Homes and Gardens October 1931, p. 23.
Figure 3.6.2.3a ‘Springtide’ Cornish’s 1931 garden entry.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)

Figure 3.6.2.3b Kemp’s Nurseries 1930 ‘Rock Garden’ entry.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens October 1930, p. 23.)
‘Springtide’ was designed as an extremely formal garden ‘room’, comprised of a water garden and a raised terrace. Cornish oriented her design so that the shorter sides of the rectangular space bordered the front and back of the garden. The main feature was a central circular pool with a wide concrete rim, surrounded by a narrow circular garden bed into which four decorative urns had been placed, evenly spaced around the pool. A path of rectangular concrete pavers was laid in a regular pattern and extended from the middle of the front border and around both sides of the pool to the back right corner of the water garden, where it was met by stairs to the terrace. Well-planned and planted garden beds surrounded the path and ran along the foot of the terrace. Italian Cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, and large raised pots containing bamboo, *Bambusa* spp, sited at the back left corner of the water garden, added an element of height to the design.228

A decorative balustrade of cast concrete ran along the front edge of the terrace, with a bowl of daffodils, *Narcissus* spp, positioned at each end. Potted topiary specimens were placed to either side of the top of the stairs, with further various potted plantings sited along both the foot of the balustrade and along the back of the terrace, all planted in decorative round concrete tubs of the same design. A potted Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, in a square concrete planter was positioned at the rear right of the terrace.229 See figure 3.6.2.3a.

### 3.6.2.4 1932 ‘The Pool of Narcissus in the Poets Garden’

Cornish’s 1932 exhibit, ‘The Pool of Narcissus in the Poets Garden’, was awarded third place, with first place awarded to John Willmott’s Spanish-inspired sunken garden and second place to Jack Kemp’s, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, rock garden.230 Although Cornish re-used many elements from ‘Springtide’, she achieved a totally different feel with this design. Like ‘Springtide’, ‘The Pool of Narcissus’ was composed of a water garden, a raised terrace, a circular pool and similar paving and massed plantings. With this combination Cornish created a juxtaposition of formal elements within a natural setting and, although obviously contrived, she achieved a model garden that could be easily transplanted as a ‘room’ within or as the main feature of a larger rock garden.231

The pool was asymmetrically positioned, shifted slightly to the left and rear of the water garden. A narrow garden bed surrounding the pool merged with the border planting on the left side, effectively nestling the pool into the garden. From the front of the garden, a path placed slightly left of centre ran straight to the pool, before wrapping around its right side and meeting the centrally positioned but slightly angled stairs within the rockery embankment. A garden bed filled the remaining space to the right of the path and pool. Above the stairs, the path continued along the left side of the terrace exiting the garden. The terrace wall either side of the stairs

---

231 Elsie Cornish, ‘1932 Model garden Entry – The Pool of the Narcissus in the Poets Garden’ [photographic collection], 1932. This collection of photographs have been kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish. Elsie inscribed the back of two of the photographs, detailing some elements of both the colour and planting schemes, as well as her thoughts about the reflections created in the pool. See Appendix 3D. ‘Model Gardens at the Royal Show’, *South Australian Homes and Gardens* October 1932, p. 46.
was treated as a rockery embankment. Small, planted terracotta pots lined either side of each step and the sides of the landing. The positioning of the rocks and the planting of the embankment, although still obviously contrived, appeared more naturalistic than the “cairn” styles of rock garden that were more frequently created by many of the other competitors. Large rocks lined the rear of the terrace in Cornish’s garden, visually connecting it to the embankment. See figure 3.6.2.4.

Two small shaped Cryptomeria spp were placed either side of the path, denoting the entrance, the use of relatively mature shrubs added a height element to the garden and created a background to the pool. Cornish included a small jet within the pool, that was apparently a great success with the crowds. However, she herself favoured the reflections created on still water, as evidenced by the inscription she wrote on the back of a photograph of the garden sent to her family interstate: ‘Sometimes I had the water playing – There was an overflow pipe so that I could leave the water on. I liked the still water best with the reflections but the crowd like to see the jet working.’ See figure 3.6.3.2. Although the little statue of Pan does not appear to have been used in this garden, Cornish used two other statues - a statue of a turtle holding jumping fish sat on the rim of the pool, and a little figure of Narcissus leaned over from the garden, viewing his reflection in the water.
3.6.2.5 1933 Portico
As in 1931, only Cornish and Jack Kemp, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, entered this year’s competition. Kemp again placed first, with another rock garden. The judges commented that this entry bettered his previous attempts. 235 Although a mound of rockwork dominated the top of Kemp’s garden, he integrated further strata of rockwork throughout the garden, alleviating the dominant appearance of the cairn. Kemp’s rock placement was still predominantly unnatural in appearance but began to take on a more naturalistic form. A sunken pond spanned by a bridge was a further feature of his design. 236 See figure 3.6.2.5a.

Figure 3.6.2.5a Jack Kemp’s, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, 1933 ‘Rock Garden’ entry.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens October 1933, p. 40.)

Cornish adopted another highly formal and geometrically structured design for her fifth entry and, although the garden was dominated by its architectural elements, it was the flower borders that were the true focus of her design. 237 The space was evenly divided into three horizontal bands, each forming a terrace. A lawn path stepped through the middle of each terrace, dividing the stepped flower borders on

---

235 ‘H. Kemp’s Third Win in Model Gardens Secures Lady Hore-Ruthven Challenge Cup Popular Feature’, p. 8.
236 ‘Model Gardens at the Royal Spring Show’, South Australian Homes and Gardens 1 October 1933, p. 40.
237 The judges felt that the ‘heaviness of the concrete work’ unbalanced the design; she also lost points for what they felt was ‘the uneven arrangement of some of the plants’. The Chronicle 14 September 1933, p. 28.
either side of the garden. Entrance to the garden was gained through a wrought-iron gate, supported by concrete-rendered piers each topped with a decorative ball. Low, curved concrete-rendered walls supported by low piers and topped with planted urns enclosed the front of the garden. An Italianate garden-house filled the left corner of the top terrace, a garden bench extended along its back wall. Access from the garden-house to the terrace was obtained by a curved concrete step protruding from between the columns of the garden-house. Low concrete edging supported each terrace, the steps in the lawn path were capped with large concrete pavers and a low round pot was positioned at either side of each step. See figure 3.6.2.5b.

Treillage panels along the back and side of the upper terrace, planted with sweet peas, *Lathyrus odoratus*, formed a background to the flower border along the right side of the garden, as well as terminating the vista from the bench in the garden-house. Cypress, *Cupressus* spp, planted along the back of the upper terrace partially enclosed the garden-house along that side. Unfortunately, Cornish did not adequately terminate the vista along the lawn path. The flower borders were backed with a variety of shrubs including bamboo, *Bambusa* spp, lavender, *Lavandula* spp, and a flowering *Prunus* spp. The carefully composed colour scheme provided in a very small space the idea of a Jekyll-inspired border, that could have been easily transposed to any suburban garden.

Figure 3.6.2.5b Cornish’s 1933 ‘Portico’ entry.

(Source: *South Australian Homes and Gardens* October 1933, p. 40.)

---

238 Elsie Cornish, ‘1933 Model Garden Entry – Portico’ [photographic collection], 1933. This collection of photographs was kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish. Elsie inscribed the back of a photograph from her 1933 design, detailing elements of both the colour and planting schemes. See Appendix 3E. ‘Model Gardens at the Royal Spring Show’, p. 40.

3.6.2.6 1934 Sunken Garden

Cornish’s 1934 sunken garden design tied for second place with AF Liddle’s rock garden; Jack Kemp, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, again won with yet another rock garden design. Cornish’s design was extremely simple, using common geometric shapes that repeatedly occurred throughout her model garden designs. Cornish excavated a large, shallow square in the middle of the standard rectangular plot, and retained it by a single course of large rocks. The main feature of the sunken garden was a circular area of crazy paving into which the statue of Pan, placed on a low rockery mound planted with small annuals, was centrally positioned. Two small flights of stairs in the middle of the front and back walls provided access points to the sunken section of the garden. Small shaped garden beds filled the remaining spaces between the paving and the rock retaining walls within this part of the design. See figure 3.6.2.6.

Narrow flower beds wrapped around the top of the front and sides of the sunken section of the garden, divided at the front by a centrally positioned crazy-paved path. Cornish planted four conically clipped Cryptomeria spp along the front of the garden, one at each corner and two smaller specimens either side of the path. Cornish finished the design with a small rectangular terrace adjoining the rear of the sunken garden. A crazy-paved path gently curved to the right of the terrace, passing through treillage panels that lined the back of the terrace. The terrace was otherwise planted with annuals and potted bamboo, Bambusa spp. Clipped specimens were planted on either side of the top step, with two small Italian cypresses, Cupressus sempervirens, flanking the end of the path.

3.6.2.7 1936 Italianate Garden

Cornish competed for the last time in 1936, and was placed second. Liddle was again placed first and Jack Kemp, representing Kemp’s Nurseries, third. There are no known pictorial records remaining of Cornish’s entry and only the very briefest description of her design survives, from a journalist covering the Royal Adelaide Show for The Advertiser:

‘Miss Cornish relied on a more formal design, modelled on Italian lines, which was certainly the best effort she has submitted to date. The balustrading introduced a novel touch and the judicious use of dwarf flowering shrubs did much to heighten the general effect.’

It appears that Cornish re-used the balustrading from her 1931 garden ‘Springtide’, possibly also re-working elements of that design. The specific mention of dwarf flowering shrubs is interesting, as descriptions of her other gardens by the media only allude to her use of spring-flowering annuals, bulbs and perennials. The possible combination of the design elements from ‘Springtide’ with the more

---

241 Elsie Cornish, '1934 Model Garden Entry – Sunken Garden', 1934. This collection of photographs was kindly lent by Elsie’s great-nephew Dr Peter Cornish. 'Show Gardens in Miniature', South Australian Homes and Gardens November 1934, p. 53.
243 'Cup in Model Gardens', p. 15.
244 'Cup in Model Gardens', p. 15.
considered planting scheme from ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ could very well have resulted in one of her best designs for the Competition.

Figure 3.6.2.6 Cornish standing in the background, top right corner, of her 1934 ‘Sunken Garden’ entry.

(Source: RAHSS Archive)

**3.6.3 Design Elements**

**3.6.3.1 Spatial Configuration**

When broken down into their elementary components, Cornish used the same simple geometrical themes throughout all of her Model Garden designs, with the exception of her 1933 entry. Each garden was comprised of a circular feature contained within a square, with an adjunct rectangular space - the exception to this being the 1929 Rock Garden, that lacked the second rectangular space. For the 1933 Portico garden, Cornish employed a different basic structure, using a nine-square grid as the basis of her design.²⁴⁵

The main design elements of Cornish’s Model Garden designs were:
- a space composed from simple geometrical shapes;
- retention of symmetry in all but one example;
- the use of simple asymmetrical elements;
  - as a “point of difference” in the otherwise highly formal symmetrical ‘Springtide’; and,
  - as the primary spatial arrangement in ‘Pool of the Narcissus’, and;
- the use of the planting scheme and garden features to balance the composition of the space.\(^{246}\)

3.6.3.2 Water
Cornish included water elements in three of her designs, as a minor element in 1929 and as the principal feature of her 1931 and 1932 gardens. See figures 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.2 & 3.6.3.4. She adopted a simple circular form for each pool, emphasising the characteristic geometrical theme prevalent in her Model Garden designs.\(^{247}\)

Typical elements found in Cornish’s Model Garden designs that contained a water feature included:
- the use of a formal shape in both formal and informal surroundings;
- a preference for still water and associated reflections, although a small water jet was included in at least one design;
- pools edged with a wide concrete rim into which small planting pockets were created;
- controlled and contained surrounding plantings in her formal designs;
- relaxed surrounding plantings in her informal designs, where plants were allowed to spill over the rim and water plants were included within the pools; and,
- associated statuary and decorative pots asymmetrically positioned in her informal designs and symmetrically positioned in her formal designs.\(^{248}\)


3.6.3.3 Paths, Paving and Driveways

The small size of these gardens precluded complex path systems. Cornish’s prevalent use of circular features resulted in paths that either traversed through or wrapped around major design elements, such as pools. The majority of her path systems retained the simple symmetry of the overall design and incorporated the main axis as in her 1930, 1933 and 1934 designs. See figures 3.6.2.5b, 3.6.2.6 & 3.6.3.5. The paths in her 1931 and 1932 designs respectively created and emphasised the asymmetrical elements in these gardens.\(^{249}\) See figures 3.6.2.3a & 3.6.2.4.

Design characteristics for Cornish’s paths and paving in her Model Garden designs typically included:

- the creation or inclusion of the main garden axis;
- the use of paths and paving as a main feature of the design;
- the predominant use of symmetrical paths in formally designed spaces;
- the use of the paths to consolidate asymmetrical forms in the informally designed spaces;
- the use of complementary materials and patterns to reflect the degree of formality within the space;
- the variation of the paving pattern within different sections of the garden to assist in distinguishing between the sections; and,

---

Materials and patterns Cornish used included:

- irregular-shaped flags laid in a 'crazy' pattern;
- irregularly sized large-format rectangular concrete pavers laid in a regular formal pattern; and,
- brick laid in stretcher-bond and circular patterns.251

3.6.3.4 Rock Gardens and Rockeries

Cornish included rockwork in two of her Model Garden designs; as the main feature of her 1929 garden, a rockery cairn, and as a significant element in her 1932 garden, a rockwork embankment. The base of the 1929 rockery cairn was composed of large rough-hewn stone and excepting the fact that it was laid in a circular fashion this layer of rockwork appears to have been positioned somewhat in keeping with the advice on Rock Gardens given in Jekyll and Weaver’s book Arts and Crafts Gardens252 and Jekyll’s book Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens. Typical of the Adelaide rock garden, a small circular pond was placed to the front of the first strata of rockwork. Unfortunately the subsequent levels of rockwork used small rocks that were not laid on their natural faces and were poorly placed – Cornish seemingly made no attempt to create further strata lines.253 See figures 3.6.2.1a & 3.6.3.4.

The rockery bank in the ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ was a more concerted attempt at rockwork and appears to have followed the principles outlined by Jekyll in Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens, for the construction of rock walls at a 45° angle. This rock garden also exhibited some of the faults from the 1929 example; however, they were not as pronounced. Much of the problem with this example was that Cornish apparently tried to meld together Jekyll’s advice on the design of angled rock walls and rock gardens, not quite successfully achieving either.254 However, the 1932 garden was the better-executed example of the two represented rockwork-themed designs.255 See figures 3.6.2.4 & 3.6.3.2.


The main characteristics of Cornish’s 1929 rock garden included:
- the use of a style typical to the period and to Adelaide, of a rockery cairn and pond;
- an initially well-laid first strata negated by circular form; and,
- subsequent rock layers that were out of keeping with the initial layer - rocks not laid on their natural faces, were positioned too closely and their size was too small for the size of the initial strata.256

Figure 3.6.3.4 Detail of the rockery mound in Cornish’s 1929 ‘Rock Garden’ entry.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)

The main characteristics of her 1932 garden differed considerably and included:
- an angled rock wall/embankment created from a selection of compatible rock sizes, that were laid on their natural faces and generally followed reasonably well composed strata lines; and,
- a restricted plant palate, planted in bold masses and arranged to create and maintain continuity, colour and textural interest.257

3.6.3.5 Small Features - Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Cornish included a variety of small features in her Model Gardens, using them as both incidences or as the main focus of the design. Over the duration of the Competition, Cornish included at least one example of a sundial and a seat, and regularly used statutes and pots throughout her designs.\(^{258}\)

The rustic seat included in her 1929 rock garden was angled within the left front corner of the garden and was sufficiently sized to accommodate two (thin) seated women. Using a hedge to provide a background, the seat was constructed from ‘rustic’ timberwork, maintaining continuity between other built elements in the garden (the fence and gate). The seat was harmonious with the informal style of the design and spatially balanced the large pot sited in the corner diagonally opposite.\(^{259}\) See figure 3.6.2.1a.

The sundial in Cornish’s 1930 ‘Bricks and Daffodils’ garden completed this particular design where it:
- provided necessary scale and a sense of importance;
- enticed visitors into the space by siting at the mid-point of the main axis; and,
- was of a design typical of the period.\(^{260}\) See figures 3.6.2.2.a, 3.6.3.5 & 3.6.3.7.

Figure 3.6.3.5 The sundial from Cornish’s 1930 entry.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)


\(^{259}\) Cornish, ‘1929 Model Garden Entry – Rock Garden’.

With the exception of her 1930 and 1934 gardens, Cornish regularly included pots and vases of varying sizes and degrees of formality throughout her designs. Cornish achieved the following effects with pots and/or vases:

- the continuity between formal garden designs and the design of the pot;
- the addition of scale, form, colour and textural elements in the garden;
- the creation of main features and/or small points of interest within the gardens; and,
- to accent boundaries and the formality of the space.\(^{261}\)

Pots were placed symmetrically in formally designed spaces and placed either side of the stairs irrespective of design formality. Cornish also used terracotta and half wine barrels regularly within her Model Garden entries.\(^{262}\) See figures 3.6.2.1a, 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.4 & 3.6.2.5b.

Small statues featured regularly in Cornish’s Model Gardens, creating small points of interest and adding an element of whimsy to her designs, particularly those that also contained a water feature. In some cases, statues were used as a central feature of the garden, such as in the ‘Sunken Garden’ design. The same statue of Pan was used in both her 1930 and 1934 designs and was probably what was commonly known during the period as a “lefco” statue. These terra cotta statues were approximately 50cm tall and were finished with a matt glaze.\(^{263}\) Interestingly, statuary was not used in her two most formal designs ‘Springtide’ and ‘Portico’. See figures 3.6.2.2b, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.3.2 & 3.6.3.4. Statues were used in Cornish’s Model Gardens to:

- denote the mid-point of the main axis;
- entice visitors into the space;
- create a main feature;
- provide and element of scale within the garden; and,
- denote and simultaneously disguise a boundary.\(^{264}\)

### 3.6.3.6 Large Features - Pergolas, Columns & Garden Houses

The 1933 portico-style garden-house, that matched the rendered wall and its wrought-iron gate, and the 1929 rustic fence and gate, are the only large-scale features used by Cornish in her Model Garden designs.\(^{265}\) See figures 3.6.2.1a &

---


3.6.2.5b. Interestingly, of all the Model Gardens that were pictorially documented, John Willmott was the only other exhibitor to include full-sized architectural features within their designs, the other competitors only including pergolas or garden-houses in miniature, which belied the nature of the Competition. See Figure 3.6.3.6a. This can in part be explained by the abundance of rock garden designs, which did not generally lend themselves to the formality of these types of garden features and the danger that such features could have dominated, creating an unbalanced design. The portico-styled garden-house of Cornish's 1933 garden could be considered a point in case. However, if her design was considered with the anticipated mature size of the planting scheme, particularly that of the flowering *Prunus* spp then any such unbalance would be alleviated.

Cornish used large features within her garden designs to:

- provide continuity between the formality of the design and the selected style and materials of the feature;
- create boundaries within the garden;
- provide colour and texture; and,
- add scale — the addition of significant height elements was not commonly seen in the Model Gardens Competition.

Figure 3.6.3.6a Willmott's 1932 'Spanish-styled Sunken Garden' entry.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens, October 1932, p. 47.)

---


3.6.3.7 Level Change - Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

Level change was the most enduring design element in Cornish’s Model Garden designs, including multiple planting levels in 1930; terraces in 1931, 1932 and 1933, a sunken garden in 1934, and rock walls in 1929. Level changes created a further degree of complexity within Cornish’s designs and allowed for the incorporation of a diverse range of associated design elements within her gardens.269

Terraces were included in four of Cornish’s Model Gardens, where they were used as both formal and informal features. Her terraces were composed from a variety of elements that enhanced either the formality or informality of the design. Formal terraces were either left as open space or treated more traditionally with lawn juxtaposed with flower borders; other key components included pots, balustrading, formal paving and accent feature planting. The informally designed terraces incorporated rockeries, informal paving, flower beds, pots and minimal use of accent feature planting.270 See figures 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.5b & 3.6.2.6.

Cornish designed her stairs to correspond with the degree of formality in each of the four gardens in which they were used, frequently aligning the stairs with the main axis of the garden. Cornish tended to butt the stairs against the terrace wall, only once actually incorporating the stairs within the wall. Concrete formwork and large rectangular pavers dominated; railings were not included. Cornish included low edging in her most formal design, the 1931 ‘Springtide’ garden.271 See figures 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.5b & 3.6.2.6.

Cornish used a variety of walling within her Model Gardens, ranging from a single course of rockwork to more intricate brickwork, including both free standing and retaining walls:

- low, dry stone, retaining walls were used to support terraces and the sunken garden;272
- low, free-standing, dry-stone walls, between one and two courses high, were used to denote garden boundaries;273
- multiple level brickwork walls and piers were used to form the basic layout of the garden, facilitating the impression of a sunken garden without actually being one;274


- hybrid rockery and a 45° angled dry-stone retaining wall were used to support a low terrace; and,
- a single course of brickwork was used as a low retaining wall, to support terracing.

The opportunity to integrate wall plantings was limited, generally due to the low stature of Cornish’s walls - only two of her designs adequately allowed for this type of planting. Cornish incorporated small planting gaps randomly along the upper section of the circular brick wall in her 1930 design, including plants with both upright and cascading forms. Further specimens were planted at the foot of the wall. Unfortunately, the general paucity of planting within this garden also carried through to the wall plantings, resulting in a disappointing overall appearance for this planting scheme. See figure 3.6.3.7. In contrast, the dry-stone angled rockery wall in the 1932 garden was densely planted, Cornish using a restricted plant palette to create two different but cohesive rockery gardens either side of the stairs. On the left, the upright form of ferns were juxtaposed with the lower rounded forms of massed cyclamen, *cyclamen* spp; to the right, the soft rounded forms of massed cyclamen, *cyclamen* spp, primrose, *primula* spp, and pansies, *Viola* hybrid cultivars, nestled against the roughness of the rock. See figures 3.6.2.4 & 3.6.3.2. This theme carried through to the low rock wall that bordered the back of the terrace. In most of her other designs, densely planted flower borders ran along the foot of the wall, sufficiently obscuring the wall to create cohesion between the wall and the planting scheme; any disunity was generally caused by the immaturity of the planting. See figure 3.6.2.3a.

Cornish’s only Model Garden to contain a sunken element was simply designed; Cornish excavated a section of the garden square, retaining the earth with a single course of large rocks. A mounted statue and a circular crazy-paved section formed the main features along the central axis of the garden and enticed the visitor into the garden. However, the insufficiencies in the surrounding planting scheme gave the space a transient feeling, as there was little to linger over before exiting to the space beyond. See figure 3.6.2.6. Other design features of this garden included:
- the use of simple geometric shapes;
- the use of large rough-hewn stones to retain the sides;
- a simple planting scheme in a ‘carpet bedding’ style; and,
- no apparent attempt to incorporate the planting scheme into the wall.

---

3.6.4 Planting Scheme

3.6.4.1 Colour

Within the limited space of her Model Garden designs, Cornish composed surprisingly sophisticated colour schemes, redolent of Jekyll’s Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden. In particular, the composition of the colour schemes in her gardens ‘Springtide’ and ‘Portico’ were simplified versions of the description of Jekyll’s flower border in her Spring Garden.  

Cornish’s design for ‘Springtide’ did not allow for the conventional long, straight flower border. Instead, she wrapped her colour progression around the garden. Beginning at the left of the path, Cornish concentrated pale pinks, blues, and creamy yellows, the colours intensifying as the border progressed to the front of the balustrade, where stronger blues contrasted with creamy yellows were dominant. The dominance of blue continued on the other side of the stairs, changing to yellow, orange and brown before changing back to lilac-pink, pink, yellow and creamy white. The middle of the space was dominated by yellow and the blue and pink of anemones, Anemone coronaria. Cryptomeria spp, clipped box, Buxus spp, cypress, Cupressus spp, and potted bamboo, Bambusa spp provided variety in form, scale and texture. See figure 3.6.4.1.

---

Notes:

281 Cornish, ‘1931 Model Garden Entry – Springtide’.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)
Figure 3.6.4.1 This hand coloured photograph of Cornish's 1931 'Springtide' entry displays an indicative representation of the colour scheme for this garden. However, it does not adequately convey the subtlety of Cornish's colour scheme as outlined by the planting scheme on the verso of the photograph.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)

In her 'Portico' design, Cornish drew inspiration from Jekyll's use of red in her Spring Garden design, introducing a hint of it into her own garden. The first terrace, composed of lavender, pink, yellow and white, shifted to blue, pink and red on the second terrace before changing to blue and creamy yellow with a hint of pink on the third terrace. Cornish paid a little more attention to foliage combinations in this garden than she did with 'Springtide'. The inclusion of the silvery foliage of lavender, *Lavandula* spp, on the first terrace combined with the pink, lavender, white and yellow flowers, and the grassy green of bamboo, *Bambusa* spp, on the second terrace combined with red, pink and blue flowers were both typical Jekyll flower and foliage colour combinations.\(^{282}\)

The colour schemes of her other Model Gardens were all composed around varying combinations of blues, yellows, pinks and whites - all apparently modelled on Jekyll's ideas. In only two of her Model Gardens does foliage colour, independent of that provided by the flowering plants, seem to have been given the same degree of thought as flower colour. The *Cupressus* spp hedging in the 1929 Rock Garden created a deep green background for the massed planting of the rockery cairn - a profusion of pink shades juxtaposed with yellows, whites and a touch of blue - and in

\(^{282}\) Cornish, '1933 Model Garden Entry – Portico'.
3.6.4.2 Flower Borders

Cornish only included one flower border in the tradition of Jekyll's long rectangular borders, in the 1933 'Portico' garden. However, in essence, all of her Model Gardens, with the exception of the 1929 'Rock Garden', were designed as vehicles for the display of flowering plants in this manner. In her 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1934 Model Gardens, the flower borders wrapped around a main circular feature, the border continuing directly around the circular feature and the adjunct rectangular spaces at the rear of the design; this area usually formed a background for the main display.

Based almost entirely on spring annuals, bulbs and occasional perennials, Cornish's borders were transient, containing little permanent planting with which to sustain the design; 'The Pool of the Narcissus' was the only exception. Although she managed to achieve sufficient variation of planting to provide form, colour and texture in both leaf and flower, Cornish did not often manage to successfully include sufficient height variations, losing the element of scale that would have given the borders a more "completed" look and feel. Her 1934 'Sunken Garden' almost verged on a 'bedding' style of planting, rather than that of a flower border. Although the constraints imposed by the RAHSS can explain some of these failings, a slightly more judicious use of plant material, including more shrubs in pots inserted into the border, could have alleviated most of these problems. See figures 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.6 & 3.6.3.2.

3.6.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

With the exception of the 'Pool of the Narcissus', trees and shrubs were not a dominant feature of Cornish's Model Garden designs. The expense of incorporating large numbers of trees and shrubs into her designs could not have been easily met either through purchase from nurseries or through propagation in her own garden nursery. Cornish most often relied on the repeated use of a number of large potted specimens, (most commonly cypress, Cupressus spp, and bamboo, Bambusa spp)

---


286 Jekyll often utilised this technique for filling gaps within her flower borders. Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, pp. 190, 241.
that regularly featured in support of the few planted specimen trees or shrubs that she used in her gardens.\textsuperscript{287}

The ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ is the anomaly. As well as containing the usual potted specimens, Cornish also planted bamboo, \textit{Bambusa} spp, silver birch, \textit{Betula pendula}, Japanese maple, \textit{Acer palmatum}, japonica, \textit{Chaenomeles} spp, \textit{Boronia} spp, rosemary, \textit{Rosmarinus officinalis}, and ferns, \textit{Nephrolepis cordifolia}, providing a consolidated framework of foliage and bark. These plants added colour, texture and scale for the massed perennials, annuals and bulbs that completed the planting scheme for this garden. A comparison of Cornish’s use of trees and shrubs in her designs against that of her fellow competitors, especially those from the Nursery industry, demonstrated that Cornish was aware of the importance of the feeling of permanence and scale that trees and shrubs instilled into a planting scheme.\textsuperscript{288} Most of her competitors did not use this type of planting in their own planting schemes; even the rock gardens that so dominated the Competition required a framework of suitable trees and shrubs, and this element was often missing from their designs. See figures 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.3b, 3.6.2.5a & 3.6.3.2.

\textbf{3.6.4.4 Hedges}

The nature of the Competition made the successful use of formal hedges almost impossible without significant resources to back the Exhibitor. Cornish made only one attempt at using what would constitute a proper hedge - massed plantings of cypress, \textit{Cupressus} spp, around the boundaries of her 1929 Rock Garden. Although the hedge was obviously unestablished, it did make her intentions clearly apparent. Adapting to these restraints, Cornish often massed a single annual planting or easily propagable shrub such as rosemary, \textit{Rosmarinus officinalis}, along her borders, to create a more cost-effective if somewhat transient low informal hedge, relying instead on well placed clipped specimens to provide formal aspects within the garden.\textsuperscript{289} See figure 3.6.2.1a.

\textbf{3.6.4.5 Topiary}

Cornish repeatedly used simple clipped forms throughout her Model Garden designs, adding necessary formal elements into her planting schemes that could not otherwise be easily realised with spring flowering annuals, perennials and bulbs. Clipped mounds of \textit{Cryptomeria} spp were used in 1931, 1932 and 1934 to denote paths and the beginning of flower borders. Potted Italian cypress, \textit{Cupressus sempervirens}, clipped to emphasise their natural shape, were used in all years except 1930, and potted clipped English box, \textit{Buxus sempervirens}, used on either side of the staircase in 1931. Both added a formal element to the design while highlighting further design elements within her gardens. Cornish’s topiary specimens also contributed much


\textsuperscript{288} Cornish, ‘1932 Model Garden Entry – The Pool of the Narcissus in the Poets Garden’.

\textsuperscript{289} Cornish, ‘1929 Model Garden Entry – Rock Garden’. 
needed green to her colour schemes, while providing form, textural qualities and a limited degree of scale to her designs. See figure 3.6.2.3a.

3.6.4.6 Lawn
Cornish included lawn in only two of her Model Garden designs; the 1930 ‘Bricks and Daffodils’ and 1933 ‘Portico’ garden. In the latter case it was used in place of paving to accentuate the colour of the adjacent flower borders. Its soft textural qualities also assisted in softening the heaviness of the rendered concrete pillars of the portico-style garden-house and the front wall. See figure 3.6.2.5b.

3.6.4.7 Creepers & Climbers
Time constraints imposed for the set-up and removal of Model Gardens by the RAHSS precluded the use of creepers and climbers to any great extent, unless they could be established elsewhere and successfully transported and installed with minimal damage. Cornish often incorporated potted sweet peas, *Lathyrus odoratus*, supported on movable treillage panels into the background of her displays; the sweet peas, *Lathyrus odoratus*, adding a wall of colour and an important height element to her designs. See figures 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.5b & 3.6.2.6.

3.6.4.8 Natives
As far as can be determined, the only native plant included by Cornish in her Model Garden planting schemes was brown Boronia, *Boronia megastigma*, in the 1931 ‘Springtide’ and 1932 ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ designs. The inclusion of a native within the formal context of ‘Springtide’ was unusual for the period. Cornish, on the back of a photograph of ‘Springtide’, particularly specifies its colour and its inclusion within the planting scheme as much, if not more, for the brown and yellow colouring of its flowers as for its scent that when combined with that of the daffodils, *narcissus* spp, added yet another dimension to her design.

3.6.4.9 Plant Selection
Cornish selected her plant palette for colour impact, provided predominantly by the massed planting of spring flowering annuals, perennials and bulbs that were at their best during the month of September. To balance the profusion of colour, she incorporated evergreen trees and shrubs, usually potted, and included a few feature trees and/or shrubs for added colour, texture and scale. Financial constraint was a

---


factor that Cornish would have had to address in her designs, further reducing the flexibility of her plant selection. Most, if not all, of the plant materials would have been grown from seed or propagated in the little nursery that Cornish established in her back garden to support her various gardening commissions, especially that of the University of Adelaide Embankment Garden.

3.7 University of Adelaide

3.7.1 University of Adelaide - Lower Grounds History and Description

The lower grounds of the North Terrace campus of the University of Adelaide were Cornish’s longest known garden association. Cornish began their design, construction, supervision of and maintenance, in 1929, continuing until her death in 1946. A commemorative plaque attached to the main staircase erroneously records this connection as being from 1929 to 1947.

Walter Bagot, the University Architect, was responsible for Cornish’s engagement at the University, essentially sub-contracting her through his firm Woods, Bagot, Laybourne-Smith and Irwin from early in 1929 until June 1934, with the University subsequently directly employing Cornish until 1946. Cornish re-negotiated the scope of her duties with the University between 1944 and 1946 to involve only the managerial components of the job, supervision and provision of design and horticultural advice. Cornish sub-contracted the physical components of the job to garden labourers.

Most of the significant design and actual formation of the gardens occurred during the period of Cornish’s employment by Bagot; this had a number of advantages for both Bagot and Cornish. Bagot was in a formal position to ensure that his advice was adopted and that Cornish’s plans for the lower grounds were congruous with his Master Plan for the overall University campus. From Cornish’s perspective she had a strong advocate to advance her ideas and support for her unusual and extensive use of succulents. Interestingly, during this period, Bagot in his typical gentlemanly, philanthropic manner undertook the financial management of Cornish’s relationship with the University free of charge.


2 Alison Brookman expressed the belief that Cornish was ‘far from well off, very little to live on except for her professional work.’ Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.

3 Jones, ‘Elsie Marion Cornish (1887-1946)’, pp. 90-1.


5 Jones, ‘Elsie Marion Cornish (1887-1946)’, p. 92.

The most significant element of the lower grounds was the approximately 300m long Embankment Garden also known as the ‘Waite Escarpment’, due to the financial support of the Waite sisters for the project. The Embankment Garden ran horizontally across the lower campus from Kintore Avenue to the rear of the Elder Conservatorium, in a rough dog-leg alignment. Although the University campus is built on the side of a small hill, The News reported that the escarpment cutting was formed as a result of quarrying soon after settlement.\textsuperscript{301} It was also subsequently re-developed as a train spur from the main railway station. The spur allowed for the easy transportation of goods and livestock to the former Show Grounds site that was originally located along Frome Road between North Terrace and Victoria Drive.\textsuperscript{302}

Cornish developed the remainder of the lower grounds into a series of formal lawns, shrubberies and copse plantings associated with the Barr Smith Library, Lady Symon, Chemistry, Refectory/Union, George Murray and Benham Laboratory buildings, Bonython Hall, and later the gardens for the new Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (IMVS) on Frome Road.\textsuperscript{303}

### 3.7.1.1 Embankment Garden

Cornish developed the Embankment Garden over a period of six years from early 1929 to late 1934, forming and planting the garden in sections. Although divided by various staircases into five different sections, the embankment seems to have been developed in three phases each taking approximately two years to complete. During the first phase Cornish completed the longest single section of the embankment, the middle section, which ran from the western side of the main brick staircase by the Barr Smith Library, behind and to just past the Union Building, where it was terminated by another staircase. The second phase consisted of the three western sections of embankment running from the Union Building to the former Bagot-designed University Caretakers Cottage (now ‘Alumni House’) on Kintore Avenue. The final phase saw the completion of the eastern section of the embankment running from the eastern side of the main brick staircase, between the Barr Smith Library and Anatomy Building to just behind the Elder Conservatorium.\textsuperscript{304}

The middle section of the Embankment Garden was approximately 100m long, 12m wide and 3.5m high, and was supported at its foot with an approximately metre high Mintaro slate dry-stone retaining wall. Images of this portion of the Embankment Garden taken in 1929 show an existing low fence running along the top of the embankment constructed from short white painted timber posts linked with sections of galvanised iron metal pipe. There was also a row of stobie poles along the top of this section of the embankment; however it appears that the electricity service was re-routed as they had been removed by the mid 1930’s.\textsuperscript{305} See figure 3.7.3.1a.

\textsuperscript{301} ‘Bank at University Now Cascade of Colour, The News 21 October 1937, p.10.

\textsuperscript{302} David Jones, personal communication, March 2006. Hodgkinson, p. 422.


\textsuperscript{305} Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The University of Adelaide’.
There is little pictorial or descriptive evidence of the western portion of the Embankment Garden. Divided into three short sections totalling just over 100m in length, they were approximately 17m wide and 5m high. Basic earth formations suggested at the periphery of a photograph taken in 1929, unclear aerial images and current remnants, indicate that the western sections of the embankment were formed into a double bank, each supported by a Mintaro slate dry-stone retaining wall. The double bank may have been created as a means for dispensing with some of the excess earth created during the excavation of foundations and other building works. There was a row of existing mature palms along the top of this section of the embankment. Bagot recommended that they be removed and replaced in 1934 with ‘hardy drought resisting shrubs...’ It is also probable that a small post and rail fence was continued along the top of this section of the embankment.

The eastern section of the Embankment Garden was the most interesting of the three sections. Unlike the other sections of the embankment that were relatively straight, the eastern section retained a significant kink. The actual escarpment itself was roughly the same height and width as the middle section. However, the kink and the availability of land between the base of the escarpment and the Barr Smith Library, allowed Cornish the opportunity to continue the garden, partially wrapping it around the western and southern sides of the Library building. A Mintaro slate dry-stone retaining wall extended from the base of the main staircase curving to the southwestern corner of the campanile at the back of the Library, creating a garden on three levels. The sharp-drop of the escarpment, a flat between the escarpment and retaining wall, and further limited tree planting and rough grass in front of the retaining wall. See figures 3.7.2.2a & 3.7.3.1b.

3.7.1.2 Shrubberies, Lawns & Copse
Cornish progressively developed a number of shrubbery and lawn areas throughout the 1930s. The shrubberies and lawns associated with the Barr Smith Library and at the base of the main staircase were completed in 1932; those associated with the Lady Symon, Union and Chemistry buildings in 1933; Bonython lawn mid 1930s; IMVS and additions to the gardens behind the Chemistry and Nutrition buildings 1939; and the Benham Laboratory in 1941. In addition to the maintenance associated with these gardens and the escarpment there was also the maintenance of the gardens on the south side of the Anatomy building and the Geology courtyard; and the care of all creepers on all of the University buildings; the White cedar, Melia azedarach var. australasica and hackberry, Celtis australis copse, which Cornish may have planted; the Cupressus spp planted along the Victoria drive frontage; fourteen English Elms, Ulmus procera and, the mowing of the lawns associated with the Barr Smith Library and in front of the Darling Building.

308 Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The University of Adelaide’.
Cornish used a selection of segment shapes for the shrubberies adjunct to the buildings and along Victoria Drive, adopting softened triangular forms for the beds either side of the main brick staircase and adjunct to the embankment behind the Chemistry building. The hackberry, Celtis australis, and White cedar, Melia azedarach var. australasica, copse, divided by an approximately north-south aligned path was formed from two beds, a slightly curved, elongated teardrop, next to the Union Building and an adjoining curved bed behind the former playing fields grandstand, since demolished. Most of the remaining lower campus grounds were maintained as rough grass, with the exception of manicured lawns in front of the Barr Smith Library, Darling Building and a central rectangular panel and grassed bank respectively in and around The Cloisters. See figures 3.7.3.2a, 3.7.3.2b & 3.7.3.2e.

3.7.2 Design Elements
3.7.2.1 Spatial Configuration
Cornish designed the University’s Lower Grounds as a number of separate distinct gardens, each directly associated with a particular building, rather than as one single garden. This seems to owe in large to the fact that the Lower Grounds were in a constant state of flux, due to the rapid growth in the number of University buildings. Cornish, through her close working relationship with Bagot, would have been cognisant of the proposed buildings and as a result directed her energy and the University’s limited resources towards the beautification of the grounds connected with completed spaces. The Embankment Garden formed a natural division between the upper and lower grounds, and it was the dominant element of the lower grounds. Cornish transformed it from a scar that marred the University grounds into an imposing background that linked the individual garden elements of the Lower Grounds. Cornish created further cohesion and unity between each garden space through the repetition of the segment form of the garden beds and the similarity of planting schemes.

3.7.2.2 Embankment Garden
It is difficult to determine Cornish’s input into the built elements of the Embankment Garden. As University Architect, Bagot took responsibility for the actual design work, leaving Cornish to determine the planting scheme and prepare the site for planting, although it is likely that she would have been consulted out of courtesy and her thoughts and ideas integrated where appropriate. The main brick staircase, built in 1928 to link the upper and lower grounds, is a substantial enlargement of the upper House terrace staircase as designed and erected at ‘Broadlees’ under Bagot. See figure 3.7.2.2a.

---


3.7.2.3 Shrubberies, Lawns &Copse
The siting and form of the shrubberies and lawns were likely to have been a collaborative undertaking between Bagot and Cornish. Cornish most probably devised a plan based upon an initial consultation with Bagot, which he then approved for implementation. Cornish chose simple, segment and softened triangular shapes, as the dominant bed and lawn forms; these softer geometrical forms more agreeably harmonised with the architecture of the buildings. More importantly the shrubberies, copses and lawns partially filled otherwise large, open voids of hard surfacing, composed of either bitumen or compacted dirt and gravel, and assisted in the formation and framing of pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes, whilst simultaneously beautifying the space. The two triangular beds in particular, created a junction at the bottom of the main staircase and directed not only pedestrian access but in conjunction with the tear-drop copse bed also created a significant axis formed by the staircase through the lower University Grounds and across the Torrens River via the Waite-donated University Footbridge. See figures 3.7.2.2a & 3.7.2.2c.

3.7.3 Planting Scheme
3.7.3.1 Embankment Garden
The most significant aspect of Cornish’s work on the Lower Grounds was her plant selection for the Embankment Garden. With Bagot’s and the Waite sisters’ support, Cornish chose a selection of cacti, succulents, natives and northern Italian hill species with which to plant out the embankment. Particularly remarkable and

---

unusual for the period was the spectacular, extensive, massed use of cacti and succulents. Nowhere, up until this point, had any public Adelaide garden been planted in this way. Cornish’s selection of plants was particularly well suited to cope with the difficult north-facing, rubbly, alkaline site, and the limited labour and water resources.\textsuperscript{313}

Although the planting scheme throughout the Embankment Garden was essentially the same, Cornish chose two tree plantings to provide continuity among the sections. An Italian cypress, \textit{Cupressus sempervirens} was planted at the top of each staircase to denote its position, and a row of kurrajongs, \textit{Brachychiton populneus}, was planted at the top of and along the entire length of the escarpment. See figures 3.7.2.2a & 3.7.3.1b. The kurrajongs eventually replaced the palms that Bagot had recommended be removed in 1934. The Italian cypress, \textit{Cupressus sempervirens}, by the main staircase and a number of kurrajongs, \textit{Brachychiton populneus}, both behind the extended Union Building and near the former Caretaker’s Cottage, on Kintore Avenue still remain.\textsuperscript{314}

To accurately identify the specific species of cacti and succulents planted by Cornish is extremely difficult; however, it is possible to identify genus groupings. Cornish definitely included a selection of \textit{Aloe}, \textit{Agave}, \textit{Opuntia}, \textit{Aeonium}, \textit{Cerastium} probably the species \textit{Cerastium tomentosum} and what was then known as \textit{Mesembryanthemum} in the planting scheme of the embankment. Many of the succulents once classified as \textit{Mesembryanthemum} have been reclassified; the textural variation of Cornish’s \textit{Mesembryanthemum} planting suggests the mixed use of the now renamed succulents \textit{Lampranthus}, \textit{Aptenia} and \textit{Carpobrotus}. Apart from the \textit{Lampranthus}, \textit{Aptenia}, \textit{Carpobrotus} and \textit{Cerastium tomentosum} a number of other unidentifiable creepers were also used in the planting scheme of the Embankment Garden.\textsuperscript{315}

Cornish planted the most extensive and massed selection of cacti and succulents in the middle section of the Embankment Garden. She planted a large drift of probably \textit{Agave attenuata} down the side of the main staircase, and further specimen plantings of the larger \textit{Agaves} along the top and middle of the embankment, including several of the then known \textit{Agave fourcroya gigantea variegata} donated by Mrs Waterhouse. Cornish added further collections of mixed \textit{Aloes} and \textit{Opuntia} around the upper \textit{Agave} specimens. From this strong structural foundation planting at the top of the embankment, cascaded drifts of \textit{Lampranthus}, \textit{Aptenia}, \textit{Carpobrotus}, \textit{Cerastium tomentosum} and other creepers, breaking through the collection of smaller \textit{Aloes} and \textit{Agaves} planted at the top of the dry stone wall and over onto the path below and which, created a cascade of colour for much of the year.\textsuperscript{316} See figure 3.7.3.1a.

\textsuperscript{313} Jones, ‘Elsie Marion Cornish (1887-1946)’, pp. 91-2.
\textsuperscript{315} Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The University of Adelaide’.
\textsuperscript{316} Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The University of Adelaide’: ‘Rare Aloes In University Gardens’, The Advertiser 10 March 1939, p. 31.
Figure 3.7.3.1a Middle section of the Embankment Garden behind the Union Building, looking eastwards, circa mid 1930s.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

Cornish’s treatment of the eastern section of the Embankment Garden differed to that of the mid-section. Whilst Agaves, Aloes and Opuntia featured they were a secondary element to the massed drifts of Lampranthus, Apenia, Carpobrotus, probably Cerastium tomentosum and a number of unidentifiable low spreading shrubs, creepers, rough grass and trees planted on the flat. The row of kurrajong, Brachychiton populneus, planted at the top of the embankment created a background screening, separating the Anatomy Buildings from the garden. Agaves, Aloes and Opuntia were mass planted at the top of the embankment but were only used sparsely, in well spaced groups, on the slope of the embankment and below it on the flat. Cypress, Cupressus spp and either kurrajongs, Brachychiton populneus, or Eucalyptus spp planted in the flat provided continuity of scale and a visual and physical link between the kurrajong, Brachychiton populneus, at the top of the embankment and with the trees planted at ground level, in front of the retaining wall. The planting of Lampranthus, Apenia, Carpobrotus, Cerastium tomentosum, the low spreading shrubs and creepers cascaded in drifts down the embankment and throughout the flat, swirling around the trees, Aloes and Agaves in a froth of colour. See figures 3.7.2.2a & 3.7.3.1b.

The planting scheme of the western section of the embankment has not been recorded with the same level of detail as the other sections; remnant plantings confirm Cornish’s employment of the same typical selection of succulents and cacti in this section of the embankment as with the others.
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317 Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The University of Adelaide’.
Figure 3.7.3.1b Eastern section of the Embankment Garden between the Barr Smith Library and the Anatomy Building, looking south-eastwards, circa 1937.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

3.7.3.2 Shrubberies, Lawns & Copse

The most substantial area of connected shrubbery, lawn and copse was planted between and around the Barr Smith Library and Union Building. A series of small lawn beds were wrapped around the façade of the Barr Smith Library; each bed symmetrically planted with small trees. Cornish’s probable intention was to replicate the mature planting at the front of the building, where two mature trees framed the entrance and softened the architecture. See figure 3.7.3.2a. Initially, the only bed connected with the Union Building was a large shrubbery that started at the building’s southeast corner and wrapped nearly the length of the southern façade; the building itself was planted with Virginia creeper, *Parthenocissus quinquefolia*. The addition of the George Murray Building in the late 1930s saw the addition of two small beds nestled against the junction of each building with the loggia. Cornish framed each of the three beds with an edging of a small, loosely clipped hedge; the beds themselves were planted with a selection of large flowering shrubs, positioned so as to frame the building windows. Cornish’s selection of shrubs would have been typical of those recommended in the popular literature of the time; see Appendices
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5B-5C, 5E-5G, the only readily identifiable shrub from the images of the garden, were brooms, *Cytisus* spp and *Genista* spp. See figure 3.7.3.2b.

Visually connecting these series of smaller beds were the two large triangular beds and the copse. It is unclear if Cornish actually planted the copse or if her responsibilities lay only with its maintenance. University records seem to indicate that she was responsible for planting the London plane trees, *Platanus x acerifolia* within this space, now known as the Barr Smith Lawns. Cornish was directly responsible for the planting of the triangular beds and framed each with a small formally box-clipped probably *Buxus* spp hedge. The planting scheme of the triangular beds was heavily based on a selection of cypress, Cornish juxtaposing the fastigiate form of Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, against the larger conical shape of other *Cupressus* spp probably including Monterey cypress, *Cupressus macrocarpa*. A selection of large flowering shrubs typical of the period and possibly including oleander, *Nerium oleander*, were used to infill the gaps between the cypress. Cornish’s use of colour, texture, form, scale and groupings were particularly well considered in these beds. The groupings of cypresses, *Cupressus* spp, were well composed, Cornish achieving multi-directional framing of either, the buildings, an element of a building, the Embankment Garden, or a combination of these when viewed from any of the three main paths. Of particular note was the view Cornish created with her planting scheme, southwards along the axis up the main staircase; the planting of the triangular beds and Embankment Garden behind, though

---


320 Bagot, ‘Maintenance of Grounds’.

321 See Appendix 6A for a list of plants that have been identified as used by Cornish in her gardens and Appendices 5B-5C, 5E-5G for a list of period typical plants.
separate, they appear as one. The deep green, tall, cypresses created a frame and provided a necessary scaling element, balancing the otherwise overwhelming size of the Darling Building, sitting on top of the embankment. Between the cypresses Cornish created a juxtaposition of colour, form and texture. Cornish combined the deep green, soft, rounded form of the kurrajongs at the back of the Embankment Garden with the flowering shrubs planted at the front of the bed. Creating a contrasting juxtaposition between them and the lighter green and glaucous, hard, spiky forms of the massed Aloes and Agaves of the Embankment Garden, in the middle. See figure 3.7.3.2c.

Figure 3.7.3.2c Combined effect of the planting schemes of the triangular beds and embankment and row of Hackberry *Celtis australis* in the plantation, looking southwards, circa 1940s.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

The remaining shrubberies, with the exception of some of those associated with the Chemistry Building, were little more than narrow strips planted at the foot of the main faces of each building. Cornish planted a period-typical selection of small and medium shrubs, using them to soften the interface between building foundation and the ground. A series of symmetrically planted Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, were planted at vantage points within the beds, Cornish using their tall fastigiate forms to frame, repeat and emphasise particular elements of Bagot’s architecture, typically a series of columns, or similar at main entrances. See figure 3.7.3.2e. In the case of the smaller buildings, such as the Nutrition Building, pairs of formally clipped probably either myrtle, *Myrtus communis* or box, *Buxus* spp

---

322 Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, 'The University of Adelaide'.
specimens in conical and ball forms were used instead of the Italian cypresses, 
*Cupressus sempervirens*. See figure 3.7.3.2d.

![Figure 3.7.3.2d Clipped plant forms at the entrance to the CSIRO building on the University of Adelaide North Terrace campus, 1947.](source)

(Source: SLSA B 29702)

Additional shrubbery gardens attached to the Chemistry Building included, two quadrant-shaped beds adjoining either end of the building; and a large triangular bed, connected to the Embankment Garden, at its rear. The two quadrant-shaped beds were left predominantly as lawn; their curved sides each lined with a series of four plane trees, *Platanus* spp. There is a possibility that a further smaller specimen tree was planted in the middle of each bed, this specimen might possibly have been a purple leaved flowering plum, *Prunus x blierana*. See figure 3.7.3.2e. The triangular bed at the rear of the building seems to have been planted with a selection of cypress and deciduous specimens, though little more is known about this garden bed. It is possible that the deciduous specimens might have included all or some of the fourteen English elms, *Ulmus procera*, planted under Bagot’s direction, although mature English elms, *Ulmus procera*, in the car park behind the Madley Building may also account for either some or all of this planting.
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The other main beds under Cornish’s care included two cypress, \textit{Cupressus} spp plantings, in segmented oval shaped beds, along the Victoria Drive frontage, in front of the Chemistry Building and the adjacent Cloisters, George Murray and Lady Symon Buildings. See figure 3.7.3.2e. It is probable that the \textit{Cupressus}, like the English elms, \textit{Ulmus procera}, were planted under Bagot’s direction. Virginia creeper, \textit{Parthenocissus quinquefolia} was encouraged to climb over most of the University Buildings, Cornish’s responsibility for their care ensured that they framed the various architectural features of the buildings, rather than smothering or subsuming them. The creepers provided a link between the buildings and the various shrubberies, softened the hardness of the masonry and surrounding hard landscapes, and they also provided a seasonal autumnal colour feature.\textsuperscript{325} See figure 3.7.3.2b.

3.8 ‘Eringa’

3.8.1 ‘Eringa’ History and Description

The extent of Cornish’s involvement with the design, construction and maintenance of Sir Sidney and Lady Kidman’s garden at ‘Eringa’, Unley Park is unclear. Cornish definitely designed and constructed two small garden ‘rooms’ for the Kidman’s in 1928; a sunken garden; and, a paved area adjacent to the portico. See Figure 3.8.1. It would however, seem likely that at the very least she would have provided professional advice on the maintenance of and modifications to the garden even if she was not directly responsible for these aspects of its development. A comprehensive representation of the ‘Eringa’ garden during the Kidman occupancy is difficult to constitute; available pictorial and documentary evidence of its design is limited to some components of some of the ‘rooms’ and the relationship between component and ‘room’ and ‘room’ to ‘room’ is poorly detailed.

Figure 3.8.1 Sunken and Portico Gardens at ‘Eringa’ 1932.

(Source: The Australian Home Beautiful August 1932, p. 17.)

326 ‘Eringa’ is located on Northgate St, Unley Park
327 The Australian Home Beautiful August 1932, p. 17. The first known published image of the Sunken Garden was in The Observer on the 27th October 1928. The immaturity of the planting scheme depicted in the photograph suggests that the garden had only recently been completed at the time it was taken. ‘A Sunken Garden In Eringa, Northgate Street, Unley Park, The Home of Sir Sidney and Lady Kidman’, The Observer 27 October 1928, p. 13.
The Kidman’s bought the property circa early 1920s where its large allotment of land was an important consideration in its purchase, providing Lady Kidman with sufficient area to ‘garden to her hearts content’ as well as space to run chickens.\(^{328}\) The Kidman’s engaged Architect F. Kenneth Milne to undertake the renovations to the house during the mid to late 1920s. Milne added the Portico to the front façade at this time. The limited available photographic evidence of the garden during this period indicates that it was composed from an amalgam of lawn spaces, interspersed with a series of geometric flowerbeds, gravel paths, arbours, and dense tree and shrub borders, that encompassed sections of the property’s perimeter.\(^{329}\)

The exact location of Cornish’s sunken garden is unclear. However, it was evidently sited close to a boundary fence, possibly in the front garden. Cornish selected a basic circular shape for the garden, excavating it from an expanse of lawn. An early photograph of the garden clearly outlines its basic structure, which divided into an inner sunken circle with a surrounding outer planted circle at ground level. The walls of the inner circle were retained with a dry-stone (probably Carey Gully sandstone) retaining wall, the floor of the garden was paved with large, irregularly shaped probably sandstone flags of which, the joints had been planted with a variety of low growing perennials and annuals. A small statue of a Pan figure, mounted on a low plinth, was centrally positioned within the space. The outer circle was composed of the entrance into the sunken portion of the garden, a series of five or six shallow stairs, and a double garden bed that encircled the wall; each bed was edged with stone. A pair of concrete balls were placed either side of the stairs at top and bottom; the outer pair at ground level and the inner pair on top of the wall.\(^{330}\) See Figure 3.8.1.

Cornish created the portico garden as a simple little rectangular, enclosed ‘room’ next to the portico, creating an area of interest and a pleasant aspect from the front door of the house. The main space was paved with a mixture of large format rectangular and square pavers, possibly sandstone, laid in a random but formal linear pattern. The paving was edged with roughly hewn rectangular stones and the joints between the pavers were planted with a variety of low growing bulbs, annuals and perennials. A white painted curved wooden seat was sited at the far end of the paved area. Cornish backed the seat with a formally box-clipped hedge. In the foreground sited next to the portico columns were two large classically shaped, planted, granite urns. Narrow rectangular garden beds flanked the remaining two sides of the ‘room’ completing the inner formal garden area. Existing surrounding mature trees and shrubs provided an immediate background to the space.\(^{331}\) See Figure 3.8.1.

How much influence Cornish had on the other modifications to the garden and how much Lady Kidman was ultimately responsible for is difficult to ascertain given the dearth of records and photographs of ‘Eringa’. The house renovations did have some impact on the garden. Images of the eastern side of the house and immediate garden

\(^{328}\) Jill Bowen, Kidman the Forgotten King, Pymble NSW, Angus & Robertson, 1995, pp. 281-2.


\(^{331}\) The Australian Home Beautiful August 1932, p. 17.
indicate the removal of a secondary drive along with a hedged garden bed, these were replaced with an expanse of lawn, house plantings, and a large rose bed. Images of either the back or western side of the garden indicate that the lawn panels, a series of geometric garden beds, and gravel paths were replaced with a large open space, bordered with a zig zagging colonnade, enlarged garden beds, crazy concrete paths, and small lawn spaces.332

3.8.2 Design Elements

3.8.2.1 Spatial Configuration

Cornish nestled the Sunken Garden into the shrub border along the fence line, strengthening the planting and partially drawing it around the Sunken Garden and sweeping it into the lawn to divide the space into distinct ‘rooms’. The entrance into the Sunken Garden, was angled away from a perpendicular line taken from the fence, Cornish used the thickest section of border planting to create a dense background for this Garden. Angling of the entrance in this way suggests that Cornish had aligned the Sunken Garden to some other feature within the garden or to a particular room in the house; the Sunken Garden formed an end point along this probable visual axis. This concept is further consolidated by the similar alignment of an adjacent garden bench.333 See Figure 3.8.1.

3.8.2.2 Sunken Garden

Cornish’s design for the Sunken Garden was semi-informal and while it was relatively well documented its association or the context it had with its ‘room’ and the rest of the garden is difficult to establish. As such, it has been necessarily considered as a separate entity. In her design for the Sunken Garden, Cornish used the repetition of the circular form and materials to provide cohesion and unity to the design. The use of sandstone for the dry-stone retaining wall, paving, stairs and garden bed borders suggests a degree of formality. However, an informal element was added by the use of crazy paving and the rough hewing of the stone. The soft textural quality of the stone provided a soft contrast to the planting scheme, the mottled and veined variations in colour harmonised with the plants and created a link between the garden and the sandstone-faced house.334

In accord with the semi-informality of the design, the stairs were simply arranged, appearing to have been composed from large slabs of sandstone with a shallow riser and wide runner. Cornish cut the stairs into the retaining wall; it formed their sides and balustrade. The width of the staircase was approximately one quarter of the garden’s diameter, Cornish allowing for the narrowing encroachment of the planting scheme within her design. The addition of the cement balls, either side of and at either end of the staircase, added a formal tone. The Pan statue, centrally sited in the middle of the garden, completed and centred Cornish’s design, forming an incidence along this garden axis.335
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3.8.2.3 Portico Garden

Cornish designed the Portico Garden as an adjunct entrance space to the front door, aesthetically creating an interesting aspect or focal point to this transitory area. Practically, it provided a private, aesthetically pleasing and comfortable place to await the arrival or departure of a car. Cornish’s design for this small space connected to the house was necessarily simple and formal its geometry being dictated by the Portico. The main space was composed from an area of formal paving adjacent to the inner width of the two outer portico columns; Cornish selected a simple pattern based on a regular rectilinear pattern laid from large format rectangular and square pavers. The sides of the garden were created from narrow garden beds, aligned to and the same width as the two outer portico columns. A further rear bed at the end of the paving enclosed the space. A simply designed, formal, garden bench-seat was sited at the far end of the paving, placing any occupant fully within the garden from where it could be fully appreciated. Two large granite urns sited at the inner edge of the outer portico columns, balanced their dominance to some degree, as well as creating an appropriate entrance to the ‘room’.

3.8.3 Planting Scheme

3.8.3.1 Sunken Garden

Cornish planted the Sunken Garden with a selection of trees, shrubs, perennials, annuals and bulbs. An annotated photograph in The Australian Home Beautiful, see Figure 3.8.1, records the inclusion of iris, *Iris* spp; rock plants; dwarf roses, *Rosa* spp; violas, *Viola* spp; anemones, *Anemone* spp; nasturtiums, *Tropaeolum majus*; scarlet geraniums, *Pelargonium* spp; and alpine daisies amongst her selection. The rock plants refer to a selection of succulents including either, *Echeveria* spp, or *Sempervivum* spp, and possibly either of the pigfaces, *Lampranthus*, *Aptenia* or *Carpobrotus*. The *Echeveria* spp, or *Sempervivum* spp, were used at the garden entrance, the pigface planted adjacent and encouraged to spill over and onto the stairs. The inner circle of planting contained a mixture of low growing, rounded and cascading plant forms, their relatively small leaf and flower size, created a soft textural contrast against the stone of the wall and the outer circle of planting. The outer circle contained larger specimens, Cornish mixing the strappy foliage of the iris, *Iris* spp, and possibly agapanthus, *Agapanthus* spp, with larger leaved and flowering, rounded plant forms; the later encouraged to encroach, in places, into the inner circle of planting. Two trees were also included in the outer planting, their size added to the scale of the garden and provided a link to the background tree and shrub border.

The wall itself does not appear to have been planted, Cornish used the cascading forms of the inner circle and planted low growing specimens at the foot of the wall to soften the stonework and provide colour and textural contrast. The planting at the foot of the wall was continued throughout the paving with the same small plants used in the paving joints; at the base of the stairs; and around the base of the statue’s
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336 The Australian Home Beautiful August 1932, p. 17.
337 The Australian Home Beautiful August 1932, p. 17.
pedestal. Although it is difficult to conclusively identify this planting it does appear to look like sweet alyssum, *Lobularia maritima*.339

The specified planting of the Sunken Garden suggests a very colourful colour scheme, with various colours coming to the fore during different seasons; winter being the only time in which there would be little or nothing flowering. The colour scheme ranged through whites, pinks, mauves and purples, oranges, reds and possibly blues. The plants selected created a scheme dominated by white, pinks and mauves earlier in the season, transitioning to the brighter oranges and reds later in the season; the transition period composed from strong contrasts. Cornish coordinated each colour scheme to coincide with natural, seasonal, variations in lighting, the softer colours more telling in the softer spring sunlight, the stronger colours analogous with the brightness of Adelaide’s summer sun. Adding to the permanence of the colour scheme were the various green and glaucous tones of the foliage. The seemingly darker greens of the tree and shrub border and the solidity of the surrounding lawn provided a settling background to the myriad of colours within the Sunken Garden.346

3.8.3.2 Portico Garden

Cornish’s planting scheme for the Portico garden both complemented the formality of her design as well as added a touch of soft informality. An annotated photograph of the garden taken in 1932 lists some of the plants used by Cornish. These include; sweet peas, *Lathyrus odoratus*; polyanthus, *Primula x polyantha*; violas, *Viola spp*; forget-me-nots, *Myosotis sylvatica*; anemones, *Anemone spp*; and little bulbs. This list seemingly mostly pertained to the planting of the paving joints; the understorey of the side garden beds, and possibly the urns. Cornish planted two formal hedges in the rear garden bed, both box-clipped. The outer, lower hedge probably ran the length of the garden bed; the inner, higher hedge backed the seat forming a solid background and ensured privacy from the street for those seated in the garden. The two side beds were each planted with a row of standard roses, *Rosa spp*, underplanted with massed seasonal colour; the urns were similarly planted with seasonal colour.341

The simple forms of the box-clipped hedges and the standard roses, *Rosa spp*, complemented the formality of the built elements. However, the planting scheme also softened the hardness of these elements through the planting of the paving joints; the softness of the massed forms of seasonal colour; the fine textural qualities of the hedging; and the softness of the colour scheme. Cornish based the colour scheme on a combination of whites, yellows, blues and pinks. The foliage of the adjacent oleander, *Nerium oleander*, the hedges, the shrubs along the fence line and the *Eucalyptus spp* provided a variety of green tones to complement the colour of the flowers.342

Cornish borrowed the surrounding landscape to complete her planting scheme; the mixed shrubs along the fence line; the *Eucalyptus spp* both at the fence line and in the neighbouring property; and the oleander, *Nerium oleander*, adjacent to the left,

341 *The Australian Home Beautiful* August 1932, p. 17.
342 *The Australian Home Beautiful* August 1932, p. 17.
side garden bed, assisted in defining the space. See Figure 3.8.1. The shrubs, but especially the mature *Eucalyptus* spp provided an upper storey element to Cornish’s planting scheme that prevented the Portico from aesthetically and physically overwhelming the garden. The tracecy of the *Eucalyptus* spp branches and the shrubs below created a secondary background that enhanced the feeling of privacy and enclosure from within the garden. Cornish also used the juxtaposition of the informality of these plantings against the simple formal elements and forms of the Portico garden to enhance the formality of the space.343

3.9 ‘Glannant’344

3.9.1 History and Description

Cornish’s known involvement with the ‘Glannant’ garden was between 1928 and 1934 when she designed and constructed a large rock garden at the rear of the house for the Harvey family.345 The original house, known as ‘Frogmore’, was constructed *circa* 1854 from Tapley’s Hill blue-stone by Mr GP Harris. The property passed through a succession of owners until it was purchased in 1896 by Mrs Harvey’s father, Mr JE Thomas, who changed its name to ‘Glannant’ after his home in South Wales.346 Thomas spent the following year undertaking renovations to both house and garden, the garden described at that time as ‘much-neglected’. During this year of renovation, Thomas sold a large parcel of land at the rear of the property, creating the current boundary and leaving ‘Glannant’ approximately one acre in size. Thomas planted a number of poplar, *Populus* spp, London plane trees, *Platanus x acerifolia*, and flowering shrubs adding to the kurrajong, *Brachychiton populneus*, white cedar, *Melia azedarach* var. *australisca*, and cypress, *Cupressus* spp, and was probably responsible for the ‘gardenesque’ design of the front garden.347

Mr LM Harvey purchased the house from his father-in-laws’ estate in 1921 and commissioned architect Walter Bagot to extend the house during 1932-33. Bagot relocated the front door, enlarged the dining room and added a new wing consisting of six bedrooms and bathrooms, connecting the new wing to the original house with a barrel-vaulted hall.348

The rock garden is the only conclusively known design element within this garden attributable to Cornish, and although the Harvey’s employed a full-time gardener Alison Brookman (*née* Harvey), daughter of LM Harvey, remembered Cornish visiting socially on a number of occasions.349 That Cornish gave further design advice to the Harvey’s is probable, especially for the rear gardens, elements of which reflect interwar gardening styles.350 The extant of the rear gardens including Cornish’s rock garden was progressively altered when ‘Glannant’ was purchased by
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343 The *Australian Home Beautiful* August 1932, p. 17.
344 ‘Glannant’ is located at 33 Dequetteville Terrace, Kent Town, Adelaide.
345 Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
346 Harvey’s wife was a granddaughter of Robert and Mary Thomas of *The Register* and as such was related to Cornish’s sister-in-law Gwen Cornish *née* Kyffin Thomas.
349 Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
350 Harvey, ‘Glannant’ [collection of photographs], circa 1930s-1940s. This collection of Harvey family photographs of the garden at ‘Glannant’ was kindly lent by Mr James Harvey.
the South Australian Country Women’s Association in 1951 to serve as their State Headquarters.\footnote{Parker, pp. 99-101.}

Images of the rock garden that date from its initial construction to some years after indicate that the garden was developed in two distinct phases.\footnote{Harvey, ‘Glannant’.} The initial construction began \textit{circa} 1928, Alison Brookman recollected Cornish constructing the garden around then.\footnote{Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.} The second phase of construction saw the addition of a second pool and some other minor modifications \textit{circa} 1933 after Bagot’s extensions to the house had been completed. The extension itself seemingly had minimal effect on the rock garden; images of this part of the garden show that the adjoining wall was rendered and that the external pipe-work was removed.\footnote{Harvey, ‘Glannant’.}

Sized approximately 10 x 8m, the rock garden was built at the rear of the house under the shade of two mature London plane trees, \textit{Platanus x acerifolia}, nestled between an L-shaped section of the house and the tennis court. Other dominant features within the site were; a rainwater tank positioned a small distance from the house, the gap between tank and house was fenced off; and a little L-shaped, iron-balustraded patio.\footnote{Parker, p. 100.}

The rock garden comprised of four main spatial elements; two long roughly rectangular embankments and two low fill sections. The first embankment wrapped partially around the rainwater tank bridging the gap between tank and house and continued along the wall before being terminated by the stairs to the patio. The second embankment jutted perpendicularly from the first, separated from it by a narrow path, before angling slightly towards the main part of the house. This second embankment incorporated one of the two mature London plane trees, \textit{Platanus x acerifolia}, and progressively diminished in height, to a single course of rockwork, opening out towards its end, to accommodate a miniature mountain. A dirt, later stone-flagged crazy path entered the rock garden at this point curving around the embankment before progressing to the patio stairs running through the main fill section of the garden. The second mature London plane tree, \textit{Platanus x acerifolia}, bordered the other side of the path entrance. See Figure 3.9.1a. The first fill section was created in the space between the house and rock embankments. Cornish utilised low strata rockwork at most one to two courses in height within this space. A small possibly bronze statue similar to the figure in Cornish’s ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ Model Garden was mounted on a pedestal in this area of the rock garden. The second fill section was incorporated between the second embankment and the lawn path which divided the rock garden from the tennis court. Cornish essentially treated this space as a simple crazy path and densely planted the joints.\footnote{Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’. Harvey, ‘Glannant’. Harvey, ‘Glannant’.}
Figure 3.9.1a The ‘miniature mountain’ shortly after construction, *circa* 1930.

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

A small round pool, remembered by Alison Brookman, was created on the house-ward side at the junction of the two embankments, the closeness of the rainwater tank ensured that it was consistently full. The pool was made from a simple concrete construction, with rocks mortared around its rim. A small statue and probably fountain of a seated cherub in half a clamshell was mounted into the rockery embankment.\(^{357}\) See Figure 3.9.1b.

Figure 3.9.1b Circular pool and associated rock work during construction, *circa* 1928.

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

\(^{357}\) Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
The second phase of development saw the incorporation of an oval pool into the design, Cornish positioned it diagonally across from the round pool, on the opposite side of the embankment to face the tennis court. This pool was also constructed from concrete with mortared rocks around its rim. To accommodate the pool, the lawn path was slightly narrowed and the crazy paving increased to create a suitable foreground to the new pool. It is also probable that the dirt paths were crazy paved at this stage of the garden's development.358 See figure 3.9.2e.

3.9.2 Significant Design Elements

Cornish achieved only limited success with her design for this rock garden as it contained many of the faults commonly found in Adelaide suburban rock gardens. See section 6.3.3. However, it is not a common Adelaide rock garden, and although some components display a semblance to the typical Adelaide rock garden, Cornish had sufficiently altered them to achieve a better appearance albeit still highly unnatural. Juxtaposed against these components was the fill section adjacent to the house, Cornish displaying a rarely seen degree of skill in Adelaide suburban rock gardens in the placement of her rocks and plants achieving an unusually high degree of naturalness.359 See figure 3.9.2a. The most significant failure of this garden was its siting against the house; Cornish disregarded all of the advice given in the period literature on this matter.360 Although whether or not this decision was entirely her own is unknown; many of the examples of rock gardens in the local popular period literature were sited in a similar manner and the Harvey's desire of following local fashions may have predetermined its location.

![Figure 3.9.2a The well considered, rock placement and planting scheme of the main fill section before modification, circa 1930.](image)

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

---

358 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
359 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
360 One such example can be found in Charles Thonger’s The Book of Rock and Water Gardens, where he wrote on the placement of rock gardens ‘“Rockeries” are put in the most absurd situations - beneath trees, even encircling the trunks; against walls of houses, and in the centre of gravel paths, where they look as though they have been shot bodily out of the cart.’ Charles Thonger, The Book of Rock and Water Gardens, London, John Lane, 1907, p. 11.
Originally the rock garden was intended as an inwards looking space, the housewards side of the rockery embankments, the main fill section and the circular pool forming the main focus of the rock garden. This intention is substantiated by the more carefully composed rockwork on this side of the garden. The later addition of the oval pool created a minor focal point within the garden from the tennis court. As the dominant element of her design, Cornish used the embankments to form the general layout and structure of the garden, creating significant backgrounds to the other features within the space and providing an element of scale.\(^{361}\)

The first embankment, which ran from the rainwater tank and along the house, was initially composed as a large mound approximately one metre in height gradually diminishing to a single course of rock by the patio stairs. Although the mound was not the usual round or oval shape so typically used at the time, the rock placement was very similar to this style of rock garden. Cornish unsuccessfully attempted to lay the rock in strata lines, the selection of too small a rock size resulted in the use of both too many rocks and strata lines. In particular, one higher strata was composed from larger rock than that supporting it creating imbalance. It appears as if an attempt was made to lay the rocks on their natural faces but as this was not continued throughout, it gave this portion of the embankment the appearance of a well placed pile of rocks. See figure 3.9.2b. The selection and placement of rock significantly improved on the inward side of this embankment, Cornish utilising the better sized and shaped material around the side of the circular pool and down the house wall, ensuring that the more frequently viewed side of the embankment was the more aesthetically pleasing and technically correct.\(^{362}\) See Figure 3.9.2c.

![Figure 3.9.2b Rock placement of the outward side of the first embankment shortly after the initial development of the rock garden, circa 1930.](image)

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

---

\(^{361}\) Harvey, 'Glannant'.

\(^{362}\) Harvey, 'Glannant'.
The second embankment jutted perpendicularly from the first, wrapping around one of the two mature London plane trees, *Platanus x acerifolia*, under which the garden was built. Although separated from the first embankment by a narrow path, Cornish maintained the height of the rock-work at this point creating a mound on the houseward side of the tree that formed a background setting to the circular pool and cherub fountain. Placement of the rock at this point was highly unnatural in appearance. The rockwork on the opposite side of the tree was only a few courses high and appears as if it had been piled against the tree as an afterthought. See Figure 3.9.2d. As the embankment progressed the mound decreased in height to a single course of rock opening out to form a border around what could be best described as a miniature conical rockwork mountain. The border rock was particularly poorly placed, typically on edge providing the greatest height to the border. The miniature conical mountain formed a further focal point within Cornish’s design, spatially balancing the circular pool at the opposite end of the embankment. See Figure 3.9.1a.

---

363 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
The circular pool was asymmetrically positioned at the base of the first London plane tree, *Platanus x acerifolia*; the immediate background formed by a small rock wall, two courses high. The cherub fountain was mounted on top of the wall and a succession of rocks in a fan style arrangement was secured around it. See figure 3.9.1b. Smaller rock specimens mortared around the rim of the pool created the foreground effectively nestling the pool within the embankment with the paths skirting the pool's edge. The pool was a main focal point within the rock garden as the minimalist nature of the main fill's rockwork in the immediate vicinity directs focus towards it.\(^{364}\) See figure 3.9.2c.

Modification of the rock garden to include the oval pool changed the garden from being purely an inward looking space with internally contained features to one that also took into account other elements within the garden. The pool in this instance nestled into the embankment and was aligned with the central net of the tennis court. Modifications to the adjoining fill also provided a greater sense of completeness to this side of the rock garden.\(^{365}\) See figure 3.9.2e

\(^{364}\) Harvey, 'Glannant'.

\(^{365}\) Harvey, 'Glannant'.

Figure 3.9.2d Rock placement against the plane tree before modification, *circa* 1930.

(Source: Mr James Harvey)
The main fill section, adjacent to the house was the only component that truly displayed any real degree of understanding of the construction of rock gardens as outlined by renowned designers such as Jekyll. Even so, there were still small pockets where the rock had been incorrectly laid. However, unlike parts of the embankment, sufficient space was maintained for the planting scheme, which, disguised these small errors. Cornish maintained a single layer of rock throughout achieving slight height variations through the use of different though similarly sized rocks which were mostly laid on their natural faces. A well considered attempt appears to have been made to lay the rock in strata lines, whereby Cornish’s most obvious failure was a need to line the edges of the paths in rock resulting in a skewing of those lines. The paths wrapped around the embankments and along the patio separating them from the fill. Although dirt initially, they were later crazy paved and whilst this may have been practicable with the path so close to the house, the soft natural effect achieved with annuals and perennial spilling over the edge onto the dirt paths was lost. The paths became harder and more unnatural in appearance once crazy paved. The path along the patio was sufficiently wide to allow garden furniture to be positioned within the space; a small pedestaled statue added an element of whimsy. See figure 3.9.2a and figure 3.9.2f.

366 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.

Figure 3.9.2e The oval pool and adjoining fill section after modification, circa 1935.
(Source: Mr James Harvey)
The small outer fill section initially only ran along the edge of the second embankment where Cornish was attempting to create a transition area between the lawn path and embankment with a length of densely planted crazy paving. Photographs of this section of the garden indicate that this was only moderately successful, the area looked disjointed and incomplete. After the addition of the oval pool, Cornish extended the width and length of the crazy paving to partially wrap around the section of embankment against the rainwater tank creating a cohesive link between the two embankments. The dense planting was retained only immediately adjacent to the rim of the pool and along the interface with the embankments. The junction between the lawn path and the paving was edged with a low border of rock and although this type of edging was detrimental to the effectiveness of the rockwork in the main fill section, in this part of the rock garden it created a boundary and the crazy paving becomes a definite path not an afterthought. The use of a path as opposed to the previous paved fill actually provided a more effective foreground, integrating it more fully into the space; creating a more complete feeling on this side of the rock garden.\(^{367}\) See Figure 3.9.2e and 3.9.2g.

---

\(^{367}\) Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
3.9.3 Planting Scheme

Cornish used an interesting mixture of plants in her planting scheme for the rock garden. Although it is impossible to determine any possible colour scheme her use of scale, texture and form is well conceived, far surpassing the typical planting schemes more commonly found in Adelaide rock gardens. Unusually, Cornish included a selection of trees, shrubs, succulents and what appeared to be tussocks of grasses within her design mixing them with the more usual selection of annuals and perennials.

Cornish seems to have divided the planting of the first embankment into two main areas; the mound around the rainwater tank and the section of embankment against the house wall. The mound was dominantly planted with lower growing specimens including annuals, perennials and succulents that have either spreading or tufted forms that covered much of the rock surfaces. Along the house Cornish planted at least two Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, their conical forms added scale and solidity of planting in this area of relatively low rockwork dominated by the large expanse of wall. A selection of shade-tolerant fern-like specimens were planted amongst the rocks between the cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, creating textural variation. See Figures 3.9.2b-g & 3.9.3b.

---

368 Limited photographic evidence of the rock garden planting scheme makes it difficult to accurately identify either specific specimens or the entire planting scheme used. Where possible, likely identifications or general groupings have been made to identify the type of plants used within this garden.

369 Harvey, 'Glannant'.

370 Harvey, 'Glannant'.
The second embankment was similarly treated to the mound section of the first embankment around the front and back of the circular and oval pools. Cornish relied on the juxtaposition of texture and form of a selection of spreading and tufted plants to cover much of the rockwork, changing the scale and type of planting around the less dense relatively open rockwork that surrounded the conical rock-mountain. In this area Cornish included a tree and surrounded the miniature mountain with *Aeonium* type succulents and a variety of shrubs and perennials that eventually almost subsumed the mountain. See figures 3.9.1a & 3.9.3a

![Figure 3.9.3a Planting scheme adjacent to the 'miniature mountain' before the modification of the rock garden, circa 1930.](image)

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

Alison Brookman remembered that the circular pool was planted with waterlilies, *Nymphaea* spp, but that the shade cast by the London plane trees, *Platanus x acerifolia*, prevented them from flowering well. Although a photograph that depicts the oval pool does not clearly show any waterlilies, *Nymphaea* spp, planted within it, it seems likely that they would have been included in this pool; the shadow cast on this pond less than that on the circular pool. Gold fish were included in both ponds. Cornish also planted creeping forms around the edges and backgrounds of the pools these plants allowed to trail over the edge and dip into the water. See Figure 3.9.2c & 3.9.2e.

In the main fill section of the rock garden Cornish used a juxtaposition of strong vertical plant forms against the dominant horizontal theme created by the rockwork and emphasised via sections of the planting scheme. Cornish selected a variety of *Iris* spp and grass species for the vertical elements and a selection of low growing

---

371 Harvey, 'Glannant'.
372 Bird, 'Interview with Alison Brookman'.
373 Harvey, 'Glannant'.
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Figure 3.9.3b Form and textural variation achieved with the planting scheme in the main fill section and inward sides of the embankments after modification, circa 1935.

(Source: Mr James Harvey)

The second fill was treated in two different ways, initially the joints of the crazy paving were densely planted with a disparate collection of succulents, annuals and perennials where the plants were allowed to cover most of the paving. The junction point of embankment and paving was planted with a border of what appears to be lavender cotton, *Santolina chamaecyparissus*. After the addition of the oval pool and the modification of the space, the paving joints were kept clear with the exception possibly of lawn and only the immediate juncture between the path and the embankment was planted. Around the pool this planting seems to have been created from a collection of succulents; a mixture of annuals or perennials were used around the embankments. By keeping the paving clear of plants and grouping the succulents and annuals and perennials separately Cornish achieved a much more successful integration of the hard and living elements creating a more cohesive space. See Figure 3.9.2e.

The last planting element of the rock garden was the neatly manicured lawns that surround it on two sides. The lawns matched the incongruity of the gardens’ overall siting between and against the London plane trees, *Platanus x acerifolia*, and adjacent to the ‘L’ shaped wing of the house.

---

374 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
375 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
376 Harvey, ‘Glannant’.
3.10 ‘Stangate’

3.10.1 ‘Stangate’ History and Description

‘Stangate’ was the home of Cornish’s youngest brother and sister-in-law, the Reverend Samuel Raymond Baron Cornish and Florence Gwennyth Cornish née Kyffin Thomas. Adelaide architect EH McMichael was commissioned to design the house which Reverend Cornish had formulated in the late 1930s whilst in London working as a Hospitaller at St Thomas’ Hospital. The Cornish’s built their house at the southern end of combined Lots 18 and 19, Fenchurch Road, Aldgate, in the Adelaide Hills, moving in on the 1st July 1940; the Thomas’ had previously bequeathed the land to Gwen Cornish. Bounded by Fenchurch (south), Edgeware (west), Euston (north) roads and Bassendene Lane (east), also locally known as Lover’s Lane, it is a large semi-rectangular property, adjacent to the Aldgate Railway Station, divided approximately in half by the Aldgate Creek; the land either side gently slopes downwards towards the creek.377

The extent of Cornish’s involvement in the development of this large garden is unknown. She certainly would have given advice to her brother and sister-in-law and may have been a regular weekend visitor.378 It is unlikely that Cornish did much of the actual labour in this garden, given her age at the time and the fact that she was beginning to minimise the extent of the physical labour that she actually personally undertook in the construction and maintenance of her gardens. Although it has been suggested that she might have started working on this garden as early as 1930-31, there is no conclusive evidence to support this suggestion.379 Logically the Reverend and Gwen Cornish supposedly concentrated their attention on the development of the garden around the house and on the southern side of the creek, including a space for Reverend Cornish to grow vegetables.380 The northern half of the property, especially the area around the ‘Old Oak Tree’, Quercus robur, was developed into what was referred to as an ‘easy care tree garden’.381

The house and garden were bequeathed to the National Trust of South Australia, passing into their ownership in the late 1960s upon Gwen Cornish’s death. The National Trust in turn approached the Adelaide Hills Branch of the Australian Camellia Research Society, in the late 1970s, to undertake the care and beautification of the garden. In the intervening years the Society have extensively modified the grounds, removing a number of old trees and planting hundreds of camellias, Camellia spp, trees, bulbs, annuals, and perennials and in the process have established ‘one of the best collections of camellias in one garden in S.A. or possibly Australia’.382 The extent of the modifications undertaken by the Society and the limited nature of the documentation of the garden prior to these modifications makes it almost impossible to accurately identify the impact of Cornish upon this garden.

381 Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
382 Adelaide Hills Branch of the Australian Camellia Research Society, ‘Stangate House and Garden’. See Appendix 3F for a copy of the map provided by the Camellia Society to visitors of the garden.
3.10.2 Design Elements

Possible remnant elements that Cornish may have had some influence upon are; the sandstone dry-stone retaining walls that support the excavations to the slope immediately surrounding the house, the staircase, the gates and, the paving around the house. A flat platform, to accommodate the house was excavated from the slope resulting in an encircling garden comprised of three main garden beds. The upper-slope bed wrapped around the west and south of the house, the lower-slope bed wrapped around the east and north of the house, and a third smaller western bed wrapped around the western flank.\(^{383}\)

The sandstone dry-stone retaining walling of the upper-slope garden bed commenced to the west of the house, a single rock high, before rapidly increasing in height as it progressed around the south of the building. The central feature of the wall, and set at its highest point, is a concrete and red brick staircase aligned to the main entrance of the house. The staircase led up to a short path and a painted wrought-iron gate set into a gap in the hedge, providing pedestrian access to Fenchurch Road. The wall at this point was approximately two metres high. The section of retaining wall behind the staircase, was constructed from buttressed concrete; the wall returning to dry-stone either side of the staircase. The stair risers and runners were made from red brick and were laid in a similar pattern to that of both the ‘Broadlees’ upper house terrace staircases and the University of Adelaide Embankment Garden’s main staircase. Concrete formwork formed the outer edge and low balustrading to the stairs; a decorative lantern attached to a painted wooden post at the top of the landing provided illumination at night and a decorative feature during the day. See figure 3.10.2a. The dry-stone wall reduced in height as it continued around the southern side of the house, eventually falling to two courses of stone in height. It is possible that Reverend Cornish cultivated this more easterly section of this garden as the vegetable garden.\(^{384}\)

![Figure 3.10.2a Brick and concrete staircase leading to Fenchurch Road, 2004.](image)

(Source: Louise Bird)

\(^{383}\) Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.

\(^{384}\) Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
The lower-slope garden was created from a succession of sandstone dry-stone retaining walls; the main wall retained the house platform and was approximately two metres high; the low front wall defined the garden bed; and a third intermediate wall created a raised planting space within the garden bed. As with the upper-slope garden, the height of the retaining walls in the lower-slope garden varied; the highest point occurring along the northern face of the house and reducing in height to its east and west.\textsuperscript{385}

The raised western bed completed the sculpting of the slope, creating the house platform and a semi-circular parking space in the south-west corner of the property. There were two vehicular access points to the property from Edgeware Road; the more southerly of the two is now known as Gate 2 and is currently used as the main entrance. The second, only slightly further north of the first is no longer used. However, the driveway gate piers are of the same design as those of the pedestrian entrance on Fenchurch Road. The drive gates at this entrance were later replaced with a modern version of wrought iron arrow-pickets; the original gates were relocated within the garden. It is most likely that this second, now unused entrance was the original entrance to the property. See figure 3.10.2.c. This supposition is supported by the design of the gate piers; a row of Limes \textit{Tilia} spp, planted along the drive from these gates up to the house; and the lack of remnant fencing or piers at Gate 2.\textsuperscript{386}

The pedestrian and driveway gate piers were simply designed to be in keeping with the house. They had a basic rectangular form and the sides were rendered a pale sandstone colour to match the rendering of the house walls. The same red brick used on the lower courses of the house walls was used to cope the piers as well as create a decorative feature on their front and back faces. The decorative detail, a row of three red bricks set approximately a third of the way down the pier, laid so as to slightly protrude from the face, formed a contrast with the paler render. The pattern of the wrought iron pedestrian and driveway gates differed but followed a similar theme. Both had an uncomplicated design and are currently painted a reddish brown colour which tones in with the red brick of the coping and feature. It is likely that their current colour is similar to that of the original.\textsuperscript{387} See figures 3.10.2b & 3.10.2c.

Cornish may also have had some influence on the paving around the house; the only remnant of original paving seems to be a small area linking the stairs to the terrazzo of the front entrance porch. This small section of paving consists of a simple three, long narrow red brick, basket weave pattern edged with a row of shorter red bricks and is similar to sections of paving at both the Wilcox residence and ‘Broadlees’. It seems likely that other sections of path around the house and the drive were laid with gravel.\textsuperscript{388}

\textsuperscript{385} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
\textsuperscript{386} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
\textsuperscript{387} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
\textsuperscript{388} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
3.10.3 Planting Scheme

Possible aspects of the planting scheme that Cornish might have been involved with include the cypress hedge, *Cupressus* spp, on the Fenchurch Road boundary; and the provision of some guidance on the tree plantings for the northern and southern gardens and around the house. The cypress hedge, either *Cupressus torulosa* or *C. macrocarpa* was typical of both Cornish and the period. This now very large hedge was planted along the Fenchurch Road boundary, with a small gap being left for pedestrian access. It seems most likely that this hedge was intended to be box-clipped. See figures 3.10.2b & 3.10.3a.

---

The tree plantings on the property fall into four distinctive periods; remnant native vegetation; those planted prior to 1940; those planted between 1940 and the late 1960s; and those planted from the late 1970s to the present. The garden contains a number of stately old Eucalyptus spp, (Grey Box, Eucalyptus microcarpa and Candlebark Eucalyptus dalyrampeana). It is probable that Cornish would have advised the retention of these specimens, particularly in the northern garden. It appears that the trees planted between 1940 and the late 1960s were concentrated along both sides of the creek; along the western half of the southern garden, the eastern half being treated as informally terraced lawns; with some individual specimens being planted around the house.\textsuperscript{390} In 1995-96 a number of, mostly conifers, considered ‘old’ and ‘unsafe’ were removed from the eastern slope of the southern garden, in the area now known as ‘Trust Hill’.\textsuperscript{391} The size of the remnant stumps, indicate that these trees also possibly date from this period.\textsuperscript{392} See figure 3.10.3d.

False acacias, Robinia pseudoacacia, and probably Japanese maples, Acer palmatum, were planted along the creek. The false acacias, Robinia pseudoacacia, created an upper storey, shading groupings of Japanese maples, Acer palmatum, below. See figure 3.10.3b. A row of limes, Tilia spp, lined the eastern side of the probable original driveway. The mixture of Tilia spp and silver birch, Betula pendula, at the top of the drive, by Gate 2, is reminiscent of a similar more extensive planting at ‘Broadlees’. Some of the trees probably planted at this time in the western half of the southern garden include: chestnuts, Aesculus spp; European Beech, Fagus sylvatica; English oak, Quercus robur; Scarlet oak, Quercus coccinea; and possibly a blue cedar, Cedrus atlantica ‘Glauc’. Silver birch, Betula pendula, and European Beech, Fagus sylvatica, were planted around the house amongst other deciduous specimens, including a close grouping comprised of cedar, Cedrus spp, and two deciduous specimens on the top lawn.\textsuperscript{393}

The northern garden was planted with a similar range of deciduous trees, however, not in the same apparent numbers as the southern garden. A number of either these specimens or earlier dating Eucalyptus spp seem to have been removed. There is a grouping of cedar, Cedrus spp, at the top of the hill, along Euston Road, that probably date from around 1940. These, plus remnant Eucalyptus spp that predate the garden, as well as new plantings of Liquidambar spp, dating from either the 1960s or from the 1970s, now predominantly form the upper storey in this half of the garden.\textsuperscript{394}

\textsuperscript{390} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004. 
\textsuperscript{391} National Trust of South Australia, ‘Stangate House and Garden Aldgate, SA’. 
\textsuperscript{392} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004. 
\textsuperscript{393} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004. 
\textsuperscript{394} Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.
Figure 3.10.3b False acacias, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and Japanese maples, *Acer palmatum*, lining the northern bank of the creek, 2004.

(Source: Louise Bird)

Figure 3.10.3c Part of the ‘easy care tree garden’ on the northern side of block, 2004.

(Source: Louise Bird)
Although it is not possible to draw any conclusions about the understorey planting, the arrangement of the trees themselves has been done so to great effect, providing colour and interest throughout the year. Of particular interest is the dominant use of evergreen specimens at the outer, higher points of the garden, the hedge on Fenchurch Road, the conifers on ‘Trust Hill’ and the cedars, Cedrus spp, at the high point of Euston Road. This outer belt of evergreens provided a solid permanent background to the garden when viewed in winter through the tracery of the deciduous boughs of the trees that dominated the inner section of the garden. Practically, the evergreens provided year round privacy restricting the view into the garden from these high vantage points. The trees provided the garden with permanent form and structure where their natural variations in scale and form create year round interest. The myriad of foliage types contributed a wide range of textural and tonal variation, including a spectacular display of autumnal colour. See figure 3.10.3d.

There is one further remnant planting that seems indicative of Cornish and that is the large clump of bamboo, Bambusa spp, planted in the far southeast corner of the property. See figure 3.10.3a. The Cornish’s designed ‘Stangate’ to be a private retreat, a place where the view of the external world was minimised; the siting of the trees, hedge and bamboo, Bambusa spp, alone demonstrate this intent.\footnote{Louise Bird, site visit of the garden, September 2001 & 2004.}

Figure 3.10.3d Remnant conifer stumps on ‘Trust Hill’ that once would have provided a background to the tracery of the branches of the deciduous trees, 2004.

(Source: Louise Bird)
3.11 Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden

3.11.1 Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden History and Description

The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden was the most politically provocative and conceptually compromised of Cornish’s known gardens. This garden was located within the Torrens Parade Ground precinct of the Adelaide Parklands adjacent to the Parade Grounds (north), Government House Domain (south), King William Street (west) and Kintore Avenue (east).

Cornish adapted her original design to conform to the needs of previously unknown site related issues and to meet the ever changing expectations and desires of a range of City of Adelaide, Parks and Gardens Committee members. The nearly three years that passed between the approval for and the opening of the garden, exacerbated the effects of the later, as the incomplete nature of the garden during this period enabled most suggested amendments, whether good or bad, to be actioned. The origin of the garden lay in centenary celebrations for the State in 1936 and was commissioned by the Government-sponsored Women’s Centenary Council of South Australia, whose primary function was to establish a befitting memorial to the pioneering women of South Australia. During the centenary year, the Centenary Council, through various fundraising activities, managed to raise £6250 towards the establishment of the memorial. 396

At a meeting of the Centenary Council on 22nd November 1937 it was decided that the most befitting memorial to the pioneering women of the State would be to offer £5000 to the Australian Aerial Medical Services (the predecessor to the Royal Flying Doctor Service) for the establishment of a base at Alice Springs. In addition to the aerial base for the Flying Doctor service, the Centenary Council decided to build a ‘Garden of Memory’ within the City of Adelaide. The original concept was for a floral clock to represent the passage of time. A bronze casket, containing various items from the centenary and to be opened in 2036, was to be incorporated somehow within the design. 397 The City of Adelaide was formally approached by the Centenary Council in May 1938 for approval to ‘... lay out a “Garden of Memory”, on the flat between the parade ground and Government House rear fence, adjacent to King William Road.’ Cornish had at this point been engaged by the Centenary Council to design, advise and supervise the construction of the garden. The Centenary Council set aside £1000 for its ‘... layout, furnishing and upkeep...’ 398

The initial proposal of a floral clock had already been supplanted. The Minutes of a the Centenary Council meeting stating on the 14th July 1938 that ‘... the Parks and Gardens Committee would not be responsible for looking after a floral clock...’ and as such the ‘passing of time’ would be ‘...marked by a sculptured figure bending over a sundial...’ 399

398 Phoebe Watson, ‘Women’s Centenary Council of South Australia’, correspondence, 20 May 1938, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.
399 National Council of Women, ‘Minutes of council meeting 14th July 1938’, minutes, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, SRG 297 series 1.
Although official correspondence between the Centenary Council, later reconstituted as the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Trust, and the City of Adelaide repeatedly refer to drawings and sketches prepared by Cornish of the garden and the modifications to it, none have been retained within their archives. A copy of Cornish’s original design for the garden was however, published in The Advertiser and is the only known drawing of any of her garden commissions.400 See figure 3.11.1a. The associated article and the initial proposal by the Centenary Council to the City of Adelaide further elaborated on the drawing providing dimensions and a relatively comprehensive, though not complete, planting scheme.401

Figure 3.11.1a Cornish’s original plan of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, 1938.

(Source: The Advertiser 29 June 1938, p. 8.)

Cornish’s original design for the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden was for a simple rectangular space, 120 feet (36.6m) long and 80 feet (24.4m) wide, encompassed by a low red brick wall. The main feature was a raised circular platform, 27 feet (8.2m) in diameter, centrally sited in the second half of the garden; the proposed sundial and casket were sited in the middle of the platform. A straight central red brick path led from centrally positioned gates at the front, to the west, of the garden to the sundial and a short, segmented staircase bridged the rise up onto the platform. Four main garden beds were proposed for the garden; two symmetrical L-shaped beds either side of the path and adjacent to the red brick walls at the front of the garden and; two symmetrical circular beds either side of the path and sited in front and to the side of the raised platform. See figure 3.11.1a.

The most significant aspect of Cornish’s design for the garden was her planting scheme, where the majority of the plants were chosen for their folkloric or symbolic meaning. These meanings were attributed to the spirit and courage of the pioneering women. Although this aspect of Cornish’s design was applied to the entire planting scheme it was particularly potent within the planting of the L-shaped beds. This intangible element of Cornish’s design has never been fully appreciated, at any point during the garden’s history.

Cornish’s original planting scheme was comprised of; five Lombardy poplars, *Populus nigra* ‘Italica’, evenly spaced along the back wall, each poplar representing one of the five members of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Trust; a flame tree, *Brachychiton acerifolius*, in either rear corner; a crimson-flowered oleander, *Nerium oleander*, planted slightly forward of the flame trees, *Brachychiton acerifolius*; with Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, planted either side of the raised platform flanking the sundial. Other trees intended for the garden included; two jacaranda, *Jacaranda mimosifolia*, planted at the side of the garden and forward of the circular beds; two holm oaks, *Quercus ilex*, in the front corners of the garden, and; two myrtles, *Myrtus communis*, either side of the gates, though still within the L-shaped beds. Three pairs of small columnar shaped shrubs were intended, directly either side of the wrought iron entrance gates and on the raised circular platform. Catmint, *Nepeta cataria*, blue salvia; *Salvia* spp, and thyme, *Thymus* spp were to be planted in a circular bed around the paved base of the sundial. A formally shaped and clipped hedge of cypress, *Cupressus torulosa*, sited against the back of the platform, at ground level, was also recorded on Cornish’s plan. The circular beds were to be mass planted with crimson glory roses, *Rosa* ‘Crimson Glory’, and edged with lavender, *Lavandula* spp. See figure 3.11.1a.

The first modification to Cornish’s design occurred almost immediately. The discovery of extant drainage pipes necessitated the alteration of the gardens dimensions from 120 feet (36.6m) by 80 feet (24.2m) to 150 feet (45.7m) in length and 60 feet (18.3m) in width, though later documentation records the width as being 70 feet (21.3). Cornish incorporated an alcove-effect into the eastern end of her design to improve the aesthetics of the gardens new form. The City of Adelaide

---

Engineer and Surveyor, Colonel William Veale, and the Parks and Gardens Curator, Mr Stanley Orchard, both authorised these amendments to the design considering them to be ‘... entirely suitable...’. See figure 3.11.1b. However, within a month of approving Cornish’s amended design for the garden, Orchard in consultation with an officer from the State Sewers Department required either the substitution of two of the trees for shrubs or their elimination from the design. Cornish again amended her design and submitted it for approval from both Orchard and the Sewers Department. The next suggested alteration was by a member of the City of Adelaide Council for the inclusion of a crazy-paving path around the outside of the wall; it seems that this was never acted upon, it being decided that a path was unnecessary.

Figure 3.11.1b Construction of the raised circular platform and the wall foundations, circa 1938.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

---


407 A. S. Orchard, ‘Parks and Gardens Department’, memorandum, 7 September 1938, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.

408 Works and Highways Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 14th November 1938’, minutes, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938. W. C. D. Veale, ‘Pioneer Women’s Memorial’, memorandum, 18 November 1938, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.
Between August 1938 and February 1939, Cornish, with the assistance of hired labourers constructed, planted and essentially completed the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, with the exception of the installation of the sundial.409 The Garden contained most of the key structural and plant elements from Cornish’s original plan, modified to conform to the required amendments. If the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Trust had at this point installed the sundial, which had formed a part of the original proposal, the Garden would have been complete and could have possibly circumvented the series of issues that conspired to necessitate yet further alterations to the design and planting scheme. Leaving the garden, even after these initial modifications, imbued with Cornish’s original concept. See figure 3.11.1c. However, the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Trust had for some time been in communication with Melbourne-based sculptor Ola Cohn, who had agreed to sculpt a figure into which a sundial would be set; this combined sculpture and sundial was proposed to replace the originally proposed sundial. Cohn made her first site visit in February 1939, beginning soon after to shape a three-ton (3048kg) pillar of Waikerie limestone into the figure and a further block of limestone into the pedestal. South Australian Government Astronomer, George Dodwell, calculated and designed the sundial to accurately reflect Central Standard Time. The combined unit was not installed until just before the official opening of the Garden in April 1941.410 See figure 3.11.1d

![Image of the garden with the circular rose and lavender beds, February 1939.](image)

**Figure 3.11.1c** The garden with the circular rose and lavender beds, February 1939.

(Source: *The Advertiser* Pictorial Library)

---

During this intervening period a number of circumstances transpired which resulted in further modification of the garden. The Parks and Gardens Curator, Stanley Orchard died and was replaced by a Mr Bone. Bone was not fully cognisant of his predecessor’s requirements for the garden and having his own concept of how the Garden should look, desired to change its form to accommodate his ideas. It seems that maintenance issues also transpired with the Garden having an unkempt appearance at times. Alderman Homburg further inflamed the situation by stating in a meeting of the Council’s Markets and Parks Committee in August 1939, that ‘... he had heard as many as fifty unfavourable comments regarding the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden...’ and that he considered it a ‘... complete misfit’ believing that ‘the Council had made a mistake in allowing the garden’. His own suggestion for the Garden was to incorporate it within a glasshouse of the type in Fitzroy Gardens, Melbourne for ‘It had been the dream of the late Curator of Parks and Gardens (Mr Orchard) to have glasshouses’. It would however, seem unlikely that Orchard would have dreamt of siting a glasshouse in this particular location.

411 Apparently Orchard had been very specific about the use of annuals within the garden, due to their high maintenance and water requirements their use was to be kept to an absolute minimum. Apparently Bone held no formal horticultural or design qualifications and was, in character, subservient to the engineer, Colonel Veale. David Jones, personal communication, June 2006.
412 Potter, ‘Re. Pioneer Women’s Memorial’, memorandum, 22 February 1939, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.
413 Markets and Parks Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 28 August 1939’, minutes, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1939.
414 Markets and Parks Committee, ‘Minutes of meeting 28 August 1939’.
From the archived documentation relating to the further alterations of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, it appears that Bone did not concisely convey or was uncertain of his requirements for the modifications to the Garden. He persistently added to the list whenever meeting with either the trustees of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Trust or Cornish. Communication between the Chairman of the Trust, Adelaide Miethke and the Town Clerk, Mr Morrison, indicates that Cornish and the Trust had agreed to alterations for the Garden suggested by Bone. However, after a meeting between Bone and Miethke, a week later, at the Garden, it became necessary for Miethke to again consult with the other trustees and Cornish about Bones’ suggestions, indicating that Bone had again modified his position.

The modifications that Cornish initially conceded to were the widening of the beds around the Lombardy poplars, *Populus nigra* ‘Italica’, at the rear of the Garden and the removal of the circular rose beds to be replaced by angular boomerang-shaped beds. Cornish was obviously reluctant to accede to Bone’s suggested modification for the L-shaped beds, eventually compromising ‘to the extent of leaving most of the shrubs as they are for the time being, and clearing the front of the beds to a depth of 3ft. to enable them to be edged with annuals.’ Waylaying Cornish in the garden after receiving communication from Miethke about their acceptance of these modifications, Bone also convinced Cornish to replace the planting of catmint, *Nepeta cataria*, blue saliva, *Salvia* spp, and thyme, *Thymus* spp, around the base of the statue and sundial, with lawn. Bone further discussed with her the most appropriate annuals to include at that time, both agreeing on tall snapdragons, *Antirrhinum* spp, edged with petunias, *Petunia* spp, and massed crimson phlox, *Phlox paniculata*, for the angular boomerang-shaped beds. See figure 3.11.1e.

Cornish officially gave up charge of the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden on the 31st May 1940. A memorandum from the Parks and Gardens Committee further stated that the Trust had made arrangements with Anderson Potter to remodel and replant the Garden. What work, if any, undertaken by Potter is unclear as images of the garden prior to the installation of the statue and sundial, which at the time of the memorandum was due in a week, clearly show a well developed, planted garden that conformed to the alterations earlier insisted upon by Bone in November 1939.

---

415 Miethke, ‘Trust for Pioneer Women’s Memorial’.
416 B. J. Bone, ‘Parks and Gardens Department’, memorandum, 9 November 1939, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.
417 Bone, ‘Parks and Gardens Department’.
418 Bone, ‘Parks and Gardens Department’.
419 ‘Miss Miethke saw the Town Clerk...’ memorandum, nd, Adelaide City Council Archives, Town Clerk’s Department (C15), Town Clerk’s Dockets (S3), Docket No. 1788 of 1938.
Figure 3.11.1e The re-configuration of the round beds to the L-shaped beds, \textit{circa} 1941.

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

The Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden was officially opened on the 19th April 1941, in conjunction with the opening ceremony of the Royal Flying Doctor base at Alice Springs. Cornish is listed amongst the official guests and was credited with its design by the popular media. The Pioneer Women's Memorial Trust handed the City of Adelaide Council a cheque for £127.12.10 on the 7th July 1941, the surplus of funds from the original £1000 set aside for the development and maintenance of the Garden, to assist in the provision of its upkeep. The Pioneer Women's Memorial Trust financed the total cost of the Garden including all of the alterations as requested by the City of Adelaide Council.\textsuperscript{420}

3.11.2 Design Elements

Cornish's original design for the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden was one of formal simplicity, relying on a series of simple formal built elements and the symmetry of the planting scheme to form the Garden's framework. Aligned not quite truly east-west the garden was configured to fit within the flat between the rear of the Government House Domain (to the south) and the Torrens Parade Ground (to the north); a row of existing London plane trees, \textit{Platanus x acerifolia}, provided the sight-line from which to align the northern wall of the Garden. The original, well-proportioned dimensions of the Garden appropriately accommodated the internal configuration of elements. Cornish elected to use a large, raised, circular platform to emphasise the Garden's centrepiece, an elaborate sundial, later the sculpture with an incorporated sundial, creating a degree of cohesion within her design, through the

\textsuperscript{420} Bird, 'In Search of the Influence of Elsie Cornish on Garden Design in Adelaide', in C. Garnaut & S. Hamnett (eds), p. 52.
repetition of the circular form in the rose, *Rosa* spp, and lavender, *Lavandula* spp, beds.\(^\text{421}\)

The sequence of events that necessitated the series of alterations to Cornish’s design affected the basic dimensions of the garden, necessitating a reconfiguration of the garden’s form to accommodate its elongation and narrowing. To minimise the aesthetic impact of this dimensional change, Cornish partially transposed the design of the hedging at the rear of the raised platform creating an alcove-effect in the wall at the eastern end of the Garden. A smaller hedge was subsequently planted against this wall; the original hedge was eliminated from the design.\(^\text{422}\) The shape of the alcove was reputedly taken from the floor-plan design of St Peters Cathedral.\(^\text{423}\) Images of the Garden under construction indicate that other than the modifications to the Garden’s dimensions and form, and the rearrangement of the planting scheme, Cornish little altered the interior configuration of the Garden’s built elements.\(^\text{424}\)

Whilst the repetition of the circular beds created cohesion and unity within the original proportions of the design, the subsequent narrowing of the Garden and the creation of the alcove aesthetically cramped the beds making them seem somewhat incongruous. The replacement angular boomerang-shaped beds, though not taking into consideration the original instruction for the minimal inclusion of annuals, did better spatially conform to the needs of the reconfigured design. There was also a degree of form replication between these beds and the L-shaped beds at the front of the Garden. The L-shaped beds at the front of the Garden created a strong entrance, balancing the dominance of the raised platform, sculpture and verticality of the planting at the rear of the Garden.\(^\text{425}\) See figure 3.11.2a.

![Figure 3.11.2a The garden shortly after its opening, 1941.](image)

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens June 1941, p. 22.)


\(^{422}\) Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’.

\(^{423}\) Broughton, p. 21.

\(^{424}\) Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’.

\(^{425}\) Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’.
Cornish maintained continuity of materials for the dwarf, encircling wall, path, stairs, and edging for the raised platform, using red brick throughout. Though simple, the pattern of the encircling wall was the most elaborately designed element of these components. Square piers, spaced at even intervals provided structural support for the wall, the pier design consisting of simple rectangular insets on their inner and outer faces and a narrow protrusion just below the coping. The wall itself had a low foot onto which Cornish designed a series of little pillars that supported the wall coping, the design of the pillars creating a simple star pattern opening between them. The entrance and gate were slightly inset and the gate piers, which were slightly taller than the wall piers, were finished with concrete balls. The path was the simplest variation of the two-brick basket-weave pattern; the mid-point distinguished with a slightly more elaborate variation of that pattern. It provided direct access from the front of the Garden to the sculpture, and evenly divided the Garden. The stairs were set against the platform wall their segmented form integrated them into the circular form of the platform.\(^{426}\) See figure 3.11.2a.

### 3.11.3 Planting Scheme

The intangible element of Cornish’s planting scheme for the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, the symbolic, folkloric meanings associated with the plants has been the least understood and appreciated element of this Garden’s design. This lack of understanding and appreciation seems to have been only by those who have been in a position to undermine this aspect of the design through either ignorance, a lack of understanding or scepticism. At least for one group of society, women, for whom the Garden was to commemorate, the ‘language of flowers’ was an aspect with which they were cognisant even if not regularly practicing. The popular media of the day reinvigorated to some extent this knowledge. TheAdvertiser, in an article on Cornish’s original design for the garden, stated Cornish and her design that:

‘*Miss Cornish has combined her expert knowledge as a landscape gardener to give it the dignity befitting such a garden and her idealism to give it the symbolic touches which will keep before those who walk in it the reason for its being.*’\(^{427}\)

The article went on to list the meaning of some of the intended planting. Three months later an article in the popular monthly journal *South Australian Homes and Gardens* dealt further with the history of plant symbolism stating that *(To-day flowers are symbols that speak a language as eloquent as any invented by man)*.\(^{428}\) The article also listed the meanings of some of the more commonly known and used flowers and plants.

The planting of the L-shaped beds were particularly symbolic, the pairing of holm oak, *Quercus ilex*, and myrtle, *Myrtus communis*, at the front of the garden conveyed protection and love. At least twenty different types of plants were intended for these beds however, only a few were actually listed. The listed plantings included and conveyed: honeysuckle, *Lonicera spp.*, (the bond of love, generosity and devotion),


\(^{427}\)March, ‘Garden of Memory’, p. 8.

\(^{428}\)Rosemary Langham, ‘The Legendry of Flowers’, *South Australian Homes and Gardens* 1 September 1938, pp. 54, 83.
veronica, *Veronica spp.*, (fidelity), rosemary, *Rosmarinus officinalis*, (remembrance, constancy, fidelity, loyalty, enduring love, devotion and memory), ground laurel, *Epigaea repens*, (perseverance), box, *Buxus spp.*, (stoicism in adversity), lilac, *Syringa vulgaris*, (memory, protection, youth, tenderness), and mistletoe, (perseverance, affection, love, the ability to surmount difficulties and was considered to be a good luck gift to a woman).\textsuperscript{429}

![Figure 3.11.3a Cornish planting the garden, circa 1939.](image)

(Source: The Advertiser Pictorial Library)

The rest of the planting scheme, with the exception of the jacaranda, *Jacaranda mimosifolia*, and flame trees, *Brachychiton acerifolia*, also contained high levels of symbolism.\textsuperscript{430} The circular beds mass planted with roses, *Rosa* 'Crimson Glory', and edged with lavender, *Lavandula* spp, (conveyed love and desire encircled with constancy and loyalty); both were considered good luck gifts for women. The catmint, *Nepeta cataria*, salvia, *Salvia* spp, and thyme, *Thymus* spp, intended to encircle the sundial, which itself represented a bent woman marking 'the passing of hours', imparted respectively love, beauty, happiness; immortality, longevity, wisdom, protection, esteem and domestic virtue; and health, healing, courage, activity and spontaneous emotion. The double pair of small clipped specimens, flanking the path on the circular platform in front of the sculpture appears to have been myrtle, *Myrtus communis*, or box, *Buxus* spp, conveying either love or stoicism. The flanking Italian cypresses, *Cupressus sempervirens*, are funereal (being a symbol of death they represented morning and lament). The oleander, *Nerium oleander*,


\textsuperscript{430} This pairing may have been included to replicate on a much lesser scale the alternating row of jacaranda and flame trees along the western boundary of the Government House Domain. This alternating row was planted in 1928 at the instigation of Lady Hore-Ruthven, possibly at the suggestion of Cornish.
symbolised warning as well as beauty and grace, which is some-what appropriate in front of the Lombardy poplar. Populus nigra ‘Italica’, which is reputed to have provided the wood for the crucifixion of Christ as well as being linked to both witchcraft and healing; together they seem to represent both good and bad luck.\textsuperscript{431}

The symbolic meanings of the Garden and their attribution to the pioneering woman of the State of South Australia was the most significantly compromised element of Cornish’s design. The repeated modifications, both necessary and unnecessary, eroded the intangible constituents of Cornish’s concept, that once redolent throughout the Garden, were now consigned to only a portion within it.

Once the significance of the planting scheme, of the L-shaped beds in particular, is fully appreciated it is understandable why Cornish ‘was disinclined to give way further’\textsuperscript{432} on the modifications requested by Bone to these beds. In having to do so the Garden lost many of the ‘symbolic touches which will keep before those who walk in it the reason for its being.’\textsuperscript{433} However, in retaining some control over replacement plants Cornish was able to convey, on, if a somewhat transient but symbolic level, some of her emotional state. The inclusion of Antirrhinum spp and petunia spp, at the edge of the L-shaped beds, respectively mean; presumption and desperation; and anger and resentment, “I am furious”. The loss of meaning in the rose, Rosa ‘Crimson Glory’, and lavender, Lavandula spp, and the Salvia spp, catmint, Nepeta cataria, and Thyme spp plantings was partially resolved through the crimson phlox, Phlox paniculata, meaning souls united and sweet dreams and the placement of lavender, Lavandula spp, either side of the stairs.\textsuperscript{434}

On a tangible level Cornish’s design for the planting scheme was unerringly simple, relying predominantly on a large expanse of lawn, limited garden beds and ornamental trees and shrubs. See figure 3.11.2a. The structure of the planting is highly symmetrical adding to the formality and structure of the otherwise uncomplicated design. The scale and form of the planting scheme provided an element of unity to her design. Cornish juxtaposed the open roundedness of the flame trees, Brachychiton acerifolia, jacaranda, Jacaranda mimosifolia, holm oaks, Quercus ilex, and myrtle, Myrtus communis, against the fastigate forms of the Lombardy poplars, Populus nigra ‘Italica’, and Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens. The rounded clipped balls of lavender, Lavandula spp, and slightly more conically shaped Buxus spp or myrtle, Myrtus communis, on the platform, created the same form variation against the verticality of the sculpture, but at a smaller and more intimate scale. See figure 3.11.3b. The dominant colour within the Garden was green; the variety of tones added to the feeling of restful tranquillity. Cornish did plan a succession of colour within the scheme, juxtaposing a seasonal series of strong crimsons and purple blues throughout spring, summer and autumn. The succession of colour is highlighted by the dominance of green tones, the green tones never overwhelmed by colour.\textsuperscript{435}


\textsuperscript{432} Bone, ‘Parks and Gardens Department’.

\textsuperscript{433} March, ‘Garden of Memory’, p. 8.


\textsuperscript{435} Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, 'The Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden'.
The modification of the planting scheme, due to the alteration of the dimensions and shape of the garden, the discovery of underground drainage pipes, and desires of the City of Adelaide Council, affected the composition and symmetry of the paired trees that had formed a significant part of the original structure of Cornish’s design. This further impacted on both the form and colour compositions of the Garden. The most notable changes were to the northern specimen of the pairings of flame trees, *Brachychiton acerifolia*, and jacaranda, *Jacaranda mimosifolia*; a golden cypress, *Cupressus* spp, replaced the northerly *Jacaranda mimosifolia* and the northerly *Brachychiton acerifolia* seems to have not been planted.\(^{436}\) Yew, *Taxus baccata*, was substituted for the crimson oleander, *Nerium oleander*, originally planted as a symmetrical pair. At some point in the Garden’s history the northern specimen was moved to the position intended for the northern *Brachychiton acerifolia*, with the southern *Brachychiton acerifolia* being removed, further upsetting the symmetry and unity of the composition.\(^{437}\)

The most incongruous change to the Garden was the extensive inclusion of annuals. At Orchard’s request Cornish had originally composed her planting scheme to avoid the use of annuals, because they were water- and labour-intensive to maintain. Their inclusion around the L-shaped beds, in the angular boomerang-shaped beds, and at the back of the alcove around the Lombardy poplars, *Populus nigra* ‘Italica’, added

\(^{436}\) Interestingly, Cornish’s acquisition of the golden cypress was so envied by Bone that he apparently offered her twice what she had paid for it, so that he could own it. Cornish obviously refused, the cypress being planted in the garden. Broughton, p. 21.

\(^{437}\) Advertiser Newspapers Pty Limited, ‘The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden’.
an intensity of colour not originally intended by Cornish. This potentially overpowered the solemnity of the calming greens and upset the carefully composed colour scheme of scarlet and purple blues seen in seasonal succession. After the modification of the form of the garden, Cornish had planted a small cypress, Cupressus spp, hedge around the back of the alcove and along a section of the adjacent wall; absurdly only the alcove hedging was removed and replaced with annuals. A small section of incongruous hedging, along the adjacent segment of wall, was left in limbo, unconnected to the rest of the planting scheme.

During recent ‘restoration’ of the Garden, the planting scheme has been again modified. Whilst respectful of some components and incorporating the needs of some of the now mature trees neither the tangible or intangible elements of the planting scheme have been fully appreciated or understood.

3.12 Darian Smith Residence

3.12.1 Darian Smith Garden History and Description

Cornish designed and constructed the garden for the Darian Smith family at 117 Barnard Street, North Adelaide, shortly after the completion of the house in 1938. Douglas Darian Smith was a noted Adelaide-based professional photographer who was particularly noted for his low-level aerial photography.

Designed by independently wealthy Adelaide architect and Cornish’s cousin, Guy St John Makin, noted for the design of ‘imposing domestic architecture, often in the Georgian style’ the house was typical of larger domestic Neo-Georgian homes built in Adelaide during this period. A black and white photograph of the completed house taken in 1940 indicates that the walls and columns were rendered a pale colour, possibly white, and that the shutters were painted a darker contrasting colour. See Figure 3.12.1. The garden that Cornish created, on this small suburban block, was one of elegant simplicity.

The small, north facing, front garden was simply laid out to complement the architectural style of the building. A straight, Dutch crocus, Crocus vernus, lined crazy path led directly from the gate to the centrally positioned front door, and potted cumquats, Citrus japonica, aligned with the decorative pillars either side of the door, created a welcoming entrance. The approximately square garden panels either side of the path were planted as a lippia lawn, Lippia phylacanescens, and a silver birch tree, Betula pendula, was centrally positioned in either panel. A mature rhus tree, Rhus succedanea, in the northwest corner of the garden was retained. It also seems likely that Cornish planted an Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, at the northwest corner of the house.

---

439 Louise Bird, Site visit of the garden, June 2003.
440 Bird, ‘Interview with Pamela Savage’.
441 Page, p. 170.
442 ‘Barnard Street’ [photograph], 1940, State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 9539.
443 Bird, ‘Interview with Pamela Savage’. D. Darian Smith, ‘117 Barnard Street’ [photographic collection], circa 1950s. This collection of photographs was kindly lent by Pamela Savage.
444 Bird, ‘Interview with Pamela Savage’.
The back garden had a long rectangular form, and a slight fall towards the south. At the rear of the house was an asymmetrical, raised, double storey verandah, reached from the garden via a short staircase that adjoined a small paved courtyard nestled against the house and a random limestone rubble wall that formed the eastern boundary of the garden. An Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, was planted at the southwestern corner of the house. A garage occupied the southeastern corner of the garden and a mature existing lemon tree, *Citrus limon*, the only remaining specimen from the orchard that had once previously occupied the site, was retained in the southwestern corner of the garden.\(^{445}\)

Cornish’s design for the back garden was unerringly simple. Wide borders along the eastern and western fence lines created a frame for the central rectangular panel of lawn. Each border was mass planted with silver birch, *Betula pendula*, Cornish included a specimen Judas tree, *Cercis siliquastrum*, in the western border and a specimen pink flowering almond, *Prunus x amygdalo-persica*, in the eastern border; the trees were under-planted with a selection of small shrubs, perennials, annuals and bulbs. A lawn-set stepping stone path led from the courtyard, along the front of the eastern border, to the garage. The first small change in level was accommodated approximately half way down the garden where Cornish created a small lawn bank. The clothesline, consisting of two wires stretched between two posts, one each positioned at the front of either border, marked this junction in the garden. The lawn and borders were continued until they reached the front of the garage with two or three steps at its western side completing the final change in level leading down to the lemon tree, *Citrus limon*, which Cornish under-planted, with massed violets, *Viola odorata*. The adjoining section of garden was left as a ‘natural garden’.\(^{446}\)


3.12.2 Design Elements
3.12.2.1 Spatial Configuration
Cornish’s design for the front garden though composed from a symmetrical arrangement of built elements and planting scheme had a slight degree of asymmetry incorporated within it. Cornish arranged her composition upon the imposing symmetry of the house, using the placement of the front door to define the mid-point within her design. However, Makin had sited the house asymmetrically within the block placing the eastern sidewall of the house hard against the eastern boundary of the block, thereby creating a narrow passage between the western wall of the house and the property boundary shifting the front door slightly east of centre. Cornish planted the Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, at the northwestern corner of the house as a means of concealing the exact boundary of the façade and to minimise the effect of the asymmetry upon her design. The retention of the mature rhus tree, Rhus succedanea, also assisted in the concealment of the extra width on the western side of the main path. The siting of the house had a similar effect on the back garden, though not to the same extent. The asymmetrical placement of the verandah and the concealment of the façade through the planting of a further cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, at the southwestern corner of the house allowed Cornish to base the symmetry of her design on the mid-point of the block width.  

3.12.2.2 Front Garden
The tiny size of the front garden precluded the use of any significant features within this space. Cornish utilised the planting scheme to create much of the garden’s structure. The front garden was enclosed with what appears to be a darkly painted, timber, paling fence and access to the property was gained through the white, decorative, wooden front gate, aligned to the front door of the house. See figure 3.12.1. A straight crazy path connected the front door with the gate and divided the front garden into approximate halves. The only other known built elements included within the front garden were the symmetrical placement of potted cumquats, Citrus japonica, either side of the front door, aligned to the columns which created a decorative feature on the front façade of the building.

3.12.2.3 Back Garden
Cornish used the bed and lawn configuration and the planting scheme to create the structure of her design for the back garden; the large, central, rectangular panel of lawn framed by the adjoining long borders formed the main feature of her design. A limited number of other minor features assisted in realising the design as well as providing practical necessities for a family within a limited amount of space. Although the design of the main ‘room’ of this garden was cohesive throughout, it seems likely that Cornish intended the space to be subconsciously divided into approximate halves; the clothes line and lawn slope provided a physical indication of this division. The half adjacent to the house was intended primarily for adult occupation, whilst the farther half and adjoining ‘lemon tree room’ provided a place for Darian Smith’s children and grandchildren to play.
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The asymmetrical placement of the raised verandah allowed room for Cornish to juxtapose a courtyard space against it. Unlike the verandah, which over-looked the garden, the courtyard was integrated into the space; a seat within the courtyard provided a comfortable resting place from which to appreciate the immediate surrounds. A potted specimen placed at either front corner of the courtyard added a slight formal element to the space. The brick stepping stone path provided direct access to the garage.  

Whilst the clothesline and lawn slope dealt with some of the practical requirements of the site, a place to dry the family clothes and the accommodation of a level change, they also formed an invisible boundary within the garden. The lower area allowed for more freedom of play and was the entrance to the ‘lemon tree room’. The incline down to the lemon tree, *Citrus limon*, and the freer, wilder nature of the planting scheme, juxtaposed against the more formal nature of the garden above, suggested the possibility of an additional garden ‘room’, the ‘lemon tree room’ providing a doorway between the garden proper and this imagined secret garden. Through her treatment of these areas Cornish achieved the creation of a sense of additional space, making the garden seem larger than it actually was.

### 3.12.3 Planting Scheme

#### 3.12.3.1 Front Garden

Cornish’s planting scheme for the front garden was deceptively simple, with an extremely limited selection of well considered plants she managed to create unity between house and garden, both enhancing and softening the architecture of the house; achieving a range of colour, texture, scale and form effects. The placement of the silver birch, *Betula pendula*, and potted cumquats, *Citrus japonica*, repeated the symmetrical composition of the house within the garden; the pale bark and tall straight trunk of the silver birch, *Betula pendula*, replicated and emphasised the verticality and colour of the columns. The maturity of the Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, currently growing at the northwest corner of the house suggests that it dates from Cornish’s design. Cornish used it to balance the slight asymmetry created by the siting of the house.

The garden’s colour scheme relied predominantly on a range of evergreen and deciduous green tones, highlighted with seasonal colour; autumnal tones in autumn and; yellow and white with a hint of lilac in spring and summer. The deep evergreen foliage of the cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, and cumquats, *Citrus japonica*, and the lighter green of the lippia lawn, *Lippia phylacanescens*, provided a solid background to the changing colour scheme throughout the year. The rhus, *Rhus succedanea*, provided strong orange reds, juxtaposed against the clear yellow of the birch, *Betula pendula*, and the orange fruit of the cumquats, *Citrus japonica*, in autumn. In winter the evergreens provided a contrast against the dominance of the starkness of the bark of the deciduous plantings. The new, yellow green growth of the birch, *Betula pendula*, in spring harmonised with the massed flowering of yellow Dutch crocus, *Crocus vernus*, and the creamy white flowers of the cumquats, *Citrus japonica*. In summer the massed flowering of the lippia lawn, *Lippia*

Phylacanescens, created a sheet of lilac centred white flowers, a small yellow dot at
the base of each petal drawing yellow tones from the surrounding foliage.\textsuperscript{453}

Cornish achieved an interesting juxtaposition of form and scale within the front
garden, combining the tall upright, open rounded weeping form of the birch, Betula
pendula, against the low horizontal sheet of the lippia lawn, Lippia phylacanescens,
and Dutch crocus, Crocus vernus. Texturally, the birch, Betula pendula, was the
most significant planting; the lightness of its leaves provided movement and a
softening haze through which to view the house, relieving its starkness. The weeping
nature of the leafless, new growth in winter ensured the continuance of this effect
through out the rest of the year.\textsuperscript{454}

3.12.3.2 Back Garden
Cornish continued the simplicity of her planting scheme in the back garden, although
the greater space afforded a wider selection of plants. The main feature of the back
garden was the large central lawn panel surrounded by a series of garden beds. Pink
climbing roses, Rosa cv, were planted at the front corners of the verandah; a bed at
its foot was mass-planted with hydrangeas, Hydrangea macrophylla. Virginia
creeper, Parthenocissus quinquefolia, was trained on the house, around the
courtyard, and on the eastern random limestone rubble wall, softening and
integrating these hard surfaces into the garden. Set off by the lawn, Cornish devised
long and wide garden beds along both the eastern and western boundary walls,
creating a background and continuity in the upper storey planting by mass planting
silver birch, Betula pendula, in either border. The specimen, pink flowering almond,
Prunus x amygdalo-persica, and Judas tree, Cercis siliquastrum, provided a mass of
spring bloom. The trees provided height and scale within the back garden. Cornish
used them to prevent the size of the building from over-whelming the small size of
the garden and its otherwise relatively low planting. The open upright form of the
birch, Betula pendula, in particular softened the boundaries, without enclosing or
over-powering the rest of the garden. The under-storey planting of these beds
consisted of a selection of small shrubs, perennials, annuals and bulbs planted to
form the effect of a cottage garden. A portrait painted in 1942 of Darian Smith’s
daughter, Pamela, as a child, used a section of one of the borders as a background. A
mass of daisies, ranunculus, Ranunculus spp, anemones, Anemone spp, and forget-
me-nots, Myosotis sylvatica, all feature in this painting and provide some indication
as to the seasonal nature of these borders.\textsuperscript{455}

Cornish designed the planting scheme of the back garden to be at its peak from late
spring until early autumn, the difficult southerly site surrounded by tall or double
storey buildings meant that the garden would have received little winter sun. Cornish
therefore adopted a deciduous and seasonal planting scheme that allowed most of the
garden to be dormant during this difficult part of the year. The skeletal forms of the
birch, Betula pendula, flowering almond, Prunus x amygdalo-persica, and Judas
tree, Cercis siliquastrum, provided scale, structure and texture within the space
during winter. The colour scheme of the back garden seems to have been composed
from a selection of pinks, blues, yellows and white, during spring and summer,

\textsuperscript{455} Bird, ‘Interview with Pamela Savage’. Smith, ‘117 Barnard Street’. 
transitioning to include a greater range of brighter autumnal colours towards late summer and autumn.  

3.13 Cornish’s Garden

3.13.1 History and Description Cornish’s Garden

Cornish lived most of her adult life and conducted her entire career as a landscape gardener from 26 Palmer Place, North Adelaide. After Cornish’s death, architect Gavin Walkley rented the property before subsequently purchasing it. Cornish’s house and nursery-garden were demolished in 1955 for the erection of the ‘Modern’ cantilevered house that Walkley commissioned Melbourne-based architect Robin Boyd to design.  

Cornish, along with her recently widowed mother and younger siblings, moved into the residence late in 1888. The property occupying an eighth of Town Acre 746. Cornish’s mother, Agnes Maria, purchased the property on the 1st November 1888 from a Mr William Peacock, for the sum of £750. The property had previously been owned by Henry Stuckey from 1850 to 1865 and later Edmund Wright, both prominent architects who had carried out a series of additions to the original structure, which was apparently built between 1845-1850. This resulted in a disjointed residence formed from an amalgam of double and single storey buildings, which Joan Hopkins has described as a ‘funny low thing’. After the death of Agnes Maria Cornish in 1913, the property became jointly owned by Cornish and her sister Florence Hilda; Florence’s death in Reading, England, in 1916, saw the property pass into Cornish’s sole ownership.

Unfortunately there are very few records to chronicle Cornish’s development of her own garden, especially her early garden. What records there are, comprise a few images of the eastern façade of the house taken from across the road, in 1927, 1939 and 1955; two aerial images taken sometime between 1940 and 1955; and the brief recollections by Gavin Walkley of the property prior to its demolition. Although focused on the adjoining property, the image taken in 1927 indicates the existence of a large tree in the front of Cornish’s garden and also suggests a different fence from that recorded in later images. See figure 3.13.1a.

The photograph taken in 1939 and the aerial images taken shortly thereafter, indicate Cornish must have redesigned and replanted the front garden some time between 1927 and 1939. The later image records the removal and replacement of the mature tree and the replacement of the previous fence with one constructed from wooden pickets. See figures 3.13.1a & 3.13.1b. The aerial images, although unable to provide intimate details, do clearly show the basic structure of the garden. Although Cornish

457 Jones, ‘Elsie Marion Cornish (1887-1946)’, p. 90.
459 Bird, Interview with Joan Hopkins, 1 May 2000.
460 Walkley, pp. 1-2.
461 ‘Palmer Place’ [photograph], 1927, State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 4207. ‘Palmer Place’ [photograph], 1939, State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 9300. ‘Palmer Place’ [photograph], 1955, State Library of South Australia, South Australiana Database, B 13382. ‘Aquinas College’.
planted the eastern portion of the property typically as a front garden, the actual front of the house seems to have faced south. The eastern façade of the house does not seem to have had an external door and as much of the house was also sited directly along the northern boundary, it seems most logical that the actual front of the house must have faced south. The siting of the house created three main garden spaces, an eastern and western ‘room’ or the ‘front’ and ‘back’ gardens, connected by a narrow strip along the southern boundary, which formed the third garden.462

Figure 3.13.1a Cornish’s front garden, looking westwards, 1927.

(Source: State Library of South Australia B 4207)

Figure 3.13.1b Cornish’s front garden, looking westwards, 1939.

(Source: State Library of South Australia B 9300)

Cornish designed the ‘front’ garden as a self-contained flower garden; the adjoining strip which was developed into a shrub lined lawn glade provided access to the flower garden, the front door and the back garden beyond. The width of the glade was wide enough to warrant double gates at its entrance. However, there is no clear record of either the type or existence of these gates. The southern boundary of the glade was planted with a row of shrubs that extended from the street to its junction with the back garden; the northern boundary formed firstly by the southern bed of the flower garden and then the house. At the junction between house and glade, Cornish appears to have centrally positioned either a sundial or birdbath. A garden seat also seems to have been sited against the fence line. The area in front of the seat was paved with lawn set stepping stones that led to the entrance of the flower garden that was formed by a verandah covered-path set against the eastern façade of the house. The verandah was removed in 1940, leaving only the path.463 See figures 3.13.1c & 3.13.1d.

Although clearly visible from and forming a background to the lawn glade, Cornish designed the flower garden, the ‘front’ garden, to be a very separate space being composed from a simple formal configuration of rectangular beds. The centre of the garden was filled with a large rectangular bed encompassed by a path and then a

462 ‘Palmer Place’, B 4207. ‘Palmer Place’, B 9300. ‘Aquinas College’.
series of narrower rectangular beds. The southern-most section of path was extended to provide access to the main path against the eastern façade of the house. Potted specimens marked the entrance to this ‘room’, and although it is not possible to determine whether or not Cornish included any further features within this space the inclusion of, at the very least, a seat, would seem likely. See figures 3.13.1c & 3.13.1d.

Figure 3.13.1c Aerial image showing the design of Cornish’s front garden, circa 1950.
(Source: Aquinas College Archive)

Figure 3.13.1d Aerial image showing the layout of Cornish’s garden spaces, circa 1950.
(Source: Aquinas College Archive)

The back garden seems to have been employed in both aesthetic and practical pursuits. The aerial images of the back garden show a small curved free-form lawn, surrounded by what were probably tree and shrub borders along the southern and western boundaries of the garden. Cornish also operated a small nursery from within this space. Gavin Walkley particularly recollected the existence of such created from raised timber hoardings. These were approximately thirty centimetres in height and contained a mixture of natives and exotics but especially succulents that were probably destined for the University of Adelaide Embankment Garden. Walkley remembered caring for two mature ornamental grapevines, *Vitis* spp, planted at the back of the house, which seem to have been trained on an arbour of some sort. He also planted one of the silky oaks, *Grevillea robusta*, from Cornish’s nursery in the front garden. The silky oak, *Grevillea robusta*, is the only connection that the current house and garden have with Cornish or her garden. See figure 3.13.1d.

---

464 ‘Aquinas College’.
465 ‘Aquinas College’.
3.13.2 Design Elements

3.13.2.1 Spatial Configuration

In the creation of her own garden, Cornish’s use of the limited space afforded by the rambling nature and siting of the house was quite astute. Cornish created a series of multi-purpose ‘rooms’ wherein the small size of the garden spaces precluded the inclusion of private enclosed ‘rooms’. The ‘front’ garden was divided to provide an entrance and a semi-private garden ‘room’, and although each space was separate to the other, the division is not obvert, the interconnection of the two spaces created a unified whole. In the back garden Cornish seems to have achieved a careful blending of practical and aesthetic requirements.468 See figure 3.13.1d.

3.13.2.2 Lawn Glade

Cornish designed the lawn glade as a welcoming entrance and conduit to her home; it directed a visitor to the front door of the house. As the main garden axis, Cornish ensured that her design for this space contained sufficient interest for it to be more than functional; making it a ‘room’ in its own right. The inclusion and positioning of the seat, sundial and paving, whilst enticing progression from the street into the space, also provided a sufficiently strong feature to induce a period of interlude within the ‘room’ before continuing on to the front door and the back garden beyond.469

3.13.2.3 Flower garden

Cornish designed the flower garden as a semi-private ‘room’, her selection of fence though apparently quite high still allowed for sections of the garden to be appreciated from the street thereby providing, to some extent, an advertisement of the quality of her work as a landscape gardener. The fence chosen by Cornish was a simple, straight, relatively widely-set painted timber picket fence, with decoratively capped painted posts. Black and white images of the fence indicate that it was painted a reasonably dark colour toned to match with the painted detailing of the house contrasting against the paleness of its painted walls. Cornish’s configuration of the paths and beds was simple but formal, providing form and structure to the garden. The design was based around a large central rectangular bed, encircled by the path, and a further series of narrower rectangular beds. Further features of the flower garden, other than the pair of potted specimens that denote the entrance, are unknown, although it would seem reasonable that a seat was included somewhere in the ‘room’. There is the possibility of their being some form of feature against the northern fence line, at the end of the wide path against the house, such a feature would have been aligned to the seat in the lawn glade and would have completed a minor garden cross axis.470 See figures 3.13.1c & 3.13.1d.

3.13.2.4 Back Garden

Cornish’s design for her back garden, combined both her practical and aesthetic needs for the space, creating an aesthetically pleasing ‘room’ and a space in which to grow and nurture young plant specimens destined for her various garden commissions. The back garden was informally designed with a largish, free-form

---

468 'Aquinas College'.
469 'Aquinas College'.
470 'Palmer Place', B 9300. 'Palmer Place', B 13382.
curvaceous lawn as the main feature, bordered on its southern and western sides with sweeping curvaceous tree and shrub beds. The sweep of the southern tree and shrub bed was designed to create privacy within the ‘room’ from the lawn glade. The location of the arbour is unclear, though it would seem likely, that it was in some way connected to the house. The most likely location for the nursery, based on the layout of the ‘pleasure’ garden, is either the northern section or north-western corner of the back garden. The western fence and the double-storey wing of the house both provided the necessary shade for the propagation and nurturing of juvenile plants in either of those locations.\textsuperscript{471} See figure 3.13.1d.

3.13.3 Planting Scheme
3.13.3.1 Lawn Glade
Cornish seems to have planted the southern boundary of the lawn glade with a selection of shrubs, borrowing height and density of planting from the adjoining shrub border of the neighbouring property. This resulted in two planted effects of varying densities. The first, at the front of the ‘room’ was more open. The lawn, which was bordered by smaller shrubs on the southern boundary and the flower border on the northern boundary, became a main feature of the space and provided a setting for the sundial and paving. The second planting was aligned with the house and was larger and denser; the adjoining planting of the neighbouring property played a considerably more significant role by enclosing the space and making it seem more private. The southern façade of the house was most likely covered, in parts, with Virginia creeper, \textit{Parthenocissus quinquefolia}.\textsuperscript{472}

3.13.3.2 Flower Garden
The flower garden seems to have been planted with a selection of roses, small shrubs, perennials, annuals and probably bulbs with a tall semi-mature tree planted in the most southerly bed forming a feature within the flower garden and the adjoining lawn glade. From the images of the garden, it is not possible to determine what colour scheme Cornish selected, though the tonality of the black and white aerial images suggest a good range of foliage colour and tone. The roses, \textit{Rosa} spp, clearly visible in the 1939 image taken from across the street, suggest paler rather than darker coloured blooms. The images of the flower garden confirm that Cornish achieved a good variety of scale in her planting scheme. The form and texture of the perennial and annual planting seemed soft, rounded and billowing and formed a contrast with the more firm, upright planting of tall shrub roses. Virginia creeper, \textit{Parthenocissus quinquefolia}, was trained along the eastern façade of the house, above the verandah, creating a seasonal autumnal colour display.\textsuperscript{473} See figure 3.13.1b.

3.13.3.3 Back Garden
Determining much about Cornish’s planting scheme for the back garden is not possible. Aerial images suggest that either trees or tall shrubs were used to provide an element of privacy within the recess of the curved lawn, in the southwest corner of the border to create a background, and, at the points in the curves of the beds. For

\textsuperscript{471} ‘Aquinas College’.
\textsuperscript{472} ‘Aquinas College’ ‘Palmer Place’, B 9300. ‘Palmer Place’, B 13382.
\textsuperscript{473} ‘Aquinas College’ ‘Palmer Place’, B 9300. ‘Palmer Place’, B 13382.
this planting Cornish chose upright rounded forms. The tonality of the image suggests a range of foliage colours and tones and some degree of variation in texture and scale. The only conclusively known planting in the back garden was the use of the ornamental grapevines, *Vitis* spp, on the arbour, which would have provided a seasonal autuminal colour display.474 See figure 3.13.1d.

474 'Aquinas College'.
Chapter Four - Australian Contemporaries

4.1 Introduction

Australia had a diverse field of Landscape Design Practitioners working at the domestic level during the Interwar period. While many originated from a horticultural background there were also a number of Architects and professionally overseas trained Landscape Designers who contributed during this period; of these a significant number were women. Although there is a plentiful list of names from which to choose from, only three have been selected from which to form a basis for the comparative and contextual analysis of Cornish’s work; they are Edna Walling, Olive Mellor and Jocelyn Brown. These three designers were selected over the others for a number of reasons:

- each designed a significant collection of domestic gardens throughout the period;
- those designs are accessible and period representative;
- each published books and/or articles within the popular media expressing their ideas, thoughts and philosophies on landscape design;
- in-depth analysis of their designs and philosophies has been conducted by current erudite Landscape Design or related Professionals;
- each has a recognised and respected position within the Landscape Design fraternity in Australia; and,
- their designs and philosophies had a significant influence on landscape design in Australia during the interwar period.

Walling is the most widely studied and recognised of the three designers. Dixon and Churchill describe her ‘as the single most important person in shaping Australian landscape design’. Walling studied at Burnley Horticultural College between 1916-17, then worked as a jobbing gardener before beginning her design career in the early 1920s when a friends architect brother, Cecil Ballantyne, commissioned her to design a garden to complement the house that he was designing. This led to further commissions and a series of regular articles in The Australian Home Beautiful including designs for the readers from 1926-34, Walling sporadically contributed after 1934. Much of her written work was later collated, edited and published in her books Gardens in Australia Their Design and Care and A Gardeners’ Log. The majority of Walling’s commissions were undertaken during the 1920s - 40s, although she did continue to design until her death in 1973. The analysis of Walling’s designs and philosophies has been based upon her garden designs and articles from The Australian Home Beautiful from 1926-46; her books Gardens in Australia Their Design and Care and A Gardeners’ Log; the biographical and analytical studies undertaken by Watts, Barrett, and Dixon and Churchill, which also include representative selections of her larger garden commissions; and a limited representative selection of her garden plans held at The State Library of Victoria.

---

1 Aitken and Looker.
2 Dixon and Churchill, p. x.
3 See Appendix 4A for a list of Walling’s articles for The Australian Home Beautiful between 1926-1946.
5 See Appendix 4B for a list of Walling’s garden design commissions.
Jane Shepherd, in an unpublished dissertation into six Women landscape designers, noted that Mellor’s body of work was significantly greater than that of Walling’s. Unfortunately her only accessible surviving plans are those that were published in either The Australian Home Beautiful or her book Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated. Mellor studied at Burnley Horticultural College in 1914-15 and was employed as a member of the teaching staff in 1917, resigning in 1919 when she married. Due to personal reasons she began working again, as a jobbing gardener, during the mid 1920s; this lead to the position of head gardener at a Toorak property in the late 1920s. Eventually, as the result of a series of circumstances, Mellor established and ran a landscape design and contractor business, employing a staff of labourers. Mellor began to contribute regularly to The Australian Home Beautiful in 1934, progressively discharging Walling’s role in the provision of both designs and horticultural advice; this due in large to the editor's frustration with Walling’s increasing irregularity. During the Second World War Mellor added Australian Women’s Land Army duties to her other business activities obtaining a senior rank within the organisation. During the late 1940s, writing under the pseudonym Grevillea, Mellor produced a regular gardening column for The Advertiser in Adelaide; later amalgamating her Australian Home Beautiful and Advertiser articles into the book, Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated. A number of chapter contributions were also made to a variety of other gardening books during this period. A weekly gardening radio program on 3DB followed during the 1950s and 60s. Mellor continued working nearly up until her death in 1978.

The analysis of Mellor’s garden designs and philosophies has been compiled from her articles and garden designs from The Australian Home Beautiful between 1934-46; her book Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated; and biographical and limited analysis of Mellor’s work by Shepherd and Pullman. Difficulties in the analysis of Mellor’s work have been compounded by the limited nature of her Australian Home Beautiful plans, these designs being only a small proportion of the five hundred plus gardens she is credited with designing. There are almost no photographic or illustrative records of her gardens in the public domain other than The Australian Home Beautiful plans, which are noted as comparatively lacking in detail to Walling’s. The limited nature of published, comprehensive in-depth analysis and the identification and documentation of Mellor’s remaining gardens has further complicated this analysis. However, Mellor is still one of the better studied garden designers from this period and the body of work which is available is still a valuable resource from which to create a foundation to undertake a comprehensive contextual and comparative analysis of Cornish’s design work.

Brown began her garden design career comparatively later than Mellor and Walling. Originally trained as a commercial artist Brown developed an initial career as a skilled commercial artist and draughtswoman before her first garden commission

---

6 Shepherd, pp.8-17.
7 See Appendix 4C for a list of Mellor’s garden designs published in The Australian Home Beautiful.
8 See Appendix 4D for a list of Mellor’s articles for The Australian Home Beautiful between 1934-1946.
10 Shepherd, pp. 8-17. Pullman, pp7-10. The garden photographs in Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated generally depict Adelaide gardens, the images largely borrowed from the local popular journal South Australian Homes and Gardens Magazine.
during the late 1930s.\textsuperscript{11} First honing an amalgamation of external ideas and influences in the design of her own gardens, she wrote a series of articles on gardening and garden design for the popular Sydney based journal *The Home* between 1939-42.\textsuperscript{12} These articles succinctly convey her design philosophies.\textsuperscript{13} Brown’s body of design work is considerably less than either Mellor or Walling, her design portfolio includes only fifteen gardens of which five were her own. However, the skill with which they were executed; the in-depth analysis of both her written and design work by Proudfoot; her articles for *The Home*; and her base in Sydney provide a strong foundation from which to conduct a contextual and comparative analysis of Cornish’s work. The analysis for Brown’s garden designs and philosophies has been compiled from her articles and garden plans in *The Home* and the comprehensive and in-depth biographical and design analysis of her work by Proudfoot.

In creating a timeframe for the analysis of these women’s work, a cut off date of 1946 (the year of Cornish’s death) was selected. This was applied to all written work in both *The Australian Home Beautiful* and *The Home*. Although Mellor and Walling’s books were mostly published after this date, they have been considered, as they essentially form a representative compilation of those articles, written prior to 1946. The design work of Walling and Mellor, dating from the beginning of their careers until 1946 has also been considered. Although Brown’s articles fall succinctly within the timeframe, six of her gardens do not, being either undated or designed post 1946. These gardens have been included, as only three were private commissions, designed during the 1950s; the remaining three were Brown’s own gardens, designed and built in succession from 1945 to her death in 1971. These gardens are representative of her design philosophy and are necessary to create a sufficient scope of work from which to base an analysis.

The degree of influence that these women had on landscape design in Australia was immense; between the specified timeframe they designed gardens in every state and territory with the exception of the Northern Territory. Their written and design work was widely received and imitated throughout the country, distributed in the popular journals, magazines and newspapers of the day. Comprehensive and in-depth analysis of their written and design work has been conducted by a number of leading professionals within either the landscape or allied fraternities. The amount of information provided by the designers themselves and subsequently by other erudite individuals creates a strong foundation upon which to apply a subjective, comparative and contextual analysis of Cornish’s work.

\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix 4E for a list of Brown’s garden design commissions including her own gardens.
\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix 4F for a list of Brown’s articles for *The Home* between 1939-1942.
4.2 Edna Walling

4.2.1 Design Overview

Walling’s idea of a garden was ‘a place of seclusion and refreshment of body and mind’ and one ‘in which you could garden if you wanted to, but if you didn’t it wouldn’t matter.’ Designed as a ‘series of pictures’ Walling used a ‘strong architectural framework’ in her designs, linking the house and garden, pictorially clothing the framework with her well honed skills as a plantswomen. During the growing season Walling intended that her planting schemes should smother the architectural framework, only to be revealed in winter where it would provide cohesive unity within the garden. Walling’s smaller gardens rely more prevalently on her typical architectural elements, believing that the smaller the garden the more it needed to be ‘constructed’. Conversely as the gardens increased in size, the more she used her planting schemes to provide this structure.

Watts in his assessment of Walling’s career as a professional garden designer, found that she used a ‘confident and personal style’ that ‘showed no apparent stylistic development of any real consequence...’. Watts has classified Walling’s gardens into three broad stylistic categories each containing a recurring set of common elements found in the gardens, irrespective of their dates of commission, with some blurring between styles. These categories include:

- ‘Cottage Gardens’;
- ‘Structured Gardens’;
- ‘Formal Geometric Gardens’.

The Cottage Gardens were ‘gardens for gardeners’ and were a spontaneous collaboration between owner and Walling; Walling maintaining a degree of overseership throughout her life of these gardens. See figures 4.2.1a & 4.2.1b. These gardens were principally composed from the planting scheme and incorporated:

- lawn areas, thyme lawns, bulb drifts, dense shrub beds and lawn copses plantings;
- structural frameworks from stone paths, dry stone walls, pergolas and self-sown terraces; and,
- small architectural incidents, such as small pools.

---

16 Watts, pp. 80, 90.
17 Dixon and Churchill, p. 29.
20 Watts, p. 77. Watts’ only caveat being Walling’s first designs, where he felt that the arrangement of the elements within the garden were ‘not particularly well disposed’, believing that at this stage in her career that she would lose sight of the ‘total concept’ when engrossed in the detail.
21 Watts, p. 77.
22 Watts, p. 79.
23 Watts, p. 80.
24 Watts, p. 83.
25 Watts, p. 79.
26 Watts, pp. 79-80.
Walling’s Structured and Formal Geometric Garden styles were closely allied, incorporating many similar elements and features, the principal differences between the styles originating from larger allotment sizes and/or grander architectural styles of the associated houses found in the Formal Geometric Gardens. Walling altered the scale and proportion of her commonly used features to achieve a complementary garden of comparable grandeur.

Elements common to both her Structured and Formal Geometric gardens include:

- architecturally structured designs softened by the planting scheme;
- composition around a series of linked ‘garden rooms’;\(^{27}\)
- the juxtaposition of formal elements in informal spaces and vice versa;\(^{28}\)
- linkage of the house to the main garden axis;
- use of architectural features in the garden to create unity between house and garden;
- termination of vistas by either external features or internal architectural elements;\(^{29}\)
- composition of both individual ‘rooms’ and the whole garden to achieve elements of mystery, surprise and the illusion of space and distance, especially in the smaller gardens; and,\(^{30}\)
- concealment of service and utility areas.

\(^{27}\) Watts, pp. 80, 84-5.
\(^{29}\) Watts, pp. 80, 84-5.
\(^{30}\) Dixon and Churchill, p. 34.
Walling’s Structured Gardens were usually designed for a $\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$ acre suburban block although they do occasionally occur in the country or on a grander scale. See figure 4.2.1c. Typically:

- the front is informally treated with densely planted sweeping perimeter beds, large specimen trees or copses in the lawn, with a stone path to the door; and
- the rear garden is formally treated, generally with a simple geometric layout utilising simple axis and a reliance on architectural forms.

![Figure 4.2.1c](source: The Australian Home Beautiful April 1927, p. 61.)

(SOURCE: The Australian Home Beautiful April 1927, p. 61.)
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31 Watts, p. 80.
32 Dixon and Churchill, p. 25, 49. This treatment is one of Walling’s most recognisable design trademarks however her very early gardens tended to be more simply and formally treated.
33 Watts, p. 80. Dixon and Churchill, p. 111 tend to consider that Walling’s later gardens were less formal, the informal sweeping borders more commonly associated with her front garden’s replacing the formal spaces.
The Formal Geometric Gardens, see figure 4.2.1d, were designed for grand houses and/or large allotments, the design based on:

- rigid geometric ‘rooms’ either directly associated with the house or connected to it axially or with a built structure;
- the progression from formal ‘rooms’ to informal spaces created through sweeping, densely planted borders of a grander scale than those in the Structured Gardens;
- the use of significant architectural elements, axially linked to the path system and intersecting the design at critical points; and,
- the dominant use of stairs, stone walls and terraces.\(^{34}\)

\(\text{Figure 4.2.1d Walling's design for 'Greenacres' is typical of her Formal Geometric style.}\)

(Source: Dixon & Churchill, p. 100.)

\(^{34}\) Watts, pp. 83-4.
4.2.2 Design Elements

4.2.2.1 Water

‘Pools and other water features have become so popular that no persuasive words are needed to induce owners to install them in our gardens.’

Walling, recognising the value of water in the Australian garden, included water features in most of her designs; her treatment of these features equally skilful, irrespective of size or setting. Watts describes her ability in the treatment of a naturalistic swimming pool for the Hughes-Jones garden as ‘a major pivot in Australian garden design.’ Walling’s treatment of the surrounding planting scheme and her utilisation of light, shadow and reflection, within the associated areas of the water feature, created a space resonate with tranquillity in even the most formal of her designs. See figure 4.2.2.1a. Walling used both formal and informal shaped pools; her plans indicating a strong preference for formal shapes, informal shapes reserved for the larger gardens. In siting her pools she tended to follow her own advocacy: ‘unless it is for a fountain, the basin of which is retained by a moulded coping, the pool should always be, as far as possible, in a position that suggests itself as the most likely place.’

![Image](image_url)

Figure 4.2.2.1a Although the section of garden containing the octagonal pool at ‘Mawarra’ is highly formal Walling’s planting scheme imbues the space with tranquillity.

(Source: Watts, p. 67.)
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Walling used formal pools and swimming pools in both formal and informal settings where they formed either an incidence or the main focus of the 'room', the degree of formality tending to increase as the size of the garden increased. Walling's pools tend to be axially arranged within the garden and/or sited as a visual feature to a particular room within the house, forming either the terminal point or an incidence along a main vista. See figures 4.2.1.1b & 4.2.2.1c. Occasionally, a pool was used as the apex of a triangular spatial arrangement within the garden. Walling favoured circular, rectangular, quatrefoil, hexagonal and basic variations of these shapes for her pools. The circular pools generally featured in her smaller gardens where they tended to be used in either one of two ways: nestled into a tree and shrub border or as the feature of usually a rectangular ‘room’. The ‘room’ walls were created by tree and shrub borders; the pool set in lawn and sited either centrally or offset to one end. Walling coped her pools with stone, set them flush with either the lawn or paving and often incorporated a single, centrally positioned low jet fountain.

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 4.2.2.1b** This pool in the Cuming garden in suburban Melbourne is illustrative of Walling’s formal pools in her smaller gardens.

**Figure 4.2.2.1c** The Cuming garden pool circa 1998 – the mature planting scheme obscures the adjoining tennis court from the house directly opposite.

(Source: Dixon & Churchill, p. 120.)

Significant fountains were used occasionally, the associated pool raised above ground level and butted against a high retaining wall where it often terminated a main vista and/or axis.

Walling’s informal pools regularly doubled as swimming pools, forming a significant feature within her larger garden designs. Walling created gently curving kidneyesque shapes which fitted into the natural or man-made contours of the site. The associated

---


41 Watts, p. 100.
settings were typically informal or naturalistic; the pool edged with boulders and the
surrounds densely planted with tree and shrub borders. See figure 4.2.1d.

4.2.2.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Walling regularly used informal lawn set stepping stones or slightly more significant
paths that purposefully meandered through her gardens. If they were to be straight,
then they were perfectly straight otherwise the reverse is true, though never
serpentine. Walling used trees, planting features and level change to validate the
curves, incorporating these features into her designs where necessary. See figure
4.2.1c. Formal geometric path systems only occurred in her highly formal gardens or
garden ‘rooms’, where they provided structure to the design and often emphasised
the main axis and cross axis. See figure 4.2.1d. Walling could not abide crazy
paving, concrete or hard edging; instead she encouraged border plantings to spill
onto the path, believing that harmony between path and planting could only be
retained through the encroachment of one onto the other. Straight paths were
always used in the utility areas of the garden.

Paved areas were a characteristic element of Walling’s designs; Walling designed
patio areas that adjoined the house, referring to them as piazzas and/or other little
paved spaces contained within the garden. Piazzas provided an outdoor living space
which, is an important aspect of her garden ethos. Walling recommended and
incorporated little paved areas within the garden as a place of rest, generally
positioning them under a shady tree and providing tables and chairs. Walling found
these spaces particularly valuable for busy people as they offered significant effect
for little effort.

Her driveways were mostly curved but not serpentine, running from property
entrance to house and/or garage; the same deceits as for her paths used to justify the
curves. In the smaller gardens, car tracks were preferred over a solid drive, the lawn
set strips having less impact on the aesthetics of the garden. In the larger country
gardens, the drive was designed to sweepingly curve following the natural contours
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of the landscape. Walling was usually in two minds as to whether or not to include bold plantings or to leave well enough alone. Bold plantings and avenues were only used when she felt that the idea of a ‘degree of magnificence’ was needed.\(^{51}\)

Walling’s most frequently used materials and patterns were:

- slate and sandstone flags, cut to irregular rectilinear shapes sunk into the earth as stepping stones, or pieced together to create solid paving - this was Walling’s most frequently used and most recognisable style of paving;\(^ {52}\)
- brick in variations of basket weave, herringbone and stretcher bond, and smaller subsidiary paths paved with half bricks laid on end;\(^ {53}\)
- gravel, specifically specified as limestone toppings, crushed rock or ironstone;
- earth and gritty sand paths in areas away from the house;\(^ {54}\)
- lawn paths, often including small sections of stepping stones to connect ‘rooms’; and,\(^ {55}\)
- the inclusion of plants within the planting joints, thymes were especially favoured for this purpose.\(^ {56}\)

Although concrete was disapproved of Walling did include a recipe for sand cement in A Gardener’s Log for the creation of irregular large format pavers that were to be used in a similar manner to sandstone and slate flags.\(^ {57}\) Similarly, Walling’s dislike of crazy paving saw it rarely included within her garden designs; it can only be found in her cottage gardens.\(^ {58}\)

**4.2.2.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries**

Dixon and Churchill have noted Walling’s frequent authorship on rock gardens and gardening. However, as a comparative proportion of her design work rock gardens were infrequently represented within her designs.\(^ {59}\) Walling’s theory and practice of rock gardens and rock work was heavily influenced by her associate Ellis Stones, the works of Reginald Farrer (English Rock Gardens) and BHB Symonds-Jeune (Natural Rock Gardening), observation of the Australian bush, and Japanese gardens. Walling used two very different styles of rock gardens or rock work in her designs: the typical traditional style of rock garden, as proposed by English garden designers, and the artistic but ‘natural’ placement of a few weathered boulders, styled on the Australian bush and Japanese gardens. This second type of rockwork is found throughout her gardens.\(^ {60}\) Walling despised rockeries which she described as ‘the use of smallish

---

\(^ {51}\) Walling, A Gardener’s Log, p. 94.


\(^ {54}\) Walling, The Gardener’s Log, pp. 49-50.

\(^ {55}\) Dixon and Churchill, pp. 2, 10, 12, 20, 26, 36, 40, 64, 66, 78-9, 90-1, 94-5, 100, 104.
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\(^ {58}\) Dixon and Churchill, p. 33.


stones piled together',\(^{61}\) by this referring to the rock mounds typically found in the suburban garden.\(^{62}\)

Of the first type of rock garden, Walling's examples were usually of generous size. Walling selected large well-weathered boulders, placing them so as to appear as natural as possible, often extending an existing outcrop, and following strata lines and site contours. Paths were added with care so as to meander like simple animal tracks through the bush and the plants were placed in drifts.\(^{63}\) In siting her rock gardens Walling felt that they should not be on the boundary fence but closer to the middle of the garden; at the very least there needed to be sufficient space for a glade between fence and rock garden.\(^{64}\) Walling generally concealed the rock garden from view, especially from the house, with her typical dense tree and shrub borders. See figure 4.2.2.3a. Two distinct types of planting were used in her rock gardens: more typically a mixture of alpines, thymes and shrubs (she despised the use of annuals) however, if the rock garden was a part of a natural outcrop, she eschewed exotics, strongly recommending the exclusive use of natives.\(^{65}\)

![An example of Walling's rock placement and her use of plants within a rock garden.](image)

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens February 1941, p. 45.)
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**4.2.2.4 Small Features - Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots**

Walling used a variety of small features in her garden designs including birdbaths, sundials, statues, sculpture, seats and pots; of these, seats were the most constant feature. Walling tended to use these features as incidents or termination points in the axial arrangement of the more formal ‘rooms’ of her garden designs. See figures 4.2.1c & 4.2.1d.

Birdbaths and sundials appear in both her formal and informal designed ‘rooms’. In the formal ‘rooms’ they are always a part of the axial arrangement of either a single ‘room’ or a series of ‘rooms’, being used in both symmetrical and asymmetrical configurations. Walling often placed these features at the intersection of paths, especially within highly formal rose or flower gardens. In the informal ‘rooms’, they tended to be sited so as to draw the visitor to that part of the garden; they may or may not form a part of a minor secondary axial arrangement specific to the ‘room’, or less obviously, to the garden as a whole.\(^{66}\)

**Statues were:**

- axially arranged in formal ‘rooms’;
- used to terminated the vista, often being mounted within a pool;
- sited at path intersections or symmetrically positioned to the main windows of a particular room, creating visual interest in difficult sections of the garden;
- set in front of hedges which were used to create a background for the statue; and,
- flanked by, symmetrical feature plantings, often of fastigate form for additional emphasis.\(^{67}\)

Walling sited her seats to provide points for ‘spontaneous relaxation’, preferring fixed garden furniture to moveable, and often included a number of seats within a single garden design. Typical Walling combinations included: the use of seats at the end of a pergola to terminate the vista, and the inclusion of seats within retaining walls. Walling disliked rustic designs and ‘pokey’ proportions, preferring the substantial mass of refectory style seating and tables, straight legs, and slab tops. She favoured combinations of wood and stone; where used, timber was allowed to weather. Walling often recommended that cushions be carried into the garden to relieve the hardness of stone seats and benches.\(^{68}\)

In formal and semi-formal ‘rooms’, seats:

- assisted in creating the structure of the space;
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In informally designed ‘rooms’, seats were typically:
- secluded within the space;
- nestled into the tree and shrub border that provided a background setting; and
- overlooked a sweep of lawn.

Pots or tubs were used to provide a succession of relatively inexpensive colour in the garden typically being ‘artistically’ grouped on the piazza of the smaller and cottage gardens. In the larger gardens, Walling used them mainly at the juncture of the house and garden to provide a degree of connection between the two, or as a formal element in the more formally designed ‘rooms’ where they were used:
to accent path intersections, a pot placed in each corner;
- at intervals along terraces;
- to denote stairs;
- to denote ‘room’ entrances, a pot sited either side of the path;
- as a formal element in the corners of rectilinear ‘rooms’;
- as a formal feature of the ‘room’, placed at intervals around the sides of the space; and,
- in combinations of single and multiple pots, running in succession down a staircase.

4.2.2.5 Large Features - Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Of the large architectural features included in her garden designs, Walling preferred both pergolas and colonnades, garden-houses rarely featured and tended to be either formally designed bathing pavilions connected to swimming pools or a variant of a pergola. Tennis courts and garages were generally subsumed into the garden concealed by dense planting.

Although Walling used different design constructs for the inclusion of pergolas and colonnades in her gardens, they achieved very similar objectives: dividing and

72 Dixon and Churchill, pp. 4-5, 14, 26, 28, 60.
73 Walling described her colonnades as ‘a series of columns with entablature...Simplify the scheme by having just the columns supporting either a single beam or two beams’. A Gardener’s Log, p. 108. She also often included low walls or hedges between the columns.
separating the garden into different ‘rooms’. Walling used these built features to create a feeling of distance or space, often framing pictures within the garden. See figure 4.2.2.5a. Using these structures as vertical garden beds, Walling draped them with a variety of climbing plants. See figures 4.2.1c & 4.2.1d. Although Walling’s pergolas were a notable feature of her gardens she actually favoured the colonnade. Walling used similar materials in the construction of both colonnades and pergolas; posts were constructed from plastered rubble columns, stone or timber piers. The colonnades were usually capped with dressed timber and pergolas with saplings; both were always planted.

Pergolas were positioned to take advantage of tree and shrub plantings and/or had perennial or flower beds along one side, see figures 4.2.1c & 4.2.1d, and were used:
- as an extension of the house and were connected to it either architecturally, physically, visually, spatially or axially;
- to frame windows or doors of principle rooms within the house where they formed a very specific, contained vista, terminated at the far end by some form of incidence;
- to draw you into the garden; and,
- as a form of garden-house, one end enclosed within the planting scheme and containing a seat.

Colonnades allowed Walling to create divisions within the garden without enclosing or concealing the spaces. Unconstrained by the need to connect or link the colonnade to the house, she used this structure freely within her gardens to interrupt horizontal spaces. See figure 4.2.25a.

Figure 4.2.2.5a A typical Walling colonnade.
(Source: Watts, p. 63.)
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Tennis courts seem to have been included only when specifically requested, forming an infrequent element of Walling’s designs. Walling generally achieved the recommended north-south alignment of the court even though this often had a significant impact on smaller gardens. The tennis court was typically disguised with densely planted boundaries comprised of either hedges or tree and shrub borders, court entrances tended to be asymmetrically sited.80

Garden-houses rarely feature in Walling’s designs; Walling achieved the same function from reconfigured pergola designs, comprised from either one of two main variations: a seat at one end of the pergola as previously discussed, or through the slight enlargement of either the end or mid section of the structure. Walling occasionally included loggias and changing rooms in association with her pools, siting them symmetrically to her formal pool designs or nestling them into the garden when the pool was of an informal design.81

Walling felt that garages should be kept simple and were best sited towards the front of the block to avoid difficulties with entering and exiting the structure.82 In her smaller garden designs - most usually for the readers of The Australian Home Beautiful - most of the garages were either sited close to the house or at the rear of the property, close to the boundary. In most of these instances, the garage would already have been built before Walling was approached to design the garden. In recognition of the fact that most of her readers would be unable to afford to relocate them, Walling chose to adjoin utility and service areas, disguising the whole with dense border plantings.83 In the larger gardens for her wealthier clients, Walling was more freely able to dictate the siting of the garage and followed her own advice by generally positioning it close to the front of the garden. As with the smaller gardens, utility and service yards were adjoined and the whole was disguised with dense tree and shrub border plantings; the driveway was generally turned into a paved feature.84

4.2.2.6 Level Change – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

‘Treatment of the contour of the ground is one of the most, if not the most, important matter in garden design’.85

Walling had a consummate talent and passion for level change, to the point where she would artificially add contours to a site using the earth excavated from sunken gardens or pools to form banks. Level change accommodated many of Walling’s favoured architectural features: particularly walls. See figure 4.2.2.5a. However she was just as equally felicitous of small changes, finding that even a single step was
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sufficient to add a point of interest to the design.\textsuperscript{86} On steep sites, her garden compositions tended to rely on symmetry and architectural frameworks.\textsuperscript{87}

Walling’s feature ‘trademark’ was low stone walls; however, she was as equally accomplished with the design and use of significantly larger walls, incorporating them into her gardens as the site dictated. Walling used both retaining and freestanding walls, either straight or curved.\textsuperscript{88} Freestanding walls were used on flat sites to divide the garden. Often constructed at sitting height, the ends were slightly broadened to create a pier-effect, which added both constructional stability and aesthetic value.\textsuperscript{89} See figure 4.2.2.6a. Walling built dry-stone, mortared and plastered walls, favouring dry-stone and mortared, although her specified treatment for mortared walls produced in her opinion the effect of a cross between a plastered and stone wall. This was achieved by keeping the mortar flush with the surface of the wall and removing any trowel marks when the mortar was partially dry.\textsuperscript{90} Retaining walls were always planted, usually with a variety of trailing plants, and flower borders were often incorporated against south facing walls where they took advantage of the softer light. Freestanding walls were occasionally planted: this most frequently occurred when the wall was incorporated into a colonnade.\textsuperscript{91} See figure 4.2.2.5a.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Wall.png}
\caption{A typical Walling freestanding wall in the garden at ‘Millamolong’.
(Source Dixon & Churchill, p. 107.)}
\end{figure}

Walling disliked the highly fashionable traditional terrace garden stating ‘\textit{There is nothing more monotonous than a set of stone walls equidistant up and down a}'}
Walling based her terraces on those found in Italian gardens; each had a different width, character, design and planting; each was considered 'an entirely separate garden'. Terraces connected to the house tended to be more formally treated and were flat; those away from the house were more informally treated, often retaining a degree of natural slope and incorporating her typical tree and shrub style border planting. See figure 4.2.1d.

Stairs, to Walling, were an aesthetic feature that also connected levels. See figures 4.2.1d & 4.2.2.5a. Writing of their common design faults, she suggested that the safest designs were generally long, low and broad; this formula was used in many of her designs. Although Walling used a variety of stair types, she tended to reuse favoured designs including:

- semi circular and segmented stairs for short runs not more than three risers high;
- the incorporation of the stairs into the wall cavity, the stair length frequently occupied a significant proportion of the walls width;
- the use of wrought iron balustrading for long runs of rectilinear stairs;
- the use of low walls and/or the planting scheme to edge staircases;
- simple square stone piers to indicate the top and/or bottom of a run of stairs;
- the intersection of a path with staircase landings; and,
- the use of boulders as stairs in informal 'naturalistic' parts of the garden.

Although appreciated for their ability to provide level change, sunken gardens were an infrequent feature of Walling's designs. Typically, Walling used circular, rectangular and octagonal shapes for these gardens and tended to treat them as lawn 'rooms'. Enclosed with her typical tree and shrub borders they also occasionally incorporated features such as a pool, specimen tree, or an encircling or partially encircling low stone wall. Very occasionally the sunken garden was also designed as a specific flower or rose garden.

4.2.2.7 Rose Gardens

Walling designed numerous formal rose and/or flower gardens, treating these spaces as individual 'rooms', typically siting them close to the house and symmetrically aligning them to a particular room. Typical garden shapes included circular, rectangular, square and octagonal geometrical arrangements: the configurations tended to become more complex as the size of the garden increased. See figure 4.2.1d. Cross-axial path systems were most frequently used and often contained a paved circle with centrally positioned feature at their junction; however the more complicated the 'room' configuration the more complex the path system. The paths
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were always aligned to or terminated by some incidence either in the 'room', garden or to the house. These 'rooms' were generally enclosed by either hedges or Walling's tree and shrub borders; Walling also included hedges and trees and shrubs as planting features to provide a permanent framework for the more transient nature of rose, perennial and annual plantings.\textsuperscript{101}

4.2.3 Planting Schemes

4.2.3.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

Walling considered '...Shade, Colour, Form and Texture to be the pillars of the perfect garden',\textsuperscript{102} consummately fusing these elements together to clothe her designs in a '...characteristic magical veil of planting'.\textsuperscript{103} In her frequent writing on their importance to design, Walling mostly linked these elements to the planting scheme - only occasionally referencing them to built elements. From both practical and aesthetic viewpoints, Walling felt that light and shade was the 'starting-point in garden thinking'.\textsuperscript{104}

Like Jekyll, Walling favoured the combination of blue, mauve, pale yellow, pink and white flowers with grey-green foliage;\textsuperscript{105} however most fundamental to her and her gardens was green: Walling using a diversity of tones to form the backbone of her planting schemes. Coloured and variegated foliage was used with discretion and restraint.\textsuperscript{106} Walling carefully combined foliage, flower, bark and berry colours to create 'pictorial effect' through both contrast and harmony. Though Walling predominantly used a succession of green tones, she was partial to purple leaved specimens using these plants as features, especially to denote specific points within the garden.\textsuperscript{107}

Walling's 'genius' with plants was her ability to 'appreciate the most intimate details of each plant and, at the same time, stand back and assess her planting combinations in terms of their contribution to the overall picture'.\textsuperscript{108} See figures 4.2.2.1a & 4.2.3.1a. Walling used the form and texture of her planting schemes to create or reinforce the structure of her gardens;\textsuperscript{109} a winter study of the texture and form of those plantings schemes was used to test and reveal design flaws.\textsuperscript{110} As a result of this study Walling developed a signature plant combination, positioning the 'misty tracery' of deciduous trees as a background to evergreens, thereby reversing the juxtaposition of the more frequent groupings of deciduous and evergreen trees.\textsuperscript{111}

Watts described Walling's general planting form as 'soft and rounded' with 'punctuation marks' provided by columnar or fastigate trees and that, texturally,
'The delicacy of her planting meant that the coarser-leaved varieties were used sparingly.' Walling was fully cognisant of the effects of leaf size on the apparent creation of distance or foreshortening of space.

Figure 4.2.3.1 Part of the now mature planting scheme in the garden at 'Appledore' illustrating Walling's use of colour, texture, scale and form.

(Source: Dixon & Churchill, p. 75.)

4.2.3.2 Flower Borders
Perennial borders and groups were not a significant element of Walling’s designs; her dominant use of trees and shrubs played a much more important role in the composition of her gardens. Perennials were typically used in two ways: planted in bays at the foreground of a tree and shrub border where they provided a seasonal focus to the ‘room’ or intermingled with flowering shrubs as a contributory element to the overall display. See figures 4.2.1c & 4.2.1d. Only extremely rarely did Walling include traditional formal perennial ‘garden rooms’ - composed from facing rectangular panels of perennials linked by a central path and/or lawn panel, backed with a hedge or tree and shrub border - within her designs. Annuals were rarely used: Walling believing that treatment of the foreground areas where they were commonly planted could be better achieved with perennials or low shrubs. When annuals were used, it was either in combination with perennial groupings or in special cut flower beds for the provision of flowers for the house.
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Less frequent, traditional usages of perennials by Walling include:

- as formal borders along a path;
- as a planting feature along one side of a pergola;
- as rectangular panels connected to loggias or courtyards;
- as a foundation planting in combination with shrubs; and;
- in formal ‘garden rooms’, either in association with the dominant planting of that ‘room’, for example a rose garden, or as the dominate feature of the ‘room’ (see section 4.2.2.7).

4.2.3.3 Trees & Shrubs

Integral to the success of Walling’s gardens were her subtle tree and shrub groupings; Walling’s abilities as a renowned plants-woman and her awareness of the individual characteristics of each specimen used resulted in the creation of ‘harmonious pictures’ in the garden. See figure 4.2.3.1a. Multiple plantings of the same specimen added to the feeling of harmony. See figure 4.2.2.1a. Tree and shrub groups were used to soften the formality of her architecturally dominant gardens or to create structure in her less formal ones. See figures 4.2.1c & 4.2.1d.

Dense borders screened garden boundaries creating private livable spaces or framed worthwhile external views, adding a perception of distance and space. Where possible Walling incorporated existing tree specimens into her design.

Trees were used by Walling:

- to conceal the smallness of the garden or space;
- in copse plantings in the lawn, the resulting view creating a perception of distance;
- rarely, as a lawn specimen;
- in fastigiate forms to create punctuation points and to add strong vertical elements to the design;
- at the narrow openings of ‘rooms’ to ensure privacy and to provide a sense of enclosure; and,
- to accent prominent positions within the garden such as entrances and transition points between ‘rooms’.
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Shrubs were used by Walling:

- as an under storey planting,

- in massed plantings using dignified and restrained schemes - achieved by the selection of a common element between different specimens, such as colour, texture or form, thereby creating a transitory link between the different shrubs,

- to create a background for flowers - darker foliage specimens were usually selected for this purpose; and,

- around house foundations, in dense border style plantings if the foundations needed concealment or in small well placed groups to break the line of large expanses of wall.

4.2.3.4 Hedges

Walling incorporated a mixture of formal and informal hedges within her designs, preferring low and dwarf hedges; Walling considered large boundary hedges to be uninspired and unnecessarily wasteful of space. Hedges were used to create 'rooms' within the garden by either encompassing the space or, more simply, as a vertical divider; the later method commonly used in the smaller gardens. See figure 4.2.1c. Walling used straight and curved formal hedges in a similar manner to her freestanding walls; her intent being to add vertical structure to the design. Informal hedges, comprised primarily from flowering shrubs, were used to create boundaries within the garden. Dwarf hedges added or emphasised a formal tone within a specific 'room' particularly when used to edge the garden beds.

Walling used hedges to:

- add structure, form and colour,
- provide a background to a specific planting scheme such as a flower border and generally in conjunction with adjoining tree and shrub plantings, borrowed from adjacent 'rooms';
- add vertical structure to flat sections of the design;
- emphasise paths, especially in her Formal Geometric designs;
- edge garden beds;
- create windbreaks;

---
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• screen driveways and utility sections; and,\textsuperscript{136}
• to replace sections of wall in her colonnades.\textsuperscript{137}

4.2.3.5 Topiary

‘it is questionable whether this art is applicable to this climate and environment. In very rare cases and in the cooler parts of the State, where the verdant growth recalls English landscapes, a desire for this form of garden ornamentation might be realised without appearing incongruous.’\textsuperscript{138}

Walling rarely used topiary forms in her designs. Instead she preferred to select plants for their natural forms and to use their natural contrasts to create incidents and highlight particular features within the design, such as a ‘room’ entrance.\textsuperscript{139}

4.2.3.6 Lawn

Walling repeatedly used sweepingly curved or palette-like shaped lawn spaces within her garden designs; the ‘room’ enclosed with dense borders of trees and shrubs and entered via a relatively narrow opening, usually accented by a pair of feature trees.\textsuperscript{140} See figures 4.2.1c, 4.2.1d & 4.2.3.1a. The tree and shrub borders in these ‘rooms’ were usually connected to the lawn through the planting of low spilling shrubs, planted at the front of the border.\textsuperscript{141} In the smaller gardens, a single palette shaped lawn space generally dominated the design; in the larger gardens this type of treatment was usually associated with the front garden, which could be composed from a series of these spaces or a single large lawn divided by tree and shrub borders. Comparatively narrow, tree and shrub bordered, curving strips of lawn were used as pathways throughout Walling’s designs.\textsuperscript{142}

Formal lawn panels were more typically associated with the formally designed areas of the larger gardens; these spaces tended to be more commonly rectangular or square, although circular, semi-circular and hexagonal panels were also used. See figure 4.2.1d. These spaces were usually simply treated, often contained a feature such as a pool and were enclosed with Walling’s typical dense tree and shrub borders or hedges.\textsuperscript{143} Less frequently seen in her designs are formal narrow rectangular panels, these being connected to either formal herbaceous borders or acting as a path through an avenue-style feature planting, such as a nut or magnolia, \textit{Magnolia} spp, walk.\textsuperscript{144} See figure 4.2.1d.

\textsuperscript{137} Watts, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{138} Walling, ‘How to Improve Our Garden Hedges’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{141} Walling, ‘Effective Planting’, pp. 28-9.
\textsuperscript{143} Dixon and Churchill, pp. 8, 12, 24, 28, 40, 42, 56, 60, 68, 70, 72-3, 118.
\textsuperscript{144} Dixon and Churchill, pp. 28, 52-3, 64, 68, 72-3, 100, 118.
Lawn planted specimen trees, often retained existing specimens, when used, where placed towards the periphery of the panel; Walling believed that specimen trees planted in the middle of the lawn disrupted the eye’s flow around the garden. See figure 4.2.2.6a. This was especially important in the smaller, narrow lawn recesses where specimen trees were only allowed at the points to aid in increasing the perception of depth. Walling’s favourite lawn planting was copses of silver birch, other typical planting features include thyme and chamomile lawns.

4.2.3.7 Creepers & Climbers
Colonnades and pergolas were ‘clothed’ with a variety of favourite creepers and climbers. Walling considered the colonnade to be the better display medium as the plant was more commonly visible from both sides and didn’t become lost on top of the structure as they commonly do on pergolas. Creepers and climbers were less frequently used on walls, fences and buildings; Walling preferring to train shrubs along these surfaces. Trained shrubs and climbers were used to unify or connect the house to the garden; climbing roses typically recommended for cottages. Larger, architecturally treated dwellings were more circumspectly treated; climbers were reserved primarily for porticos and verandahs, the line of large expanses of wall tending to be more often broken with groupings of well-placed shrubs.

4.2.3.8 Natives
‘I think it is neither necessary nor desirable to consider where a plant comes from for the average home garden, ..., so long as it harmonises with its neighbours...’

Walling’s initial relationship with natives was one of comfortable acceptance; she had a limited selection of favoured plants that she found associated well with her more typical exotic palette. Walling used these specimens within her gardens as well as extolling their virtues within her articles for The Australian Home Beautiful. She was also willing to retain any natives on site that could be incorporated into her design. However, in the mid-1950s, ‘almost overnight’ her palette changed to the almost exclusive use of natives; Watt’s believing that ‘...in some short space of time the notion of a purely native garden crystallised in her mind to such an extent that she could see no reason why anyone should persist with exotic plants in the Australian environment.’ Although there has been significant speculation as to why this occurred, Walling never fully explained the change. Just as suddenly, late in her life she reverted back to a more equitable balance between native and exotic plants.

---
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4.2.3.9 Plant Selection\textsuperscript{153}

'Walling insisted on using plants which, although often exotics, were suited to the particular site conditions. Everywhere in her books is the evidence of this approach.'\textsuperscript{154}

Walling’s usual palette of plants were well suited to her Victorian and Tasmanian gardens; Dixon and Churchill noted that she did take into account climatic differences between Victoria and New South Wales when designing these gardens, adapting her palette for the hotter and drier conditions.\textsuperscript{155} She continued this adaptation in her Western Australian gardens, relying more predominantly on natives and a selection of atypical exotics that better suited the hot dry climate of Perth.\textsuperscript{156} Interestingly, however, this did not carry through to Walling’s South Australian gardens and, although she did visit Adelaide on a number of occasions, it seems ‘she under-estimated the hot Mediterranean climate’ and ‘alkaline soils that are prevalent throughout the Adelaide plains’.\textsuperscript{157}

4.2.4 Influences

Walling borrowed, developed and was generally influenced by a number of sources both locally and internationally; however, Watts describes these influences as ‘a matter of fine-tuning of already well-formed ideas.’\textsuperscript{158} Walling primarily drew her inspiration from printed sources, ‘Few people she knew personally affected her thinking or her work.’\textsuperscript{159} The sources that had the most significant impact on Walling’s thoughts and designs were the works of Gertrude Jekyll, books on Italian gardens and a lifelong study of the natural environment both in Australia and, as a child in Devon, England.\textsuperscript{160}

4.2.4.1 Gertrude Jekyll

Jekyll had a profound impact on Walling through both the written and pictorial content of her of books; many of Jekyll’s thoughts and ideas subsequently emanated from Walling’s own collection of articles for The Australian Home Beautiful and, later, her books Gardens in Australia and A Gardener’s Log. Jekyll’s influence on Walling can be seen throughout all aspects of Walling’s career as a garden designer and as an author. Walling used Jekyll’s ‘personal style of writing’ throughout her written work as well as basing the format of A Gardener’s Log on Jekyll’s book Wood and Garden.\textsuperscript{161} Among Walling’s collection of books and articles were signed copies of Jekyll’s works.\textsuperscript{162}

Jekyll’s influence was infused within Walling’s gardens. Walling adopted a number of Jekyll’s garden ideals, such as: the creation of harmony between house and

\textsuperscript{153} See Appendix 4G for a selective list of plants used by Walling in her planting schemes.
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Walling initially formed and structured her ideas on colour, form and texture on the writings of Jekyll, quoting Jekyll on a number of occasions in her articles for _The Australian Home Beautiful_. \(^{165}\) Like her mentor, she favoured flower and foliage combinations based on blues, whites, purples and yellows with silver. \(^{166}\) However, unlike Jekyll, who designed large gardens with space for season specific ‘garden rooms’, Walling’s gardens were generally of smaller scale and, as such, the entire garden needed to provide year round interest. The influence of Italian gardens and Walling’s own observations of the natural landscape both in Australia and England provided a fundamental shift towards foliage colour, tone and texture rather than fleeting seasonal colour. Walling frequently quoted Osbert Sitwell on this topic: ‘one secret of the most beautiful gardens in the world...is that they show as few flowers as possible...green is the clue to creating a garden, and not the possession of all the hues in the rainbow.’ Walling described this statement as ‘an important truth’. \(^{167}\) While many of Walling’s ideas and aspects of her designs owe their foundation to Jekyll, Walling’s success is in their adaptation to Australian conditions. \(^{168}\)

### 4.2.4.2 Designers and Thinkers

Walling was influenced and inspired by a number of designers and thinkers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; amongst them a number of leading architects and landscape architects or garden designers, all generally accessed through Walling’s extensive collection of books and magazine articles. \(^{169}\) Of note, her collection included articles by North American architects Royal Barry Wills and Frank Lloyd Wright, and a collection of books including: \(^{170}\) Lewis Mumford’s _The Culture of Cities_ and _The Image of the City_; books on Italian gardens, especially Jellicoe and Shephards _Italian Gardens of the Renaissance_ and possibly Wharton’s _Italian Villas and their Gardens_; the works of landscape designers Mawson in _The Art and Craft of Garden Making_ and Triggs in _Garden Craft in Europe_; and; Robinson and Hudson (editors of the English journal _Country Life_). \(^{171}\)

---

\(^{163}\) Watts, p. 62, 90.

\(^{164}\) Watts, pp. 60, 62.


\(^{166}\) Barrett, p. 73.

\(^{167}\) Walling, _Gardens in Australia_, p. 17.

\(^{168}\) Watts, p. 122.

\(^{169}\) Watts, p. 57.


Italian gardens provided Walling with inspiration on both a design and philosophical level; Walling typically employed a number of design components garnered from these gardens in her larger formal designs including strong, axial, architectural forms and elements such as terraces, water, sculpture, stairs, and ramps.\(^{172}\) On both practical and philosophical levels, the appeal of Spanish and Italian gardens was their design for livability. Walling was amazed at how little this aspect of these gardens had been adopted in Australia where the similarity of climate made them a practical choice over the more popular but less suitable style of English gardens.\(^{173}\)

Landscape designer William Guilfoyle is the only known local landscape designer to have had any significant impact on Walling’s garden designs. Guilfoyle’s most accessible work was The Melbourne Botanic Gardens, which Walling considered to be a masterpiece. Watts notes that although Walling wrote little about Guilfoyle, ‘there is much in her work that bears comparison with his’\(^{174}\) particularly the similarity in ‘flowing forms’, as well as her use of views, perspective, and the composition of space through which Walling imbued anticipation and the desire to explore and discover the garden.\(^{175}\)

### 4.2.4.3 Natural Environment (Australian Bush & Devon England)

Walling’s study of the natural landscape began in childhood in Devon, England, where walks through the countryside with her Father engendered her love for ‘low-growing plants, of mauves and soft greens, of mossy boulders and gritty pathways’.\(^{176}\) Guessing games, played with her Father, based around size and distance, began to develop her skills with perspective, an attribute for which she would later be noted.\(^{177}\) In Australia, Walling became extremely comfortable with the bush, often camping throughout Victoria. Dixon and Churchill believe that the ‘essence’ of Walling’s work lay in her understanding of the ‘fragile relationship between garden and landscape’.\(^{178}\) Through her study of landscape, both bush and countryside, Walling augmented her understanding of the use of space, utilising this ability within her garden designs.\(^{179}\) Her awareness of the ‘principles of planting design’\(^{180}\) as obtained through written sources such as Jekyll, were consolidated through her intimacy with the landscape. Walling writing in The Australian Home Beautiful, ‘Who has not observed when wandering in the bush or open country Nature’s scheme for planting trees, and beneath or behind them graceful shrubs, whilst lower down hugging the earth are perhaps tangled vines or other massed growth?’\(^{181}\) Walling followed these rules as set by nature, in her own planting schemes.\(^{182}\)
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4.3 Olive Mellor

4.3.1 Design Overview

To Mellor ‘A House without a garden is not a perfect house. Its setting is just as important to a residence as the frame is to a picture....’ Mellor designed average sized suburban gardens for average families, Pullman describes her gardens as ‘...most effective and particularly suitable for the home gardener on the average size block,...’. Mellor’s gardens were influenced by the various architectural styles prevalent during the period, though her gardens contained little architectural framework of any significance; Mellor relied on her spatial arrangements of tree and shrub borders and lawn panels to provide much of the structure. Mellor strived to achieve designs that met the diverse requirements of her clients within the limited space of the average suburban block. Her designs were composed as a series of ‘garden rooms’, though the limited space often meant that an entire section of the garden became a single ‘room’. To Mellor the back garden was the ‘real garden’ and it was here that she would attempt to create more than one ‘room’ if space permitted. Her designs achieved a fine balance between utility and pleasure and where necessary she incorporated multiple uses into the same ‘room’, allowing the feeling of the ‘room’ to reflect its immediate use at a particular point in time. Mellor designed three distinctive styles of gardens: Formal/Geometric, Informal/Curved and Combined; examples of each style can be found in both her suburban and country designs.

Mellor’s Formal/Geometric garden designs, see Figure 4.3.1a, were composed as a series of rectangular spaces, although circular and oval ‘rooms’ were occasionally included. The structure of the garden was typically obtained from straight tree and shrub borders planted at the boundaries of the garden and as small perpendicular rectangular protrusions, creating the division of space without enclosing the garden. Smaller subsidiary borders composed from flower borders and beds of roses were also used to create the structure within these gardens. Formal/Geometric gardens were more likely to contain:

- small and large architectural features;
- rectangular pools;
- straight paths that cut through the middle of the ‘room’;
- paths that were axially aligned, providing limited structure in the garden; and,
- the limited use of lawn specimens, generally sited towards the boundary of the ‘room’.

---
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Figure 4.3.1a A garden plan designed for an *Australian Home Beautiful* reader in the formal/geometric style.

(Source: *The Australian Home Beautiful* June 1940, p. 37.)
Informal/Curved garden designs, see Figure 4.3.1b, were composed of informally shaped ‘rooms’, created through wide, curved, sweeping tree and shrub borders that formed the main structure of the garden. Those borders that were thinly planted with trees and shrubs were filled with annuals and perennials. Informal/Curved gardens were more likely to contain:

- curved paths at the boundary of the ‘room’;
- kidneyesque pools or rock gardens nestled into the tree and shrub border; and,
- multiple lawn specimens (in the larger gardens these were often grouped in threes creating structure and providing division of space without overly enclosing the garden).

Figure 4.3.1b A garden plan designed for an Australian Home Beautiful reader in the informal style.

(Source: *The Australian Home Beautiful* November 1938, p. 21.)
Combined gardens, see Figure 4.3.1c, were a combination of both the Formal/Geometric and Informal/Curved styles; Mellor typically applied the Informal/Curved style to the front garden and Formal/Geometric style to the back garden. This allowed Mellor to maximise the utilisation of space and conformed to her belief that the front garden was little more than a show piece kept necessarily tidy, the back garden being divided into both the pleasure and utility gardens. 

Figure 4.3.1c A garden plan designed for an Australian Home Beautiful reader in the combined style.

(Source: The Australian Home Beautiful May 1939, p. 21.)

4.3.2 Design Elements

4.3.2.1 Water

‘...water always adds to the serenity of the landscape.'\(^{189}\)

Mellor was appreciative of the value of a water feature in the garden, however, her writing and the relative infrequency of its inclusion in her garden designs indicate a degree of reticence in its use. Much of her written work on water is either constructional how-to or horticultural notes on aquatic plants. Mellor included only a small section on water features in her book *Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated*, regurgitating period representative information of some of the more basic design aspects of water features. These included:

- the formal treatment of water features in formal sections of the garden;
- the informal use of water as cascades and little steams emptying into catchment ponds in wilder parts of the garden, often in conjunction with a rockery or rock garden so as to mimic the tendency of the natural association of water and rock in nature; and,
- the siting of a water feature below the highest point of the garden.\(^{190}\)

Mellor designed both formal and informal water features, the majority tending towards a formal design; Mellor used the simplest and safest design constructs resulting in an effective if somewhat repetitive expression. Her formally designed pools were typically rectangular, though oval pools were occasionally used. See figures 4.3.1c, 4.3.2.1a, 4.3.2.1b & 4.3.3.3a. They were generally:

- centrally positioned as a main feature of a rectangular ‘room’, the ‘room’ typically bordered with either a tree and shrub border or a feature rose planting;
- axially aligned to some other feature of the ‘room’, often a seat;
- edged with either stone flags or concrete; and,
- surrounded by lawn.\(^{191}\)

Mellor’s informal water features were often associated with rockwork; her plans display an indicative semblance to the popular rock garden and pond combinations of the period. It is more difficult to assess the effectiveness of these designs from Mellor’s plans than for her formal pools. Although her plans occasionally suggest a degree of aesthetic success most indicate that these water features were likely to be little more than a period typical, poorly designed but fashionable addition to the garden.\(^{192}\) See figure 4.3.1b. The designs for her country based informal water features appear to have been significantly better conceived; none were incorporated into a rock garden. All were kidneyesque in form; set in an expanse of lawn;

---


\(^{190}\) Mellor, *Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated*, p. 206.


asymmetrically positioned within the ‘room’; and formed the main feature of the space. Mellor designed a single swimming pool, choosing a rectangular form and symmetrically situating it within two rows of trees and a hedge alcove.

Figure 4.3.2.1a Garden plan in the formal/geometric style containing a typical formal pool treatment.

(Source: The Australian Home Beautiful May 1946, p.16.)

Figure 4.3.2.1b Representative drawing of the formal pool and surrounds in the adjacent plan.

(Source: Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, p. 17.)

4.3.2.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Mellor used two distinct types of path in the main area of the garden; invariably the front path was crazy paved, the majority of the remaining paths were either square or rectangular, lawn set stepping stones. See figure 4.3.1a. Each path was designed to have a definite purpose, providing:

- access to the house or other specific point in the garden;
- limited circulation; and,
- the minimisation of lawn damage in high traffic areas.

Curved front paths were considered preferable to straight, serpentine or semi circular forms; Mellor often included some form of contrivance within her design to justify the curve. Mellor chose lawn set stepping stones for her other paths as she believed that they had had an architectural quality and lightness that didn’t overtly carve up the garden; they were seemingly sited for functional rather than aesthetic purposes. These secondary paths though occasionally curved tended to be mostly straight and geometrically structured around the main access points of the house and typically lead to the functional parts of the garden. See figures 4.3.1c & 4.3.2.1a. Mellor

preferred to only use stepping stone paths within her small garden designs; crazy paving was considered to be too heavy and cutting in these smaller spaces.\textsuperscript{195}

Materials preferences for her paths were rarely stated, Mellor probably left the selection to the budget of the garden’s owner. It would seem likely that given a choice she would have selected either sandstone or slate flags for her crazy paving, nearly always recommending that the joints be planted. Both coloured and uncoloured concrete pavers as well as sandstone and slate seem likely for the stepping stones. Solid concrete paths were avoided were possible, their solid line considered hard and cutting, especially in smaller gardens.\textsuperscript{196}

Mellor considered that the paths located within the utility section of the garden were worthy of the same design consideration as the paths within the main part of the garden. Mellor recommended that these paths be well proportioned, beautiful and edged with plants.\textsuperscript{197} Utility paths were always straight and often paved with stepping stones, though it would seem likely that gravel, dirt and concrete paving would also have equally featured within these areas. In gardens without a driveway a solid concrete path was added along the garden boundary to provide adequate access to the utility garden from the street.\textsuperscript{198}

Where space permitted, a paved terrace or patio area was included adjacent to the house, Mellor considered them to be a useful annex. These areas were most frequently crazy paved with planted joints, although closely set large format square pavers with lawn between the joints were also popular.\textsuperscript{199} Small paved areas were occasionally included under garden furniture.\textsuperscript{200}

In city gardens Mellor preferred short driveways, only in the country were they extended to become a garden feature. Concrete was recommended for her driveways, either grey or coloured, solid drives in the larger gardens, and drive-strips in the smaller gardens. The only exception in the smaller gardens, was when the garage was close to the road, then solid driveways dominated. The central portion of the drive-strips were; crazy paved; filled with stones and planted with alpines; planted with lawn; or planted with low growing plants. Gravel and stepping stone drive-strips were only occasionally used.\textsuperscript{201}


\textsuperscript{198} Mellor, Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, p. 9.


\textsuperscript{201} Mellor, ‘Layout for Another Country Garden’, p. 24.
4.3.2.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

‘Rockeries have come into their own again. The general public at last realises that a rockery gives character to any garden...’

Rock gardens and rockeries feature throughout Mellor’s designs, Mellor considered them to be a character adding feature, a special point of interest, and a camouflaging technique for ugly corners and fences. While cognisant of and in agreement with the general professional consensus that rock gardens are best suited to the wilder parts of the garden and away from the house; Mellor still often incongruously sited rock gardens and rockeries within the formal areas of the garden, even placing them along the house foundations. See figures 4.3.1a, 4.3.1b & 4.3.2.6a.

Mellor designed three main styles of rock gardens and/or rockeries:

- low rock formations, only a few courses high, usually set around the house or along a fence;
- high rock formations, up to six feet (1.8m) in height and ranging down to a single course of rock, creating a ravine effect for water to cascade over before collecting in a pool; and,
- naturalistic rock formations to delineate a change of level.

The first two styles of rock garden were the most prevalent in Mellor’s designs, the third occurred rarely. Images of Mellor’s rock gardens are rare and provide insufficient evidence from which to judge the success or effectiveness of her designs. Mellor outlined basic design and construction techniques in her book Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, which seem to indicate that her rockeries were probably slightly more well considered and built examples of the rock gardens and rockeries illustrated in the popular period literature. Mellor’s main design constructs were:

- attempt to follow nature;
- study and copy the strata lines of the site;
- rough outcrops were to be created from flattish rocks, laid in a step-like form; not from up-ended rock in horizontal lines - the rocks should be positioned ‘so that they stand out, one over the other as a natural rock ledge washed bare of earth.’;
- hillock or mounded rockeries were created from the formation of an irregular mound of earth, with boulders of differing sizes planted into the side of the mound ‘in such a way that they lock one another into position.’; and,
- plantings were either a combination of small shrubs, alpines, perennials and annuals or succulents and cacti.

---

4.3.2.4 Small Features - Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Small garden features, with the exception of seats, were rare features in Mellor’s garden designs; the dearth of these elements is explained by Mellor’s belief that ‘A small garden should never be overcrowded with ornaments, although one pool, sundial, or bird bath may be pleasing.’ Statues do not appear in any of her designs nor are they mentioned in any of her articles. Pot or tub plants rarely featured, appearing only on paved terraces or in pairs either side of the front door.

Birdbaths and sundials tended to occur in Mellor’s earlier designs for formal garden ‘rooms’, where they were centrally positioned on either lawn or paving to create a point of interest and were axially aligned to another aspect of the ‘room’ such as paths, stairs and/or seats. Her only informal use of such features appeared in a country garden design where a birdbath was set in an alcove created in the shrub border.

Seats were widely used throughout Mellor’s garden designs in both formal and informal settings to create a point of interest; to terminate a vista; or as a quiet retreat, especially in the larger suburban and country designs. Rectangular bench style seats are represented on her plans in formal settings, where they are axially aligned within the ‘room’ and are backed or set within a hedge alcove and/or shrub, rose or perennial border. See figure 4.3.3.3a. The area under the seat was often paved. Rectangular and curved seats are represented on Mellor’s plans in informal settings: often sited close to the garden boundary they were backed with tree, shrub and/or perennial borders and took advantage of garden views. See figure 4.3.1a.

4.3.2.5 Large Features - Pergolas, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Mellor’s conviction that the majority of the gardens that she designed for The Australian Home Beautiful were too small to accommodate more than a single small feature, including pools, also explains the lack of larger garden features within her designs, with the notable exception of the garage. Pergolas, garden-houses and tennis courts do appear in the larger country gardens, but still infrequently, suggesting a degree of apprehension in either the structures or her ability to successfully design and integrate these features into her gardens.

---
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'The pergola is a godsend if rightly placed and correctly proportioned'\(^{216}\) Mellor designed three gardens for *The Australian Home Beautiful* that contained pergolas. The first was a series of short sections that spanned part of a large circular driveway; the other two examples followed the more traditional treatment of the structure during this period and were axially aligned to the house and divided garden ‘rooms’. Mellor used one to create an interesting entrance to the utility garden and, the other as a point of rest, the far end terminated with a fence and seat.\(^{217}\)

Only two garden-houses appear in Mellor’s designs; one a bush-house, the other a cubby house intended for adult conversion at a later date. Mellor’s garden-houses were places of retreat and were included, in the informally designed gardens, within secluded ‘rooms’, in the back corner of the garden were they were nestled into the tree and shrub border.\(^{218}\) See figure 4.3.1b.

Tennis courts were an infrequent element of Mellor’s designs that only occurred in the larger country gardens. Mellor tended to site the court towards the boundary of the property and maintained the recommended north-south alignment where possible, even though this had a significant impact on the useability of the back garden.\(^{219}\) Mellor used dense tree and shrub border plantings to conceal the court, the incorporation of paths through the borders created a feature walk in the garden.\(^{220}\)

In situations where the siting of the garage had not already been predetermined by the owner, Mellor preferred to site it as close to the road as possible to minimise its impact on the garden. Where the garage was a part of the main house Mellor treated it in the same manner as the rest of the house. Where the garage was a free standing structure Mellor often used it to divide the utility and pleasure gardens, densely planting any faces that showed within the pleasure garden with tree and shrub borders or a hedge. Access paths were provided from the garage to the front door.\(^{221}\)

### 4.3.2.6 Level Change – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

It was difficult to ascertain Mellor’s views on level change - her plans and articles in *The Australian Home Beautiful* that dealt with sloping sites were executed in a matter of fact, no-nonsense manner; only limited detail was outlined. In her book, the *Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated*, level change is only peripherally mentioned, suggesting that a sloping site was an issue to deal with rather than an opportunity to relish. See figures 4.3.2.6a & 4.3.2.6b.

Mellor’s use of walls is limited to retaining walls in conjunction with terraces or as the front fence. Retaining walls were constructed from either brick or stone and could be cemented, dry-stone or rock-pocket; of these Mellor was exceedingly partial to rock-pocket walls, customarily including this type in her garden designs. See figure 4.3.1b. Where the front fence was a wall, it was typically constructed as either a retaining or freestanding rock-pocket wall; low freestanding brick walls were rare. A rock-pocket wall, as can be best ascertained from Mellor’s descriptions, is an amalgamation of a dry-stone wall and a form of rockery - most probably a cross between a dry-stone wall and an angled wall at forty-five degrees as outlined by Jekyll, but incorporating rock of more irregular shape and at wider intervals than in a proper wall. Without constructional diagrams or images of these walls it is difficult to determine their exact appearance, however, the descriptive similarity between these walls and those constructed by Cornish for the Model Garden Competition provides some indication of their most probable appearance. Although many of Mellor’s walls were by necessity straight, she appears to have appreciated

the possibilities of curved walls. Roses, lavender, perennials and annuals were usually planted as a border either at the top or along the foot of the wall.\textsuperscript{225}

Mellor’s terraces tended to have an irregular curvaceous shape that suggest she predominantly followed site contours. This gave her gardens a restful, informal feeling. Only infrequently did she include more formally designed rectilinear terraces, these taking the form of a single terrace that wrapped either partially or completely around the house. Mellor retained her terraces with a variety of walls, rock-pocket walls being the most typical. A degree of slope was often retained in the terrace. The borders of the terrace were typically planted with a feature planting such as roses, perennials, shrub border, etc, leaving the majority of space as lawn with the inclusion of an occasional specimen tree.\textsuperscript{226}

Mellor’s written work was both extremely vague as well as very specific in the design of stairs stating that ‘...it should be remembered that two shallow steps create more interest than one deep one,...’ further specifying that steps should be not more than seven inches (17.78cm) high and at least twelve inches (30.48cm) in depth.\textsuperscript{227} Her plans indicate that she predominantly designed rectangular stairs; segmented stairs were infrequent inclusions. Both stone and concrete were used in their construction; low edging seems to have also been included. Feature specimen plantings at either the top or bottom of the stairs were used to denote the stairs position, especially when associated with annual and perennial borders.\textsuperscript{228} See figures 4.3.1b, 4.3.2.6a & 4.3.2.6b.

Sunken gardens were regularly included as a method for treating irregularly sloped sites, Mellor typically created a sunken circular lawn and surrounded it with tree and shrub borders. Grass banks were occasionally used to retain the sunken space; annual and perennial borders assisted in the creation of the circular form. Less frequently rectilinear sunken gardens were created - these most often also being a rose garden.\textsuperscript{229}

4.3.2.7 Rose Gardens

Where space permitted, Mellor would often include a Rose Garden within her designs, believing that they were best designed along formal lines and set out in geometrical beds.\textsuperscript{230} Although her rose gardens were designed along formal lines


\textsuperscript{227} Mellor, ‘Plan for a Suburban Garden Coping with a Site that had its Difficulties’, p. 17.


\textsuperscript{230} Mellor, Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, p. 23.
they lack the geometrical beds often associated with these gardens. Mellor used the same basic design with some minor variations for her rose gardens:
- they were composed within rectangular ‘rooms’;
- roses were placed in rectangular beds around the boundaries of the space; and,
- the central area was usually left as an expanse of lawn, although in some cases it was crazy paved.

Mellor designed her rose gardens to have either one of two functionalities; a transition space from one area of the garden to another; or as an enclosed private space. As a transition space, the rose garden was still treated as a ‘room’ in its own right, however, it contained central openings on opposite sides of the ‘room’ either completely or partially linked with a stepping stone path, the path usually aligned to another ‘room’ or feature within the garden. As an enclosed private space, the rose garden featured a single access point into the ‘room’; a seat on the opposite side of the garden usually terminated the axis. The enclosed rose garden also typically contained a central feature, often a pool and tended to be enclosed with either a brush fence, a hedge, or in rare cases tree and shrub plantings, planted at the back of the rose beds. See figure 4.3.3.3a.

4.3.3 Planting Scheme
4.3.3.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

‘Use of colour is one of the chief charms of the modern idea and those who catch its spirit have infinite opportunities for varied expression of idea.’

Although colour, texture, scale and form were important features of Mellor’s garden designs (especially in her planting schemes), she wrote comparatively little about this element of design in either her articles for *The Australian Home Beautiful* or in her book *Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated*. Unlike Walling and Brown, who both expressed a favoured colour combination, Mellor never mentions what hers was. Mellor used the permanence of trees and shrubs to provide a setting for the home; her plant combinations achieved a range of textural, scale, form and shadow effects. Annual and perennial borders and groupings were used to add vivid colour throughout the garden. The background to Mellor’s colour schemes were dominated by a myriad of green tones; her colour usage was bright, vivid and indicative of the typical patterns of colour usage during this period. Variegated and purple leaved forms were used to provide accents within the garden and often denoted entrances and other similar incidences within the design. Mellor was particularly fond of

---

autumnal colour; her planting schemes were often formulated to achieve a spectacular autumn foliage display in at least one part of the garden.\textsuperscript{236}

**4.3.3.2 Flower Borders**

Mellor freely used perennials and annuals throughout her gardens, generally tending to plant separate beds of either annuals or perennials, although annuals were considered appropriate as a small proportion of a perennial bed.\textsuperscript{237} Mellor used flower borders in three distinct ways:

- in groups at the foreground of the tree and shrub border;\textsuperscript{238}
- against the house in either curved or rectilinear beds; and,\textsuperscript{239}
- in a modified variant of the more traditional usage of perennial borders.

Mellor usually composed her perennial borders from rectilinear beds, siting them in the back garden, against the fence. A limited number of shrubs were included to provide permanence, height and flower colour when the rest of the border was out of season. Where they formed a significant component of the ‘room’ or were used to create the structure of the ‘room’, a seat was usually contained within the space. Mellor always used lawn as a foreground to her perennial borders.\textsuperscript{240} See figure 4.3.1a.

**4.3.3.3 Trees & Shrubs**

‘Trees and shrubs form the framework of the garden,...’\textsuperscript{241}

This statement elucidates the importance of trees and shrubs to Mellor in garden design; they form the structure of her gardens. Mellor used both curved and straight borders of trees and shrubs to form her garden ‘rooms’, creating private livable spaces that either concealed external detractions or enhanced external views where they existed.\textsuperscript{242} Mature existing specimens were always retained when possible, Mellor often based her design around them. Significant tree and shrub borders were planted along the boundaries of her small gardens. See figures 4.3.3.3a & 4.3.3.3b. In the large gardens the borders were used to create an inner ‘proper’ garden, the outer garden usually planted in a park-like manner. Trees were also regularly planted or retained as lawn specimens, Mellor believed that the view through a framework of foliage was the most beautiful method from which to exhibit the clean lines of modern architecture. Mellor further planted either accent plantings or low shrub borders against the house walls. See figures 4.3.1a, 4.3.1c, 4.3.2.1a & 4.3.2.1b. The

\begin{footnotesize}

\footnotesize Mellor, ‘Colour in the Garden Part II continued’, The Australian Home Beautiful April 1945, pp. 36-7.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{237} Mellor, Complete Australian Gardener, p. 74.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{241} Mellor, ‘Framework of a Garden’, p. 16.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{242} Mellor, Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, p. 8.
\end{footnotesize}
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rectilinear regularity of a number of the shrub borders represented on Mellor’s plans suggests their frequent use as informal hedges.\(^{243}\)

Mellor typically used trees and shrubs:
- for accent and colour;\(^ {244}\)
- at vantage points to create permanence and structure within the design;\(^ {245}\)
- as wind breaks;\(^ {246}\)
- as a background to seasonal colour;
- in single specimen groupings to either emphasise a section and/or create a feeling of restfulness within the garden;
- to create privacy;
- to accent the architecture of the house; and,\(^ {247}\)
- to accent the transition between ‘rooms’ and the property entrance.\(^ {248}\)

Mellor considered trees to be a part of the communal landscape not just a private affair. Trees were also used:
- as lawn specimens were they where used as a feature of the design;
- to break the skyline; and,
- to provide shade.\(^ {249}\)

Figure 4.3.3.3a Garden plan containing characteristic tree and shrub border arrangements.

(Source: The Australian Home Beautiful May 1946, p. 17.


\(^ {244}\) Mellor, ‘An Appropriate Garden for the Seaside’, p. 16.


4.3.3.4 Hedges

Hedges were used throughout Mellor’s designs. She believed that their resurgence was due to the horizontal lines of modern architecture, the hedge echoing those lines within the garden. For Mellor, hedges provided balance and symmetry. Mellor used both clipped and informal hedges of single or varied specimens, often selecting her specimens for flower and/or berry as well as for foliage effect. See figure 4.3.1c. The line of the hedge was often broken with contrasting but complementary specimens. Mellor utilised a variety of hedge heights within her gardens, tending towards intermediate and lower heights rather than tall hedges; finding that the tall sheltering evergreen hedges of the past were suitable for only large or very formal gardens.250

Hedges were used:
- to divide or create structure in her ‘rooms’;
- to screen driveways and utility areas;
- at the property boundary to screen external views or as a front fence;
- to create a background to flower borders;
- to edge flower beds;
- to highlight other built features such as walls, stairs, and terraces;
- as a background to seats in an alcove style planting; and,
- against the house to emphasise the lines of the architecture.251
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4.3.3.5 Topiary
Mellor wrote very little about the use of topiary in the garden, rarely including it in her designs. Where topiary was used it was in conjunction with a dwarf rosemary hedge - balled forms of rosemary were clipped slightly higher than the hedge and were sited to create small emphasis points at each break along its length. Mellor did regularly plant accent specimens at regular intervals along the length of a hedge, especially those against the house; often selecting plants with columnar or pillar forms.\(^\text{252}\)

4.3.3.6 Lawn
Mellor believed that ‘The lawn is the true setting of a good garden – the very basis of it, in fact.’\(^\text{253}\) further specifying that it should account for between fifty and seventy percent of the front garden alone. Her garden plans substantiate these written beliefs; Mellor used lawn as a dominant element of her designs. See figures 4.3.1a & 4.3.2.1a. Mellor used lawn spaces in a number of distinct ways, each to achieve a particular purpose within the garden. The architectural style of the house often played an important role in Mellor’s design of lawn spaces; houses of modern design considered best exhibited by an expanse of surrounding lawn broken only by specimen trees.\(^\text{254}\) Mellor used lawn:
to display planting features to their best advantage;
as a mellowing influence on the garden;\(^\text{255}\)
to create a sense of spaciousness by allowing it to run up to the house; and,\(^\text{256}\)
in sweeps to create a sense of restfulness.\(^\text{257}\)

Lawn was used as both formal and informal panels, encompassed and divided by Mellor’s typical straight or curved tree and shrub borders creating rectangular, circular, oval or free-form ‘rooms’ that successively progressed around the house. The planting scheme was typically retained at the boundary of each ‘room’; the lawn was not to be cut up by a series of garden beds, although specimen trees were frequently planted as features.\(^\text{258}\) See figure 4.3.3.3b. In her country gardens Mellor generally used lawn in the inner garden (those garden ‘rooms’ typically connected to the house); the outer ‘rooms’ were designated as native or rough grasses.\(^\text{259}\)

4.3.3.7 Creepers & Climbers
Although considered a valuable asset to the garden, the use of creepers and climbers was very limited in Mellor’s designs. Creepers and trailing plants were generally confined to the rock garden; climbers being occasionally used to camouflage


\(^{254}\) Mellor, Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated, pp. 7-11.


\(^{256}\) Mellor, ‘Planting an Awkward Garden Site’, p 33.


unsightly fences or on verandah posts. Instead of climbers, Mellor made extensive use of wall shrubs and espalier. A variety of wall shrubs were used against the house to emphasise particular architectural traits or to break an expanse of wall. Wall shrubs were trained against fences in preference to climbers, especially along the narrow section of garden between house and side boundary fence. Espaliered fruit trees were regularly planted against division fences between the pleasure and utility garden and/or against boundary fences in the vegetable garden, creating both a practical and beautiful covering.

4.3.3.8 Natives

"...in our own natural flora we have a wonderful field to draw from,..." Mellor was fully cognisant of both the beauty and suitability of native plants for Australian gardens, finding their only limitation being the lack of nurseries commercially growing them. Mellor comfortably mixed both exotics and natives together, relying on a familiar collection of both from which to draw her planting schemes. Natives were not a dominant element in Mellor’s suburban gardens though to a large extent the garden owners predetermined the plant palette; Mellor included, as best she could, the owners favourite plants within her planting schemes. Natives were much more heavily relied upon in her country gardens. See figure 4.3.1b & appendix 4H. Mellor was genuinely pleased when specifically asked to design gardens that relied on native plants finding that the word native influenced her layout in that it conjured up an image of "...something free and restful, with nothing prim or formal; so the lines are generous and the planting random". Where possible, existing native specimens were often retained and were likely to be turned into the main feature of the ‘room’ if considered appropriate: Mellor would arrange the rest of the planting scheme to highlight the specimen. Interestingly, in one article and garden plan for The Australian Home Beautiful, Mellor made mention of the possible use in the garden of the local native flora. This recommendation for the use of region indigenous plantings in the popular period literature is extremely unusual and further highlights Mellor’s acceptance and comfort with Australian native plants.

4.3.3.9 Plant Selection

Although the majority of Mellor’s garden designs were based in Melbourne and rural Victoria she did design gardens in New South Wales, Tasmania, Brisbane and Western Australia. Regardless of geographic location, horticultural necessities were always a primary consideration when determining her planting schemes. Mellor’s planting lists strongly reflect this; the specimens chosen were always well suited to
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262 Mellor was a foundation member of the Society for Growing Australian Plants (now Australian Plants Society), set up in 1957. Pullman, p. 9.
263 Mellor, ‘Possibilities of a Native garden’, p. 20.
264 Mellor, ‘Possibilities of a Native garden’, p. 20.
267 See Appendix 41 for a list of plants typically used by Mellor in her planting schemes.
the climates for which she recommended them. Mellor was extremely comfortable in her choices for her Victorian clients, however, for the interstate gardens, if unsure she would state this to be the case, completing a suitable partial list and suggesting that the garden owner liaise with a local nurseryman for further suitable specimens to complete the scheme.  

4.3.4 Influences

External influences on Mellor are more difficult to isolate than for Brown and Walling. Unlike Walling and Brown, Mellor does not overtly ‘borrow’ text and images from other designers, nor does she specifically mention others work in any of her articles. The closest she ever comes to attributing her ideas to external sources is in her article for her colour gardens where she writes ‘In the cultivation of Colour Gardens, keen interest has lately been displayed overseas, particularly in America.’ This is not to suggest that Mellor worked in isolation; she didn’t, the practical how-to nature of her articles and her emphasis on horticultural matters generally obscures the more obvious impact of external influences upon her. Probable influences on Mellor logically include: Gertrude Jekyll, Burnley College and the other authors for The Australian Home Beautiful including Walling, as well as a number of landscape practitioners and architects involved in authoring garden book compilations to which Mellor also contributed.

4.3.4.1 Gertrude Jekyll

Although the influence of Jekyll is less overt than for Walling and Brown, Mellor was influenced by Jekyll in at least two key areas of her garden designs; her use of colour and rock walls. Jekyll’s own preference for colour combinations based on whites, yellows, blues and pinks is reflected throughout Mellor’s permanent plantings in her tree and shrub borders; these colours dominating. It is in her flower borders where Mellor significantly differs from Jekyll, Mellor preferring hotter colours and more vibrant combinations; though this is to a large extent the adoption and subsequent adaptation of Jekyll’s ideas on hot coloured borders. It also reflects the patterns of colour usage of the period, especially by women artists, Mellor writing that the use of colour in the home and especially the garden ‘...offers particular scope for the exercise of that creative instinct in women of which modern industry has robbed her to a great extent.’ The flower border is particularly pertinent in providing an outlet for this experimentation with colour. Mellor’s rock pocket-walls also seem to owe something to Jekyll if in concept only; these walls, which Mellor used freely throughout her designs, appear to be (as best as can be determined from descriptions of intent) an amalgamation of Jekyll’s dry-stone
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walls and angled walls at forty five degrees. Though this is not to suggest that these walls were carried out with the same degree of refinement as achieved by Jekyll in her gardens, it is unlikely that this was the case.274

4.3.4.2 Burnley College
As both initially a student and later a teacher at Burnley College, Mellor would have been exposed to the ideas and thoughts of the staff as well as having access to a wide range of garden design and horticultural literature from the UK, America and Australia.275 As an example, the practical nature of and horticultural considerations given in American Herbert J. Kellaway’s How To Lay Out Suburban Home Grounds, offers some similarities between Mellor’s articles and to a lesser extent the spatial arrangement of some of her gardens.276

4.3.4.3 The Australian Home Beautiful & Gardening Books
The Australian Home Beautiful and Mellor’s collaborative authorship of the gardening books The Garden Lovers’ Log and Australian Gardening of Today Illustrated brought Mellor into contact with the thoughts and ideas of many of the leading authorities in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Design and Horticulture, including Professor E.G. Waterhouse, William Hardy Wilson, Arthur Swaly (a friend and instigator of the Society for Growing Australian Plants), members of the Victorian Architectural community, Walling, R.T.M. Pescott and E.E. Pescott. The Australian Home Beautiful also provided access to ideas from both the UK and America through its articles.277

4.4 Jocelyn Brown

4.4.1 Design Overview
Brown viewed the garden as more than a framework for the house or as a space for horticultural endeavours, it was an ‘outdoor room’…where it is possible to commune with Nature, where jaded nerves may be refreshed and the spirit recreated.”279 The house and garden were an inter-twinned unit ‘each complementing and extending the other’.280 These fundamental philosophical principals were infused in each of Brown’s gardens, forming the basis for all of her designs. Brown’s gardens had a distinctive, strongly formal, architectural style complementary to the popular domestic Neo-Georgian, Colonial and Italianate architectural building styles prevalent during the period;281 Brown created resonance between house and garden by echoing the architectural elements from the house within the garden.282

275 Mellor completed the two-year Diploma in 1915, returning to teach between 1917-1919. Pullman, p. 8.
277 Pullman, pp. 9-10.
278 Proudfoot, p. 9.
280 Proudfoot, p. 94.
281 Proudfoot, p. 16.
282 Proudfoot, pp. 21, 22, 93.
Proudfoot, divided Brown’s career as a garden designer into two distinctive periods. The first period encompasses her early work and was dominated by suburban garden designs; see figure 4.3.1a the second period showed a maturing and focusing of her design abilities, the majority of these gardens were country oriented. See figure 4.3.1b. As a result, Brown’s gardens were composed from either one of two stylistic sets of design elements with a third common set applicable to both.283

Brown’s early, predominantly suburban designs:
- were formal;
- were structured;
- were self-contained inward looking spaces;284
- were dominantly composed through axial alignment;
- incorporated internal vistas and features;
- used straight paths;
- used architectural features to reinforce the design; and,
- relied on a massed, often overcrowded, planting scheme to soften the architectural dominance of the garden.285

Brown’s later, largely country-oriented designs:
- relied less on contrived architectural features;
- more readily accepted and borrowed external landscape elements from which to anchor points within the design;
- were increasingly informal, the strong geometry associated with her early gardens softening to gentle curves;
- used fewer highly formal ‘garden rooms’, which were always immediately connected to the house; and,
- contained freer and less formal planting schemes.286

Brown created all of her gardens as a series of linked but contained ‘rooms’, designed as living or personal spaces, see figure 4.3.1c which included:
- changing perspectives;
- the element of surprise;
- the blending of formal and informal design elements;
- the incorporation of symmetry within asymmetrical layouts;
- a combination of ‘room’ types including perennial borders, water and rose gardens, formal lawn spaces and utility areas, etc; and,
- a carefully considered planting scheme to soften the architectural elements of the design.287

283 Proudfoot, pp. 53-83.
284 Brown’s suburban designs tended to be more inwards looking as there were often few if any remnant external views worthy of integration into her designs after the site had been cleared for development. Instead she was more frequently presented with external views which needed concealment from the house and garden. Jocelyn Brown, ‘Re-Planning the Garden’, The Home March 1940, p. 36.
286 Proudfoot, pp. 22, 52, 104.
288 Proudfoot, pp. 21-2, 36, 52, 104.
Figure 4.4.1a A typical Brown suburban garden design, as published in The Home.

(Source: The Home March 1942, p. 51.)
Figure 4.4.1b Brown's design for the garden at 'Coolibah' is typical of her later country-based designs.

(Source: Proudfoot, p. 69.)

Figure 4.4.1c Brown's design for the Walton's shows her progression towards less formally treated spaces in the outer parts of the garden.

(Source: Proudfoot, p. 47.)
4.4.2 Design Elements

4.4.2.1 Water

'Our climate lends itself admirably to the use of water... but ...as a young people we have not learned to use water as a decorative element.'286

Proudfoot describes Brown’s use of water as imaginative;289 however her designs show that she followed a number of set patterns highly reminiscent of the arts and crafts gardens and architectural styles that stylistically permeated her work.290 See figures 4.4.2.1a & 4.4.2.1b. Water was a dominant feature of her gardens, and Brown’s water features were designed with a high degree of sophistication; but it can be argued that this use is not so much imaginative as an ability to successfully scale down and integrate those influences into the Australian suburban garden. Brown used her water features both as decorative elements and as minor or major focal points,291 she frequently incorporated multiple water elements into her designs.292

Brown tended to design formal water features; she preferred circular pools although rectangular forms and variations upon rectangular forms were occasionally used within her gardens. Brown’s formal water features tended to be both the main focus of the space as well as a focal point for either a major axis or cross axis within the garden. Brown set her pools in either paving or lawn, generally always edging the rim of the pool with rough-hewn sandstone. Small fountains or water jets and aquatic plants were frequent inclusions.293 See figures 4.4.1c, 4.4.2.1a & 4.4.2.6a.

Although Brown’s articles indicate her approval of the use of informal shapes, ‘The shape should be irregular, but the outlines kept in simple curves’,294 she only infrequently included them within her designs. However, when included they formed a dominant feature within the garden. Brown was just as likely to utilise a formal shape and to treat it informally by placing it within a ‘naturalistic’ setting. All of her informal ponds were closely associated with either tree and shrubbery plantings or, in the case of her own garden at ‘Fountains’, within a depression created by a disused quarry and as a part of a significant rock garden.295

Small decorative pools, basins or wall fountains were often included in her courtyards and patios, creating a decorative element or minor focal point within the space; usually offset to one end and providing a focus without reducing the functionality of the site.296 See figure 4.4.2.1a.
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289 Proudfoot, p. 16.
290 Proudfoot, p. 16. Jekyll’s work strongly influenced Brown, this is particularly apparent in regard to Brown’s water features, especially through Jekyll’s books, Wall and Water Gardens, and with Lawrence Weaver Gardens for Small Country Houses.
291 Proudfoot, p. 23.
292 In these instances the water features will usually consists of a small pool or fountain set in a courtyard or patio and a more significant feature as a focal point elsewhere in the garden.
293 Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 41, 43, 47, 55-57, 75.
295 Proudfoot, pp. 43, 60, 64, 66, 72.
296 Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 41, 43, 60, 66, 69.
Figure 4.4.2.1a Fan-shaped pool in the Paved Garden at ‘Wandanian’ 1942.
(Source: Proudfoot, p. 40.)

Figure 4.2.2.1b This image of a fan-shaped pool in Arts and Crafts Gardens was an obvious influence on Brown’s design of the above pool at ‘Wandanian’ and shows her adaptation of such designs to suit the smaller size of the gardens.
(Source: Arts and Crafts Gardens, p. 164.)
4.4.2.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

`when their position and nature have been decided, the garden plan has been determined also.'

This statement, made by Brown in her article for The Home April 1940,\(^{297}\) indicates the significance that Brown placed on paths within the garden. Throughout her articles she prescribed precise methods for determining the position and nature of path systems, rules which she followed in her own designs. As the ‘bones of the garden’\(^ {298}\) Brown used her paths to provide continuous circulation around the garden, enticing you from one aspect or vista and leading you to another. See figures 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b & 4.4.1c.

The architectural style and size of the garden was used by Brown to determine the design and style of paths and driveways. In her earlier gardens and the formal ‘rooms’ of her later gardens, or where a path was directly associated with the house, her design was highly formal and axially aligned with asymmetrical layouts used as a feature.\(^ {299}\) In small spaces Brown felt that both paths and drives should be straight and dignified. In the less formal areas of both her small and large gardens, lawn set stepping-stones were often included. Curved paths were only used in her informal or ‘wild’ ‘rooms’, generally limited to the larger gardens; where such paths were:

- never serpentine;
- retained definite purpose; and,
- led to their destination as directly as the fall of the site and planting schemes allowed.\(^ {300}\)

In her larger gardens, Brown allowed her drives to sweepingly curve from the entrance, past the front door, continuing to either the garage or to a turning point\(^ {301}\) or, alternatively, were straight planted avenues with appropriate vista termination. Entrance gates were recommended to be set back from the road.\(^ {302}\)

Brown treated patios and courtyards as proper rooms, designed as a useable space, that acted as a direct intermediary between house and garden and, as such, she designed the space formally to harmonise with the architecture of the house.\(^ {303}\)

Brown selected her materials and patterns for:

- serviceability;
- attractiveness; and,
- harmonious connection with the architecture of the dwelling.


\(^ {299}\) Brown generally believed that winding paths were ‘unnecessary’ and that good axial planning should never be negated. Jocelyn Brown, ‘It’s All in the Approach’, The Home January 1942, p. 34.


\(^ {301}\) Where a sweeping drive has been used it also incorporated the front path. The surrounding garden had to be designed to create a series of pictures unfolding along its length.


\(^ {303}\) Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 37, 40-1, 43, 47-49, 51, 60-3, 66-71.
Her most frequently used materials and patterns included:
- sandstone\textsuperscript{304} as irregular and rectangular sawn slabs in either crazy or regular patterns;
- bricks, generally used set on their sides, the most prominent patterns included herringbone, basket weave and stretcher bond; and,
- plants, which were used within the joints of paved paths and spaces.\textsuperscript{305}

Brown infrequently used gravel, considering it to be an unsatisfactory material as it was not as aesthetically pleasing as her favoured paving materials and was uncomfortable to traverse. Turf paths were typically included in areas of light traffic; this type of path was particularly used for those paths connected with flower and/or shrub borders.\textsuperscript{306} Stepping stones were used in the ‘Wild’ sections of her larger gardens, and in the less formal areas of her smaller ones. Brown used little or no concrete in her gardens, only directly mentioning its use in her articles in connection to edgings.\textsuperscript{307}

4.4.2.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

Brown’s exposure to the well designed rock gardens of England and America led her to the belief that rock gardening had the potential to become ‘perhaps one of the most fascinating forms of horticulture’\textsuperscript{308} in Australia. Unfortunately, most suburban rock gardens from this period were poorly designed, planted piles of rock used to either cheaply solve difficult problem areas in the garden or as a major feature with little relationship or relevance to its siting.\textsuperscript{309} Brown’s own sophisticated rock gardens took advantage of Sydney’s sloping sites and natural rock outcrops, significantly outclassing those more commonly found in the average suburban garden.\textsuperscript{310} Brown only incorporated rock gardens and rockeries into her designs where she felt that a natural appearing integration between the features of the site and the rock garden could be achieved. See figure 4.4.2.3a.

Brown’s rock gardens and rockeries:
- repeated the characteristic rock lines in the surrounding landscape;
- followed strata lines and the contours of the site;
- were formed from rocks that were laid on their natural faces and bedded into the earth with a slight backward tilt; and,\textsuperscript{311}
- included moraines where appropriate, as a feature.\textsuperscript{312}

\textsuperscript{304} The softly toned Sydney sandstone was Brown’s most popular paving material, its texture, form and subtle colours providing a suitable foil for her planting schemes. Brown readily used this material throughout her gardens as a paving material and for stairs and walls.


\textsuperscript{306} Although Brown loved grass as a paving material she was sensible enough to use it only in areas of light traffic thereby preventing damage.


\textsuperscript{308} Jocelyn Brown, ‘Rock Gardening is an Art’, The Home December 1939, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{309} Jocelyn Brown, ‘Rock Gardening is an Art’, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{310} Proudfoot, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{311} Jocelyn Brown, ‘Rock Gardening is an Art’, pp. 27-8, 64.

\textsuperscript{312} In ‘The Moraine, an Adventure in Rock Gardening’, The Home September 1940, pp. 46-7, 64.

Brown outlined this form of rock gardening, which she described as an ‘unorthodox and still’
Proudfoot considered Brown’s rock garden and rockery planting schemes to be well considered. Brown retained a miniature scale without becoming flat and uninspiring. The background planting was often ‘borrowed’ from groups of trees and shrubs in other parts of the garden, whilst the planting scheme within the rock garden or rockery was exclusively exotic and heavily reliant on perennials and shrubs. Brown also used seasonal annuals to create a sequence of varied effects throughout the year. See figure 4.4.2.3a.

4.4.2.4 Small Features - Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Brown considered small features as essential tools for completing a design and used an extensive mixture throughout her gardens including: birdbaths, sundials, statues, seats, reflective balls, vases and pots. Of these, sundials and birdbaths feature the most prominently. Practical items, such as weather vanes and rain gauges, were usually architecturally treated. The appropriate siting of these features was extremely important to Brown; she felt that they had to retain the useful purpose for which they had been originally designed, otherwise they became just meaningless additions to the garden. See figures 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, 4.4.1c, 4.4.2.1a, 4.4.2.6a & 4.4.3.3a.

Birdbaths, sundials, statues and reflective balls were used:

- as incidents and focal points;
- to provide focus to the planting scheme; and,
- to emphasise other incidents or focal points, such as path intersections.

somewhat experimental type, for growing alpines’. Precise instructions and construction diagram’s as well as a suitable alpine planting list were included in the article.

Proudfoot, p. 23.


Proudfoot, p. 24.


Pots and vases were used:
- as focal points at doorways, steps, paths and along terraces; and,
- to add seasonal colour and textural notes to the garden.  

While primarily a place from which to view the garden, Brown also used seats:
- as places of retreat and rest; and,
- to terminate vistas in her formal garden 'rooms'.

4.4.2.5 Large Features - Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses

Pergolas, columns and, to a lesser degree, garden-houses were important elements within Brown's designs: where they were used to echo the architecture of the house and create a cohesive link between house and garden. Brown frequently incorporated pergolas and rows of detached columns in both her small and large garden designs. However, Brown's favoured deceit was the use of columns, either with or without chains. See figures 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b & 4.4.3.3a. Brown sited pergolas and rows of columns in her gardens so they:
- were axially aligned;
- provided a focus for the planting scheme;
- added a height element, creating scale within the garden; and,
- added a supportive structure upon which to drape climbing plants.

Brown's garden-houses and pavilions generally:
- terminated vistas;
- were axially aligned;
- drew their design from the houses architectural treatment (if directly associated with it); and,
- were incorporated into the design of swimming pools and tennis courts.

Brown also incorporated free standing walls and treillage into her garden designs, see figures 4.4.2.1a & 4.4.2.6a, in order to:
- screen and divide the garden, creating different 'rooms' and opportunities for interesting openings into those spaces;
- provide a decorative backdrop adding pattern and texture; and,
- act as a background to the planting scheme.

4.4.2.6 Level Change - Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

Level change was integral to Brown's designs; Proudfoot regards Brown's abilities in this area as 'skilful'. Brown considered sloping gardens to be the epitome of bad design, although in some areas of the garden, gently sloping grassed areas

---

326 Proudfoot, pp. 24, 57.
surrounded by shrubberies were deemed acceptable. Instead, Brown relied on series of terraces, incorporating them into her designs to deal with unlevel sites. Brown designed period typical, formal terraces in her early gardens and only retained this formality in her later gardens if the terrace was directly associated with the house. In these later gardens, her terrace designs tended to connect with and follow the natural contours of the site. Brown supported her terraces with retaining walls, as opposed to grass banks, which she considered to be wasteful of space and difficult to keep aesthetically pleasing. Brown's retaining walls ranged in height from walls that required significant buttressing down to those requiring a single course of stone and were used to provide additional planting space and to add texture and colour within the garden.

Brown primarily used brick and stone in the construction of her terrace retaining walls, favouring dry-stone walling and the use of local materials where possible. See figure 4.4.2.6a. Proudfoot considers Brown's affinity for dry-stone walls to be partially linked to the potential planting schemes that resulted from the additional planting space that arose from this type of wall construction; Brown was noted for the attention that she paid to those planting schemes. Flower borders were generally also incorporated along terrace walls, Brown equally happy to plant either along the top of the wall or at its foot.

![Figure 4.4.2.6 The water terrace at the garden at 'Comely'.](Source: Proudfoot, p. 56.)

328 Proudfoot, pp. 43, 47-8, 51, 55-6, 60, 68, 71, 79.
329 Jocelyn Brown, 'Wall Gardens', pp. 20-1, 63. Proudfoot, pp. 43, 47-8, 51, 55-6, 60, 68, 71, 79.
Of stairs, Brown believed that 'Firstly they should be of generous width wherever possible and the grade easy.' Brown predominantly incorporated her stairs within the wall cavity; in her formal gardens she also often included low piers and extended the last two or three steps past the wall, changing their shape from rectangular to semi-circular. See figure 4.4.2.6a. For low terrace walls, Brown commonly butted groups of two to three broad semicircular steps against the wall. Brown also generally constructed the stairs in the same material as the wall; used dominant planting features to indicate the position of the stairs; and, commonly adorned low piers with vases and pots.

Although infrequently used in her designs, Brown included sunken gardens to add interest through level change in flat areas of the garden. Her design of sunken gardens created dominant geometric forms within the garden, with both symmetrical and asymmetrical elements axially arranged to them.

4.4.2.7 Rose Gardens
Brown included rose gardens in the majority of her garden designs. In her early formally designed gardens, the rose garden would be one of a progression of 'garden rooms'. In her larger informal gardens, the rose garden was one of the few formal spaces connected to the house. Brown's rose gardens were typically treated as formal 'garden rooms' usually composed within a square layout, which contained a cross-axial path system with a centrally placed feature, or a symmetrical path system that contained the dominant axis also terminated by a feature. Brown regularly incorporated both hedge and specimen plantings of lavender within the rose beds. See figures 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b & 4.4.1c.

4.4.3 Planting Schemes
4.4.3.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form
In Brown's written work, colour, texture, scale and form were linked primarily to her planting schemes, not to the design as a whole, with colour dominating her thoughts. It could be assumed that she expected the public to translate the presented information to all aspects of design and not just to a single aspect within it. Possibly like Jekyll, who in her book, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden clarified her own bias towards colour through the belief 'that the question of colour, as regards its careful use, is either more commonly neglected or has fewer exponents' can also potentially explains Brown's partiality. Despite her obvious bias towards colour and its correct use in the garden, she did regard it as a secondary consideration after her 'rules of design', best described by Brown herself: 'The successful and satisfying
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331 Jocelyn Brown, 'Where'er You Walk', p. 74. Brown's ideal measurements are 14-18 inches (35.6-45.7cm) for runner widths and 4-6 inches (10-15cm) high for risers.
332 This was an important design note for Brown, as outlined in 'Where'er You Walk', flower borders were not to be just left to run into the stairs, without some form of finishing point.
333 Jocelyn Brown, 'Where'er You Walk', pp. 16-17, 74. Proudfoot, pp. 24, 33, 43, 47-8, 51, 55-6, 58, 60, 68, 71, 79, 93, 97.
334 Proudfoot, pp. 35, 74-6, 97.
335 Proudfoot, pp. 33, 35, 43, 47, 51, 67.
336 Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, p. 316.
337 Jocelyn Brown, 'How We Use Colour Schemes in the Garden', The Home June 1940, p. 54.
planting scheme will embody good proportion, scale, line, contrast and unity. If any one of these is absent, the cultured eye will be conscious of loss.  

Proudfoot metaphorically describes Brown’s use of colour to be as how a painter would use colour in a picture; this analogy was borrowed from Brown herself who used art to convey the common sense of her colour theories to the public. Brown acquainted her readers with her colour theories throughout her regular monthly articles, of which a number specifically outline colour-themed planting schemes. Most of her advice directly followed Jekyll’s book Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, her favoured colour combinations mimicking Jekyll’s; silver foliage combined with blues, whites, purples and yellows. The only deviation from her mentor is her greater advocacy for the use of brighter red, purple, brown and yellow colour schemes.  

Conscious of the effect that it creates in the garden, she used colour as a dominant feature within her designs, creating her colour schemes from the entire composition and not just the flowers within it. Brown used foliage and its variety of colours and tones to create her colour framework, creating strong contrasts and textural variety, variegated forms prompting the only hesitancy in her colour schemes.

4.4.3.2 Flower Borders

Flower borders were Brown’s passion; many of her articles reflected her adoration for flowering plants and the seasonal colour that they brought to both the garden and home. Brown composed her borders from a mixture of perennials, small shrubs for permanence, bulbs for flower and foliage effect, and annuals for fleeting seasonal
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342 Brown often discussed the ability of colour to: create the illusion of distance or to foreshorten a space; draw the eye harmoniously over the ‘room’ or to jerk it from place to place; relieve the monotony associated with haphazardly planted gardens, and; create points of interest when subtle colour combinations were used and conversely ruin the unity of the whole scheme when vivid splashes of colour were used. Jocelyn Brown, ‘How We Use Colour Schemes in the Flower Garden’, pp. 54, 69. Jocelyn Brown, ‘How We Use Colour Schemes in the Flower Garden’, pp. 46-7.
343 Proudfoot, p. 25.
344 To emphasise the importance of foliage to her readers, Brown designed a planting plan based entirely on foliage, thereby illustrating her point that foliage alone provided colour, unity, form, scale and texture within the garden. Jocelyn Brown, ‘Leaves from the Garden’, p. 24.
345 Proudfoot, pp. 26-7.
346 Appreciative of the ‘charming incidents’ that could be created in the garden with variegated foliage, she was concerned that unless ‘discretion’ was used in their selection and placement, a ‘restless and weak effect’ would be the result. Proudfoot, p. 25.
347 Floral decoration inside the home was important to Brown, writing about the importance of flowers inside the home and including a list of plants for the cutting garden in Jocelyn Brown, ‘Many are Culled but Few are Chosen: Grow Selected Flowers for House Decoration’, The Home January 1941 pp. 28, 59.
Flower borders were a significant feature of Brown’s smaller suburban gardens where they were:

- formally treated;
- bordered by paving or lawn as either a path or formal space; and,
- backed by walls, hedges or suitable tree and/or shrub groupings.  

Figure 4.4.3.2a Brown’s flower border at ‘Greenwoods’.

(Source: Proudfoot, p. 101.)

Flower borders were secondary features of the larger country gardens, though flowering plants still played an important role. Flower borders were informally composed, filling a space rather than being a formal border, with the background being provided by tree and shrub groups, borrowed from other sections of the garden. 

Provision for small annual beds was occasionally made in the foreground of shrub plantings around the foundations of the house or in mixed beds, with bulbs either bordering walks or under groves of trees. Brown allowed her plantings to retain their natural forms, providing contrast and textural variety between the juxtaposition of the planting and the hard surfaces of walls and paths.
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348 Proudfoot, pp. 20-1, 24-7.
349 Brown particularly liked the dark colour of citrus foliage, especially orange’s, to provide a background for flower borders, often using them within her gardens. Jocelyn Brown, ‘Making the Most of a Small Garden’, The Home March 1942, p. 56. Proudfoot, pp. 33, 35, 37, 41, 43, 47-8, 67, 75, 77, 101.
350 Proudfoot, pp. 43, 51.
351 Proudfoot, pp. 33, 41, 43, 51.
4.4.3.3 Trees & Shrubs

"...first thought must be given to the trees that are needed..." 353

Although Brown’s passion was perennial borders, she was rational about their employment within the garden; tree and shrub plantings forming the basis of her designs. In an article on the importance of trees to garden design Brown, wrote that "Faulty design may be rendered less obvious by the beauty of well-grown trees, but no perfection of layout can produce a satisfying picture without the aid of trees." 354

Brown’s use of trees and shrubs differed between her small and large gardens. In the small gardens they were predominantly located at the boundary of the property, providing privacy and creating a background. This allowed Brown the space to create the garden ‘rooms’ that dominate the smaller gardens; Brown using small specimen trees within these spaces to soften the formality of her design. Shrubs, particularly camellias and azaleas, were also often planted along the house foundations. 355 See figures 4.4.1a, 4.4.1c & 4.4.3.3a. The large gardens provided more scope for Brown to fully express her ideas on the use of trees and shrubs in the garden, relying on tree and shrubbery plantings to create the garden rather than the formal garden ‘rooms’ of her smaller garden designs. 356 See figures, 4.4.1b & 4.4.1c.

Figure 4.4.3.3a Part of Brown’s planting scheme at ‘Greenwood’.
(Source: Proudfoot, p. 100.)
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355 Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 37, 40-1, 43-5, 47-9, 51, 60-3, 67-72, 75, 77, 79, 97, 100-1.
356 Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 37, 40-1, 43-5, 47-9, 51, 60-3, 67-72, 75, 77, 79, 97, 100-1.
Brown used a variety of trees in her gardens:
- for their individual beauty;
- as a massed background;
- as windbreaks;
- to conceal unattractive external and internal features such as neighbouring buildings and fences;
- to frame both internal and external vistas; and,
- as 'a third dimension to the layout' bringing perspective, scale, form and colour into the garden.\(^{357}\)

Both trees and shrubs were used;
- as 'walls' to divide the garden into 'rooms';
- to create privacy;
- to create unity and balance within the garden; and,
- to add form, colour and texture to the garden.\(^{358}\)

### 4.4.3.4 Hedges

Brown used hedges prominently throughout the garden, questioning the more common restricted usage at the boundary of the garden.\(^{359}\) Brown used both formal and informal hedge forms, combining a variety of hedge heights throughout her garden designs. Tall hedges were used predominantly as screens or backgrounds; a hedge providing a '...no better background to the flower border...' and 'enhancing the colour of the flowers.'\(^{360}\) Smaller hedges tended to be used as borders to flower gardens; for example the use of lavender in her rose gardens. See figures 4.4.1a & 4.4.1b. Brown’s hedges:
- screened and enclosed sections of the garden, creating a sense of space by concealing the exact extent of the garden;
- provided contrast to the planting scheme; and,
- provided scale and focal points, directed vistas, and added rhythm and formality to the design.\(^{361}\)

---


4.4.3.5 Topiary

'At the present time we appear to be enjoying a more balanced expression of garden art, and a modified form of Topiary is again acceptable to cultivated taste.' 'It is the misuse of plant-clipping that has made it so despised. 362 Brown used simple topiary forms, particularly ball forms and simple combinations of balls and squares; although, she did draw the more complex form of topiary birds to illustrate her article on the subject. 363 Brown used topiary in the garden:

- to provide focal points;
- to create contrast to natural plant forms;
- to highlight path entrances and stairs; and,
- as freestanding forms associated with hedging of the same plant, adding unity and formality to her design. 364

4.4.3.6 Lawn

Brown wrote comparatively little on the use of lawn in the garden, mentioning that it highlighted the flower border and that it was a 'delightful' surface for walks in areas of light traffic. 365 In her early gardens, lawn was an important design feature; Brown using it as a surface covering in her formal 'rooms', often associated with flower or shrub borders, or in small naturalistic settings under trees thereby creating an area of quiet repose. Brown was readily aware of a lawn's soft textural qualities and the contrast possibilities created with hard surfaces. 366 See figures 4.4.1a & 4.4.1c.

In her larger country gardens, Brown's focus on rigid formality softened, creating increased scope for lawn usage. Usually she would incorporate large, contained (but not enclosed) areas of informal lawn, connected to the house, and planted with groups of trees and shrubs, which then transitioned to areas of similarly planted lawn, designated as rough grass on her plans, linking the garden to the rural landscape. 367 See figure 4.4.1b.

4.4.3.7 Creepers & Climbers

Like Jekyll and Weaver in Arts and Crafts Gardens, Brown felt that creepers and climbers should ‘clothe’ not ‘smoother’ pergolas, walls and other architectural features including, where appropriate, the house. She often used these plants to minimise any demarcation that existed between house and garden, creating unity where before there had been 'a feeling that the house and garden are not happily related to one another.' 369 Brown also trained creepers and climbers to frame statues and sculptures sited in front of a wall. Climbing roses were typically trained along the chains that connected the series of pillars so often used in her gardens. 370

363 Jocelyn Brown, 'Topiary the Art of Bush-Barbering', pp. 52-3, 68.
364 Jocelyn Brown, 'Topiary the Art of Bush-Barbering', pp. 52-3, 68.
366 Proudfoot, pp. 29, 33, 35, 47-9, 75, 77, 97, 100-1.
368 Republished as Jekyll and Weaver, Arts and Crafts Gardens, pp. 133-140.
369 Jocelyn Brown, 'Garden Creepers Common and Rare', The Home April 1942, pp. 32-3.
4.4.3.8 Natives

Brown was very circumspect in her use of natives; they were *not a guest to be invited in.*\(^{371}\) Her later, less inwards-oriented, country-based designs helped facilitate a slightly more comfortable relationship with natives where she placed 'a greater emphasis on the combination of introduced and native plant materials'.\(^{372}\) This was in response to 'a conscious attempt to integrate the garden with the surrounding landscape',\(^{373}\) which was achieved through the use of natives as a background planting in the less formal areas of the garden.\(^{374}\) See figure 4.4.1c.

Brown made little mention of natives in her articles, their potential limited to flower or foliage colour. In her early gardens, natives were sometimes retained and incorporated into her design if they already existed on site. Brown slowly shifted her thinking from their total exclusion to their inclusion as an external backdrop if they existed in the surrounding landscape.\(^{375}\) See figure 4.4.3.3a.

4.4.3.9 Plant Selection\(^{376}\)

Brown used an almost exclusive palate of exotic plants, both selecting and recommending specimens for her gardens and readers that were horticulturally suitable for Sydney and the immediate surrounding parts of rural NSW.\(^{377}\)

4.4.4 Influences

Brown drew inspiration from many sources, reflecting such influences in her own garden designs. Those which most strongly influenced and directed her natural abilities as a garden designer include: Gertrude Jekyll, Welwyn Garden City, and the Sydney Architects responsible for the fusion of Neo-Georgian and Mediterranean styles and forms during the interwar period. To a lesser degree, William Robinson, Elizabethan and early Georgian gardens, and a garden tour of Europe in 1920 that included the gardens of 'Luxembourg', 'Versailles', 'Malmaison', 'Villa d'Este', 'Frascati' and 'Borghese' also played a role in directing Brown's talents.\(^{378}\)

4.4.4.1 Gertrude Jekyll

Jekyll's influence upon Brown is the most significant, both academically through Jekyll's written works, and physically via Jekyll's gardens that Brown had the opportunity to visit during the early 1920s.\(^{379}\) Brown's adaptation of Jekyll's design principles to suit the climate and size of her Sydney gardens is readily apparent in both her gardens and her articles for *The Home.*\(^{380}\) Jekyll's most obvious influences included: her theories on and the use of colour; plantsmanship; dry-stone walls; rock gardens; and water.

\(^{371}\) Proudfoot, p. 22.
\(^{372}\) Proudfoot, p. 52.
\(^{373}\) Proudfoot, p. 52.
\(^{374}\) Proudfoot, p. 52.
\(^{375}\) Proudfoot, pp. 22, 52, 59, 82.
\(^{376}\) See Appendix 4J for a list of plants typically used by Brown in her planting schemes.
\(^{377}\) Proudfoot, p. 94.
\(^{378}\) Proudfoot, pp. 12, 14, 16-17, 20, 28, 94-6, 102.
\(^{379}\) Proudfoot noted that *Wall and Water Gardens* and *Gardens for Small Country Houses* from the Brown library were particularly well worn. Proudfoot, p. 16.
\(^{380}\) Proudfoot, pp. 14, 92-3, 102.
Jekyll’s influence on Brown in relation to colour and its usage has already been discussed in section 4.3.3.1 In addition, a comparative example of both women’s written work illustrates the point more fully. In Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden Jekyll wrote of blue gardens: ‘a blue garden,...may be hungering for a group of white lilies, or for something of palest lemon-yellow,’ and ‘...the blues will be more telling – more purely blue – by the juxtaposition of rightly placed complementary colour.’ Brown, in an article for The Home on colour, wrote of blue gardens: ‘I say predominantly blue because the quality of blueness will be enhanced if white and pale yellow accents are used judiciously.’ Further examples of the commonality between Jekyll’s and Brown’s writings on colour can be found, when considered in conjunction with Jekyll’s writings, throughout Brown’s articles.

Brown’s water features borrow their shape and form from Jekyll and Weaver’s book Arts and Crafts Gardens and Jekyll’s book Wall and Water Gardens. While Brown followed the principles outlined in these works, she adapted the scale and siting of her water features to harmonise with the smaller size of her gardens and the Sydney environment. A similar, but stronger relationship, occurred between rock gardens and walls, particularly dry-stone walls; the principles and ideas, as discussed by Jekyll, were more closely followed and, although adaptation to suit the scale of the garden and the different environment occurred, it was not as pronounced as with her water features. In articles on walls and rock gardens Brown reiterates Jekyll’s writing and even ‘borrows’ Jekyll’s images.

Brown, as a practical gardener, was heavily influenced by the way in which Jekyll used her plants, incorporating similar colour, form, scale and textural combinations in her planting schemes. Both women densely planted their borders allowing the natural form of the plants to spill over architectural structures within the garden, thereby softening and integrating these hard, dominant features into the garden. The freedom of the plants was always closely watched and controlled if they appeared to be ‘smothering’ rather than ‘clothing’ their intended structure. Although Brown’s usual drawing style is architecturally based, she also styled her border drawings on Jekyll’s.

4.4.4.2 Welwyn Garden City (England)
Brown spent three years living and working on the Welwyn Garden City project, just north of London in Hertfordshire. Proudfoot described the influence that this project had on Brown: ‘Many of the landscaping themes and incidents used by Jocelyn Brown in her Sydney gardens were adapted from her Welwyn experience,...’ Proudfoot goes on to list the landscaping themes and features as:
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381 Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, p. 218.
382 Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, p. 221.
383 Brown, ‘Garden Blues (Blue Flowers)’, p. 46.
384 A list of Brown’s articles for The Home can be found in Appendix 4F.
385 Republished as Jekyll and Weaver, Arts and Crafts Gardens, pp. 162-178.
389 Proudfoot, pp. 20-1, 24-5, 92-3.
those elements shared between the Jekyll-Lutyens partnership and Welwyn of combinations of 'built formal elements' softened 'with elements of studied informality' such as the planting scheme.

- 'curved streets of differing widths'
- 'accommodation of existing trees to provide variety'
- 'the creation of closes and small village green spaces'
- the avoidance of 'fences and hard lines of demarcation..., hedges and turf banks were favoured.'\(^{390}\)

4.4.4.3 The Architects

Of the Sydney architects and landscape designers practicing during the interwar period, the most influential on Brown were her husband Alfred Brown, William Hardy Wilson and Prof. EG Waterhouse. Through various Sydney connections, including The Home, and the garden 'Eryldene' (designed by Wilson but owned and modified by friend and landscape designer Prof. EG Waterhouse), the Brown's were exposed to the 'inner circle's' advocacy of the 'Georgian Rule of Taste'; Brown's gardens 'were designed to complement the domestic examples of the movement.'\(^{391}\) Although it seems that the Brown's were never formally a part of this 'inner circle', the Brown's home 'Fountains', designed by Alfred Brown, implements many of these ideals. Proudfoot describes Alfred Brown's involvement with Jocelyn's designs as 'practical advice on the architectural elements that she utilised', however believing that further in depth discussions between husband and wife makes it 'difficult, ...to disentangle his contribution from the total result.'\(^{392}\) In the two gardens that Wilson designed, 'Eryldene' and his own home 'Purulia' (both of which were featured in The Home), Brown found a sympathetic reinforcement of her own architectural designs.\(^{393}\) In Waterhouse, Brown found a fellow plants-man, Waterhouse emphasising the form and textural qualities of plants and their abilities to create richness, surprise, coherence and balance in the garden.\(^{394}\)
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390 Proudfoot, p. 12.
391 Proudfoot, p. 20.
392 Proudfoot, p. 20.
393 Proudfoot, p. 20.
394 Proudfoot, p. 96.
395 Proudfoot, pp. 94-6.
396 Proudfoot, p. 96.
Chapter 5 - South Australian Contemporaries

5.1 Introduction

South Australia and Adelaide in particular had a diverse range of allied Landscape Design and Horticultural professionals working during the interwar period. A number of Architects and Architectural firms also provided, to varying degrees, garden designs and/or advice on aspects of garden design. Unfortunately there has been only limited research and in-depth analysis undertaken and published about the ideologies and garden designs of these professionals or the influence that they had upon the general gardening population.\(^1\) That they had immense influence is irrefutable: most accessibly reaching the public through the popular print media although a number of individuals did also regularly give public presentations.\(^2\) On a tangible level, elements of the Adelaide Botanic Garden served as an easily accessible exemplar for the public, most notably the rock garden developed around the Palm House.\(^3\)

The singularly most important local publication both during the period and as a historical record was the monthly journal South Australian Homes and Gardens and its alternatively named antecedents Australian Homes and Gardens and The Builder. As 'Adelaide's Home Magazine' it's articles covered a range of design topics related to houses, gardens and interiors amongst such other topics as book reviews, cooking and the gossip pertaining to the Adelaide social elite. Although the articles in themselves provided valuable design advice, the magazine was also lavishly illustrated with high quality black and white photographs taken by both staff photographers and other such notable professional photographers as D. Darian Smith. Whilst the larger society homes and gardens were predictable features the magazine also regularly included images of the more typical suburban home garden, thereby providing a record of their layouts.\(^4\)

Each of the major newspapers provided regular weekly gardening columns and although the content of these columns were usually horticulturally based they did occasionally include elements of design and/or feature photographs and descriptions of the larger Adelaide society gardens.\(^5\) A number of Adelaide nurseries similarly produced or contributed to horticulturally based publications and catalogues, of these the most significant during the interwar period was E. & W. Hackett's Gardening Bulletin which was published monthly from September 1917 until August 1951.\(^6\)

---

1. David Jones, Designed Landscapes in South Australia, pp. 68-71.
   Agricola, 'Horticultural Impressions Mr. Kemp in England', The Observer 19 February 1921.
   Agricola, 'Planning a Garden Advice of Mr. Bailey', The Observer 19 September 1925, p. 15.
5. Aitken and Looker, pp. 9, 562, 343.
Exactly who else besides Cornish was practising within the field of garden design in Adelaide during the interwar period is difficult to comprehensively identify; many of these Garden Designers and Architects warrant the same level of research into and the analysis of their designs as given to Cornish. Conducting that detail of research and analysis lies outside the scope of this thesis. However, the work of some of these designers has been more easily accessible than others and a broad overview of their designs have been used to provide a typical local garden design context.\(^7\)

A selective range of individuals either allied to the various publications and/or practising garden design have been selected for review from which to provide a local contextual basis for the analysis of Cornish’s garden designs. The individuals selected either wrote about and/or designed within the prevalent styles of garden design in Adelaide during the period and were aligned to varying degrees across the range of garden ideologies widely presented in England during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and to a lesser extent influenced by the ideas and practises in North America and Europe, especially Italy. These ideologies provided the main influences upon garden design practise in Adelaide during this period. As a result, garden design theory and practice ranged from the informal through to the highly formal architecturally designed garden. Various degrees of fusion between both saw the amalgamation, by some, of formal and informal gardening styles within the same garden, often the back garden was treated following the ideas of the formal school whilst the front garden was treated with the ideas of the informal school.\(^8\)

Those individuals selected have been placed into three broad categories including: South Australian Homes and Gardens; Newspapers and Nursery Publications, and; Architects and Garden Designers. Those individuals covered within South Australian Homes and Gardens include: Alfred J. Quarrell, John Oliver and a collection of unknown authors amongst which the unidentified ‘Homebird’ and K. McClure contributed articles. Those individuals covered in Newspapers and Nursery Publications include: the unknown ‘Agricola’ and ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’; and, Frank Fairey. The Architects and Garden Designers include: Herbert S. Hartshorne; Russell S. Ellis, and; Mary A. Parkhouse.

**5.2 South Australian Homes and Gardens**

**5.2.1 Background**

South Australian Homes and Gardens magazine began as a monthly edition of the weekly trade magazine, The Builder and was aimed at the home owner and buyer. However, only issues for August, September, December 1924 and March and April 1925 were ever published before becoming Australian Homes and Gardens. Australian Homes and Gardens was published monthly from May 1925 to September 1931 before it was renamed South Australian Homes and Gardens. A change in publisher, from the Builder Publishing Company to Shipping Newspapers, at this point seems to suggest that the magazine might have been sold at this time. South
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\(^7\) David Jones, *Designed Landscapes in South Australia*, pp. 68-71.

\(^8\) Aitken and Looker, pp. 560-1.
Australian Homes and Gardens continued from October 1931 until its demise in December 1953. 9

The Garden Editor and most significant and prolific garden and gardening contributor was horticulturist Alfred James Quarrell. Quarrell initially wrote for the magazine between 1924–1929 under the pen name ‘Smallholder’, using his real name from August 1929 until his death in December 1940, although his articles continued to be published until February 1941. John Oliver took over from Quarrell in March 1941 and contributed the gardening columns and calendars until late 1949, at which point ‘Enthusiast’ took over these regular features of the magazine. 10

The core of Quarrell’s articles covered horticultural issues and plant lists however, he also included basic design recommendations as they related to the usage of plants. Quarrell also authored a number of articles on rock gardens and rockeries and pools. 11 Whilst little is known about John Oliver it is obvious from his articles that he had spent a significant amount of time living in England and that if he wasn’t actually English he was certainly an Anglophile. Like Quarrell, the content of Oliver’s articles were horticulturally based although he did include some design advice in relation to both built and plant elements within the garden. 12


Between May 1925 and February 1931 approximately a dozen articles were authored on aspects of garden design that had a completely different tone to Quarrell’s style of writing. Of those articles, only two contained a by-line ‘Rockeries and Rustic’ by ‘Homebird’ and ‘Garden Ornaments’ by K McClure. It has not been possible to determine who authored these articles but they are important as they dealt less with plant and horticultural considerations and more with the philosophical and design aspects of the garden. Herbert Sydney Hartshorne provided a series of seven articles between July 1930 and January 1931 that similarly dealt with design and philosophy rather than plants and horticulture. Edna Walling fulfilled this role between 1938 and 1942 providing edited versions of her articles previously written for The Australian Home Beautiful and Architect Russell S. Ellis took up the mantle with a series of articles written post-war covering the design of home and garden.

Hartshorne’s work as both writer and designer is more closely examined in section 5.4.2. Walling’s work as both author and designer has been extensively covered in section 4.2 and the similarity between Walling’s articles for The Australian Home Beautiful and South Australian Homes and Gardens therefore makes any further analysis of her work superfluous. Ellis’ garden design work undertaken as a part of the South Australian Homes and Gardens Ideal Homes Garden Competition is covered in section 5.4.1 and his post-war written work falls outside of the period covered by this thesis.

5.2.2 Alfred J. Quarrell

5.2.2.1 Design Overview

Although design was not a prominent feature of Quarrell’s articles, he did author one article titled ‘Gardens and Garden Construction’ that provided an overview of his basic garden design ideas. Some of the thoughts expressed in this article were repeated to varying degrees throughout his other articles. ‘Gardens and Garden Construction’ dealt with the remodelling of existing gardens rather than the construction of a new garden and is a plea by Quarrell for the elimination of the ‘sameness’ that he felt was apparent in suburban gardens. That ‘sameness’ being the use of narrow borders of standard roses to edge plots of lawn. Although he was...

---

16 See Appendix 5A for a list of Walling’s articles for South Australian Homes and Gardens between 1938-1942.
pragmatic enough to suggest that those gardeners who maintained a continual display of colour in these types of gardens and who included rose arbours and the like did still have attractive and interesting gardens.\textsuperscript{17}

Quarrell expressed an obvious preference for gardens designed in the informal manner of ‘our grandfathers’. He felt that formal gardens did not allow the owner to express individuality or artistic ability and that they were unoriginal and often uninteresting as their layout allowed them to be viewed at a glance. Elements to be incorporated into the remodelled informal garden were curved paths; sunken gardens; rockeries; rock mounds; pools; stepping stones; sundials and garden ornaments, which were used to create a design that provided ‘new features and interesting displays at every turn’. To complement the redevelopment of the garden, Quarrell also argued for the reintroduction of the old fashioned plants that had been supplanted to a large degree by ‘showy annuals’ and also the greater use of a large specimen tree or groups of fastigate trees.\textsuperscript{18}

\subsection*{5.2.2.2 Design Elements}

Rock gardens, rockeries and their associated water features were the only built elements that Quarrell dealt with in any detail in his writings; they were a recurrent theme throughout both \textit{South Australian Homes and Gardens} and the various newspapers which he contributed to.\textsuperscript{19} Quarrell believed that those who included rock gardens within their gardens were ‘bold spirits’ attempting to move away from the ‘commonplace in their garden planning’ who had provided ‘an artistic setting for their plants and shrubs’ through the introduction of rockwork.\textsuperscript{20} Quarrell considered rock gardens and rockeries as suitable features for gardens of any size and whilst he considered their ideal situation to be upon undulating ground where a suitable background of trees and shrubs already existed or could be planted he offered numerous other potential locations for their siting. See figure 5.2.2.2a. These included:

- the narrow strip of land between the driveway and boundary fence, which he considered should provide sufficient scope for those gardeners with artistic ability;\textsuperscript{21}
- around sunken gardens, the excavated earth providing the surrounding rockery banks and;\textsuperscript{22}
- around and under trees, which provided opportunities for the use of shade loving plants.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{17} Quarrell, ‘Gardens and Garden Construction’, pp. 60-2.
\bibitem{18} Quarrell, ‘Gardens and Garden Construction’, pp. 60-1.
\bibitem{20} Quarrell, ‘Individuality Expressed in Rockeries and Rock Gardens’, p. 36.
\bibitem{22} Quarrell, ‘Individuality Expressed in Rockeries and Rock Gardens’ p. 69.
\end{thebibliography}
While Quarrell was adamant that rock gardens should not be located in the middle of the lawn they could be sited in either a corner or at the side of the lawn and finish within a portion of it.\textsuperscript{24} Preferably, they were to be afforded some degree of seclusion, Quarrell suggesting that either a winding path or a plant covered pergola would provide a satisfactory approach to the rock garden.\textsuperscript{25}

Quarrell’s detailed instructions for the construction of the rock garden or rockery began with the suggested study of natural rock-work, especially that within the Adelaide Hills. The selection of the rock was the next consideration, Quarrell advised that it should preferably be weathered and covered with either moss or lichen.\textsuperscript{26} Larger rocks were essential. Quarrell cautioned against the use of a large quantity of small rock so as to avoid the ‘appearance of child’s play at garden making’.\textsuperscript{27} Quarrell further advocated the limited use of rock, stating that the use of fewer and larger rocks would produce a ‘more natural and artistic effect’.\textsuperscript{28} See figure 6.3.3e of F.H. Snow’s rock garden at ‘Beechwood’, Stirling in the Adelaide Hills. Rules for laying the rock included:

- their placement so as to mimic a miniature range of hills or hillocks, and their associated valleys;
- that the rocks were not to finish in an abrupt line but rather in diminishing outcrops that suggested that the rock continued underground; and,
- their firm placement into the earth so as to lie naturally on their heaviest sides; they were not to be stuck up on end.\textsuperscript{29}

Pools were considered to be a charming addition to the rock garden. Quarrell recommended that the pool be located at the lowest point within the rock garden. Pools of irregular outline were preferred and were to be edged with rock so as to conceal the concrete used in its construction and were to be backed with a miniature rock mountain.\textsuperscript{30} See figure 5.2.2.2b.

Quarrell advocated a wide range of plant materials for the rock garden matching the horticultural requirements of the plants to the siting of the rock garden and thereby the resulting conditions under which the plants were expected to grow. As a result he was disinclined to mix different categories of plants together, particularly cacti and succulents which he felt looked better grouped by themselves. Although he did begrudgingly state that if they must be grown with other plants such as the alpines and perennials that they should be accommodated at the top of the rock garden. His suggested planting schemes were of a permanent nature, annuals were only recommended to fill voids until such time as the permanent planting had become established.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{24} Quarrell, ‘This Craze for Rockeries’, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{25} Quarrell, ‘This Craze for Rockeries’, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{27} Quarrell, ‘Individuality Expressed in Rockeries and Rock Gardens’, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{28} Quarrell, ‘Individuality Expressed in Rockeries and Rock Gardens’, p. 37.
5.2.2.3 Planting Schemes

As a horticulturist, plants were obviously Quarrell’s first love and whilst his articles pertained mostly to horticultural requirements, plant recommendations and new introductions he did provide limited advice on how best to employ the plants within the garden from a design perspective.

5.2.2.3.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

Quarrell was not overt in his advice on colour, texture, scale and form although these aspects of design were included within the scope of his articles; the most evident were scale and colour. Quarrell specifically recommended the use of trees and shrubs to relieve the otherwise flat nature of a garden reliant on annuals and perennials. His opposition to the unnecessary pruning of trees and shrubs and his emphasis of the fastigiate form of poplars and Italian cypress introduced, to his readers, the idea of different but natural forms within the garden. Scale and form were fleetingly addressed in the composition of the mixed border whereby Quarrell simply outlined how the differing heights of various perennials were best suited to the different locations within the border, taller specimens towards the back, smaller towards the front. Within the mixed border he was very specific in that plantings of perennials should be carried out in clumps not rows; conversely the annual flowerbeds bordering the lawn were often composed of rows, creating a ‘ribbon’ type effect.32

Quarrell countenanced two different colour usages within the garden: one for the garden as a whole and another for the narrow flowerbeds that bordered the lawn and/or the circular or shaped flowerbeds within the lawn. Within the garden in
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general he advised his readers to plant in masses of colour to avoid spotty effects and to choose colours that would harmonise and blend into each other. Foliage, flower, berry and fruit colours were all taken into consideration. Conversely the flowerbeds were used to provide a 'splash' of colour and/or contrast. Circular and/or shaped flowerbeds within the lawn were either planted with a single massed planting of a brightly coloured annual such as red salvia, or where massed planted with one type of flowering annual or perennial, which was then edged with another, such as hot pink canna lilies, *Canna* Hybrid Cultivars, edged with the silver foliage of *Cineraria maritima*. The narrow flowerbeds that bordered the lawn were planted with rows of two or three rows of differently coloured annuals, some creating vivid contrasts, others achieving a slightly better blending of colours. Some typical combinations included: scarlet and purple; brown and blue; black and white; black, white and yellow and the more typical blue and yellow, pink and blue; blue, pink and mauve; and white with a range of single colour combinations such as red and white and blue and white.33

5.2.2.3.2 Flower Borders

Quarrell focused primarily on introducing new and popular annual and perennial cultivars as well as providing horticultural advice rather than providing intricate planting schemes. He appears to have been equally partial to mixed flower borders that contained trees and shrubs for permanent structure as well as smaller flowerbeds that were mass planted with either a single or very limited number of different annuals, often of contrasting colours and either bordering or within the lawn.34

5.2.2.3.3 Trees & Shrubs

Although most of Quarrell’s articles related primarily to flowering plants, he did consider trees and shrubs to be integral to the garden; a garden without trees and shrubs was considered to be unworthy of being called a garden. The only caveat being very small gardens in which trees might be omitted but not shrubs.35 Trees and shrubs were selected for their height and form and relieved the garden of the 'flatness' that Quarrell felt resulted from the exclusive use of annuals and
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35 Quarrell, ‘Ornamental and Flowering Shrubs’, p. 6. Quarrell, ‘Flowering Shrubs that Should be Familiar Favourites’, p. 34.
perennials.  

Quarrell believed that trees and shrubs needed to be carefully selected so as to provide year round interest through, flower, berry/fruit and seasonal leaf colour, deciduous trees especially noted for the contrast of leaf colour against the more sombre tones of evergreens.

Trees were noted for their ability to provide shade and shelter from wind as well as break the skyline behind houses of modern design. However, Quarrell gives little advice on where to plant trees other than to suggest their use as lawn specimens or the use of groups of fastigiate specimens to create a background to a feature such as a seat. Interestingly he felt that the use of single fastigiate specimens or pairs of fastigiate specimens either side of an entrance to be ineffective.

In Quarrell’s bid to relieve the ‘flatness’ that he often felt was associated with annual and perennial borders, he concentrated upon trying to induce his readers to include shrubs as both a background and throughout these plantings; dismissing the perception that shrubs belonged only in specialised shrubberies. Quarrell also recommended that shrubs be used to conceal unattractive features such as fences and the chicken run and that where space was limited that they be trimmed and trained flat.

5.2.2.3.4 Hedges

Quarrell encouraged careful consideration as to whether a garden needed a hedge or not; he felt that the local bias, especially for a tall hedge along the front boundary was often entirely unsuited to the smaller sized garden and had a tendency to turn the home into a ‘gloomy prison’. He further questioned the need for the front garden to be totally secluded from passersby believing that one of the ‘joys’ of a garden was the ability to share it with others. During the 1930s he began to question the need for front division fences at all, referring to the American model where neighbours collaborated with their planting schemes.

The only instance in which a high front hedge was permissible was if strong winds and dust were a problem. In general, Quarrell recommended that the front hedge was to be kept at a height that allowed for the creation of external views from the house, the combination of a low hedge with trees planted along the front boundary was his preferred solution. Within the garden hedges were useful for disguising the utility areas of the garden or providing a background to a flower border. Although Quarrell strongly recommended the use of trees, shrubs and climbers in place of hedges, he
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did provide lists of the most suitable hedging plants for hedges at a variety of heights including both the typical specimens and a range of flowering shrubs.\(^{41}\)

### 5.2.2.3.5 Topiary

Quarrell was vehemently opposed to topiary and pruning of any kind, which he considered to be unnecessary: in his opinion there was no better shape for a plant than its natural one. However, he did concede that some plants were more predisposed to trimming and as such they made good hedge plants. He also had no objection to the trimming of trees and shrubs contained in tubs with the proviso that they were correctly positioned and that there weren't too many of them used within the garden. It seems that Quarrell assumed that his readers knew what the correct positions and numbers were.\(^{42}\)

### 5.2.2.3.6 Lawn

Most of Quarrell’s advice regarding lawn dealt primarily with horticultural considerations and the selection of the most suitable type or combination of lawn grasses for Adelaide’s climate. It seems that he was partial to larger expanses of lawn rather than small sections cut up with various small flowerbeds. However, he was partial to:

- flowerbeds or rose beds encircling the lawn;
- large rose beds within the lawn;
- the inclusion of a circular annual bed within the lawn, into which a single hot coloured annual was massed planted;
- specimen trees such as a Canary Island date palm, *Phoenix canariensis*, planted as a feature in the middle of the front lawn;
- the replacement of smaller flowerbeds within the lawn with a small grove of trees; and,
- daffodils, naturalised within the lawn.\(^{43}\)

### 5.2.2.3.7 Creepers & Climbers

Quarrell viewed creepers and climbers as an asset that could make an artistic contribution to the garden. Quarrell recommended their use on pergolas, fences, houses, dead trees, stone work, arbours and arches. Discretion in their placement was essential as they were to clothe not smother their supports. He was particularly


adamant that they should be extensively used to clothe unattractive elements within the garden such as outbuildings and fences deploring the extent to which these items were left uncovered. Creepers and climbers were considered particularly suitable for narrow garden beds and as a replacement for hedges.\(^{44}\)

### 5.2.2.3.8 Natives

Quarrell recognised the beauty and practicality of Australian native plants. He noted that their wholesale clearance in the past had been a mistake, and pleaded for them to be included in the home garden, in parks and as street trees, in combination with those exotics more suited to the Adelaide climate. Quarrell regularly included natives within the lists of plants that he recommended to his readers.\(^{45}\)

### 5.2.2.3.9 Plant Selection

Quarrell recommended a huge variety of plant materials to his readers, both native and exotic, which he considered to be horticulturally and aesthetically worthy of inclusion within the garden.\(^{46}\) Importantly, Quarrell did differentiate between the Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills garden specifying what was best suited to each based on their horticultural requirements. Whilst he often recommended and introduced new species and cultivars for inclusion within the home garden he also favoured and recommended those plants which he considered to be old fashioned favourites such as lavender, *Lavandula* spp, pinks, *Dianthus* spp, and primroses, *Primula* spp.\(^{47}\)

### 5.2.3 John Oliver

#### 5.2.3.1 Design Elements

While Oliver included small aspects of design throughout his articles he did author two, which pertained to the gardens design: ‘How to Plan a Garden’ and ‘Planning a Formal Garden’. Oliver considered the main objectives of the garden to be the provision of ‘as many attractive pictures as possible’ and ‘convenient access to all parts of the ground from the house itself’.\(^{48}\) To achieve harmony, Oliver recommended that the house and garden be planned simultaneously and that the garden be thought of as an outdoor ‘room’ and as such as a place to be lived in and
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\(^{46}\) See Appendix 5B for a list of plant typically recommended by Quarrell for use in the Adelaide home garden.


\(^{48}\) Oliver, ‘How to plan a Garden’, p. 19.
enjoyed rather than just a space for the cultivation of flowers.\textsuperscript{49} The smaller size of the suburban block meant that the house necessarily became the most significant aspect of the garden and that the creation of garden pictures was done so in relation to the house and ‘their effectiveness when viewed from the main windows of the house’.\textsuperscript{50}

In designing the garden, pathways and the driveway were the first considerations; pathways had to lead to a definite point and the driveway was best located along the boundary leading directly from street to garage. Oliver considered driveways that swept through the grounds of these smaller blocks as ‘eyesores’. Once these primary considerations had been determined then it was possible to determine which built elements were suitable and where they should be located. One main garden feature was essential and was to be axially arranged upon the main architectural feature of the house; without this correct placement, Oliver considered that the garden would be incongruous to the house. The planting scheme was also used to achieve unity and harmony between house and garden with the use of creepers on the house walls and plantings along the house foundations.\textsuperscript{51}

‘Planning a Formal Garden’ gave direction about the creation of a formal garden ‘room’, which was either axially aligned to the house or closely related to it so as to achieve harmony. Formal gardens were considered particularly useful as a feature for a site that otherwise lacked a necessary ‘individuality and distinction’ with which to bestow upon a garden of informal design. A garden of formal design required a central feature around which the composition was based; both sundials and pools were offered as examples around which the planting scheme was arranged. Feature or accent plants were to be included within the planting scheme, which could be formed from a variety of plant types or be a specific garden, such as a rose garden.\textsuperscript{52}

5.2.3.2 Planting Scheme
5.2.3.2.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form
While Oliver wrote about the importance of foliage, flower and fruit or berry colour within the garden he primarily focused on colour schemes for the flower border; much of what he wrote appears to have been influenced by Jekyll. Oliver felt that too little thought was given to colour composition in the Adelaide garden and that without both harmony and contrast it was impossible to achieve full beauty, especially within the flower border. Outside of the flower border, Oliver recommended that the colour of the planting scheme should be harmonious not only within the planting scheme but also with the home and built features contained within the garden. As such he recommended that the planting scheme avoid extremes of colour.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{49} Oliver, ‘Tree Planting’, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{50} Oliver, ‘How to Plan a Garden’, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{51} Oliver, ‘How to Plan a Garden’, pp. 19, 37.
\textsuperscript{52} John Oliver, ‘Planning a Formal Garden’, \textit{South Australian Homes and Gardens} November 1944, pp. 15, 43.
Like Jekyll, Oliver felt that gardens of a single colour were lacking - Oliver used the classic Jekyll blue, white and yellow colour combination to demonstrate this.\(^{54}\) Other combinations that he recommended where:

- the contrasting combination of truly coloured red and blue flowers;\(^{55}\)
- a concentration of bright colours in the middle of the border tapering to pastel shades either side; and\(^{56}\)
- white, lavender, pale blue and pale yellow at either end, transitioning to pink, deeper blues, rose, mauve and deep yellow with scarlet, orange and crimson in the middle.\(^{57}\)

Unlike his predecessor, Oliver wrote specifically about light and shadow, texture, form and line of composition. Oliver felt that the finished planting scheme should be rounded and the use of conical or spire shaped plants should be limited to accents, further cautioning his readers that the overuse of accent plantings resulted in none at all. He also wrote of the use of textural effect in the creation of the illusion of distance or its foreshortening and the need to specifically study foliage texture and colour to create foliage contrast within the garden.\(^{58}\)

### 5.2.3.2.2 Flower Borders

Flower borders to Oliver were of traditional design - long wide rectangular spaces, with a foreground of lawn. The absolute minimum width allowable was six feet and the border was to be as long as possible. If this resulted in the border terminating against the boundary fence then the fence was to be clothed with creepers and a few suitable shrubs to suggest that the garden continued into the neighbouring one.\(^{59}\) The arrangement of the border was a primary concern throughout Oliver’s articles; he deprecatingly referred to borders arranged in height determined rows from tallest to smallest as looking like ‘an unattractive market stall’, further stating that such an arrangement was ‘dreary’ like the massed annuals so frequently and unimaginatively used within the garden.\(^{60}\) In arranging the border planting, Oliver recommended that the colour scheme and heights of the plants be determined and recorded on paper. The aim was to provide a ribbon of colour from late spring until early winter; the selection and arrangement of the plants was to be complementary as well as provide contrast – the border was not a space to display individual beauty. Most importantly, the heights of the plants were to be interspersed, with taller varieties occasionally brought towards the front of the border. Those plants at the edge were to be encouraged to spill over onto the lawn.\(^{61}\) Oliver was indefatigable in his
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\(^{56}\) John Oliver, ‘Flowers for the Permanent Border’, *South Australian Homes and Gardens* July 1943, pp. 21, 35, 39.

\(^{57}\) John Oliver, ‘Work in the Garden for August’, *South Australian Homes and Gardens* August 1943, pp. 39-42.


\(^{59}\) Oliver, ‘Flowers for the Permanent Border’, pp. 21, 35, 39.

\(^{60}\) John Oliver, ‘Work in the Garden for July’, *South Australian Homes and Gardens* July 1941, pp. 42-4.

recommendations for the use of annuals both generally within the garden and specifically within the flower border - they were to fill the gaps only; Oliver considered that those who predominantly used annuals within the garden were worthy of 'pitying tolerance' 62

5.2.3.2.3 Trees & Shrub

Oliver reiterated the importance of trees and shrubs within the garden throughout his articles. Trees and shrubs created 'permanence', 'atmosphere', 'peace' and 'serenity', qualities which Oliver considered to be the 'hallmarks' of the successful garden – qualities which were unobtainable with flowers. 63 Oliver stressed the importance of the inclusion of trees and shrubs within the small garden, advising that a careful study of their growth habits be undertaken before planting, as the inclusion of too large a specimen was disastrous for the garden as an examination of many of the older Adelaide gardens could attest. 64 Oliver was particularly partial to flowering and berried trees and shrubs; those with autumnal leaf colour; those that could provide year round interest; and the inclusion of fruit trees either espaliered, as a lawn specimen or trained over a pergola or similar structure. 65 Oliver particularly advocated the inclusion of a wide belt of trees and shrubs at the boundary fence to ensure adequate privacy. 66

5.2.3.2.4 Hedges

Oliver gave no direction as to how to use hedges within the garden and only generally advised his readers about the most suitable types. He strongly advised against cypress hedges, Cupressus spp, feeling that they lacked interest. This was further elucidated upon in reference to formally clipped hedges of yew, Taxus spp, which were frequently used in England; Oliver felt that this style of hedge was out of character in Adelaide. Oliver held an obvious bias for roses, Rosa spp, bougainvillea, Bougainvillea spp, fuchsias, Fuchsia spp, lavender, Lavandula spp rosemary, Rosmarinus officinalis, and English box, Buxus sempervirens, although he recommended that any shrub particularly flowering ones, which had foliage to the ground and could be trimmed could be used for hedging purposes. 67

63 Oliver, 'Tree Planting', p. 36. Oliver, 'Tree Planting Time', pp. 21, 47. Oliver, 'Flowering Trees and Shrubs', pp. 7-8.
66 Oliver, 'Planning a Garden', p. 38.
5.2.3.2.5 Topiary

The use of topiary within the garden is not mentioned by Oliver other than the inclusion of standardised trees and shrubs as emphasis points and to relieve any 'sense of flatness' within a formal garden 'room'.

5.2.3.2.6 Lawn

Oliver wrote little in regard on how to compose areas of lawn within the garden, except to lament the prevalent use of intermingled squares of lawn and annuals and to promote its association as a foreground to flowering plants. Interestingly, he felt that allowing the flowering plants, often perennials, to spill over onto the lawn was 'unconventional' but it was an action, which he encouraged. He frequently suggested the use of non-traditional grasses for lawns such as lippea, Lippea phylacanescens, chamomile, Chamomile spp, and thyme, Thymus spp, as well as suggesting that there should be areas of unmanicured lawn that were scythed when it became too long. He frequently recommended that various bulbs be naturalised within the lawn.

5.2.3.2.7 Creepers & Climbers

Oliver recommended the typical criteria for the use of creepers and climbers within the garden: that of covering unsightly fences or architectural faults within the home or garden. He also recommended their use on pergolas, on or cascading over walls and considered climbers as a potential substitute for more typical hedge plants.

5.2.3.2.8 Natives

Oliver like Quarrell lamented the limited use of native plants within the suburban garden. Oliver felt that nostalgia for England was no longer an acceptable excuse for their exclusion from the garden. Although he did specifically write a few articles about natives recommending their hardiness, beauty and uniqueness, he more importantly included them within the general list of plants provided monthly within the magazine and suggested where in the garden they could be most suitably cultivated. For example, the native violet, Viola hederacea, in the rock garden; the blue lace flower, Trachymene coerulea, as a planting in the blue section of the flower border; fenns for general garden use and shade house; amongst the more usual shrubbery and mixed border recommendations. He also made note of how certain natives were particularly sort after in England possibly in an attempt to foster a greater acceptance through the illusion of exclusivity.

5.2.3.2.9 Plant Selection

Although much of the contents of Oliver’s plants lists were typical of the Adelaide period literature he did show some lack of understanding of plant suitability for the Adelaide plains.72 Whilst many of those plants which could be considered unsuitable for the plains would have grown well in hills gardens he did not differentiate between these two areas. For example both rhododendrons and azaleas, Rhododendron spp, would have been very difficult to grow in the alkaline soils of the plains and herbaceous peonies, Paeonia lactiflora, would have been unsuccessful for all but the most lucky and skilled of plains gardeners, whilst horse chestnuts, Aesculus spp, would possibly have struggled through with significant care.73 Oliver was also vehement in his recommendations for the planting schemes for rock gardens – only those plants typically considered rock garden subjects—mainly alpines were to be grown in the rock garden. He commented most deprecatingly about those rock gardens that contained cacti and succulents.74

5.2.4 'Homebird’, McClure & Others

5.2.4.1 Design Overview

While these early articles only provided very limited specific details on garden design they did provide some of the more typical over-arching guidelines often found within the period literature. Importantly they did include a philosophical bias towards the connection between the garden and the human psyche and how this therefore directed the design of the garden. While much of the information presented is similar in vein to that provided in many of the gardening books coming into the State from overseas, it is important in that it made this type of information accessible to the wider community rather than just those who could afford to buy these books or those with the time to read them at the State Library.

The more direct design advice pertained towards a simplicity of design rather than a garden deemed as fussy. Fussy gardens were difficult to keep aesthetically pleasing throughout the year without constant labour and expense. One suggested solution for half of the garden was to lay a large portion of lawn and then surround this with a framework of trees, shrubs, perennial and ground covers with one main walk that had small subsidiary paths branching off to points of interest within the garden.75 This type of design was reiterated for gardens of smaller dimensions, where the use of shrubs around the house and flowerbeds within the lawn were to be eliminated, in

72 See Appendix 5C for a list of plants typically recommended by Oliver for use in the Adelaide home garden.
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favour of the creation of a shrubbery in a narrow band around the boundary of the block, with large unbroken panels of lawn surrounding the house.76

The more generic advice given within these articles included:
- the need for a proper plan, which was to be undertaken at the same time as the house was being planned;77
- a comprehensive survey of the site;78
- the need for the garden to reflect the style of the houses architecture; and,
- an awareness that not everything can or should be accommodated within the garden in relation to both built features and the planting scheme.79

A number of themes were covered within the three articles that pertained primarily to a philosophical understanding of the garden. These included:
- the garden as an art form;
- the intrinsic connection between garden and psyche;
- the societal benefits of gardening;
- the non discriminative nature of the garden; and,
- the role of landscape architecture and the search for an Australian garden.

‘Plan Your Garden as You Would Plan Your Home’ considered gardening to be one of the most elusive forms of art probably because it was often unrecognised as being an art form, although the creation of a garden was as much of ‘an expression of an idea’ as any other art form. It was not enough to collect the components of a garden and expect to have a garden ‘Yet a garden is what we all want. The vague disappointment in an effect, the feeling of incompletion, of falling short of what we hoped for or were seeking to attain, all these are indicative of that desire for a definite something – a something so subtle that to express it in words often eludes us, though we may feel it ever so keenly’.80 Gardening was described as a ‘greater perfection distinguished by refined subtleties’ rather than a mere collection of trees, shrubs and flowers.81

‘Gardening Just for the Fun of It’ described the garden as ‘the simplest form of ownership’ linking this space with a person’s innate need for seclusion, tranquillity, refuge, pleasure and as a place where it was possible to directly commune with nature. Within the garden you became your own master, able to determine and undertake those tasks best suiting your current disposition. More than that the garden did not discriminate but was a place for old or young, male or female and for those from all social standings. The garden was a place of recreation and physical activity where the work of gardening reinvigorated the mind.82

76 ‘Space Around the House’, Australian Homes and Gardens February 1930, p. 40.
82 ‘Gardening Just for the Fun of It’, pp. 8-9.
'Fitting the Land for Human Use A Review of the Renaissance of Garden Architecture' was an interesting article in that it attempted to define both the role and place of Landscape Architecture and as such began to argue a case for the development of an Australian garden. 'Landscape gardening' was described as the parallel of Architecture, which was itself described as the pre-eminent art form. The author felt that 'Landscape gardening' could only be 'expressive' and 'interesting' if it was treated as an 'applied art with a definite and legitimate function' – the garden had to retain its relationship with people, if it was only a thing of beauty then it would be unlikely to succeed. The author continued by describing how definite styles of Landscape Architecture reflected various cultures way of life and how they were designed to meet those cultures specific needs and as such how the transplantation of these styles to new environments were frequently unsuccessful. Of larger and more elaborate garden styles, the author felt that they had lost their links with their origins developing a universality: the creation of Italian gardens all over the world was given as an example. Australia was unconstrained in the same ways as Europe and as such the author felt that Architects and Landscape Architects should define the concept for the Australian way of life – our outdoor way of life - and as such accommodate this within the design of our buildings and gardens.

5.2.4.2 Design Elements

5.2.4.2.1 Water

The author of 'The Water Garden' noted with surprise the limited use of water features within the Adelaide garden and felt that generally Adelaide gardens suffered as a consequence. The extensive and successful use of water within Persian gardens and the similarity of climate between Adelaide and Persia were used as a means of extolling the potential virtue and beauty of including more water features, either formal or informal within the garden. It was the author's considered opinion however, that formal pools were more suitable for the suburban garden and that pools of naturalesque form were better suited to a hillside where it was possible to make them appear as if the pool were feed by a stream.

Formal pools could be sited either in the middle of the lawn as a central feature or be hidden away in some shady location to provide a place of quiet repose. The author had a preference for square and quatrefoil shaped pools believing that rectangular pools were better suited to large gardens were there was sufficient space to accommodate the suitable dimensions necessary for a pool of this shape. Oval and circular pools were recommended for informal or 'rustic' settings as the author felt that it was too difficult for the average garden owner to achieve the perfection of curve required of these shapes within a formal setting. It was recommended that 'rustic' pools be finished with a surround of crazy paving, whilst bricks and cement were recommended for more formally designed pools.

---

83 Although this article contains no by-line, the topic of the article and the image used to illustrate it suggest that the most likely author was Walter Hervey Bagot.
5.2.4.2.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Of the two articles concerning paths, ‘The Graceful Path’ and ‘Pathways Play an Important Part in the Garden Scheme’, published in the magazine during this period, the later provided the more comprehensive information on the creation of pathways in the garden. First considerations included circulation patterns, the use of the path, the selection of materials as they related to the architectural style of the house, and site considerations such as level change.87

Both articles expressed a preference for curved paths, ‘The Graceful Path’ considered a curved shape to increase the apparent size of the garden; increase the amount of promenading space; add to the beauty of the garden; and provide opportunity for hidden spots embellished with arches, arbours and seats. Straight paths were only appropriate under an avenue of trees, by hedge rows and in the utility sections of the garden.88 ‘Pathways Play an Important Part in the Garden Scheme’ was less emphatic about curved paths although it was the author’s opinion that a curved path was more interesting. Where straight paths were included within the garden they were not to be laid parallel or close to the driveway.89

‘Pathways Play an Important Part in the Garden Scheme’ gave further direction on material types, their cost and suitability for various locations within the garden; suitable widths were also discussed. Materials included concrete, brick, flagstones, flat stone, crushed stone, gravel, sand, turf, macadam and tanbark. Flagstones set into the lawn were considered to create the most natural looking path, while lawn paths were considered essential in low traffic areas of the garden, especially when connected to the rose and/or perennial garden. Three simple patterns were illustrated and included, crazy, stepping-stones and random rectangular paving.90

5.2.4.2.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

‘Homebird’ considered that a rockery was one feature of the English garden that could be adapted for use in the suburban garden. Ideal locations for the rockery were often those areas of the garden considered to be difficult such as a corner or shaded fence. ‘Homebird’ also felt that rockeries built in the middle of a large lawn achieved a good effect and that they could be adapted to form terrace walls in sloping gardens. Very little advice was given on construction techniques other than to suggest that the owner take their time over its construction so as to achieve an artistic effect. Cement was not recommended and the selection of the rock or stone was to be of a suitable size and strength for its position within the rockery.91

87 ‘Pathways Play an Important Part in the Garden Scheme’, Australian Homes and Gardens July 1930, p. 27.
88 ‘The Graceful Path’, p. 27.
89 ‘Pathways Play an Important Part in the Garden Scheme’, p. 27.
91 Homebird, pp. 14-5.
5.2.4.2.4 Small Features – Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

McClure felt that the use of garden ornaments provided relief from mediocrity within the home garden and that garden ornaments could be used to provide new attractions within the garden especially as landscape gardening became progressively more fashionable. McClure was careful to note that the style of ornament should be in keeping with the style of the house. Although the choice and placement of ornaments within the garden largely depended on the artistic ability of the owner, McClure did suggest that by observing their surroundings whilst travelling, even within the state, that it was possible to achieve ‘most interesting decorations’. Ornaments suggested by McClure as being suitable for the home garden included, well heads, seats, sandpits, sundials, birdbaths, small terra cotta statues and historic ornament such as ships cannons and anchors. Both rustic timber-work and rustic stone-work were favoured, concrete forms were to be colour rendered.

5.2.4.2.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Rustic work within the suburban garden was considered an artistic method for incorporating some of the natural appeal, found in larger English gardens. While ‘Homebird’ considered rustic work a suitable medium for numerous garden features she felt that a rose pergola was a particularly suitable and artistic project for the garden. Scrub gum was considered to be the most suitable material from which to build rustic features. See figure 5.2.4.2.5a. McClure further combined rustic timber-work with brushwood feeling that the use of these natural materials helped to restore ‘the wooded effect so often lost in the home garden’, recommending the use of these materials to create fences, arbours and arches. McClure’s solution for the homebuilders lament at having a seasonal creek running through their property was to construct a rustic bridge over the creek as ‘one takes a sheer delight in walking over a rustic bridge, even if a stream does not run beneath’. The ‘picture’ that such a construction would create could be further enhanced with the addition of rustic pergolas at either end.

---

92 McClure, p. 52.
93 The statues referred to by McClure were known as “lefco” statues, they were approximately 50cm tall and were made from terra cotta and glazed with a matt finish. McClure, p. 24.
94 McClure, pp. 22-4.
95 Homebird, pp. 14, 17.
96 McClure, p. 23.
97 McClure, p. 23.
98 McClure, p. 23.
Figure 5.2.4.2.5a This image of a ‘rustic’ pergola was used to illustrate the reprinted version of McClure’s earlier article.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens July 1932, p. 53.)

5.2.4.2.6 Level Change – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens
While advising that a change in level could be accommodated by either a slope or retaining wall, the author of ‘Make Retaining Walls a Thing of Beauty’ felt that retaining walls provided a definite benefit to the design of the garden. Retaining walls could define boundaries, introduced texture and variety and create a background for the planting scheme. A variety of retaining wall types were suggested including dry-stone, masonry either solid or veneer and reinforced concrete. The materials selected were dependant on the nature of the site and the type of planting although the author was clear in emphasising that if the wall was near the house that it needed to be constructed from the same or similar materials used in the construction of the house. Otherwise the wall needed to harmonise with its surroundings within the garden. On a practical level, the article provided enough detail about the constructional requirements of retaining walls to make it possible for the home owner to calculate wall heights, widths and foundation requirements and included diagrams of the main types for all but the very largest walls.99

5.3 Newspapers & Nursery Publications

5.3.1 Background
Five main Adelaide newspapers provided significant gardening content through their weekly gardening columns, these included the daily newspapers The Register and The Advertiser and the weekly published The Observer, The Chronicle and The Mail. The shared nature of the journalistic and gardening content indicates affiliations between The Register and The Observer, both owned by branches of the Thomas family, and an affiliation between The Advertiser, The Chronicle and The


The communality between the newspapers saw the influence of a number of key horticultural professionals upon the Adelaide gardening public. Of these the most influential and prolific writer was Alfred J Quarrell. As well as fulfilling the role of garden editor and main garden contributor to the South Australian Homes and Gardens magazine, Quarrell was also the garden columnist for both The Mail and The Advertiser writing under the nom-de-plume of ‘Speargrass’. After Quarrell’s death late in 1940 Jack Kemp from Kemp’s Nurseries took over Quarrell’s newspaper columns; Kemp wrote under the nom-de-plume of ‘Grevillea’. Olive Mellor replaced Kemp during the late 1940s at The Advertiser and used the nom-de-plume ‘Quercus’; these articles along with her work for The Australian Home Beautiful would form the basis of her book the Complete Australian Gardener Illustrated. Edna Walling contributed a number of weekly garden articles to The Advertiser during the mid-1930s, although interestingly these were not contained within the gardening pages but rather within a section entitled ‘The Modern Home’. The main contributors for The Observer were the unidentified ‘Agricola’, ‘Dog Rose’ and ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’. Frank Fairey, writing under the nom-de-plume ‘Greenleaf’, contributed the gardening column ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’. Fairey, as ‘Greenleaf’, also contributed to E&W Hackett’s Gardening Bulletin.

Quarrell’s newspaper articles were of a similar tone to those contained within South Australian Homes and Gardens and as such his work has been extensively reviewed in Section 5.2.2. Similarly, the body of work undertaken by both Mellor and Walling has been covered in Chapter Four. Of the remaining horticultural contributors ‘Agricola’, ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’ and Fairey are the most significant as

---


102 Aitken and Looker, p. 343.
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104 Jones, ‘Limestone, Silver Birch, Pelargonium in the Dry State’, p. 73.
they provided more than just horticultural advice and plant lists to their readers. To varying degrees, they covered design and social linkages between the garden and gardening.

5.3.2 ‘Agricola’

5.3.2.1 Background

The identity of ‘Agricola’ is unknown but he/she authored the majority of the content for the gardening pages of The Observer throughout the 1920s in a section entitled ‘The Garden’. This section of The Observer would be retitled ‘The Amateur Gardener’ in late 1928 and although it did not contain a by-line much of the information presented was of a similar vein to that which preceded it. ‘Agricola’ included a range of information within ‘The Garden’ and although most of this information was practical horticulture for the home gardener ‘Agricola’ also included basic design advice and book reviews of design related gardening books.\(^{105}\)

5.3.2.2 Design Overview

As well as expressing his/her own ideas on garden design within the pages of ‘The Garden’, ‘Agricola’ presented a number of design related articles and/or garden plans from other sources that he/she considered might assist in the development of local gardens. These articles and/or garden plans included:

- two articles with accompanying plans by E.N. Ward, the superintendent of The Sydney Botanic Garden and reprinted from The New South Wales Agricultural Gazette;\(^{106}\)
- an article and garden plan from The Leader; and,\(^{107}\)
- a garden plan from an unknown source.\(^{108}\)

Ward presented only the most basic of design information focusing on ground preparation and horticultural considerations. The first article presented two possible designs for a front garden of regular shape; one was intended to be planted as a shrubbery and the other as a rose garden. The second article presented the third design which was for a garden on an irregularly shaped and sloped block, the main feature of which was a large rockery next to the house to facilitate the level change. These designs were highly reminiscent in form to that of those designs presented by John Claudius Loudon for suburban gardens and as such were somewhat typical of Adelaide front garden designs from the later half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\(^{109}\) See figures 5.3.2.2a-c.

---

\(^{105}\) See Appendix 5D for a representative list of gardening books reviewed in The Observer.


The article from The Leader is very similar in tone to Henry Ernest Milner's book The Art and Practice of Landscape Gardening in that it reads as an abridgment of the major themes of that work. The accompanying plan was, however, more gardenesque in feel than those presented by Milner.  

110 See figure 5.3.2.2d.
The garden plan from the unknown source is more architecturally and axially designed. Although the simple curved structure of the garden away from the house was obtained from the composition of the planting scheme, that next to the house is reliant on formal built and plant elements. These elements included a connected terrace and pergola adjacent to the main rooms of the house and a formally shaped panel of lawn, bounded by clipped box hedges, *Buxus* spp, that contained a birdbath as a feature at one end.\(^{111}\) See figure 5.3.2.2e.

![Figure 5.3.2.2e The garden plan reproduced from an unknown source.](image)

(Source: *The Observer* 23 February 1924, p. 13.)

‘Agricola’ emphasised simplicity of layout and pre-planning in the design of the garden, especially small gardens, and was predominantly reliant upon the planting scheme to create the design and structure of the space. The garden tended to be composed of a lawn expanse, shrubberies and flowerbeds with a simple straight or slightly curved path to provide the most direct access to the house. Shrubberies tended to clothe the boundaries with rose and/or flowerbeds adjacent to the lawn. Foundation planting was also an integral component of this design ethos linking the house and garden. This is in keeping with his/her preference for Landscape Gardening as shown via the articles on design that ‘Agricola’ selected for reproduction within the pages of ‘The Garden’.\(^{112}\)

### 5.3.2.3 Design Elements

‘Agricola’ made little reference to the use of built elements within the design of the garden. Limited information on paths, driveways, rock gardens, pergolas and summerhouses was conveyed. Pergolas and summerhouses were covered through a summary report of a lecture delivered by the Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden, Frederick Bailey. Bailey made reference to their current popularity and suitability for displaying creeping and climbing plants.\(^{113}\) ‘Agricola’ also made

---

\(^{111}\) ‘A Useful Plan for a 50-ft Frontage Block’, p. 13.


\(^{113}\) Agricola, ‘Planning a Garden Advice of Mr Bailey’, p. 15.
frequent references to the rock garden surrounding the Palm House in the Botanic Garden.\(^{114}\) See figure 6.3.3d.

### 5.3.2.3.1 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Paths had to have a definite purpose and lead as directly as possible to their objective. ‘Paths are meant for use and not to make a crazy pattern’.\(^{115}\) Straight and slightly curved paths were deemed most suitable with a slightly curved path preferred over a straight one. Curvaceous paths, those paths that were more of a serpentine nature, were to be avoided as they made the garden appear smaller than it actually was.\(^{116}\) Crazy paved paths, with plantings both on and to the side of, were noted as being a current trend in English gardens, which would be well suited to Adelaide Hills gardens.\(^{117}\)

The only example of driveways was made in reference to a drive at a property on Grove Street, Unley Park. The author thought this particular driveway skilfully displayed a winding drive in the landscape gardening style. The sides of the drive were edged with hedges, and concealing shrubs at the curves gave the impression that its destination was some distance, although this was not the case. The placement of trees and shrubs at the curves of paths was likewise recommended so as to produce a ‘natural look’.\(^{118}\)

### 5.3.2.4 Planting Scheme

#### 5.3.2.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

‘Agricola’ regarded colour, texture, scale and form to be important considerations when planning and planting the garden, especially in relation to the permanent planting scheme - the trees and shrubs. However, with the exception of colour little practical advice or example was provided to the readers. For example, in relation to planting a shrub border, ‘Agricola’ wrote ‘Grouping and arrangement will depend entirely on soil and climatic requirements, the colour and texture of the foliage, the time of flowering and the colour of the blossom’.\(^{119}\) While foliage, flower and berry or fruit colour, period of flowering and plant sizes were provided as well as flower colour and foliage colour combinations little is mentioned in relation to the differing foliage textures or how to combine them. Foliage colour was particularly important, ‘Agricola’ suggested combinations of evergreen and deciduous shrubs, the selection of trees and shrubs for autumnal colour effects and was partial to the combination of purple leaved specimens with those of grey foliage, particularly prunus with acacias.\(^{120}\) Floral colour combinations for flower borders were simple and generally composed from only a few different colour shades and tones. Harmony between the colours was paramount with some contrast added to heighten the effect. Whilst a


\(^{118}\) Among the Shrub Planting a Shrubbery’, The Observer 6 April 1929, p. 12.


range of colours were used, 'Agricola' was more cautionary of hot colours, especially reds.  

5.3.2.4.2 Flower Borders

'Agricola' felt that the most suitable situation for flowerbeds in the average suburban garden was surrounding the lawn with further beds against the house. The planting scheme for the flowerbed at the front of the house was to contain tall specimens so as to create a background for the rest of the garden. While the beds against the sides of the house could be planted in a 'ribbon' style if desired, it was however, clearly stated that this was the only area in the garden where such a planting could be undertaken.  

5.3.2.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

'After the establishment of the lawn, the permanent features of the garden are the next consideration. These are trees.'

Trees, especially shade trees, were considered essential components of the garden. Large specimen trees were generally preferred at the rear of the house where they formed a background rather than being planted in the front garden, although this was not a hard and fast rule as the primary purpose of these trees were to shade the house. Flowering and ornamental trees and shrubs added dignity and relieved the 'flatness' of the garden. 'Agricola' generally suggested their placement in mixed plantings along the boundary to create privacy and the impression of a larger garden.

Shrubs provided the 'foundation' of the garden linking the background and foreground 'to form the middle distance' whilst providing cut flowers and 'patches of colour to show off the annuals and perennials in the borders'. Specific notes on the arrangement of and spacings between the plantings in the shrubbery were provided so as to prevent a 'jungle' from forming. The general arrangement saw large shrubs planted at the rear with small shrubs placed in the foreground, specific spacings between plants were given, for example, shrubs that would ultimately reach eight feet in height should be spaced ten feet apart. This was to allow their natural forms to be appreciated and avoid the disfigurement of pruning. Shrubbery were promoted as 'probably the most important class of plants in the up-to-date garden' primarily for their labour saving abilities with the shrubbery used to define boundaries, frame the lawn and screen out undesirable views.

---

5.3.2.4.4 Hedges
Although not expressly stated, it seems most likely that the inclusion of hedges within the garden was in relation to that along the front boundary of the property only. While Bailey, reported in the pages of ‘The Garden’, believed that the selection of a hedge was one of the first considerations when planting the garden, ‘Agricola’ was not so emphatic on the inclusion of hedges. Agricola was firmly of the belief that the front boundary of the garden was defined either by a decorative fence or a hedge grown through a cyclone wire fence. The combination of hedge and ornamental fence was considered to ‘always look ridiculous’. Agricola suggested the inclusion of a path between the front boundary hedge and the adjoining bed to help facilitate ease of clipping and to prevent competition between the hedge and the plants of the adjoining bed.

5.3.2.4.5 Topiary
As nothing specific was mentioned in relation to topiary, it seems unlikely that ‘Agricola’ was an ardent supporter of this form of plant training. This seems likely in view of the fact that he gave very definite plant spacings so as to avoid the cramping or pruning of shrubs so that they could obtain their natural form. However, pictorially the elaborate topiary work in Mr J Bower’s garden at Stirling was featured and endorsed as a good example of this style of gardening.

5.3.2.4.6 Lawn
‘The foundation of most gardens is the lawn ... as it is the setting which is to show off the flowers, trees, and shrubs, or is, in other words, the background on which the picture or landscape is to be painted’.

The lawn was to be spacious, useful and as unbroken as possible. Unnecessary paths and little geometric flowers beds were to be avoided as they diminished the apparent size of the garden making it feel small and ‘toy’ like, although the inclusion of the odd circular bed within the lawn seems to have been acceptable. Wide borders and beds of perennials, annuals, shrubs or roses were all acceptable lawn boundary plantings.

5.3.2.4.7 Creepers & Climbers
‘Agricola’ did not extensively cover the use of creepers and climbers as a design element within the garden. Instead, suitable specimens for use in the garden were listed in a matter of fact manner and their placement was left to the discretion of the garden owner. However, creeper and climber clad trellis placed so as to disguise unpleasant aspects within the garden was recommended. Pictorially, the images ‘Agricola’ selected to illustrate the pages of ‘The Garden’ depicted the use of

129 Agricola, ‘Planning a garden Advice of Mr Bailey’, p. 15.
creepers and climbers covering garden shelters, arbours, pergolas, fences, house walls, planted so as to enclose the front verandah, and their placement upon tripods within the garden.¹³⁷

5.3.2.4.8 Natives

‘Agricola’ treated natives with the same regard he/she bestowed on non-natives and although they were occasionally presented to the readers in native-specific articles they were dealt with in the same manner as non-natives; their chief attributes and their most suitable applications within the garden were listed. Unlike other garden writers who tended to plead for the inclusion of natives within the garden, ‘Agricola’ just regularly reminded the readers not to forget that there were many suitable natives for the home garden. Due to ‘Agricola’s’ obvious association with the Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden, there were recommendations for a surprisingly large number of natives as well as advice on whether or not they could be viewed within the grounds of the Botanic Garden. Similarly, ‘Agricola’ apprised the readers of their availability from local nurserymen.¹³⁸ Although ‘Agricola’ adopted a subtle written tone of endorsement, pictorially the articles illustrated the beauty and necessity of retaining mature specimens within both the garden and the landscape surrounding the garden, stating of one such image that ‘the background of eucalypts enhances the beauty of the surroundings’.¹³⁹

5.3.2.4.8 Plant Selection

‘Agricola’ presented a period typical range of plants to the readers, focusing on trees, shrubs and natives rather than annuals and perennials.¹⁴⁰

5.3.3 ‘The Garden Lover’ by ‘A Professional Women Gardener’

5.3.3.1 Background

‘The Garden Lover’, written by ‘A Professional Women Gardener’, first appeared within ‘Elizabeth Leigh’s Pages for Women’ in The Observer on August 1929 and ran relatively regularly although not quite weekly until January 1930. A few articles of a similar vein were published prior to these dates under a different pen name. The column seems to have been created in answer to the belief that regular gardening columns were aimed at men and the understanding that the general gardening aims of men and women were entirely different. Men being more competitively minded were

¹⁴⁰ See Appendix 5E for a list of plants typically recommended by ‘Agricola’ for use in the Adelaide home garden.
focused on the production of the biggest and best specimen and as such the garden was dominated by flowerbeds for this purpose. The author also lamented that women in general seemed to have become disconnected from the garden and gardening, their work being more focused within the home; this was both to the detriment of the home and spiritually to the women themselves. A women’s garden should be ‘places of peace, where cares may be laid aside, and worries forgotten – great out-of-doors rooms, where everybody may feel at home, and have a share in the health giving magic which comes from the spade and trowel’. The identity of the author or authors is unknown. Although there are a number of potential candidates, the seemingly most obvious include Cornish, Elizabeth Leigh, Margaret McGuire, Mary Parkhouse or any of the three unidentified women locally trained in horticulture by Adelaide hills nursery-woman Coralie Caley Smith.

5.3.3.2 Design Overview

While ‘The Garden Lover’ was obviously cognisant of a range of current and past garden styles from England, North America and Europe, she held an obvious bias for both the English walled and cottage gardens following the English resurgence in the late nineteenth century for these styles of gardening. ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’ adapted the constructs of the walled garden and instilled its essence into her design for the back garden and arranged the front garden, especially small front gardens, in a cottage garden mode. Only in the back garden was it possible to obtain the ‘suggestion of peace and seclusion’ the ‘privacy, the faint air of mystery ... essential to the romance of a garden’. The walls of the garden were composed from creepers, climbers and shrubs; a large lawn and large shade trees were essential components whilst flagstone paths, a sundial, a water feature and tub plants were all possible features within the composition.

‘The Garden Lover’, although very aware of the origins of the front lawn, was derisory of its inclusion especially in small front gardens and rather wished that suburban garden owners would look to the English cottage garden rather than the English mansion garden for inspiration.

5.3.3.3 Design Elements

5.3.3.3.1 Water

‘A Professional Women Gardener’, advocated the use of water in the garden stating that she could ‘imagine nothing more fascinating than to bring the deep peace of still water to one’s own garden’ and that if a mountain lake was unavailable then it was possible to ‘at least fashion a lily pond beside which we can dream’. Little practical design advice was given. The article dealt more specifically with the basics

144 ‘Flowers and Flower Gardens’, p. 54.
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of construction and the most suitable plants to grow both in and around the pool - the inclusion of and reflection cast by iris was considered particularly entrancing. It seems most likely that a pool or irregular outline or of the simplest geometrical shapes such as a rectangle were the most likely intended forms. The most suitable location for the pool was within the shelter of either a building or trees and shrubs, the later could be planted right up to the waters edge if the pool was constructed slightly lower than ground level. Care was to be taken with the siting and planting of trees and shrubs to ensure that they did not cast shade over the entire surface of the water.148

5.3.3.3.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

‘For the picturesque garden nothing can take the place of paved walks’.149 The ‘Professional Women Gardener’ advocated the use of both stone and aged brick within the garden finding that they ‘set off’ the colours of the flowers. While architects tended to favour squared stone set in concrete, ‘The Garden Lover’ had a preference for unconcreted crazy paving believing that it allowed for greater artistic expression in the design of the path and the softening inclusion of small plants. The middle of the path was to be kept clear of planting. Crazy paving with planted joints was also recommended for little courtyards, which were further decorated with tub plants.150 Within the small garden the front path led directly from gate to door, was centred and was the only path dividing the garden.151

5.3.3.3.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

‘The Garden Lover’ felt that the fascination of the rock garden was largely due to the possibility for the creation of a whole garden in miniature that could transform a ‘neglected corner...into a place of beauty’.152 In siting the rock garden the needs of the plants were of paramount importance but neither was it to be placed too close to formal surroundings, especially cultivated lawns, and flower borders. The rock garden was not a pile of rocks rather the elevation was created through the massing of earth into which the broad face of the rock was to be sunk, tilted slightly backwards, with the plants covering the joins between the rocks. A crazy path through the rock garden was considered ‘delightful’ and was achieved through the placement of sunken irregular stone slabs, grey gravel paths were also considered suitable. A range of plant materials was recommended including both alpines and smaller succulents.153

5.3.3.3.4 Small Features – Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Although sundials were considered the domain of a walled garden, ‘The Garden Lover’ strove to re-create the essence of this style of garden within the back garden and as such recommend their inclusion. It seems likely that a formal setting was intended: although not explicitly stated, the sundial being used in combination with
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lawn and flag paths.\textsuperscript{154} Birdbaths, if sited correctly, were rather over optimistically compared with having a creek running through the garden; the birdbath was to be informally placed close to a suitable tree or shrub.\textsuperscript{155}

Seats were considered integral to the garden: the smallest of gardens was considered unfinished if it did not possess a seat while large gardens relinquished a portion of their beauty without them, as the ability to stop and relax within the garden was lost. Seats were to be sited partially under a tree and could be as simple as a bench or a more elaborate affair that encircled the tree’s trunk. Colourful stripped canvas cushions, that could be taken into the garden, were also recommended.\textsuperscript{156}

The use of pots, tubs, and painted half wine barrels, were the only garden features to be consistently mentioned throughout the series of articles. ‘The Garden Lover’ lamented the under utilisation of both tubs and proper pots in Adelaide, especially when compared with Sydney and Melbourne. This was due in part to the belief that the average Adelaide garden was bigger than its interstate counterparts and as such did not have to rely as heavily upon them.\textsuperscript{157}

Half wine barrels, most commonly painted green or white and occasionally blue were most frequently referred to, possibly as they were less expensive than the other options. ‘The Garden Lover’ also referred to pots made in concrete of ‘Italian’ form; vases; urns; Easter jars; troughs, for use on the verandah; and molten ore pots in Florentine designs, made locally at Wallaroo.\textsuperscript{158} Pots and tubs were used to:
- denote and soften the interface between a path and the front door;
- terminate a walk;
- mark a stairway;
- fill an awkward corner in the garden;\textsuperscript{159}
- provide planting space and decorate small courtyards;
- enhance paths, adding an element of formality when containing formally clipped specimens; and,\textsuperscript{160}
- highlight and adorn seats.\textsuperscript{161}

5.3.3.3.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

The use of larger built elements within the garden was limited to the inclusion of creeper clad shelters as a part of the secluded back garden.\textsuperscript{162}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{154} ‘Flowers and Flower Gardens’, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{155} A Bird Bath for Your Garden’, The Observer 4 September 1930, p 54.
\textsuperscript{156} A Professional Woman Gardener, ‘The Garden Lover’, 16 November 1929, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{157} A Professional Woman Gardener, ‘The Garden Lover’, The Observer 7 September 1929, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{158} A Professional Woman Gardener, ‘The Garden Lover’, 7 September 1929, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{159} A Professional Woman Gardener, ‘The Garden Lover’, 16 November 1929, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{162} ‘Flowers and Flower Gardens’, p. 54.
\end{flushright}
5.3.3.4 Planting Scheme

5.3.3.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

Colour was very much a secondary consideration to texture, scale and form for ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’. Form and texture were a consistent theme throughout the articles. While colour, texture, scale and form were primarily related to the permanent planting scheme of trees and shrubs, consideration of these elements was also provided in relation to the transient planting scheme. Both colours and textures were to be massed and contrasted within the garden and while both trees and shrubs provided both colour and texture, shrubs were specifically noted for their infinite colour massing and contrasting possibilities while trees were specifically noted for their textural scope. The ‘fantastic’ patterns of native trees were especially recommended.163 No specific colour schemes were detailed other than a description of Princess Mary’s blue border at Goldsborough Hall in England. While the limited lists of the favoured blue, white, pink and yellow plants were favoured, some scope was provided for the more hotly coloured flowers, especially within the transient planting scheme.164

5.3.3.4.2 Flower Borders

Although traditional flower borders were a component of ‘The Garden Lover’s’ garden, she provided general rather than specific detail on their inclusion. ‘There would be borders of sweet herbaceous plants, to remind us that violas and Iceland poppies are not the only possible edgings’.165 Flowerbeds were suggested for the front garden, bordering either the main path or lawn and massed borders of bulbs or flag iris were suggested for longer paths within the garden. A suitable background was essential for the herbaceous border ‘the colour and form of the flowers are doubly appreciated...when seen against a bank of healthy green’.166 The easiest solution was to use creeper and climber clad trellis while that composed from evergreens was considered the most difficult. Orange trees, Citrus sinensis, were also considered a suitable companion planting for the flower border.167 The only description of a border was that of Princess Mary’s at Goldsborough Hall in England to provide some idea of the importance of scale, foliage colour and texture and the need for plant density within a successful herbaceous border.168

165 ‘Flowers and Flower Gardens’, p. 54.
166 ‘Making a Garden Background’, p. 68.
5.3.3.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

'The Garden Lover' considered trees and shrubs essential to garden making and made reference to the fact that it was rare to see an American house and garden without at least one large specimen tree. Shrubbery beds of flowering shrubs were to be included in all but the smallest of gardens where their inclusion and arrangement was to be determined during the planning stages rather than as a haphazardly placed afterthought. Large specimen trees were essential in the creation of an 'English' garden and provided areas of shaded seclusion as well as windbreaks. Smaller trees were used within the perennial border and as paired specimens in the front lawns of smaller gardens especially those houses of Spanish Mission style; oranges, Citrus sinensis, were noted as being particularly suitable for both examples. Shrubs were used in shrubbery borders to provide the 'walls' of the secluded garden as well as amongst the flower border, particularly for the provision of either a flowering or evergreen background.

5.3.3.4.4 Hedges

Little mention was made of the use of hedges within the garden other than the potential of the native shrub Westringia to be hedged.

5.3.3.4.5 Topiary

'The Garden Lover' only referred to the use of topiary in reference to formally clipped specimens within pots; the reference made specifically in relation to their decorative potential when arranged next to straight paths.

5.3.3.4.6 Lawn

Lawn was an integral part of 'The Garden Lover’s' garden: her ideal situation being a secluded 'carpet' of lawn large enough to walk in, lie on or sit under the shade of a large tree. 'The Garden Lover' was not interested in small 'handkerchief' lawns and if there was only sufficient space for such then she rathered that the lawn be removed in preference for a cottage style garden.

5.3.3.4.7 Creepers & Climbers

'The Garden Lover' used creepers and climbers in three basic ways: trained over shelters within the back garden to assist in making it both appear and feel like a walled garden; as a tub plant, spilling over the sides of the container; and, to cover trellis screens in the formation of a background for the flower border.

169 'Flowers and Flower Gardens', p. 54.
170 A Professional Woman Gardener, 'The Garden Lover Flowering Shrubs', p. 45.
172 A Professional Woman Gardener, 'The Garden Lover', The Observer 5 October 1929, p. 52.
5.3.3.4.8 Natives
Although natives did not form a significant component of the content of ‘The Garden Lover’ articles, it was obvious that ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’ held them in high regard. She considered that the local population was too conservative in their selection of the more typical exotic trees and shrubs and considered that many natives were suitable for inclusion within the garden. Significantly, if there was only sufficient space within the garden for one or two trees then she recommended that natives be used, especially for their ‘fantastic pattern’ and ‘the alluring suggestion of natural growth’.176

5.3.3.4.9 Plant Selection
Of those plants listed by ‘A Professional Women Gardener’, most tended to be typical of those commonly listed within the popular literature with the exception of natives.177 Whilst Eucalypts and other more typically included natives were alluded to, ‘The Garden Lover’ concentrated on recommending the less commonly mentioned natives such as the quandong, Santalum acuminatum.178

5.3.4 Frank Fairey – ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’
5.3.4.1 Background
‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ was the invention of Frank Fairey, the managing director of E&W Hackett’s nursery and a horticultural writer, writing under the nom-de-plume of ‘Greenleaf’, for both The Observer and The Gardening Bulletin. ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ began as a regular weekly column in The Observer beginning circa 1910 and continued until January 1925, when it transferred to E&W Hackett’s The Gardening Bulletin, continuing in a monthly format until Fairey’s death in 1942. As ‘Greenleaf’, Fairey also contributed regular specific horticultural advice to the readers of The Gardening Bulletin between 1917 and 1942.179

Although ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ was used primarily as a vehicle for the delivery of basic design and horticultural gardening advice, in a friendly personal way, it allowed Fairey the opportunity to make social and philosophical comment outside the purely horticultural scope of his other columns. Recurrent themes that Fairey addressed on a regular basis were the role of women in the domestic garden as

---

both garden owner and as a career, and the links between the garden and social respectability.180

Through ‘Mrs Brown’, Fairey acknowledged not only the role that women played within their own garden, but also promoted gardening as a suitable career for women. ‘It’s all very well for some of you men ter snigger at us women gardeners, but all I know is that some of the best gardeners you hear of has been women.’181

Fairey believed that women were primarily responsible for most of the domestic garden schemes carried out and their associated planning, and that without their involvement that there would be fewer and less beautiful suburban gardens.182 After a trip to Melbourne, which entailed a visit to the Burnley School of Primary Agriculture and Horticulture in 1922, Fairey again through ‘Mrs Brown’ wrote about how a number of girls were being trained to undertake positions as gardeners stating that the women were employed after their training at the same rates of pay as men and that employers preferred women gardeners to men as they were considered to be more reliable and trustworthy. As a result, there where, at the time, insufficient women either trained or enrolled to fulfil the need.183

Considering the primary role of ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ was as a gardening column and one of some note, Fairey used it to level some reasonably severe social critique upon Adelaide. Obviously upset by societal changes due to the First World War, Fairey used ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’, to comment on a range of topics including the laziness of men, the fast pace of living and women’s fashionable dress, that was considered to be too scanty.184 On a less severe note and in relation to the garden and gardening, Fairey advocated the social benefits of the garden. He believed that those who had a garden were more likely to have better relationships than the ‘runabouts’ who could not be bothered. He further stated that the garden, irrespective of its size, was commonly used to judge the owner and his establishment. On a totally practical level he maintained that a garden increased the value of the house.185

5.3.4.2 Design Overview

The most consistent and fundamental aspect of garden design that Fairey offered through ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ was thought and planning before action within the garden; this advice pertained to both the pleasure and utility gardens. While the pleasure garden was more frequently the primary topic of the discussions between ‘Mrs Brown’ and ‘Greenleaf’, Fairey did regularly include within the column advice relating to the utility garden. The main function of the back garden was for the production of home-grown fruits and vegetables, cut flowers and untidy plants. Although Fairey made his living out of providing gardening advice to the general public, he advised his readers through ‘Mrs Brown’ to experiment and not just blindly follow the advice given by the experts. He also could not abide those who could not be bothered thinking about the composition of their garden, considering them to be worse than those gardener’s who were unfortunate enough to have little or no taste.

While much of the thought and planning within the columns did pertain to seasonal colour schemes, ‘Mrs Brown’ did offer more general factors for consideration in the development of the garden. Fairey wanted his readers to think about their plant selection, not just acquire specimens because they were available, rare or fashionable. He wanted his readers to think about how the plant material was to be used, what effect it would have in the garden, its size and whether or not there was space to adequately accommodate it.

There was no room in ‘Mrs Brown’s’ garden for plants that did not perform well. All plants were given a specific amount of time to prove themselves within the scope of what Fairey considered and promoted to be acceptable care, and if they did not do well within that timeframe they were removed or in some cases transplanted and given a temporary reprieve. Although Fairey wanted his readers to think about and then plan their gardens he did not necessarily want them to become bogged down within this process. ‘Mrs Brown’ attempted to provide his readers with a middle ground between their desire for instant results and the impact that a little bit of time, thought and care about the plants and the provision of their basic necessary horticultural needs could have upon the ultimate appearance of the garden.

---

189 Greenleaf, ‘Marier Garden Artist’, The Observer 7 February 1920, p. 11.
5.3.4.3 Design Elements

Fairey, through ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’, offered very little built or structural design advice to his readers, instead concentrating on plant usage, groupings and the introduction of new species and cultivars for use in the Adelaide garden. The limited advice given is very basic and covers an insignificant proportion of the usual garden components of the period. Advice on relative bed widths in the front garden as per those used at ‘Greenlea’, ‘Mrs Brown’s’ garden, was proffered. Fairey stating that the minimum width should be three feet, although he considered four feet to be better; the bed widths also needed to be varied so as to achieve a good garden perspective. The example offered consisted of a simple bed configuration for the front garden, four rectangular beds arranged around a central, rectangular panel of lawn. If the two side beds and that against the fence were three feet wide then the fourth bed against the house needed to be five feet wide. This prevented a typical optical illusion that would have otherwise made the fourth bed appear much narrower than the others.\(^{193}\)

Other perfunctory advice included:

- the use of straight paths in small gardens, curved paths were considered suitable only in large gardens where there was the space for them to look good; and,\(^{194}\)
- the use of hedging, rather than trellis to create separate garden areas.\(^{195}\)

5.3.4.4 Planting Scheme

5.3.4.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

‘Mrs Brown’ made little comment on scale, form and texture within the garden, reserving the majority of her comments for colour, which she espoused through her regular descriptions of the current arrangement of her own flower borders and beds. To give credence to these schemes, Fairey, in one of his earliest articles, through ‘Greenleaf’ describes ‘Mrs Brown’s’ ‘faculty of planting correctly’. ‘Her colour schemes are seldom at fault – her idea of perspective is good, and her idea of grace and elegance all go to show the mind of the true artist, untaught certainly; but none the worse for that’.\(^{196}\) In the mind of the reader, Fairey was trying to create a parallel between ‘Mrs Brown’ and Gertrude Jekyll and in doing so add authority to his own concepts.

While reference is often made to Jekyll, and her works are a perceptible influence, especially those in relation to colour, the schemes outlined by ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ show only a rudimentary ability in the translation of Jekyll’s colour concepts to the garden at ‘Greenlea’. ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ seemed to have only a clear understanding of individual colour relationships as outlined by Jekyll, and appeared to have difficulty in combining those elements to form a cohesive whole. For example ‘Mrs Brown’ often combined a single shade of blue with a single shade of yellow within a bed, utilising to an extent Jekyll’s ideas on the combination


\(^{194}\) Greenleaf, ‘Marier Interferes’, The Observer 5 May 1923, p. 11.


\(^{196}\) Greenleaf, ‘Marier Garden Artist’, p. 11.
of blue and yellow. Other similar types of basic colour combinations based on Jekyll’s more complex ideas also regularly appeared.\textsuperscript{197}

‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ were unable to achieve, with any real degree of success, what Jekyll described as the practice of gardening as fine art. ‘In practice it is to place every plant or group of plants with such thoughtful care and definite intention that they shall form a part of a harmonious whole...’. The ‘successive portions’ and ‘single details’, do not readily ‘show a series of pictures’\textsuperscript{198} instead more often tending to be disjointed. Their major fault was essentially an inability or unwillingness to use sophisticated colour combinations, or to include the necessary colour transitions between their different colour combinations. The narrowness of the borders, the style of planting and the lack of foliage effect were contributory factors to their relatively unsophisticated use of colour, when compared to that of Jekyll. However, in comparison to what was often presented within the popular gardening literature of the day, ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’s’ use of colour far surpassed what was commonly depicted. Fairey appreciated that most of his readers were not capable of replicating Jekyll’s abilities with colour but he at least wanted them to think about colour relationships within their gardens, and avoid the typical mixed cacophony of flower colours that were so frequently planted.\textsuperscript{199}

5.3.4.4.2 Flower Borders

Although ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ dealt with many garden issues, the recurrent theme of Fairey’s column was flower borders and the associated colour schemes that were considered a necessary part of their arrangement. Although reference was made to Jekyll and the quality of her books as a garden resource it appears as if much was lost in the translation between the arrangement of her flower borders and those of ‘Mrs Brown’.\textsuperscript{200} Albeit that those of ‘Mrs Brown’ were by necessity an adaptation of Jekyll’s concepts. ‘Mrs Brown’ regularly outlined the seasonal planting schemes of her own borders and beds at ‘Greenlea’; no doubt these were the arrangements that Fairey trialed within his own garden. The principal arrangements were usually conducted within the front garden, which was arranged as a series of long, narrow borders, between three and five feet in width, set around a central rectangular panel of lawn. Further, long borders were arranged against the house and in other unspecified locations within the garden. Particularly long borders were divided by three-foot sections of lawn.\textsuperscript{201} Although disapproving of lawn set geometric beds of


\textsuperscript{198} Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, p 18.

\textsuperscript{199} Greenleaf, ‘Maria on Colour Scheme’s’, pp. 135-6.

\textsuperscript{200} Greenleaf, ‘Women as a Gardener’, pp. 111-12.

elaborate form, ‘Mrs Brown’ did also have a number of circular beds in her garden.202

In planting the borders and beds within the garden ‘Mrs Brown’ preferred to mass individual specimens in each bed. ‘Mrs Brown’ felt that mixed plantings compromised the individual beauty of the plants. The division of the long beds therefore allowed a greater range of cultivars to be included in the garden. While her descriptions of her border and bed schemes often conformed to this advice, a number of borders were also regularly planted in a ‘ribbon’ format. Interestingly, ‘Mrs Brown’ disliked those who often repeated the same scheme, whether successful or not, believing that the scheme needed to be regularly changed. ‘Mrs Brown’ also recommended that a plan of the garden be drawn up and that each scheme be resolved and recorded on the plan before planting.203

5.3.4.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

‘I just loves ter see fair-sized trees and shrubs in gardens what have room for them, but before you plant them I reckon you want ter sit down and try and see them about 10 years ahead so as ter git some idea of what will happen after you puts them in.’204

‘Mrs Brown’ considered trees and shrubs to be an important aspect of the garden, stating that their correct placement made a garden look ‘dignified’ and that their incorrect use made the garden look ‘ridiculous’.205 For all the lists of tree and shrub specimens given there was little guidance as to what was considered to be the correct or incorrect placement of these specimens. What guidance was given included:

- large specimen trees were not to be planted in the middle of the lawn;206
- appropriate bed space was to be allowed for the size of the trees and/or shrubs;207
- the use of small trees in small gardens; and208
- the use of a mixture of evergreen and deciduous specimens, to ensure ‘good garden effects’ and to prevent monotony within the garden.209

5.3.4.4.4 Hedges

Hedges were treated as an important feature of the garden; ‘Mrs Brown’ was jubilant that a greater range of hedging plants were being introduced into the Adelaide garden. Most of ‘Mrs Brown’ s comments were necessarily directed towards front boundary hedges, the smaller size of the suburban garden being capable of only accommodating many of the more typical hedging plants at this location. With the introduction and usage of a wider range of hedging plants, with a greater variety of sizes, ‘Mrs Brown’ began to recommend the use of hedges within these smaller

207 Greenleaf, ‘Marier Interferes’, 5 May 1923, p. 11.
209 Greenleaf, ‘“Leaves that Fall”’, The Observer 9 June 1923, p. 11.
gardens to divide spaces, particularly the front from the back garden. Fairey, through ‘Mrs Brown’ was most particular in ensuring that his readers instituted good hedge care practises, particularly in relation to their clipping and training. Flowering hedges were especially recommended for locations within the garden not overtly accessible to the public.

5.3.4.4.5 Topiary

Topiary was an aspect of garden culture of which ‘Mrs Brown’ disapproved, preferring instead to allow the plants to grow in ‘the way nature intended’. This is further supported by her attitude towards standard roses, which although not strictly topiary, are very much modified from their natural form. Standard roses were only allowed in a formal front garden, planted in rows, in narrow beds, around a panel of lawn and under planted with annuals; they were not to be used anywhere else in the garden. See figure 5.3.4.4.5a.

Figure 5.3.4.4.5a Illustrates a typical layout for the front garden during this period with a narrow bed around the lawn planted with standard roses mass under-planted with flowering annuals.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens May 1932, p. 68.)

---

211 Flower theft from front hedges was a significant enough of a problem to ruin the effect of the hedge, thereby making the use of such a hedge along the front boundary impracticable. Greenleaf, ‘Marier Talks Hedges’, p. 9.
212 Greenleaf, ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’, p. ?.
5.3.4.4.6 Lawn

Other than engaging in practical considerations, such as ensuring ease of mowing, by keeping the level of the lawn and its edging at the same height, ‘Mrs Brown’ treated the lawn as an important secondary component of the front garden, where it was used specifically to enhance her flower borders. Fairey also considered that lawn gave the garden a cool and tidy appearance. ‘Mrs Brown’ often remonstrated against the penchant of the Adelaide gardener to place large trees, especially palms, in the middle of the lawn, where they had a tendency to take over.214

5.3.4.4.7 Creepers & Climbers

‘Mrs Brown’ encouraged the use of climbers on the house, particularly Virginia creeper, *Parthenocissus quinquefolia*. The more specific use of creepers and climbers generally throughout the garden was not covered. However, in one article ‘Mrs Brown’ made reference to the need for the appropriate selection and use of evergreen and deciduous climbers around the house, so as to ensure access to winter sunlight.215

5.3.4.4.8 Natives

‘There’s a flower what is a native of Australia, and will grow almost anywhere, and why them City Fathers don’t make a real feature of it somewhere here I can’t understand. I don’t think people make enough fuss over some of our own flowers.’

Fairey, through ‘Mrs Brown’ regularly made impassioned pleas for the greater inclusion of Australian native flowering trees and shrubs in the garden. The proposed list of plants offered over the thirty-six years of articles although small only included those specimens, considered by Fairey, to be suitable for domestic garden culture in Adelaide.217

5.3.4.4.9 Plant Selection

The plants listed and recommended by ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ were typical of those being included within much of the popular gardening literature of the period.218 Fairey used ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ to both consolidate the position of those plants typically recommended as well as to introduce new species and cultivars; particularly, new annual and perennial cultivars, suitable for use in Adelaide.

---

218 See Appendix 5G for a list of plants typically recommended by Fairey, through ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’, as suitable for the Adelaide home garden.
5.4 Architects & Garden Designers

5.4.1 Herbert Sydney Hartshorne

5.4.1.1 Background

Herbert Sydney Hartshorne was born in Botany, New South Wales, on the 27th March 1903. How, when or why he came to reside in Adelaide is unknown but he was in the employ of Adelaide Architect, W Lucas, as an architectural draftsman, in 1923, a position he retained until 1939, amongst other situations. Architect Kenneth F Milne employed Hartshorne between February 1936 and October 1937, Hartshorne taking up a position with the state Architect-in-Chiefs Department from October 1937. Under the tutelage of these Architects he was able to apply for and gain certification and registration to practise as an architect in South Australia from the 17th September 1940.219

Hartshorne established his own business in 1927, as a Domestic, Architectural and Garden Designer.220 The greater part of the commissions from this business pertained to designs and specifications for private residences and gardens. Architecturally, Hartshorne tended to design smaller homes, and stylistically followed the typical Adelaide styles of the period, including those predominantly categorised as English Domestic Revival, Neo-Georgian and Spanish Mission, although he did also experiment with more geometrical forms of architecture.221 Hartshorne’s surviving business records, dating from 1928 to 1945, indicate that the majority of his commissions for dwellings resulted directly from an association with builder J. McDonough for residences at both Springfield and Medindie; including McDonough’s own house and garden.222

Although Hartshorne’s focus was directed towards becoming an architect, garden design comprised a significant proportion of his business and was included to a lesser extent within the scope of his duties for Lucas, Milne and the Architect-in-Chiefs Department.223 Hartshorne appears to have been influenced by the advocacy of renowned architects such as Bagot, Wilkinson and Berry for the integration of house and garden; Hartshorne carried this philosophy into his design and written work.224 Walling’s early designs and articles written during the 1920s for The Australian Home Beautiful also seem to have influenced Hartshorne; his written and design work are strongly redolent of Walling’s work from this period, although they have been tempered with his architectural background. A series of articles written for Australian Homes and Gardens especially that of his last article ‘From The Ordinary To The Sublime: The Renaissance of House and Garden’, clearly shows these

---

219 Herbert Sydney Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, PRG 771/7/1, PRG 771/7/2.
220 Only those business records dating between 1928 – 1945 have been donated to the State Library of South Australia. It is unclear if Hartshorne continued to practise privately after 1945.
221 Domestic architectural styles as defined in Peter Cuffley, Australian Houses of the Twenties & Thirties, Victoria, The Five Mile Press, 1993, pp. 74-106.
222 Herbert Sydney Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, State Library of South Australia, Archival Database, PRG 771.
223 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771.
influences upon Hartshorne; Hartshorne outlining his own design philosophy within this article. 225

5.4.1.2 Design Overview

For Hartshorne, the garden, no matter how small, contained space for 'pure aesthetic joy' the beauty of the space 'determined by its design, and careful arrangement of foliage forms and texture.' 226 Although the inclusion of such spaces within his garden designs were paramount to Hartshorne, he was still cognisant of the needs of the owner and believed that functional spaces could be retained through the careful arrangement of the design. Finding that the addition of such spaces added 'a touch of simplicity and independence to any home'. 227 The garden for Hartshorne was a manifold place; it focused the design of the house and created a setting for it; it created an environment were the owner could be refreshed and recuperate from the tasks of daily life; and it provided necessary additional living space to the home, the garden was an outdoor 'room'. 228

Hartshorne designed three main styles of garden:

- Formal Structured Gardens;
- Wild or 'Naturalistic' Gardens; and,
- Combined Gardens.

Formal Structured Gardens formed the majority of Hartshorne's designs and were those most obviously allied to his design philosophy. Hartshorne designed this style of garden for both small houses and allotments and for larger grander homes with correspondingly larger allotment sizes. The back garden was usually composed from a series of 'rooms' incorporating a highly formal 'room' for 'pure aesthetic joy' and concealed designed functional spaces that could be a feature in their own right. Front gardens tended to be semi-formal in design and functionally provided a setting for the house. Stylistically the major differences between Hartshorne's designs for larger and smaller gardens included: larger more formal features and the greater likelihood of there being a series of formal garden 'rooms' in the larger gardens whereas the smaller gardens tended to have only a single formal 'room' in the back garden, and a greatly simplified front garden. 229

The back gardens of Hartshorne's Formal Structured Gardens contained:

- a highly formal, symmetrical 'room' connected to the house, usually formed from a lawn panel bordered by tree and shrub borders and perennial plantings;
- a main axis formed between a main room of the house and the formal garden 'room', providing a vista from the house;
- the termination of the vista by a combination of an architectural feature, such as a pool or seat and a sculptural planting feature;
- an occasional minor cross axes that incorporates an architectural feature from the main axis within it;

---
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the use of the planting scheme or a large architectural feature such as a pergola to divide ‘rooms’ and screen functional spaces;

- the use of small orchards and vegetable gardens as concealed feature ‘rooms’ which were usually linked to a cross axis within the garden; and,

- the limited use of functional paved paths, which lead to a specific location within the garden and which were usually straight and flagged.\textsuperscript{230}

The main structure of Hartshorne’s designs for the larger front gardens of the Formal Structured Garden style developed from a double entrance and curved driveway that divided the front garden into two main planted spaces. This included a large, semi-circular or segmented, planted lawn panel at the front of the garden and a planted lawn area against the house. If the semi-circular or segmented bed was asymmetrically positioned, then a smaller subsidiary planted lawn panel completed the design at the front of the garden. The lawn juxtaposed between the house and drive was usually planted with specimen trees and shrubs with tree, shrub and perennial groupings also being planted against the house walls. Curved flagged paths provided access to the house from the drive. Trees and tall shrubs were used to conceal the front and side boundaries; a hedge was also often included along the front fence line.\textsuperscript{231} See figure 5.4.1.2a.

---

\textsuperscript{230} Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/10/1, PRG 771/2/14, PRG 771/2/16, PRG 771/2/23, PRG 771/3/3.

\textsuperscript{231} Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/8.
The smaller front gardens tended to be designed as either specimen tree and/or shrub planted lawns; or as simple formal rectangular lawn panels or walled gardens, with boundary plantings composed from feature trees, roses and garden beds. The arrangement of elements in the second style of front garden was formal and symmetrical; the composition containing axially aligned small architectural features. Pathways and driveways were usually composed from drive strips that were straight and paved with stone flags. See figure 5.4.1.2b.

Figure 5.4.1.2b Plan for a small garden in the formal structured style.

(Source: State Library of South Australia, PRG 771/2/23.)

Hartshorne’s Wild Gardens described by him as either ‘natural’ or ‘naturalistic’, ascertained their structure from palette-shaped and curvaceous sweeps of lawn divided by sweeping borders of trees and shrubs. Hartshorne described the aim of the design of the ‘naturalistic’ garden as the replication of the ‘spirit, freedom and beauty of nature’. This style of garden would occupy most of the garden space, although Hartshorne still included the necessary functional spaces, dividing these

---
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'rooms' from the wild garden with tree and shrub plantings. These gardens contained:
- simple wooden or 'rustic' garden furniture including seats and garden houses;
- curved, flag stepping stone paths;
- occasional specimen tree plantings within the lawn panels; and,
- feature rock gardens often associated with irregularly shaped, curved pools with rivulets.234

Hartshorne's Combined Gardens were an amalgam of the Formal Structured Garden and the Wild or 'Naturalistic' Garden. In smaller allotments the Wild Garden could occupy either the front or back garden and was often directly connected to the house. The alternate space was typically arranged in the Formal Structured Garden style as appropriate to that space as already outlined. In the larger allotments the 'wild' section or sections of the garden become subsidiary 'rooms' adjoining typical Formal Structured Garden arrangements adjunct to the house; being screened from both the house and the formal garden 'rooms' by tree and shrub borders.235 See figure 5.4.1.2c.

![Figure 5.4.1.2c](image)

**Figure 5.4.1.2c** A small garden designed in the combined style with the front garden designed in a 'naturalistic' manner with the back garden more formally arranged.

(Source: State Library of South Australia, PRG 771/2/18.)

---

235 Hartshorne, 'Herbert Hartshorne', PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/14, PRG 771/2/18, PRG 771/2/23.
5.4.1.3 Design Elements

5.4.1.3.1 Water

Hartshorne used water features throughout his garden designs believing that water added 'contrast' and 'life' to the garden.²³⁶ Although he seemed equally happy to design both formal and informal water features the majority of Hartshorne’s pools tended to form a significant element within his formal garden 'rooms'. Hartshorne’s formal pools were generally:
- axially aligned within the ‘room’;
- formed either the terminal point of the main axis or a cross axis or indicated the point at which the axes cross;
- composed from simple geometrical forms including square, rectangular, circular, semi-circular or hexagonal shapes;
- at ground level but may be raised with raised pools tending to form the central feature of a walled courtyard;
- flanked with stone flags; and,
- flanked and/or backed by pairs or groups of sculptural tree plantings, often of fastigate form and were surrounded by further tree and shrub borders.²³⁷ See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

The informal pools:
- were an irregularly curved shape;
- often incorporated rock gardens and rivulets;
- formed the central feature of the space and often had an associated seat or garden house;
- were edged with a combination of lawn, shrubs and small boulders; and,
- were occasionally spanned by small, simple, curved, wooden bridges.²³⁸ See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2c and 5.4.1.3.3a.

5.4.1.3.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Hartshorne’s use of paths were relatively limited, mostly being included to provide access to various points within the garden or to the house: it seems he was trying to avoid overtly carving up the garden. To limit the length of front paths they were often connected to the drive and a secondary path was often incorporated into the design providing access to the utility section of the garden. Hartshorne included both flag and lawn set stepping stone paths within his gardens, using both straight and curved designs. Interestingly, he often did not include contrivances to justify the curve within a path.²³⁹ See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

Paving features were often incorporated into Hartshorne’s garden designs and were always sited next to the house. Hartshorne included paved enclosed courtyards,

²³⁶ Hartshorne, 'The Natural Garden', pp. 11.
patios and porches, and small sections of paving adjacent to a porch or patio. These spaces tended to be paved with either flags made from stone or concrete, brick or, if funds were limited, from concrete slabs.\textsuperscript{240} See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

Two types of driveways were generally included in Hartshorne’s designs. In the larger gardens they were:
- a significant feature of the front garden;
- were usually curved or semi-circular;
- provided access to the property from two points;
- generally split at some point along their length to provide access to a garage; and,
- often surfaced with gravel. See figure 5.4.1.2a.

In the smaller gardens Hartshorne minimised their impact on the garden by usually designing straight, flag or concrete drive-strips, one of the drive-strips also often doubled as the front path.\textsuperscript{241} See figures 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

5.4.1.3.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

Hartshorne only included rockeries or rock gardens in the more naturalistically designed ‘rooms’ of his gardens where they were invariably combined with a pool; the combination forming the main feature of the ‘room’. The main rockery structure usually created a background to the pool, Hartshorne placing individual and groups of boulders around the sides and foreground. Both the main rock structure and the boulders were planted with a selection of dwarf shrubs, junipers, \textit{Juniperus} spp and typical rock garden plants. Medium shrubs and trees planted behind the rockery created a background to the rock garden. Although Hartshorne’s drawn and written understanding of rockeries appears well considered, the only image showing the execution of one his designs, indicates that the translation between page and garden was poorly conceived. The rocks were poorly placed and although some attempt had been made to follow potential strata lines in a small section around the pool, the majority of the rockwork appeared as if it had been dumped into position rather than strategically placed.\textsuperscript{242} See figure 5.4.1.3.3a.


\textsuperscript{241} Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/9, PRG 771/2/14, PRG 771/2/15, PRG 771/2/16, PRG 771/2/18, PRG 771/2/23.

5.4.1.3.4 Small Features- Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots
Hartshorne included a selection of small features throughout his more formal garden designs, using only benches or seats within the informally designed ‘rooms’.

Sundials and birdbaths were used in the formal garden ‘rooms’:
- as an incidence along the main axis;
- as a central feature of a courtyard; and,
- as a feature at the intersection of the main axis and a cross axis. See figures 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

Seats within Hartshorne’s formally designed ‘rooms’ were used to terminate either the main or cross axis; the planting scheme, often architecturally composed, provided a background. Hartshorne used either curved or rectangular benches of formal design that were often constructed from stone. Simple wooden or rustic benches were used in the informal garden ‘rooms’, where they overlooked a sweep of lawn, Hartshorne nestling them into the planting scheme, which then formed the background. See figures 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

Pots were used mainly within porches or paved entrances, flanking either the front door or the junction between porch and path or stairs. In Hartshorne’s most formally designed garden ‘room’, composed from a series of terraces, pots and urns were used to highlight the position of the stairs and were positioned to flank the top of each staircase. Pots or urns were used infrequently to adorn the top of gate piers that flanked the driveway, or at the corners of formally set, rectangular or square pools.

From the limited pictorial evidence of Hartshorne’s use of pots it appears that formal

---

terracotta and concrete forms were most often used. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.3.6a

5.4.1.3.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Hartshorne only infrequently included pergolas within his designs, employing them only within formal garden ‘rooms’ where they were used as a ‘room’ divider, to separate the formal garden from the utility sections of the garden. Hartshorne’s pergolas were usually aligned to the main windows of a particular room within the house creating an enclosed vista. A seat was often incorporated at the mid-point of the pergola where it usually terminated a cross axis from within the adjoining garden ‘room’. The side adjacent to the garden ‘room’ was often densely planted with perennials, the only access between the pergola and the ‘room’, gained via a path that connected it with the seat within the pergola. At least one of Hartshorne’s pergolas was used to form an entrance to an orchard. See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b, 5.4.1.2c and 5.4.1.3.6a.

Hartshorne included only two garden houses within his designs, both in informal settings; one a rustic structure as a component of a ‘wild’ garden; the other of more formal design and alignment included within a less contrived informal garden ‘room’. As a component of the ‘wild’ garden the rustic garden house was nestled against a tree and shrub border and overlooked a sweep of lawn and adjoining pool and rock garden. The more formally designed garden house was nestled into a shrub border, the shrubs being drawn around its sides; a large shade tree also flanked either side. The entrance to this garden house was aligned to the entrance of an orchard. See figures 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

Tennis courts appear to have been included at the request of the owner and occur in only the larger gardens. Hartshorne attempted to achieve as best as possible the recommended north-south alignment of the court but not to the detriment of the surrounding garden, this often resulted in courts slightly skewed from that alignment. Although the path to the tennis court often formed a feature within the formal ‘room’ through which it passed, Hartshorne concealed the court from view with shrub borders, creating the expectation of another garden ‘room’. See figure 5.4.1.2a.

Garages were an element to be considered and incorporated from the outset of the house and garden’s design. In the smaller properties that Hartshorne designed the garage would be included in either the structure of the house or towards the side and front of the property. In the larger properties the garage could also be positioned towards to side and rear of the property where it would be incorporated into the utility section of the garden. If the garage was a freestanding structure and towards the front of the garden it would be used to; conceal the utility garden; and/or, divide or create a division of space within the garden proper. Irrespective of the location of

246 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/18, PRG 771/2/23.
247 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/18, PRG 771/2/23.
248 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5.
a freestanding garage, Hartshorne always used shrub borders to conceal much of its structure. See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.1.2c.

5.4.1.3.6 Changing Levels – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

Only three of Hartshorne’s designs included terraces; two paved and planted verandah like spaces against the house, one L-shaped the other rectangular; and a series of formal terraces in the more traditional sense, as the main feature of the McDonough garden. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.3.6a. In the first instance the terraces provided a decorative feature against the house that created a link between house and garden as well as providing access points to a variety of garden “rooms”. Although the terrace garden at the McDonough residence was laid parallel to the house, Hartshorne used a perpendicular layout to achieve a greater sense of space within this section of the garden. Enclosed within significant tree borders, lawn walks flanked with perennial borders and an elaborate pergola terrace formed the main feature of this garden. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.3.6a.

Figure 5.4.1.3.6 The terrace garden at the McDonough residence, Springfield.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens April 1936, p. 23.)


Walls were not a significant feature of Hartshorne’s gardens, only a few examples of either retaining or freestanding walls appear within his designs, where their inclusion appears to be more for practical rather than aesthetic purposes.

- Retaining walls were used to support terraces and sunken gardens; mortared stone for the terraces and a curved low dry-stone wall for the sunken garden.
- Rendered brick freestanding walls were used to enclose courtyards.
- Low freestanding walls were used to divide ‘rooms’, both mortared stone and rendered brick being used in their construction.251 See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b, 5.4.1.2c, 5.4.1.3.3a and 5.4.1.3.6a.

Hartshorne’s limited use of artificial level change and the natural levelness of the gardens he designed, precluded any significant use of stairs. Any height difference between house and garden was usually small and was accommodated with a single step, formed by a porch or verandah. Those stairs included in his gardens include:

- stone segmented stairs, two risers high, butted against a retaining wall, within a wild garden;
- stacked rectangular stairs butted against a terrace wall, three risers high; and,
- probable concrete formwork stairs butted against a terrace wall and incorporated into the adjoining garden bed at the foot of the wall, five to six risers in height, edged with a low formwork balustrade, with low stone piers at the top of the staircase.252 See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2c and 5.4.1.3.6a.

Hartshorne appears to have included only a single sunken garden within his portfolio of garden designs. The sunken garden formed a ‘room’ within the ‘Naturalistic Garden’ for the Tolhurst residence and was typical of similar gardens designed by Walling. A simple short stone staircase of segmented form led to a palette-shaped lawn surrounded by tree and shrub borders. However, unlike Walling’s planting schemes for her sunken gardens, Hartshorne grouped a series of fastigiate trees that added a formal element to his planting scheme.253

5.4.1.3.7 Rose Gardens

Hartshorne included three rose gardens within his Formal Structured Garden designs, using them as either an enclosed private space and/or as a transition space. They were axially aligned to either a room within the house or to another ‘room’ within the garden, and incorporated highly formal elements within an asymmetrical layout. They usually contained a main axis and a minor cross axis, the main axis was usually terminated with a seat; a feature such as a pool or sundial was used to indicate the junction of axes.254

---

5.4.1.4 Planting Scheme

5.4.1.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

Although cognisant of the importance of colour in his planting schemes, Hartshorne was more concerned with the form, scale and textural qualities of the plants he selected. He used the form and texture of his planting schemes to form his garden ‘rooms’ and provide their structure. Trees of fastigate form were repeatedly used throughout Hartshorne’s designs as strong accent points and were juxtaposed against the soft, open, rounded and pyramidal forms of a selection of trees and shrubs. Hartshorne typically used a variety of different specimen types maintaining unity within, and the juxtaposition of, his typically favoured forms, varying their scale and texture throughout the garden, irrespective of, the gardens, style or size. Although comprehensive plant lists were not always included on his plans, Hartshorne left no doubt about the relative scale of the plantings throughout the garden, indicating the location and heights of each specimen. This ensured that boundaries were retained and screened; that ‘room’ divisions were adequately constructed; and that intended vistas were formed and framed.255

5.4.1.4.2 Flower Borders

Hartshorne used flower borders in two distinct ways; as the foreground planting to the tree and shrub border in his formal garden ‘rooms’; and in the more traditional sense as a formal perennial garden and walk. In the first instance mixed perennials, annuals and bulbs were included as a band between the tree and shrub border and the lawn, adding seasonal colour to the ‘room’ and softening the interface between the taller boundary planting and the lawn. Less formally structured beds of perennials, annuals and bulbs were occasionally included in front of the mixed shrub borders located at the front boundary in the larger Formal Structured Gardens.256

In the second instance, Hartshorne designed both a formal perennial garden and a border. The formal perennial garden gained its form from the simple axial arrangement of the path system and the inclusion of a pool, birdbath and seat. Trees and shrubs were included in limited groupings to provide a background, create the ‘room’ boundaries and provide year round colour, form and structure. Hartshorne added his typical combination of fastigate trees to create an architectural note within the design.257 See figure 5.4.1.2b.

Hartshorne created double perennial borders to form the side boundaries of the terrace garden at the McDonough residence in Springfield. Each border was composed from a long central lawn path, flanked either side with long rectangular perennial beds that were to be filled with a mixture of perennials and limited shrub groupings. The paths provided access to either the tennis court or ‘naturalistic’ garden located to the sides and behind the terrace garden. The tree and shrub borders that enclosed the terraces formed a solid background to the perennial borders.

---


256 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/16.

Unfortunately, it does not appear as if this planting was carried out in the way Hartshorne intended, the only images of the garden show that the perennial borders were filled with a massed planting of petunias, Petunia x hybrida creating a flat and uninspired if somewhat potentially colourful walk. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.3.6a.

5.4.1.4.3 Trees & Shrubs
Hartshorne used trees and shrubs to provide architectural form and structure within his gardens, using them to screen the boundaries and create internal divisions of space. He relied strongly on trees with fastigiate form within his formal garden ‘rooms’, using them in straight and curved rows as a feature planting, often as the background to a seat or pool, strengthening the terminal point of the main axis. Pairs of fastigiate trees were also used to indicate and frame room entrances, staircases, or other such features within the garden. The provision of shade was an important element in Hartshorne’s designs, he believed that the careful placement of trees around the home could alleviate the need for verandahs. Large single specimens were either planted in the lawn in the front garden and/or at the boundary of the back garden, providing shaded areas. Hartshorne used trees and shrubs to provide year round colour and interest to his garden designs. Shrubs were always included in groupings around the house foundations, Hartshorne using them to soften the interface between house and garden. See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b, 5.4.1.2c, 5.4.1.3.6a.

5.4.1.4.4 Hedges
Hartshorne used hedges within his garden designs to provide structure, screen boundaries and to divide ‘rooms’. Although medium to high formally box-clipped hedges were used in both the small and larger gardens, Hartshorne appears to have relied more prominently upon informal shrub borders and rows of fastigiate trees to create the same effect. Formally clipped hedging was used to create archways between ‘rooms’. In the larger gardens a formally box-clipped medium sized hedge was often included at the front boundary, screening the home from the road, creating a private space and providing a background to the shrub and flower border usually planted at its foot. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.2c.

5.4.1.4.5 Topiary
It is difficult to ascertain the extent of Hartshorne’s use of topiary within his gardens, although it does appear to be limited. Hartshorne seems to have relied on the natural form of his planting scheme to provide an accent point within the design, using standard roses, fastigiate trees, and domed forms to create these effects. See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b, 5.4.1.2c, 5.4.1.3.6a.

258 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/5.
261 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/10/1, PRG 771/2/15.
5.4.1.4.6 Lawn
Lawn was a significant component of Hartshorne’s designs; it was the most extensively used surface covering in his gardens. In the Formal Structured gardens a formal lawn panel was always used in the back garden to create an interesting form within what was usually a rectangular space. This often lead to adjoining, significant, less formally treated, panels of lawn either of simple geometric shapes in the smaller gardens or curvaceous and palette shaped panels in the larger and ‘naturalistic’ gardens. Lawn was used as a foreground to tree, shrub and flower borders and only specimen trees and the occasional shrub grouping were allowed to break its expanse. See figures 5.4.1.2a, 5.4.1.2b, 5.4.1.2c and 5.4.1.3.6a.

5.4.1.4.7 Creepers & Climbers
It is difficult to determine the exact extent of Hartshorne’s usage of creepers and climbers in the garden. They were definitely included on the pergolas and seem to have been occasionally planted and trained along house walls, where they would frame windows and soften the architecture. See figures 5.4.1.2a and 5.4.1.3.6a.

5.4.1.4.8 Natives
Hartshorne rarely included natives within his known planting schemes. The occasional Eucalypt spp might be retained as a lawn specimen if it was in the correct location and some shrubs such as Grevillea spp and Eugenia spp were occasionally incorporated into the shrub border. Natives seem to have been included more readily within the planting schemes of the ‘naturalistic’ gardens, though they still formed only a negligible component of those planting schemes.

5.4.1.4.9 Plant Selection
Hartshorne’s selection of plants was typical of those being recommended in the local popular gardening literature of the day. Although some of his plans had a reasonably comprehensive planting scheme included upon them, in the majority of cases he would only specify those plants vital to the necessary structure of his design. Hartshorne left the selection of plants to the owner, specifying the location, size and type of plant on the plan, for example ‘four-foot high shrubs’.

---


265 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/1/7, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/9, PRG 771/2/18.

266 See Appendix 5H for a list of plants suggested by Hartshorne for planting in his garden designs and Appendices 5B-5C and 5E-5G for lists of plants recommended by the local horticulturists as being suitable for the Adelaide home garden.

267 Hartshorne, ‘Herbert Hartshorne’, PRG 771/1/7, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/9, PRG 771/2/10/1.
5.4.2 Russell S. Ellis

5.4.2.1 Background

Russell S. Ellis was born in the Adelaide suburb of Semaphore in August 1912 and would later become a significant South Australian architect in the second half of the twentieth century. Although he designed a diverse range of buildings, residential dwellings would become his forte. Ellis’ outlook was decidedly modern and when presented with the opportunity he would design houses ‘in the true international style’; a number of his residential commissions also included garden plans. However, during the early to mid 1930s he studied architecture at the South Australian School of Mines and, whilst a student, he entered and won both the five and six roomed house categories of the South Australian Homes and Gardens magazine Ideal Homes Garden Competition.

5.4.2.2 Design Overview

Ellis’ winning garden designs were highly formal and showed little indication of the direction that he would later follow. However, there were distinct similarities between some of the individual features used in these gardens and those of his later gardens: for example, his use of brush fences and trellis panels. Although the components of Ellis’ gardens were highly symmetrical there was an element of asymmetry within their layout.

Ellis’ designs for his back gardens were highly structured, axial and geometric, including the layouts for the utility yards. The designs were highly reliant on built elements with the planting schemes being ancillary, although they did soften and frame the built components of his gardens. Interestingly, Ellis did not configure his designs to include possible future garages within the utility yards, instead he placed them to the side but still within the main garden, where they would eventually become an imposing feature of these spaces. This approach allowed Ellis to more easily spatially facilitate his axial, geometric arrangements and accommodate vistas from the main rooms of the house. He did not specify how the impact of the future garage upon the space was to be minimised or really how the area was to be treated

before the construction of the garage other than to suggest that the ground could be planted.\footnote{Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Small House', pp. 62-3. Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.} See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

Front gardens were considerably more simply and plainly treated. In the garden for the six-roomed house, much of the front garden was left as open space, Ellis stating that this was to accommodate the future extension of the house. The large expanse of lawn and specimen trees provided a setting for the house and the flower borders a degree of colour. See figure 5.4.2.2b. The front garden of the five-roomed house was slightly more formally treated; Ellis included a simple formal axially aligned rectangular water feature within a rectangular panel of lawn. Further small panels of lawn, specimen trees and flowerbeds framed both the feature lawn and pool and the house.\footnote{Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Small House', pp. 62-3. Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.} See figure 5.4.2.2a.

![Figure 5.4.2.2a](source: South Australian Homes and Gardens May 1934, p. 63.)

![Figure 5.4.2.2b](source: South Australian Homes and Gardens July 1934, p. 73.)
5.4.2.3 Design Elements

5.4.2.3.1 Water

Ellis included three highly formal water features within the two gardens: two within the garden for the five-roomed house, one each in the front and the back garden and one in the back garden for the six-roomed house. Each pond had a simple geometric form; they were respectively shaped as an elongated rectangle, fan and circle. All were axially arranged and formed a significant feature within the garden. Both the fan-shaped and elongated rectangular pools in the five-roomed house garden design were decoratively edged with rectangular pieces of flagstone; the circular pool in the six-roomed house garden design was edged with a concrete rim around which four concrete frogs were evenly spaced. The elongated rectangular pool formed the main feature of the front garden in the five-roomed house garden design and was symmetrically set within the lawn. The asymmetrically sited fan-shaped pool formed the foreground for the garden-house and an incidence along a major cross axis and was set within a small flagstone terrace. The circular pool formed the junction at the cross axis of the path system in the back garden of the six-roomed house garden design and was surrounded by gravel. The circular and fan-shaped pools were designated as water lily pools whilst the rectangular pool was designated as an iris pool. See figures 5.4.2.2a, 5.4.2.2b and 5.4.2.3.1a.

Figure 5.4.2.3.1a Drawn details for the six-roomed house garden design.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens July 1934, p. 72.)

---

5.4.2.3.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Ellis used extensive path systems to create much of the structure within each of the gardens. The path systems with the exception of a single curved path were unerringly straight, highly geometrical and axially arranged. Ellis constructed all of the front paths with lawn set flagstones. The only curved path occurred in the design for the six-roomed house, where a small section of path curves from a straight drive-strip, which provided access from the street, linking the pathway thereby formed by the drive-strip with the front door; the placement of trees within this section of the garden provided the necessary deceit for the curve. A separate tradesman’s entrance was provided were space allowed. The design of the path systems within the back gardens were highly elaborate for the size of the gardens. Ellis essentially created a highly formal, geometric ‘garden room’, typical in design of those created by the Architects and Landscape Architects designing English gardens in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Gravel was adopted as the surface covering for the paths within the back garden although flagstones were given as an alternative option in the design for the six-roomed house garden design. See figures 5.4.2.2a, 5.4.2.2b and 5.4.2.3.1a.

Although neither house possessed a garage, space was allocated for their future construction within the back garden and driveways incorporated within the design. Both driveways were constructed from lawn set flagstone drive-strips, that subsequently ran through a significant proportion of the length of the property, along one side of the garden. Until such time as the driveways were actually needed, Ellis left them only partially complete. In the five-roomed house, the drive-strips were used as a feature along the side of the house and were terminated by a low hedge, that separated the front garden from a gravel area in the utility yard. In the six-roomed house garden a decorative paved feature was laid in front of the drive-gates and only the drive-strip, that linked with the curved section of path and which together formed the main entrance was to be immediately laid. See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

Ellis included a number of paved areas within these gardens; both possessed a pergola covered terrace immediately adjacent to the living room. Further small areas of paving were incorporated around the garden-houses; adjacent to the entrance patio; and as a decorative feature at either end of the drive-strips in the six-roomed house design. See figures 5.4.2.2a, 5.4.2.2b and 5.4.2.3.1a.

5.4.2.3.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

Incongruously, Ellis incorporated a rockery into both of his highly formal back garden designs. In the five-roomed house garden design the rockery was sited adjacent to the highly formal and elaborately designed lawn panels of the back

---

Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.
Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.
Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.
garden and juxtaposed between the future garage and the formality of the garden-house and associated fan-shaped pool; it was totally out of keeping with its surroundings. Interestingly, in Ellis’ only picture illustrating this section of the garden the rockery has been replaced with what appears to be a shrubbery. See figure 5.4.2.3.7a. The rockery in the six-roomed house garden design was sited against the future garage and was a little better screened from the highly formal section of adjacent garden. Ellis’ treatment of his rockeries suggests that they were a shrewd and fashionable inclusion that played upon at least one of the judge’s bias rather than a feature that Ellis felt comfortable in designing.\(^{278}\) See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

5.4.2.3.4 Small Features – Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Ellis included a number of small features within his garden designs; seats, pots or tubs and decorative trellis panels were the most consistently used although a birdbath was included in the five-roomed house garden design. The raised birdbath provided an incidence at the junction of the main garden axis and cross axis formed by Ellis’ elaborate path system; a circular row of bricks formed a decorative kerbing around the little platform.\(^{279}\) See figure 5.4.2.2a.

Other than the seating included in the summerhouses, Ellis included one further seat within each back garden and a circular seat around a tree in the front garden of the six-roomed house. The seat in the five-roomed house garden design was used to terminate the main garden axis, and was backed with a decorative trellis panel, flanked with a symmetrical pair of pines, probably Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, and surrounded either side with various shrubs. The seat in the six-roomed house garden design was sited in the back corner of the garden and was partially hidden by the rockery on one side and the tree and shrubbery planting along the back fence on the other. It possibly also had an arbour constructed over it as it was referred to as a sheltered seat on the plan. The circular seat was located close to the front door providing a comfortable and aesthetically pleasing place to await the car. The seat was afforded a small degree of privacy provided by the adjoining tree and an outlook over the perennials planted around the house foundations.\(^{280}\) See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

Tubs, which in Ellis’ drawing work appear to be half wine barrels, were used in symmetrical pairs throughout both garden designs to denote entrances.\(^{281}\) See figures 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.


The use of small trellis panels used either solely or incorporated with brush fence arches was a feature of Ellis' designs. Ellis used the combination of trellis and brush-arch to form a feature along the brush-wood fence which divided the pleasure and utility grounds in the design for the garden for the six-roomed house. Trellis panels were used in the garden for the five-roomed house to form a background for the already mentioned seat and to create a vista from the dinning room window which, would have otherwise looked directly onto the boundary fence. The planting scheme was used in all three cases to complete and strengthen the effects achieved by these panels.\textsuperscript{282} See figures 5.4.2.2a, 5.4.2.2b, 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.

5.4.2.3.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts and Garages
Ellis incorporated a pergola into the design of both terraces, completely covering the terrace in the five-roomed design and partially covering the terrace in the six-roomed design. Ellis' treatment of the area surrounding the pergola covered terraces was such that the terrace and pergola becomes very much a component of the house and appears disassociated from the garden, even when covered with plant material.\textsuperscript{283} See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

Garden or summerhouses were also incorporated into each garden where they formed the terminus for either a major axis or cross axis. In both cases Ellis attempted to nestle the garden-house into the planting scheme. This was achieved in the garden design for the six-roomed house; however, the inclusion of the rockery in the plan of the garden for the five-roomed house suggests a less successful integration of the summerhouse with the planting scheme. The summerhouse in the five-roomed house garden design was a rectangular structure constructed from rough stone with a pitched timber roof. While the summer house for the six-roomed house garden design was half octagonal in shape and appeared to be have been formed from trellis panels supported between columns, possibly with an open beam roof covered with climbing plants.\textsuperscript{284} See figures 5.4.2.2a, 5.4.2.2b, 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.

5.4.2.3.6 Level Change – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens
Although there was no level change within either garden, a low stone wall was included as the front fence in the five-roomed house garden design.\textsuperscript{285} See figure 5.4.2.2a.

5.4.2.3.7 Rose Gardens
Although Ellis did not include a traditional rose garden per se, he did include two rose plantings, one in either design. From a design perspective, the two square beds planted with roses in the five-roomed house garden plan were probably the better

\textsuperscript{282} Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Small House', pp. 62-3.
\textsuperscript{283} Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.
\textsuperscript{284} Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Small House', pp. 62-3.
\textsuperscript{285} Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Small House', pp. 62-3.
executed, providing an entrance to the lawn set iris pond. Horticulturally they would not have performed to their optimum underneath the shade of a large tree. See figure 5.4.2.2a. The design of the two small rectangular rose beds within the six-roomed house garden design is uncertain. While it was obvious that Ellis had tried to incorporate a feature to complete and balance the design of the rest of the space, the two small rectangular panels of lawn which could have been substituted with flower beds totally surrounded by standard roses, then set within gravel paths is a peculiar treatment. No component of such a planting would have been shown to advantage and the central lawn or flowerbed would have been extremely difficult to maintain. A more aesthetically pleasing solution would have been to mass plant both beds either with roses or flowers or to eliminate the small north-south path, joining the two beds together and again mass planting them. While much was made of the axis formed by the north-south path, which divided these beds in the caption adjoining the plan and the treatment of the brush fence on the other side of the lily court which terminated its northern end there was no mention of how the southern end of the axis was to be terminated either before or after the garage was built, resulting in this end of the axis being unattractively finished with the garage wall. See figure 5.4.2.2b.

Figure 5.4.2.3.7a Drawn details for the five-roomed house garden plan.

(Source: Australian Homes and Gardens May 1934, p. 62.)

5.4.2.4 Planting Scheme

5.4.2.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

Ellis’ composition of his spaces suggests a juxtaposition of horizontal and vertical planes. Expanses of flat lawn, paving and water against tall fences, trees and built structures such as the garden-houses. This is also carried through into the planting of the flower borders, Ellis’ meagre suggestion of relatively low growing perennials, annuals and bulbs massed around spires of hollyhocks, *Alcea rosea*, and delphiniums, *Delphinium* spp. Textural variation and contrast seemed to be more focused towards that between built and plant elements rather than that contained within the planting scheme. Nothing is specifically mentioned about a colour scheme, rather those plants listed by Ellis suggest an inclination towards blue, pink, white and yellow subjects, with a focus towards intense rather than pastel shades. Ellis also directly copied the combination of hollyhocks, *Alcea rosea*, and delphiniums, *Delphinium* spp, ie. dark red pink against an intense blue from Quarrell for one flowerbed against the five-roomed house.²⁸⁷

5.4.2.4.2 Flower Borders

Interestingly, despite the extremely formal nature of Ellis’ designs he did not include flower borders in the traditional sense. Perennials, annuals and bulbs were massed around the house foundations with the occasional shrub included to provide a permanent structure. A long border was included in the garden for the six-roomed house along the northern boundary fence; the flowering plants planted underneath three large trees. Common to both of these styles of flower border was Ellis’ direction that the edge be uneven; it is unclear if he simply intended that the plants be allowed to unevenly spill over the edge or if it were to be planted as such. Two large rectangular beds each containing an asymmetrically positioned soft fruit tree, in the back garden of the five-roomed house garden, were designated as beds, suggesting that Ellis also intended these spaces to be massed with perennials, annuals and bulbs. This would have provided a decorative feature from the house and created a degree of privacy within the adjoining decorative lawn panels and water feature. Both lawn and gravel were used as foregrounds to Ellis’ flower borders.²⁸⁸ See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

5.4.2.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

Ellis used trees in two main ways within his garden designs: to enhance the formality of and frame the formal built elements within the garden, and to provide shade for the house from the hot northerly and westerly summer sun. Shrubs were little used by Ellis and appear to be almost an afterthought. Shrubs were included amongst the trees planted at the rear of the garden, concealing the boundary fence in both gardens. A long border similar to the flower border in the six-roomed house garden was included along the western boundary fence of the five-roomed house garden;

Ellis specified that it be planted with shrubs and plants.\textsuperscript{289} See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

5.4.2.4.4 Hedges

Ellis used hedges in two ways within his garden designs. Hedges were included along the front fence line; a low hedge was specified for the five-roomed house garden. Further small sections of hedging, with openings, were used to create a division of space without overtly enclosing the garden. In the case of the five-roomed house garden the division was between the front garden and the utility yard at the side of the house. In the six-roomed house garden two small hedges divided the side passage respectively from the front garden and the utility yard in the back garden. This created a separate space at the side of the house which, doubled both as a tradesmans entrance and as a flower garden.\textsuperscript{290} See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

5.4.2.4.5 Topiary

Topiary forms in the true sense appear to have only been used in Ellis’ tub plantings, with standardised specimens clipped to a ball form adding a degree of formality to the entrances that they denoted. Ellis also used the natural fastigiate form of Italian cypress, \textit{Cupressus sempervirens}, in symmetrical pairs to again denote entrances, indicate a transition between spaces and to flank elements such as seats, adding to the formality of the design.\textsuperscript{291} See figures 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.

5.4.2.4.6 Lawn

Lawn was used very formally within Ellis’ back gardens and relatively informally within the front gardens. Decorative formal lawn panels were a major component of Ellis’ design for both back gardens, the main structure of the space derived from their arrangement within the path system. Gravel paths provided both a colour and textural contrast enhancing the colour and softness of the lawn. Conversely, in the front garden the lawn was used as a surface covering for any remaining ground after the other elements had been determined providing a suitable setting for those elements including the house.\textsuperscript{292} See figures 5.4.2.2a and 5.4.2.2b.

5.4.2.4.7 Creepers & Climbers

Creepers and climbers where planted along boundary fences, brush fences used to divide the pleasure and utility sections of the garden and as a feature on the decorative lattice panels used by Ellis to create visual interest in various parts of the garden. Although it was not specified, it could be assumed that he also intended the pergolas to be clothed with climbing plants. Small plants were intended to provide a


foreground to much of Ellis' creeper and climber plantings, integrating the vertical and horizontal plane.  

5.4.2.4.8 Natives
Ellis only composed a very basic planting scheme for his designs, denoting many of the plants on his plans as simply as tree, hedge, etc. In the annotations included to provide a basic description of the plans at least one gum, *Eucalyptus* spp, was included within each garden, although their location is difficult to ascertain. The drawing of the vegetation around the summerhouse in the five-roomed house garden suggests that the pair of trees in the back corner of the garden were intended to be *Eucalyptus* spp.

5.4.2.4.9 Plant Selection
Ellis only listed a vague and meagre collection of plants for his garden designs; plants within these gardens were somewhat subservient to the built components of the garden. The plants selected were all recommended within the pages of the *South Australian Homes and Gardens* magazine and as such were suited to Adelaide.

5.4.3 Mary A. Parkhouse
5.4.3.1 Background
Little is known about Mary A. Parkhouse as a designer, and only one of her garden designs is known to have been published. The design was awarded second place in the *South Australian Homes and Gardens* magazine Ideal Homes Garden Competition in the six-roomed house category. Parkhouse's design was both interesting and relevant as it observed much of the design advice found within *South Australian Homes and Gardens* magazine. Parkhouse as both a woman and probably a mother designed a garden that achieved balance between servicing the needs of a family with that of aesthetics.

5.4.3.2 Design Overview
Parkhouse purposefully aimed to provide a simply designed garden feeling that the average sized suburban block did not allow for an elaborate design nor that the owner of such a sized block generally had the time, money or desire to have or to adequately maintain an elaborately designed garden. Although Parkhouse's design

---

Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.

Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3.

Ellis, 'Ideal Homes Garden Competition Details of Winning Design for Six-Roomed House', pp. 72-3. See Appendix 51 for a list of plants recommended by Ellis for use in his garden designs and Appendices 5B-5C and 5E-5G for a list of plants considered suitable for planting in the Adelaide home garden by local horticulturists.

296 Mary A. Parkhouse, 'A Garden All the Year Round', *South Australian Homes and Gardens* March 1935, pp. 28-9.

297 Parkhouse stated within the article accompanying her garden plan that the block size was 74 feet by 12 feet; it is assumed that 12 feet was a typographical error and should have been 120 feet. This results in a block approximately 820m².
had an air of informality, the composition of the space was essentially formal using subtle axial arrangement within an uncomplicated design mainly achieved through the layout of tree and shrubbery beds. A small informally planted but formally shaped and aligned pool assisted in the development of the fusion of formal and informal.  

Figure 5.4.3.2a Parkhouse’s plan for the garden in the six-roomed house category.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens March 1935, p. 29.)

Parkhouse, pp. 28-9.
Primary considerations for Parkhouse’s design included provisions for:
- fruit trees and vegetable beds;
- play spaces for children;
- cut flowers;
- a secluded outdoor space, adjoining the living rooms of the house, for relaxation and entertaining;
- the creation of an attractive setting for the home through the development of the planting scheme; and,
- the usual utilitarian requirements such as incinerator, garage, compost heap and clothes line, etc.  

To accommodate the prerequisites for this garden, Parkhouse divided the garden into five main areas composed of two large lawn spaces, one with an adjoining terrace; a transition and entry space that linked the lawn spaces; a utility yard; and a tradesman’s entrance that could later be converted into a driveway. The main garden areas were composed from large rectangular lawn spaces created and framed, through the placement of tree and shrub borders and/or hedging. The transition and entry space was located to the front and side of the block and was composed of the main path that led from the street to the front door passing a large rockery feature and a long narrow tree and shrub lined lawn path that both concealed and connected the front garden with the terrace and back garden beyond. The utility yard which, in reality, occupied nearly two thirds of the back garden but which, through clever design would not have appeared this large, contained all of the essentials of such a space. Parkhouse’s placement of the fruit trees on the boundary with the pleasure garden framed the lawn on this side and created the perception that this planting was apart of the pleasure garden rather than the utility yard. The long narrow tradesman’s entrance ran from the street to the utility yard along the side boundary of the property. Parkhouse’s utilisation of two pergolas and a simple planting scheme within this space would have provided an aesthetically pleasing corridor to the utility yard at its end.  

5.4.3.3 Design Elements
5.4.3.3.1 Water
Although Parkhouse felt than an elaborate pool or fountain was out of keeping with her garden design she did include a small semi-circular pool adjacent to and as the main focal point of the uncovered section of the terrace. The immediate surrounds of the pool were developed into a bog garden. The stepping stone path adjacent to the pool that provided access to the utility section of the garden was continued around the curved edge of the pool thereby creating a suitable separation between pool and the adjoining lawn. The gaps between the stones were planted with small creeping plants.  
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5.4.3.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

Parkhouse employed a simple path system which provided access to the main points within the house and garden. The main path from the street to the front door was the only substantial pathway within the garden and took the elongated form of the upper half of an S; an extensive rockery provided an incidence to assist in justifying the curve. Two smaller and slightly curved lawn-set stepping stone paths provided access from the main path just prior to the entrance porch and the terrace as well as from the terrace to the utility yard. Parkhouse suggested that the main path could be either crazy paved or brick laid in a decorative pattern. Her plan suggested the use of randomly sized rectangular flagstones. The property did not include a garage and therefore had no driveway. However, the tradesman’s entrance was designed in such a way so as to be easily converted into a straight driveway along the side boundary of the property; this strip from street to utility yard was laid with red gravel. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

Parkhouse included two paved areas within the garden: the terrace and a small section of uncovered paving adjoining the front porch. Both appear to have been paved in a similar manner as the main path. The partially pergola covered terrace provided the private outdoor living room that Parkhouse considered essential. Adjoining both the living and dining rooms the terrace provided an extension to both of these rooms as well as a pleasant aspect from their main windows. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries

Parkhouse included a large rockery within her design, which she sited with in an “L” shaped alcove next to the front entry porch and house. Parkhouse suggested that the rockery be formed with a few large, moss covered and weathered rocks, partially sunk within the earth and laid with their original faces exposed. The adjoining porch and house wall were partially concealed with large shrubs; further smaller shrubs and perennials formed a permanent structure within the rock garden. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4 Small Features – Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Small features were essentially missing from this garden, Parkhouse mentions seating upon the terrace but does not state its type. She also included four tubs or garden vases within her design. The first pair were placed so as to flank the transition between the main path and the paving adjacent to the front porch and the second pair the transition from the paving to the porch. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

---
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5.4.3.3.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Although the garden was quite small, Parkhouse astutely included three pergolas within her design. The main pergola covered half of the terrace and aware of the vista from the dining room window across the terrace towards a large rowan tree, Sorbus aucuparia, Parkhouse specifically mentioned using four posts for its construction although the span only required three. This was to prevent the middle post from interrupting the view. The remaining two pergolas were constructed over two sections of the tradesman’s entrance, providing shade from the northerly sun and an aesthetically pleasing outlook from a bedroom and the kitchen windows which would otherwise have had an unappealing and hot view of this narrow space and the boundary fence.306 See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4 Planting Scheme
5.4.3.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale and Form

Parkhouse achieved a range of compatible scales, forms and textural variations within her permanent planting scheme; selecting her scheme to provide year round interest with foliage, flower and berries. Her permanent colour scheme was predominantly based on blue and lilac-blue as she felt that these flower colours were the most complementary to the large amount of red building materials used in the construction of the house although whites, yellows and pinks were also prominent. These softer colours were focused around the house and rear lawn panel and were complemented with a range of green tonings provided by the foliage of the permanent plantings. Parkhouse did include sections of more hotly coloured flowers within the main tree and shrub border along the fence line; these colours where also reflected within a number of berried shrubs and the strong autumnal colour achieved with a number of the trees, shrubs and climbers planted throughout the garden. Plants with purple and variegated foliage were used with care and restraint.307

5.4.3.4.2 Flower Borders

Parkhouse did not include traditional flower borders within her garden design instead she mixed them within the tree and shrub border. Bulbs were planted in drifts and left to naturalise under the soft fruit trees planted in the utility section of the garden.308

Perennials, annuals and bulbs were selected for length of flowering, their ability to provide cut flowers and what Parkhouse described as a ‘distinct decorative quality in their way of growth’. Perennials, annuals and bulbs were:

- planted amongst and in front of the tree and shrub plantings;
- massed planted in beds against the house foundations within a permanent framework of shrubs; and,
- planted in small rectangular panels along the fence line in between plantings of specimen trees: climbing roses, Rosa spp, were used to create a background for these beds.309 See figure 5.4.3.2a.

308 Parkhouse, pp. 28-9.
5.4.3.4.3 Trees & Shrubs
Trees and shrubs constituted the main focus of Parkhouse’s planting scheme and were selected to provide year round interest and beauty as well as to minimise the amount of upkeep required within the garden. Parkhouse used trees and shrubs to create and frame the ‘rooms’ within the garden. The tree and shrub plantings were predominantly sited along the fence line and around the house foundations; a row of soft fruit trees in the utility yard provided a ‘wall’ between this section of the garden and the private ‘room’ in the back garden. Specimen trees were planted at the edges of the lawn panels and also denoted the entrances to the property from the street. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4.4 Hedges
Parkhouse used hedges within her garden design to encompass and define the pleasure garden from both the utility yard and the street. A medium sized hedge was planted along the street and continued within the garden dividing the tradesmans entrance from the front garden. This section of hedging was also used as a background for the tree and shrubs planted along its width. A dwarf hedge was used to define the pleasure garden from the utility yard and finished the ‘wall’ achieved between these two spaces by the row of soft fruit trees. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4.5 Topiary
The only topiary used within the garden was contained within the four pots or garden vases placed in pairs denoting the front entrance of the house which, contained simply clipped box, Buxus spp, specimens. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4.6 Lawn
Lawn was a major component of this garden; Parkhouse framed two large rectangular panels one each in the front and back gardens with her planting scheme. A third long and narrow lawn walk was used to join these two spaces – a stepping stone path used to prevent damage to the turf in this area. A large specimen shade tree was included at the edge of each panel; the back lawn was intended as a private space but also had to accommodate children’s games and play. Interestingly, Parkhouse did not believe that this could be achieved within the front lawn even though it was enclosed within hedge and tree and shrub borders and in essence could have been considered to have been almost as private as the back garden. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4.7 Creepers & Climbers
Creepers and climbers abounded within this garden; there was not a vertical surface that was not clothed with some for of climbing plant, including sections of the house. All three pergolas and the porch were covered with vines or flowering climbers. The fences within the utility yard were practicably clothed with productive climbers and vines, while those within the pleasure garden were covered with a variety of flowering plants. See figure 5.4.3.2a.
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5.4.3.4.8 Natives
Parkhouse made no special mention of natives however, she did include four specimens within her planting scheme. Two Eucalypts, a Geraldton wax shrub, *Chamelaucium uncinatum*, and the native frangipani tree, *Hymenosporum flavum*. While the native frangipani, *Hymenosporum flavum*, and the larger Eucalypt were planted at the gardens boundaries, the smaller Eucalypt and Geraldton wax shrub, *Chamelaucium uncinatum*, were planted as a feature against the house. See figure 5.4.3.2a.

5.4.3.4.9 Plant Selection
Parkhouse’s selection of plants was well suited to an Adelaide plains garden.

---

315 Parkhouse, pp. 28-9.
316 Parkhouse, pp. 28-9. See Appendix 5J for a list of plants to accompany Parkhouse’s design, including those plants that she recommended as suitable alternatives.
Chapter Six – Analysis

6.1 Introduction

Chapter Six analyses and discusses Cornish’s key design and plant themes as were identified in Chapter Three. The sequence of this chapter is similar in structure to that of Chapters Four and Five in that a design overview of Cornish’s garden designs is followed by a detailed dissection delineating the key design elements and the main aspects of her planting schemes. Detailed analysis of a contextual and/or comparative nature of Cornish’s work is then undertaken within the setting provided by each of those subheadings in relation to:

- the gardening literature that she most likely had access to that displayed some degree of pertinence to her garden designs;
- the garden designs of the Australian contemporaries as outlined in Chapter Four; and,
- the garden advice and designs of the local South Australian contemporaries as outlined in Chapter Five.

While the sequence of information as outline above is the most common format, in some instances the order has been slightly modified to provide a more coherent flow of information.

6.2 Design Overview

‘“O, come with me and we will go among green things.” This call, holding out to us as it does such promise of good things – rest, beauty, healing – proves irresistible and we drop our work and find our way to the garden in search of these longed-for blessings’.1

These, the opening sentences of Cornish’s only known piece of written work convey the sense of what the garden meant to her. The rest of the page and a half takes us on a journey through ‘Her Garden’ - Cornish’s idealised concept of what constituted a garden both physically and psychologically.2 Constructed on the side of a hill, this garden commenced at the house upon a paved terrace beautified with potted hydrangeas, standard roses, climbers upon the house walls and a seat at one end of the terrace where it was placed in the shade created by the avenue planted along the drive. The descent down the hill passed through a rose garden formed upon a lawn terrace, shrubberies planted along its sides created a background for the beds of roses and delphiniums. A paved path with a sundial set at its mid point ran through the middle of the rose garden and led to a rose covered arch and a second terrace that contained a pool surrounded by lawn. Set against the retaining walls of the second terrace were ‘iris of every shade’ the whole enclosed by a tree-backed shrubbery. A stepping stone path led from the water garden via a cypress hedge arch to a daffodil dell and then onto a leafy walk bordered with primroses and forget-me-nots. This leafy walk provided access to a carefully planned and hidden shrubbery that ascended back to the main house terrace from which a further glimpse of gaily-coloured flowers backed with trees could been seen through an opening in a hedge.

2 A full copy of this text can be found in Appendix 6B.
Such a garden was a place to be refreshed both ‘mentally and spiritually, our cares forgotten’ and it was a type of garden that was ‘not for one country or clime alone. It is universal (sic)’. As has been discussed in Chapter Three and will be considered in the following, many of the ‘garden rooms’ depicted in this idealised garden were components of her actual known garden designs.

Including her own garden, Cornish has been conclusively linked to twelve gardens in Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills of which the six model garden designs have been counted once. Of these Cornish can only knowingly be credited either solely, or collaboratively in the case of ‘Broadlees’, with designing the entire garden in about half of these cases. Her involvement with the remaining gardens ranged from actual gardening through to advice and the design of particular ‘rooms’ within these gardens. Within the twelve gardens, Cornish’s design portfolio was diverse and while generally her designs could be categorised as large suburban gardens, large in the sense that they were bigger than the average quarter acre block, generally averaging around one acre in size, this would be misleading. Two were actually Adelaide Hills gardens, ‘Broadlees’ and ‘Stangate’; two were designed as public spaces, The University of Adelaide Embankment Garden and the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden; and three were smaller than a quarter acre, the Darian Smith residence, Cornish own garden and the six model garden designs. However, for all that Cornish’s portfolio of garden design types were diverse, small and large, suburban and Hills, and private and public spaces, her gardens tended to exhibit a number of design similarities, albeit that these were modified to suit their specific purpose and location.

Cornish’s gardens:
- were composed as formal spaces;
- were composed from a series of interconnected ‘rooms’ that were generally rectilinear in outline, the division between these ‘rooms’ was often as much psychological as physical;
- were axially arranged;
- occasionally incorporated asymmetrical arrangements within their design, particularly within individual ‘rooms’;
- were typically enclosed inwards looking spaces;
- contained axially arranged large features that terminated an axis, including pools;
- incorporated small features along an axis that were most frequently sited at the junction of an axis and cross axis, including pools;
- frequently incorporated level change, this element was often added to flat gardens, and their associated retaining walls and stairs;
- only included a small number of paved paths, these were typically straight and arranged along the main garden axis or formed the structure of a particular ‘room’ such as a perennial garden;
- used mixed borders of trees and shrubs at the boundaries to define and enclose the space;
- contained large expanses of lawn that contained either specimen or accent tree plantings;

3 Cornish, ‘Her garden’, pp. 164-5.
4 See Chapter Three for detailed information and elaboration about these gardens.
• tended to contain feature plantings and spaces such as rose, perennial and water gardens, each as an individual ‘room’ within the space; and,
• had limited foundation plantings around the house.\(^5\)

The works of Gertrude Jekyll were particularly influential upon Cornish and the design of her gardens. As such Cornish’s gardens were highly reminiscent of the constructs of the Arts and Crafts style of garden.\(^6\) Tim Richardson described Jekyll and Weaver’s book Gardens for Small Country Houses as a ‘well-illustrated source-book of ideas rather than a visionary manifesto’ that was ‘a response to a perceived stylistic vacuum, intended to help remedy the situation through good example’.\(^7\) This is exactly how it appears Cornish used this resource - as a sourcebook for concept, layout and individual templates for various garden features, such as the pergola at ‘Broadlees’ and the garden-house at the Darling residence.\(^8\)

Probably the two most important concepts that Cornish took from Jekyll was the need for ‘close connection of house and garden’ and particularly pertinent to the design of small spaces the need for simplicity.\(^9\) ‘The success of the scheme is the result in no small measure of not attempting too much, which is the usual fault in very limited gardens’.\(^10\) Cornish’s gardens complemented the architectural style of its associated house and provided both a setting for and were ‘intimately’ connected to it. Through ‘not attempting too much’ for the space, Cornish achieved gardens that were elegant in design and replete with repose.

While the general derivation of the layout of Cornish’s gardens can be pictorially found throughout Jekyll and Weaver,\(^11\) Walter Godfrey’s most succinct description of the form of the garden was indicative of Cornish’s designs.

‘The stretches of lawn, the enclosures for pleasure gardens, the terraces, wide walks and greens should be rectilinear in outline as far as possible; the paths should be straight, the planting should be formed in simple masses – the whole effect being balanced and restful’.\(^12\)

Similarly Agar’s comments on the design of the small garden\(^13\) and Nichols’ contemporary garden history that contained a chapter on the ‘modern’ garden in the formal style as derived from a consensus of opinion from the architects practicing at the time and to which Cornish’s garden designs tended to correspond to, described the garden as:

---

\(^5\) These points are drawn from the detailed descriptions of Cornish’s gardens in Chapter Three.
\(^6\) The influence of Jekyll is elaborated upon throughout the rest of this Chapter and within sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.5, 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.6.2.5, 3.6.3.4, 3.6.4.1, 3.6.4.2, 3.9.3 where specific references to support this statement can be found.
\(^8\) See section 6.3.5 below.
\(^9\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 13.
\(^10\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 99.
\(^11\) Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 12, 19, 21, 23, 25, 87-99.
\(^13\) See section 2.2.2.1 for detailed information and elaboration on Agar’s comments of the small garden.
'the essentials of their system are balance if not symmetry of design; an outer enclosure providing seclusion for people, and protection, besides a background, for flowers; clearly defined divisions and subdivisions and ornamental features to accent various centres of interest. Differences of level in the different sections are added, when possible, to avoid further danger of stiffness or monotony.'\textsuperscript{14}

Other attributes of Cornish’s designs can also be sourced back to a number of the other books authored by Jekyll that were available to her. The most influential of these as will be seen below were Wall, Woodland and Water Gardens and Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden. Similarly there were a range of other authors that appear to have provided Cornish with pertinent advice in relation to various aspects of the garden and its design of which Cornish seems to have incorporated into her designs. These have been detailed below, in connection to those aspects.

In comparison to Walling, Mellor and Brown, Cornish’s gardens as a whole appear more overtly formal. While her large gardens did tend to lack the outer informal spaces that were often components of her interstate contemporaries’ similarly sized designs, it was the nature and arrangement of their respective planting schemes, rather than any greater architectural treatment of Cornish’s gardens that created this apparent greater degree of formality. Both Walling and Brown in particular, designed highly architectural gardens, yet they clothed their gardens in such as way as to relieve this architectural dominance whereas Cornish’s planting schemes tended to emphasise this aspect of her designs.\textsuperscript{15}

Walling, Mellor and Brown tended to use more shrubs within their planting schemes than Cornish appears to have done. They also drew their tree and shrub plantings more fully into their gardens, using them as borders to facilitate ‘room’ divisions. With the exception of specimen trees and the Adelaide Hills gardens, Cornish used tree and shrub plantings predominantly at the boundary of her gardens. While this assisted to soften Walling and Brown’s architectural designs it also created greater divisions of more fully enclosed spaces within their gardens than Cornish did within her known gardens. While Cornish often had enclosed private ‘rooms’, such as the perennial garden adjacent to the front lawn at the Darling residence, some sections of her gardens tended comparatively to be arranged more in a semi open-plan style. However, each ‘room’ within that section still had its own discrete purpose and was divided psychologically and also sometimes with a minimal physical barrier from the next, but visually these ‘rooms’ formed an interconnected whole.\textsuperscript{16}

Contextually, within Adelaide during this period, most of the smaller suburban gardens were still heavily influenced in their design by Loudon and the later, often horticulturally biased, garden designers from England, North America and Australia, that were collective described as designing in the informal or landscape-gardening style. Overlaid upon this were areas often designed with the ‘geometric characteristics of the colonial and Victorian periods’.\textsuperscript{17} While many larger gardens also adhered to these design styles, there were amongst the Adelaide social elite and


\textsuperscript{15} See Chapter Three and sections 4.2.1, 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 for detailed information.

\textsuperscript{16} See Chapter Three and sections 4.2.1, 4.2.3.3, 4.3.1, 4.3.3.3, 4.4.1 and 4.4.3.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

\textsuperscript{17} Jones and Payne, pp. 59-64, 70-3, 77-84.
a number of practising architects, a significant influence from English Arts and Crafts, and Italian gardens upon local garden design. This included gardens totally designed, based upon these influences, but also those that only incorporated a few such 'rooms' or spaces.  

Cornish’s local horticultural contemporaries who wrote for the popular media generally continued to promote the informal style of gardening to their readers. This style of garden was often better suited to the average size of the suburban block, the architectural style of the house, the abilities of the home owner and more easily facilitated ‘a sense of leisure and recreation, a celebration of the outdoors (that) were important cultural considerations’ during this period. It was also significantly cheaper to construct.

The three garden designers and/or architects followed both these formal and informal design influences to varying degrees within their designs. Ellis’ garden designs showed the most overt influence towards the formal of the three. While the simplicity of his front gardens were sympathetic to the size and style of the block and house, his back garden designs probably better illustrate why informally designed gardens were better suited to the average suburban garden. Hartshorne designed gardens in the mixed style, those that were composed from both formal and informal elements. The execution of Hartshorne’s formal spaces were simpler and less fussy than Ellis' and were therefore more successful and effective. Parkhouse’s design was the least formal and incorporated many informal elements into it. However, her use of rectilinear spaces and the layout of a significant portion of her planting scheme were derived from formal design styles.

Cornish’s generally larger gardens enabled her to design more formal gardens that were strongly influenced by Arts and Crafts and Italian garden influences more than that of her contemporaries. However, a comparison of her smaller gardens with that of theirs showed an understanding for the need to drastically simplify those influences to guarantee the success of the garden; something that both Hartshorne and Parkhouse also achieved. It was also within these smaller spaces that Cornish recognised the suitability of a more informal design, as her own garden could attest.

---

19 See sections 5.2 and 5.3 for detailed information and elaboration upon this point.
20 Jones and Payne, p. 73. 59-64, 70-3, 77-84.
21 Kellaway, p. 4.
22 See section 5.4 for detailed information and elaboration on the garden designs of Hartshorne, Parkhouse and Ellis.
23 See Chapter Three and section 5.4 for detailed information.
6.3 Design Elements

6.3.1 Water

"It always seems to me that no part of a garden is more satisfying, more "answering," as A.A. Milne uses the word, than a well planned water garden surrounded by trees – cool, quiet, lovely."²⁴

Water was a significant element of Cornish’s garden designs. Cornish designed both formal and informal water features although formal designs tended to dominate. Of her known complete private garden design commissions ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox and Darling residences all contained at least one significant water feature. Pools were included in half of her model garden designs for the years 1929, 1931 and 1932. Cornish’s formal pools where either circular, rectangular or a variant of a rectangular form. All were axially aligned and were predominantly sited at the junction of the main garden axis and a significant cross axis where they also formed a major feature of the garden ‘room’ that they were sited in. Formal pools were less frequently used to terminate the main garden axis as in the garden at ‘Broadlees’.²⁵

Cornish’s two largest and most significant formal pools located within the Wilcox and Darling residences illustrated Cornish’s preferred setting for formal water features ‘Sheer delight makes us catch our breath. What is it that is so arresting? A still pool of shining water set in vivid green grass…and a tree grows nearby, it’s reflection thrown back in added glory.’²⁶ See figures 3.4.2.3a, 3.5.1 and 3.5.3.6. Both were set within a large expanse of lawn and had at least one specimen tree nearby.²⁷ The small size of the model gardens would have precluded the successful use of lawn in this manner in Cornish’s designs. Instead she encircled the ponds with vegetation integrating the pond with its surrounding planting scheme.²⁸ See figures 3.6.2.3a and 3.6.3.2. With the exception of the pool on the rose terrace at ‘Broadlees’ all of Cornish’s known formal pool designs were set within vegetation, this single pool being sited within the paving. Even so, vegetation was encouraged to grow in the dry-stone retaining wall that backed the pool and to cascade down the steps at its sides.²⁹

Reflection was one of the most important aspects of the water garden for Cornish as seen in her writing:

‘At all hours of the day, and of the night, too, the water has something to show us – blue sky, fleecy clouds, storm clouds with the moon breaking through, and above all the vivid sunsets with which we are so often blest. Their reflections come back to us glorified, forming an ever-varying succession of pictures.’³⁰

²⁴ Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 164.
²⁵ See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
²⁶ Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 164.
²⁷ See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.5 for detailed information on the water features at the Wilcox and Darling residences.
²⁸ See sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.3.2 for detailed information about Cornish’s model garden water features.
²⁹ See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration about this aspect of Cornish’s water features.
³⁰ Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 164.
This was further supported by her comments on the verso of two of the photographs sent to her family of her 1931 and 1932 model gardens where she expressed her preference for still water and reflection.31 Although reflection was an important aspect of Cornish’s pools she did also frequently include aquatic plants in her water features with water lilies, *Nymphaea* spp, the most commonly used. Period images of those pools indicate that Cornish intended that such plantings should not cover the entire surface of the water.32 Although Cornish’s preference was for still water and reflection she definitely included single jet fountains in the middle of the pools at the Wilcox residence and in her 1932 model garden. It seems likely that single jet fountains were similarly included in the ponds at the Darling residence and in the 1931 model garden as well. This allowed for the ‘play’ of water at the owners discretion.33 Cornish’s most elaborate known pond and fountain located at ‘Broadlees’, was at odds with her other examples and can potentially be explained as a possible experiment early in her design career or it could also be attributed to the influence of Eva Waite, the gardens co-designer.34

Cornish included informal water features predominantly in conjunction with rock gardens or rockwork. Only one of these pools that in the rock garden at ‘Broadlees’ had an irregular outline the rest were either predominantly circular or less frequently oval. Those informal pools directly associated with a rock garden were generally nestled within the rockwork. Cornish typically sited the pool at the base of the rockery mound. As these pools were an integral component of Cornish’s rock gardens they have been considered more fully in section 6.3.3.35 Although two of the gardens that Cornish was involved with contained natural seasonal creeks, ‘Broadlees’ and ‘Stangate’, it was difficult to ascertain what treatment Cornish employed for the garden adjacent to these creeks. Limited period photographs of ‘Broadlees’ suggested that in addition to the rock garden there was a flag-stone path that ran along a portion of the creek’s length and at ‘Stangate’ the remnant tree plantings suggested the idea of a woodland walk.36

Cornish’s formal rectangular pools were surrounded with copings that slightly overhung the water. The copings appeared to be made from the same stone used in the construction of the adjacent garden retaining walls, sandstone at the Darling residence and Mintaro slate at the Wilcox residence.37 All of her circular and oval pools appeared to have concrete edges. Where these pools were an element of a rock garden, rocks were set into the concrete edge such as at ‘Glannant’. Flagstones were used to cover and overlap the concrete edge of the irregularly shaped pool in the rock

---

32 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3.6, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.3.4, 3.6.2.1, 3.9.1 and 3.9.3 for detailed information on Cornish’s use of water plants within her pools.
33 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.3.2 for detailed information on this aspect of Cornish’s water features.
34 See sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.5 for detailed information about the elaborate pool and fountain at ‘Broadlees’.
35 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.2, 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 for detailed information and elaboration about Cornish’s informal water features associated with rock gardens.
36 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.3.3.6, 3.10.1 and 3.10.3 for detailed information about this topic.
37 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.5 for detailed information on this topic.
garden at ‘Broadlees’. While Cornish minimised the concrete rim of the circular pool in the rose terrace at ‘Broadlees’; the concrete rims of the 1931 and 1932 model garden pools were widened to allow planting spaces within the rim. 38 Further examples of this later treatment would be illustrated in a number of private residences within the pages of the South Australian Homes and Gardens magazine. 39

Figure 3.6.1a Circular pool with wide concrete rim in an Unley Park garden.  
Figure 3.6.1b The water feature at ‘The Lodge’, Strathalbyn the Hills residence of the Stirling family. This water feature is attributed to Guy Stirling the son of Sir Lancelot and Lady Stirling.

These two circular water features use a similar pool to that of Cornish in her model gardens and show a similar style of treatment to that of her 1931 ‘Springtide’ model garden. While the first example is of a similar quality to Cornish’s work the second has a less sophisticated treatment that has drawn on the local proclivity for rockwork. Cornish’s 1932 ‘Pool of the Narcissus’ illustrates a better combination of this style of pool in association with rockwork.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens April 1932, p. 32.)  
(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens October 1931, p. 20.)

Cornish designed her formal water features as highly formal spaces. Her designs were exceedingly reminiscent of the ideas and examples pictorially represented by Jekyll and Weaver in Arts and Crafts Gardens and to a lesser extent by Jekyll in Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens. 40 Cornish’s use of the simplest of forms for the shape of her pools and her uncomplicated though effective treatment of the adjacent surroundings enabled her to create water gardens that were ‘cool, quiet, lovely’. 41 This was in keeping with Jekyll and Weavers advice that ‘water needs to be employed very simply in small (gardens). Little pools and rills and fountains, with

38 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.2, 3.10.1 and 3.10.2 for detailed information on this topic.  
41 Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 164.
their waters not too vigorously “jaillissantes”, need to be disposed with a sparing hand.42

Like Cornish, Walling, Mellor and Brown’s water features all owed much to Jekyll and Weaver in their design. However, Cornish’s known formal pools were the most overtly allied to that illustrated by Jekyll. While the same basic design constructs can be applied to all four designers formal water features; Cornish’s associated planting schemes tended to enhance the feeling of formality. Cornish achieved this by employing an extremely limited palette of plants within the immediate vicinity of the pool. This created and emphasised a strong juxtaposition between the horizontal plane of the pool and surrounding lawn, with that of the verticality of the fastigiate forms of the specimen trees and sword-like foliage of the associated planting schemes. A belt of softer more rounded tree forms then encircled this space. The planting schemes, to varying degrees, of Walling, Mellor and Brown tended to provide a more informal setting. The planting scheme tended to be massed, softer and planted more immediately around these water features than Cornish’s.43 See figures 4.2.2.1a-c, 4.4.1c and 4.4.2.6.

While it could be argued that Walling, Mellor and Brown, of which Walling was the most successful, had managed to adapt Jekyll’s ideas into something that better suited and represented Australian conditions and that Cornish had not, this would be an unfair estimation of Cornish’s water features. It would be to take them out of context with her experience of the prevalent fashions amongst those parts of society from where her client base emanated, and the siting of her water features in relation to the house and the buildings architectural style.44

Cornish’s two most formal water features, those of the Wilcox and Darling residences were immediately connected with large very formal Neo-Georgian or Italianate buildings that demanded that a formal water garden be treated with the same degree of formality. The encircling belts of softer, more rounded foliage trees at the periphery of the water gardens and Cornish’s use of sword-like foliage against the hardness of the stone retaining walls softened the space. Combined with the prevalence of natural tones; green of the foliage and ochres and browns of the walls Cornish created ‘rooms’ that although formal in nature where still restful, peaceful and tranquil.45 Where Cornish’s formal water features were not so closely associated with the house, such as at the ‘Broadlees’ rose terrace, they became less strictly formal.46 Cornish’s 1931, ‘Springtide’ model garden was interesting in that it appears that she derived her concept for this garden from the water and flower terraces depicted throughout Arts and Crafts Gardens by Jekyll and Weaver, albeit on a greatly simplified and smaller scale.47

42 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 163.
43 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.2, 4.2.2.1, 4.3.2.1 and 4.4.2.1 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
44 See sections 4.2.2.1, 4.3.2.1 and 4.4.2.1 for detailed information.
45 See sections 3.2.1, 3.4.2.3, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5 and 3.5.3.4 for detailed information and elaboration on this aspect of the Wilcox and Darling residence water features.
46 See sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.2 for further information on this water feature at ‘Broadlees’.
47 See section 3.6.2.3 and 3.6.3.2 for detailed information on the water feature of Cornish’s 1931 model garden and Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 47, 59-61, 75, 79, 92-3, 107, 168, 189.
From the local perspective, Cornish's formal water features reflected the Arts and Crafts influences that her client base looked towards for guidance in relation to garden design. 48 This was further supported through her association with members of the architectural community. Of her local contemporaries it was the architects Ellis and Hartshorne that designed water features in a similar vein to Cornish albeit that their designs were less formal, although this can be explained by their generally smaller garden sizes. 49 See figures 5.4.1.2b and 5.4.2.2a-b. Those water gardens pictorially illustrated in South Australian Homes and Gardens that were of a larger size and owned by individuals who sought an arts and crafts expression within their gardens show that Cornish's designs were equal if not superior to the better examples represented within the magazine. 50 See figures 6.3.1c-d.

Figure 6.3.1c The water feature at 'Gunneda', Glenunga.

Figure 6.3.1d The water feature at 'Linden', Burnside.

These examples in an Arts and Crafts style are indicative of the better-executed water features within Adelaide during this period and are of a comparable quality to Cornish's known work.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens September 1935, p. 11.) (Source: Australian Homes and Gardens February 1931, p. 32.)

6.3.2 Paths, Paving & Driveways

In the design of her paths, Cornish followed a number of set principles that also conformed to the prevailing ideas set down within a number of the gardening texts that she had access to. Within her formal gardens Cornish's paths were either predominantly straight or maintained a geometrical curve facilitated by either a circular feature or a necessary curvature within the design of the space. Within her

48 Aitken and Looker, pp. 560-1.
49 See sections 5.4.1.3.1 and 5.4.2.3.1 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
infrequent informal garden ‘rooms’ her paths tended to be curvaceous but were not serpentine.\textsuperscript{51}

Cornish’s main garden paths tended to be paved, although not necessarily along their entire lengths, and were also axially aligned forming a ‘backbone’ within the garden.\textsuperscript{52} Other typical design precepts about Cornish’s paths that drew upon salient points from the period literature included:\textsuperscript{53}

- a purpose or reason for their existence in that they led to a specific point within the garden, linked garden ‘rooms’ and/or created the structure within her small garden ‘rooms’,\textsuperscript{54}
- a definite beginning and end, with the inclusion of a suitable terminal feature;\textsuperscript{55}
- axial alignment, especially of paved paths within her formal gardens;\textsuperscript{56}
- the influence of the house and/or surroundings on both the materials and pattern choices used in the paths construction;\textsuperscript{57}
- that a deviation in the direction of a path in her formal gardens generally occurred at a right angle;\textsuperscript{58}
- a widening at the junction of cross axial paths that also generally contained a feature to denote this point;\textsuperscript{59}
- the introduction of a pause point along the length of the path through the inclusion of a widening in the path also marked with a suitable feature;\textsuperscript{60}
- the inclusion of points of interest, often flower beds, along the length of long straight paths;\textsuperscript{61}
- the inclusion of small plants or lawn within the paving joints where appropriate;\textsuperscript{62}
- utility, in that they were conveniently placed, allowing for parts of the garden to be accessed during wet weather and were easy to traverse in both material and gradient; and,\textsuperscript{63}
- that they were kept to a minimum, Cornish did not overtly carve up her gardens with paths just for the sake of having a path and as such such paved paths were also minimised where possible in preference to either grass paths or lawn spaces.\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{51} See sections, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.7, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, .3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, and 3.13.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.

\textsuperscript{52} Agar, p. 108.

\textsuperscript{53} See sections, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.7, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, .3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, and 3.13.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.


\textsuperscript{55} Davies, pp. 303-5. Agar, p. 121. Thonger, \textit{The Book of Garden Design,} p. 33. Rogers, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{56} Jekyll, \textit{Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens,} p. 411.


\textsuperscript{58} Agar, p. 119. Rogers, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{59} Agar, p. 119. Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 241, 245.

\textsuperscript{60} Rogers, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{61} Davies, pp. 303-5.


\textsuperscript{64} Wright, pp. 133-5. Kellaway, p. 43.
Cornish’s limited use of paved paths was particularly suited to the Adelaide climate where the need to provide dry access was an unnecessary consideration for a significant proportion of the year. The majority of Adelaide’s rainfall occurred during the colder months when the gardens occupants were less likely to want to spend much time upon the lawn sections of the garden that formed such an important feature during the warmer months. Cornish’s provision of paved paths were such that while they provided structure to the garden they were also connected to those sections of the garden that could be made into a feature during those wet winter months. In summer her limited use of paved paths reduced the amount of heat and glare reflected within the garden.65

Typical patterns employed by Cornish included:
- basket weave, often with a secondary pattern created either throughout with the specific placement of small plants in the paving points or through modification to the pattern creating a central motif;
- herringbone;
- stepping stones with regularly shaped flagstones or large format pavers;
- stretcher bond;
- crazy; and,
- regular random created by a reasonably regular placement of a limited number of differently sized rectangular and square pavers.66

Typical materials used by Cornish in the construction of her paths included:
- red brick;
- large format concrete rectangular and square pavers, new and recycled;
- sandstone;
- slate;
- grass; and,
- earth but only within an informal garden ‘room’ such as a rock garden.67

While Cornish, Walling, Mellor and Brown all used the same types of materials and patterns in the construction of their paths, Cornish was probably more inclined to either include one significant paved path within the main garden and contained subsidiary paths forming the structure within a specialised garden ‘room’ such as a perennial garden or under a pergola, or only have a small number of these smaller paved paths. This left much of the rest of the garden in either case as either a lawn panel and/or a lawn path. While lawn as both a panel and a path did prominently feature in Walling, Mellor and Browns work, they were more inclined to include stepping stone paths throughout these spaces than Cornish was inclined to do. They also seemed to rely less on significant paved paths within the main portions of the

65 Thonger, The Book of Garden Design, p. 13. Rogers, p. 45. Agar, p. 108. See sections, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, and 3.13.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
66 See sections, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.7, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, and 3.13.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
67 See sections, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.7, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, and 3.13.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
garden. This can be explained by another significant difference between the designers. Of Cornish’s four known complete garden commissions for private clients, only one had a front path that led from the street to the front door. In the case of Walling, Mellor and Brown this path was typically treated in the more significant and substantial manner. In the case of Cornish’s gardens at ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox and Darling residences any visitor coming via foot would have had to use the driveway. This had a lot to do with how and where the houses were oriented on the block. None had a separate front garden enclosed from the rest of the garden in the typical sense and to have to have included a path from street to front door would have meant replicating the driveway with a path that ran parallel to it. This would have been both a waste of space and looked ridiculous. In the case of the garden at the Darian Smith residence, Cornish’s utilisation of paths was similar to that of her interstate contemporaries. The primary path was a straight front path that lead directly from street to front door, dividing the front garden into approximate halves while a less substantial secondary path of stepping stones was used in the back garden. Cornish’s paths were suited to the style of garden she chose to design and the relationship that it bore with the house in the same way Walling, Mellor and Brown’s paths were suited to the houses of and the gardens that they designed.68

The opinions expressed by Cornish’s local contemporaries in relation to paths was generally so diverse that it would have been possible to find support for almost any point of view in relation to type or shape of path, with one exception. All considered serpentine paths to be unsuitable. Points in common tended to include that all paths should have a purpose, this avoided superfluous paths unnecessarily carving up the garden, and there was a general though not unanimous preference for curved paths. The most popular paving patterns included crazy, stepping stones and rectangular pavers laid in a regular random pattern. South Australian Homes and Gardens confirms the general pattern preferences but like that of the garden writers it is possible to find images that would have supported most points of view or preferences in relation to the use of the path in the design of the garden.69

Of the three local contemporary garden designers and/or architects it was possible to say that all three in some way or another used paths in a similar manner to Cornish within their designs. However, from the perspective of impact upon the garden, only Hartshorne and Parkhouse’s paths retained that similarity to Cornish’s. Ellis’ highly formal designs for his back gardens meant that his path systems within this space dominated. Although both Cornish and Hartshorne used such similarly formal path systems to Ellis within particular garden ‘rooms’, generally a perennial garden, this was but one space within a number of connected spaces and the subsequent impact of the paths when considered upon the garden as a whole was minimal.70

Cornish’s path systems tended to follow the general local advice in relation to the need for a purpose, and the most popular paving patterns. She did not follow the prevalent opinion that a curved path tended to look better than a straight one within the garden. In this she was in greater accordance with the two architects Hartshorne

68 See Chapter Three and sections 4.2.2.2, 4.3.2.2 and 4.4.2.2 for detailed information on this topic.
69 See sections 5.2.2.1, 5.2.3.1, 5.2.4.2.2, 5.3.2.3.1, 5.3.3.3.2, 5.3.4.3, 5.4.1.2.3, 5.4.2.3.2 and 5.4.3.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
70 See sections 5.4.1.3.2, 5.4.2.3.2 and 5.4.3.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
and Ellis. Cornish’s use of straight paths better conformed to the axial arrangement of her garden designs.71

Cornish included only a few of what could be termed paved areas within her known gardens. These included the central space and adjoining paving in front of the seat in the perennial garden at ‘Broadlees’, the paved area adjacent to the portico at ‘Eringa’ and what appeared to be an area of paving within her own garden. All three sections of paving were connected to seats and provided: a foreground setting, a stable base for the seat and comfort for the occupant in that they rested their feet on a comfortable dry surface. Small plants or lawn were included within the paving joints. Crazy paving and large format square and rectangular pavers laid in a regular random pattern were used to pave these areas.72

Unlike her local and interstate contemporaries, Cornish does not seem to have included paved outdoor living spaces, these were not a component of her known designs. However, in fairness to Cornish, many of the gardens that she was involved with already had such a space or verandah directly connected to the house that had been included by the architect in his design for the house. This made the need for Cornish to include such a space within the garden superfluous. Further comment about the use of paving in conjunction with seats is covered under the heading of Small Features.73

Of Cornish’s known gardens, there were only three in which she may have had some form of involvement with the driveway, these were: ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox and Darling residences. Of these three, the driveway at the Darling residence is the only one that Cornish appears to have potentially had any involvement in its siting. The driveway at ‘Broadlees’ was already in existence before Cornish became involved with this garden and due to the nature of the site it followed the easiest gradient from road to house. It seemed most likely that the architect, Eric McMichael, determined the position of the driveway at the Wilcox residence. Although again the siting of the house and garage and the slope of the block suggested that its location was the most logical.74

The siting of the driveway at the Darling residence was governed by a number of constraints these being: the location of the entrance gate off Palmer Place, the location of the garage, and the location of the front door and its adjoining portico that together created the entrance to the house. It is unknown if Cornish was responsible for the fence that was built along the Palmer Place boundary around the same time that the house was being extended. It is possible that the architects, English, Soward and Jackman, were responsible for this aspect of the garden and therefore the location of the entrance gate. In either case, the siting of the entrance gate to the north of the house precluded any possibility of a straight driveway through to the garage, if it were to pass as closely as possible to the entrance of the house without

71 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.7, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.2.6, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.3.3, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2, 3.13.1, 3.13.2.3, 5.2.2.1, 5.2.3.1, 5.2.4.2.2, 5.3.2.3.1, 5.3.3.3.2, 5.3.4.3, 5.4.1.2.3, 5.4.2.3.2 and 5.4.3.3.2 for detailed information.
72 See sections 3.3.2.3, 3.3.3.2, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.8.3.2, 3.13.1 and 3.13.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
73 See Chapter Three and sections 4.2.2.2, 4.3.2.2, 4.4.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
74 See sections 3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
some form of significant type of forecourt-style arrangement. This would have had a substantial detrimental impact upon the appearance of the garden resulting in significant loss of useable space.75

Other than the oblique S form that the driveway eventually took, the siting of the entrance gate also allowed for the possibility of a typical Adelaide period driveway, that of a curve. A curved driveway in comparison to the oblique S chosen by Cornish would have resulted in a poorly conceived driveway in that the curve would have formed a difficult junction with the road. This would have precluded, without great difficulty, the entrance of the property at this point if travelling to the north along Palmer Place. Cornish’s design of the oblique S form for the driveway allowed her to maximise the space available to develop as garden, thereby enabling her to effectively deal with some of the site’s faults as well as providing comfortable passage from vehicle to front door, before the vehicle continued through to the garage located in the service yard.76

The one aspect similar to all three driveways was the use of a light coloured gravel as the surface covering. The lighter coloured gravel was in keeping with the light colour of the building render at ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox residence and the sandstone used in the construction of the Darling residence.77

Cornish’s driveway generally conformed to the consensus that while driveways should be direct, their form could be either straight or curved as dictated by the site conditions or desires of the owner. If curved, there needed to be some form of contrivance to justify the curve be it either natural or artificial. In suburban gardens the drive should not encircle the house least it ‘make the house appear like and oasis in the desert’.78 A variety of surfacing were recommended although gravel seems to have been generally preferred.79

Only Fletcher Steele’s small gardens were really small in that they dealt with a block size typical of that of an Australian Home Beautiful reader, seemed to pay much attention to the real impact the siting of the driveway had upon the potential garden. His preferred solution was to have the garage located to the side of the property and close to the street so as to have as short a drive as possible.80

While Walling, Mellor and Brown designed both short and long and straight and curved drives they did try to in all cases minimise the effect of the driveway upon the garden or turn it into a feature.81 From a local context, while many different types of drives were illustrated in South Australian Homes and Gardens, there was an obvious bias towards curved and semi-circular forms that often had a significant impact upon the front garden. This is hardly surprising as the preponderance of advice in relation to driveways recommended a curved form. Only the later horticultural writer Oliver and the architect and garden designer Ellis and Parkhouse deal more thoroughly with

75 See section 3.5 for detailed information on this topic.
76 See section 3.5 for detailed information on this topic.
77 See sections 3.3.1, 3.4.1 and 3.5.1 for information on this topic.
78 Kellaway, p. 36.
80 Fletcher Steele, Design in the Little Garden, Boston, Atlantic Monthly Press, 1924, pp. 84-8.
81 See sections 4.2.2.2, 4.3.2.2 and 4.4.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
the impact of the drive on the small block. They generally recommended that it be located close to the property boundary and although the garage was located towards the middle to rear of the block, attempts were made in the design of the drive to reduce its overall impact upon the garden. Cornish in the design of her driveway located it as skilfully as possible based on the constraints imposed by the site, the prevalent local fashion for a curved driveway and the congenial need of the residents to be able to be driven to the front door. 82

6.3.3 Rock Gardens & Rockeries
Cornish designed four known rock gardens and/or rockeries, two as model gardens and one each at ‘Broadlees’ and ‘Glannant’. While some of Cornish’s known rock work, that of her 1932 model garden, the rock garden at ‘Broadlees’ and parts of the rock garden at ‘Glannant’, suggested her potential ability in the execution of rock gardens and rockeries, her 1929 model garden and the majority of the rock garden at ‘Glannant’ illustrate that within the scope of her known work that this potential was not reached. Of the two permanent rock gardens that Cornish designed, the rock garden at ‘Broadlees’ would have to be considered the better executed. Although exactly how much work Cornish needed to undertake to complete this garden and how much already existed naturally is difficult to ascertain. 83 See figures 3.3.2.7a and 3.3.3.6a.

The rock garden at ‘Glannant’, more completely described in section 3.9, better illustrates the duality of Cornish’s success or lack thereof with rock gardens. The internal fill section, that was predominantly only a single course of rockwork high, was for the most part well executed and when viewed once planted out became a good illustration of this style of gardening. However, the miniature conical mountain surrounded with a border of rock placed on end and the associated stack of rock against the tree and to a lesser extent the rockery mound against the house wall seemed incongruent and unsophisticated when compared with the work adjacent to it. 84 See figures 3.9.1a-b, 3.9.2a-g and 3.9.3a-b.

The model gardens for 1929 and 1932 again illustrated this duality of ability and although some constraints were imposed upon Cornish, such as size, they enabled her to more freely express her own ideas than she was potentially able to in the design of her other known rock gardens, as the desires of her clients also had to be met. Her 1929 rock garden, essentially a rockery mound, although in keeping with local rock gardens frequently illustrated in the popular print media of the period, was at complete odds with the majority of the books on the subject that Cornish would have had access to. Her 1932 model garden of which an angled wall type rockery was a major component was far better executed. However, the success of this model garden was as much if not more so derived from the other major components of the design, the pool and the planting scheme. 85 See figures 3.6.2.1a, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.2 and 3.6.3.4.

82 See sections 5.2.3.1, 5.4.2.3.2 and 5.4.3.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
83 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.3.3.6, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.4 and 3.9 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
84 See section 3.9 for detailed information to support these conclusions.
85 See sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.3.4 for detailed information to support these conclusions.
The guiding principles for the construction of a rock garden as derived from a number of period garden book authors can be distilled to:

- observe and follow nature and the better examples of artificial rock gardens;
- follow a definite scheme of stratification;
- use real stone and rock not brick, concrete and other such artificial materials;
- use fewer but the biggest rock that can be procured and physically managed, rather than numerous smaller pieces; and,
- lay the rock on its broadest side and place it firmly into the earth.\(^8\)

Combined amongst these principles was a myriad of usually unillustrated descriptions of existing rock gardens that the author had either visited or constructed, a series of what not to do’s, and information on what and how to plant amongst other horticultural consideration.\(^7\) Robinson was probably the most helpful in his advice on how to arrange a rock garden in *Alpine Flowers* stating that ‘Of the general arrangement of the rock-garden I can offer no better guidance than is conveyed by the various illustrations in this book.’\(^8\) of which he proceeded to include many, depicting both good and bad examples of the style.\(^9\) Jekyll and Robinson seemed to be the only authors that included copious pictures within their books to help illustrate the intent of their words.\(^9\)

Water was a component of all of Cornish’s rock gardens. Cornish’s duality in relation to rock gardens was also reflected within this individual component. While the pools associated with the rock garden at ‘Glannant’ and the 1929 model garden where typical of that style of rock garden within Adelaide during the period, Cornish achieved rock garden pools of more consequence at ‘Broadlees’ and in her 1932 model garden. At ‘Broadlees’ the way in which the pool was integrated into the rockwork at the base of the slope suggested to the onlooker that this constructed pool was a naturally formed seasonal pool, due to a seasonal quasi-waterfall, that collected run-off from the slope during winter. Although still artificial in appearance it looked more natural and in keeping with the images of water in the rock garden in Jekyll’s *Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens* albeit that these pools and rock gardens were significantly larger.\(^9\)

The circular and oval pools at ‘Glannant’ screamed their artificiality but then the size and location of the ‘Glannant’ rock garden was so artificial that an informally shaped pool would have seemed just as ridiculous. The success of the circular pool in her 1932 model garden was due largely to the informal setting achieved with the planting scheme. In keeping the pool and angled rock wall

---


separate Cornish achieved a much better disposition of these two obviously artificial features than when combined in her ‘Glannant’ and 1929 model rock garden.\textsuperscript{92}

Most of the faults in Cornish’s rock gardens were largely due to her building them to a disproportionate height, especially when constructed on level ground, and an overuse of stone. This latter point was especially pertinent of her mounded style rock gardens.\textsuperscript{93} While many of the period authors that Cornish would have had access to derided the rockery mound,\textsuperscript{94} Robinson actually described, illustrated and recommended this type of rockery for the suburban garden. Such a garden was to be built upon the lawn in a section of the garden that could be hidden by trees or shrubs and was described as being ‘without any of the pretensions of the ordinary rockwork’.\textsuperscript{95} Unfortunately, many of these rock gardens, including Cornish’s 1929 model garden, with the exception of the pool that Robinson did not mention nor include, tended to be poor representations of his words rather than the accurate intent conveyed in the example illustration. After the bed that would form the base of the rockery mound had been improved ‘...worn stones of different sizes were placed around the margin, so as to raise the bed on average one foot or so above the turf. More soil was then put in, and a few rough slabs arranged so as to crop out from the soil in the centre...’.\textsuperscript{96} Once planted, Robinson unfortunately described the result as a ‘nest of small rocks and alpine flowers’,\textsuperscript{97} which actually belies the illustrated example see figure 6.3.3a but which more accurately conveys the essence of what was frequently constructed in Adelaide. The potential confusion that can be derived between word and picture as illustrated between Robinson’s description and illustrated example of a mound-type rock garden may partially explain much of the difficulty experienced in the construction of the rock garden in Adelaide. Cornish’s inclusion of pools backed by miniature mountains in both the 1929 model garden and at ‘Glannant’ can be directly attributed to the influence of local horticulturist and garden writer Alfred Quarrell.\textsuperscript{98}

Figure 6.3.3a Robinson’s illustration of what a rockery mound should look like. This example bears no comparison to the type of rock garden popularly constructed in Adelaide of the mound form.

(Source: Robinson, \textit{Alpine Flowers}, p. 29.)

\textsuperscript{92} See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.3.3.6, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.4 and 3.9 for detailed information to support these conclusions.
\textsuperscript{93} See sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.4 and 3.9 for detailed information to support these conclusions.
\textsuperscript{95} Robinson, \textit{Alpine Flowers}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{96} Robinson, \textit{Alpine Flowers}, pp. 28-9
\textsuperscript{97} Robinson, \textit{Alpine Flowers}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{98} See section 5.2.2.2 for detailed information.
The better rock placement in the section of rockwork along the house in the ‘Glannant’ rock garden, especially that opposite the circular pool was obviously an attempt by Cornish to place her rockwork, albeit on a much reduced scale and of a more artificial nature, in a similar vein to those pictorial examples provided by Jekyll and Negus in Arts and Crafts Gardens. This could be best described as the rocky sides of a ravine see figures 6.3.3b-c. While it is also possible to see this influence in the rock stacked around the tree in the ‘Glannant’ rock garden Cornish’s rock work in this section of the rock garden was in reality nothing more than a pile of planted stacked rock. See figures 3.9.2b-d.

While Cornish followed the prevailing advice that the rock garden be located in a quiet, secluded site, for the rock garden at ‘Broadlees’ and for both of her model rock gardens, their designs do suggest that Cornish intended them to be complete and contained garden ‘rooms’. The ‘Glannant’ rock garden was opposingly sited against the house, next to trees and in the shade. Cornish must have found solace in Mrs FA Bardswell’s The Book of Town and Window Gardening who writing about the above advice proffered by, as she described them, ‘the writers in the best horticultural papers’ stated that while this advice was appropriate for those in possession of large grounds that those in possession of smaller grounds ‘must cut their coats according to their cloth’. She then went on to describe the building of her own two rock gardens, near to the house and trees and one of which was also in the shade.

100 See section 3.9 for detailed information on the rock garden at ‘Glannant’.
101 Bardswell, p. 95.
However, while Bardswell did recommend Jekyll’s books as invaluable to anyone wishing to construct a rock garden, she was so desirous of executing a natural appearing stratification of her own rockwork that she referred to a book on geology and copied one of the styles illustrated within its pages.\textsuperscript{102}

Mellor’s rock gardens were difficult to assess as they were unillustrated except in plan form. It does however, seem likely that her rock gardens were comparable or only slightly better executed than the typical rock garden of the period.\textsuperscript{103} See figure 4.3.1b. Walling and Brown both designed and built significantly better rock gardens and incorporated natural rock outcrops in their gardens. Both of these designers rockwork was infinitely better than most of the examples proffered in Adelaide as being good examples of rock gardens and in general surpassed Cornish’s examples. The only aspect of Cornish’s rock gardens that can be considered comparable to that of these contemporaries is in her planting schemes. Cornish’s planting schemes for her rock gardens showed a high level of sophistication and although the colour schemes were mostly unknown her plant selection showed great attention to detail in regards to scale, form, texture and planting in bold masses.\textsuperscript{104} See figures 4.2.2.3a and 4.4.2.3.

Cornish’s poorest examples of rock gardens were comparable to the better examples regularly illustrated in South Australian Homes and Gardens and to those rock gardens regularly awarded first place in the model garden competition. See figures 3.6.2.3b and 3.6.2.5a. While much of the information provided in the popular local media was of a similar vein to that provided in the gardening literature from England, the one local proponent in the best position to ensure a better understanding of the rock garden, Alfred J Quarrell, allowed lesser standard rockwork to be exemplified as good examples. Quarrell’s writing on rock gardens like his contemporaries conveyed one set of advice on the construction of rock gardens while those images he selected to illustrate what could be considered fine rockwork conveyed the opposite. See figures 5.2.2.2a-b. The same duality occurred in the model garden competition where Quarrell was one of the regular judges.\textsuperscript{105} Even Hartshorne, who seemed to have a good understanding of the rock garden, had difficulty in translating this into reality. Although this might be explained, in part, if he was not involved in the actual construction of the rock gardens he designed. The rock garden at the McDonough residence in Springfield is a potential example of this possibility. See figure 5.4.1.3.3a.\textsuperscript{106}

The two local examples of rock gardens that held the general consensus amongst the local horticultural writers as being the best in Adelaide were those around the Palm House at the Adelaide Botanic Garden and those at ‘Beechwood’, Stirling, the Adelaide Hills residence of FH Snow.\textsuperscript{107} See figures 6.3.3d-e. The potential indicated

\textsuperscript{102} Bardswell, pp. 95-99.

\textsuperscript{103} See section 4.3.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on Mellor’s rock gardens.

\textsuperscript{104} See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.7, 3.3.3.6, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.4, 3.9, 4.2.2.3 and 4.4.2.3 for detailed information and elaboration on Cornish, Walling and Brown’s rock gardens and their rock garden planting schemes.

\textsuperscript{105} See sections 3.6.2 and 5.2.2.2 for details.

\textsuperscript{106} See section 5.4.1.3.3 for detailed information on Hartshorne’s rock gardens.

in Cornish’s better executed rock gardens, when viewed in context with these two examples, suggests that if she were given similar circumstances and siting that her rock gardens would have equalled or surpassed these better examples. This would have placed Cornish’s rock work on the same level as both Walling’s and Brown’s and ranked her rock gardens amongst the best in Adelaide, for the period. 108

Figure 6.3.3d The rock garden surrounding the Palm House at the Adelaide Botanic Garden.

(Source: State Library of South Australia, PRG 280/1/30/168.)

Figure 6.3.3e Part of Snow’s rock garden at ‘Beechwood’, Stirling.

(Source: Australian Homes and Gardens September 1931, p. 27.)

6.3.4 Small Features – Birdbaths, Sundials, Statues, Seats, Vases & Pots

Cornish used a full range of small features throughout her garden designs and, of these, statues, seats and pots and vases were the most frequent inclusions. Birdbaths and sundials were components of many of Cornish’s formal garden ‘rooms’ where they were typically axially aligned and most frequently placed either as the central feature of the ‘room’ and/or at the junction of cross axial paths. While most of Cornish’s sundials and birdbaths where symmetrically sited, they were occasionally asymmetrical placed such as the sundials in the enclosed perennial garden at the Darling residence and on one of the landings in the zig-zag staircase at ‘Broadlees’. Stylistically, Cornish chose birdbaths and sundials that were of simple formal design. 109 See figures 3.3.2.3b, 3.3.3.4a, 3.6.2.2a and 3.6.3.5.

‘Sundials, like other ornaments, depend more for their decorative success on their right placing than on their intrinsic merit as garden sculpture’. 110 Cornish generally


See sections 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.4, 3.9, 4.2.2.3, 4.4.2.3, 5.2.2.2 and 5.4.1.3.3 for detailed information to support this conclusion.

See Chapter Three for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

Jekyll and Weaver, p. 241.
followed this right placement of her sundials and birdbaths, that was generally accepted as at the junction of paths or at a point along an axis, with the path widened at these points to accommodate the feature. It was acceptable for these features to be placed on the lawn but a base or platform with some degree of surrounding paving was considered essential. The only possible aspect that Cornish may potentially be considered to have failed in the placement of these little features was the lack of a base in a few of her examples. These were the sundial in her 1930 model garden and the birdbath at ‘Broadlees’: both lacked a plinth. However, her use of significant feature paving around the birdbath and a little garden bed around the sundial could be considered acceptable substitutes.111

Cornish, like Brown, maintained the typical siting of sundials and birdbaths within formal garden ‘rooms’ throughout her garden designs. Although Walling also typically employed this setting, she was also willing to site these ornaments, more frequently a birdbath than sundial, within less formal surroundings. Mellor so infrequently used either that to make any form of comparison to her work in this sense would be both difficult and potentially erroneous.112

Local horticultural writers tended to only mention that these little features were suitable ornaments to include in the garden, leaving their siting to the owners discretion and therefore allowing for them to be potentially misplaced. Oliver was more specific in that he mentioned that the sundial should be a component of the formal garden. ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’, Hartshorne and Ellis were the only local contemporaries to either use or allude to the correct placement of these features.113 Of those garden pictures within South Australian Homes and Gardens that depicted sundials and birdbaths, most indicate that the placement and surrounding treatment of sundials and birdbaths generally conformed to the accepted dictates for the placement of these ornaments, even if there was still often some degree of error. However, these errors, often that of an insufficient base, can, like Cornish’s small omissions, be considered acceptable when viewed in light of the surroundings. Even in those circumstances, where these ornaments may have looked better with a base, its omission was not so egregious as to ruin the desired effect.114

111 Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 241-5, Rogers, p. 187. George Dillstone, The Planning and Planting of Little Gardens, London, Country Life, 1920, p. 34. See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.4, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.2.2, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.3.5 and 3.13.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
112 See sections 4.2.2.4, 4.3.2.4 and 4.4.2.4 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
113 See sections 5.2.3.1, 5.2.4.2.4, 5.3.3.3.4, 5.4.1.3.4 and 5.4.2.3.4 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
Cornish included a number of statues in her garden designs, most were of small size and often whimsical, although she did incorporate a significant work by sculpture Ola Cohn within her design for the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden. Of the statues that Cornish included in her formal garden 'rooms', these were typically axially aligned and placed centrally within the space. Less frequently they were used as a feature at the entrance to the room or in the case of the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden placed asymmetrically towards the rear of the space. It is important to note that no statuary was known to have been included in two of her three most formally designed gardens: the Wilcox and Darling residences. A single statue was included at 'Broadlees' where it was incorporated into the formal pool and fountain. The incongruent nature of this feature in relation to the rest of the garden at 'Broadlees' has already been commented upon, see sections 3.3 and 6.3.1. Cornish was obviously aware that significant pieces were required for these spaces and that the small whimsical pieces often used by her in her model gardens and small garden 'room' commissions were inappropriate and of a suburban nature. In her informal garden 'rooms' Cornish frequently employed two small statues closely together. In the case of her 1929 and 1932 model gardens these were placed around the water feature. Similarly a small statue was sited adjacent to the circular pool in the rock garden at 'Glannant' however, there was also a further small statue mounted on a pedestal and sited in the opposite diagonal corner of this garden.\(^{15}\) See figures 3.3.2.5a, 3.6.2.2b, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.3.2, 3.6.3.4, 3.8.1, 3.9.1a-b, 3.11.1a, 3.11.1d and 3.11.3b.

Jekyll and Weaver were of the opinion that statues of the right scale were particularly relevant in the small garden with some caveats.

'The more the designer lacks space, the apter should he be in making us forget his garden's limitations. Ingenious pleasantries of treatment here and there arrest the interest. By concentrating it they make the visitor oblivious of the smallness of the theatre which yields so much diversion. This is not a plea for many ornaments, still less for any one that stands out markedly from its surroundings'.\(^{16}\)

Of the type of statues most suitable for the small garden Jekyll and Weaver recommended cherubesque figures and those with the 'motif of the sporting child'.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.5, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.2, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.2, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

\(^{16}\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 235.

\(^{17}\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 235.
Less specific about their placement within the garden, the illustrations in *Arts and Crafts Gardens* generally depicted the use of statues in hedge niches, axially aligned and set in the middle of a pool, denoting entrances and transitions between 'rooms', and if an appropriate figure could be found placed to as to appear as if it were floating within a flower border.\(^{118}\) Rogers was of the converse opinion that statues had no place within the small garden.\(^{119}\)

Of Cornish’s interstate contemporaries, only Walling and Brown included statues within their garden designs. These statues were large elegant pieces that lacked the suburban whimsical nature of the cherubesque and pater pan style statues commonly used by Cornish. While Cornish’s use and placement of her little statues may have been generally effective, such as in the sunken gardens at ‘Eringa’ and her 1934 model garden and around the pool in the 1932 model garden, Cornish’s work in this regard can not be considered to be of the same high standard as Walling’s and Brown’s. However, when Cornish had access to the same quality of statutory, such as the Cohn piece at the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, she was able to site the statue and treat the surrounding area in such as way as to achieve the degree of dignity and formality that befit both the piece and the concept of a memorial garden.\(^{120}\)

Little pan and cherubesque statues of a whimsical nature were often included in the smaller Adelaide suburban gardens and were treated in a very similar manner to that of Cornish. Only rarely were larger more elegant pieces illustrated in *South Australian Homes and Gardens*. The local garden writers dealt little with the use of statues in the garden. McClure recommended them as a means of providing an attraction within the garden and stated that their successful placement would depend largely on the artistic ability of the owner. In this respect Cornish’s use of the popular little pan and cherub statues suggests a fancy for these fashionable little pieces, a willingness to acquiesce to the owners desire and, when considered in relation to her model gardens, a possible strategic marketing ploy.\(^{121}\)

The primary purpose of the seat in the garden was comfort, although it was understood that this was not necessarily easily achieved as the most comfortable of seats also tended to be the most susceptible to the weather. As such, seats of a more permanent nature had to be considered for inclusion in the garden and were to be treated as a ‘*decorative aid*’.\(^{122}\) Seats were considered accessories, not principal objects; that said however, they were considered suitable as a feature within the immediate surroundings and were recommended as a means to terminate axes. Wherever it was located within the garden, a seat needed to have some form of view. Some form of paving under and in front of the seat was also generally recommended.

---

\(^{118}\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 234-8.

\(^{119}\) Rogers, p. 190.

\(^{120}\) See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.5, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.2, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.2, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 4.2.2.4 and 4.4.2.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.


\(^{122}\) Jekyll and Weaver, p. 246.
The style of the seat needed to be in keeping with its surroundings although simpler designs, especially for small gardens, were considered more appropriate. Wooden seats could be either left to weather to a natural colour or be painted white, never green, the artificiality of the painted colour considered to conflict with the natural greens of the garden. 123

Cornish generally followed this advice in her selection and placement of seats in her gardens; seats were one of the more frequent inclusions in her garden designs. Typically she used a range of wooden and stone benches, both straight, curved, and circular seats placed around a tree. Her seats tended to be of simple and formal design although she did include a rustic seat in the 1929 rockery model garden. Cornish appears to have included seats more prevalently within formal garden spaces than informal spaces. Seats included in her formal garden ‘rooms’ or within her formally designed garden houses where often axially arranged and frequently terminated that axis. The seats within these formal spaces but not within a garden-house were backed with hedges that occasionally wrapped around the sides of the bench. Most of the seats in these formal spaces also contained some form of paving or hard surfacing under and in front of the seat, the only exception being the stone bench on the ‘Broadlees’ lawn terrace adjacent to the house. The seats included by Cornish in less formal spaces were seemingly sited for both comfort and prospect; this often resulted in the seat being placed in a corner of the ‘room’ under the shade of a tree. Pictures of the ‘Glannant’ rock garden show that the family did place moveable furniture within this space and that some of the rockwork, especially that near the circular pool, was suitable to sit upon. Of the images that show the seats used by Cornish in detail they appeared to stylistically reflect the simpler designs illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver. Those that were constructed from timber appear to have been either left to weather to a soft natural colour or were painted white. 124

Cornish typically used seats in the same manner as Walling, Mellor and Brown, especially in relation to their use in more formal ‘rooms’. It is difficult to draw many conclusions about Cornish’s placement of seats in informal settings, with that of her interstate contemporaries, as there are few examples of this type of Cornish’s work. It generally appears that Cornish’s seats placed in informal surroundings were not as secluded as those of the other designers. 125

Cornish’s use of seats was also generally typical of that of her local contemporaries. Some of the readily apparent differences were both Quarrell’s and Hartshorne’s treatment of the background; both used or suggested the more sculptural effect of rows or pairs of fastigate trees. Her local contemporaries also seem to have achieved a greater degree of seclusion and privacy than Cornish in relation to the positioning of seats in informal areas of the garden. The comment on sample size previously stated in regards to her interstate contemporaries is also applicable here. It is also easier to make a statement in relation to seclusion and privacy in a gardening column

124 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.5, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.9.2, 3.13.1 and 3.13.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
125 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.5, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.9.2, 3.13.1, 3.13.2.2, 4.2.2.4, 4.3.2.4 and 4.4.2.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
than it is to actually have to achieve it within the confines set by the garden.126
Stylistically, Cornish's seats fall comfortably within the spectrum of seat types
illustrated in South Australian Homes and Gardens. Although with the exception of
the rustic seat in her 1929 model rock garden, she did avoid both extreme ends of the
spectrum of illustrated designs.127

Pots and vases were the most frequently included small feature in Cornish's gardens
and, although they were used more frequently within her more formally designed
spaces, they were still occasionally included in those of informal design. Cornish
used a wide range of pot types, sizes and materials and even cast her own pot designs
in concrete. The most common pot material types included terra cotta, concrete and
half wine barrels and typical shapes included a variety of urns, Easter jars, troughs,
typical Italian designs including rolled rims and swag designs, small bowls and large
squares amongst others. Cornish planted many of the pots, especially those that
denoted an entrance or change in level with a feature planting, such as a succulent,
cacti, strappy foliage plant or simple topiary specimen, such as a ball on stick or
inverted cone.128 See figures 3.3.2.2c, 3.3.2.3b, 3.3.2.5a, 3.3.2.6a, 3.3.3.3c-e,
3.4.2.3a, 3.5.2.3, 3.6.2.1a, 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.5b, 3.6.3.2 and 3.8.1.

Cornish typically formally used pots and vases:
• to denote the top or base of a staircase;
• either side of a path to denote an entrance;
• at strategic points around the house, often either side of a window, at an entrance
  or in alignment with columns;
• on top of wall piers generally to denote an entrance;
• along walls either as a feature or in the case of the Wilcox residence to indicate
  the edge of the terrace;
• to denote an entrance into a ‘room’; and,
• as a symmetrical feature around a formal pond.129

Cornish typically informally used pots and vases:
• as a feature of the space; and,
• in a run on either side of each step in a set of stairs.130

As pots and vases were generally considered a form of garden ornament, most of the
points relevant to the other forms of ornament and features were also applicable to
them. Cornish typically used her pots and vases in a similar manner to those

126 See sections 5.2.2.3.2, 5.2.5.2.2, 5.2.4.2.4, 5.3.3.3.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2.3.4, 5.4.3.3.4 for detailed
information and elaboration about this topic.
127 A representative selection includes: ‘Thank God For A Garden’, Australian Homes and Gardens
January 1931, p. 24, ‘In the Garden at “Linden”’, p. 22, “Gumneda” Glen Osmond The Home of Mr.
And Mrs. R. Buring’, South Australian Homes and Gardens January 1933, p. 35. D. Darian Smith,
‘Garden at “St. Margaret’s” Aldgate’, South Australian Homes and Gardens June 1937, p. 28. Smith,
South Australian Homes and Gardens January 1947, p. 37.
128 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6.2, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2 and 3.12.3.1 for
detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
129 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6.2, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2 and 3.12.3.1 for
detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
130 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6.2, 3.6.3.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.3, 3.12.1, 3.12.2.2 and 3.12.3.1 for
detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
illustrated examples given by Jekyll and Weaver as well as using them in preference to other more decorative forms of ornament in her gardens. This was often more suitable for the smaller nature of the garden that Cornish designed. For example, where Jekyll and Weaver illustrated the use of a pair of statues flanking a staircase Cornish would use the simpler and more appropriate form of a suitably shaped pair of pots.  

Cornish used pots and vases in a similar manner to both Walling and Brown. However, Mellor was more reticent in their use tending to only use a pair of pots by the front door or upon the patio area of the house. Of Cornish's local contemporaries, only 'A Professional Woman Garden' seems to have recommended both the same types of use, forms and frequency of inclusion of pots and vases within the garden. Hartshorne and Ellis tended to more frequently use pots in pairs to denote particular points within the garden. Many of the types of pots that Cornish used and her typical placements were illustrated within the pages of South Australian Homes and Gardens. However, due to the architectural style of the known houses that Cornish designed gardens around, she appears to have not used pots in the typical Adelaide style of a pair of decorative vases set upon the pillars that provided the endpoint to the winged entrance to the house or along verandah edges.

6.3.5 Large Features – Pergolas, Colonnades, Garden-houses, Tennis Courts & Garages

Cornish only included a single pergola in the sense of what such a structure was commonly considered to be during the period that of being 'for the display of beautiful climbing plants, as well as ... a shady way in summer'. This was in the garden at the Darling residence. Cornish did include a combined pergola/colonnade along the front of the rose terrace at 'Broadlees' and there was a pergola-like structure attached to the fence of the tennis court at 'Holmfield' that Cornish might have been responsible for. See figures 3.2.1c, 3.3.2.2a, 3.3.2.2c, 3.3.3.1a and 3.5.2.3.

Jekyll and Weaver stated that of the design of a pergola that 'it should always lead from one definite point to another; one at least being some kind of full-stop, either of summer-house or arbour, or, at any rate, something of definite value in the garden design'. Weaver later stated that 'the pergola should always be regarded as a

132 See sections 4.2.2.4, 4.3.2.4 and 4.4.2.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
133 See sections 5.3.3.3.4, 5.4.1.3.4 and 5.4.2.3.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
135 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 193.
136 See sections 3.5.2.3 and 3.5.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration about the pergola at the Darling residence.
137 See sections 3.2.1, 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.2 for detailed information and elaboration about the pergolas at 'Holmfield' and 'Broadlees'.
138 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 194.
connecting-link between two definite parts of the garden, and not as a thing which is justified in its own right wherever it may be put'.\textsuperscript{139} Kellaway, in his book dealing specifically with the design of the suburban garden was less stringent and used the pergola as a means to enclose a garden ‘room’ or disguise an objectionable feature such as the service yard. He was however, most specific in the design of the structure itself, favouring a solidity of structure that ensured that it ‘belonged to the place’ and did not appear as if it had been ‘dropped by a passing wind’.\textsuperscript{140} As such, the pergola also had to bear some relation in its design to its surroundings, be that the garden or the house.\textsuperscript{141}

Although Jekyll and Weaver described the possible construction of pergolas as either ‘a mere framework of poles’ or ‘posts of solid masonry’ those pergolas that were illustrated with wooden poles were not flimsily constructed.\textsuperscript{142} As a covered walk it was generally recommended that the pergola be straight, although Jekyll and Weaver did illustrate a curved pergola; its width should be greater than its height; and it was always associated with a planting, the structure itself covered with vines or other climbing plants.\textsuperscript{143} The associated planting could be as simple as Agar’s placement of the pergola in the rose garden for which it then required no ‘straining...to give it good reasons for its existence’\textsuperscript{144} it being solely covered with climbing roses. Rogers felt that the planting of the pergola should be more complex than just a structure for climbing plants recommending that ‘the pergola walk should be flanked with borders’.\textsuperscript{145} Jekyll and Weaver similarly illustrated this type of planting.\textsuperscript{146} Particularly pertinent to Cornish and Adelaide were references to the pergola’s origins in Italy where the similarities between climate made the provision of shade, a primary function of the pergola, an imminently suitable structure to be included within the Adelaide garden.\textsuperscript{147}

None of Cornish’s pergolas provided a link between garden spaces but did otherwise generally conform to the advice listed above. The pergola at the Darling residence did have a definite beginning, the portico and front door of the house, and a definite full stop for an ending, the wall and assumed seat that must have been placed there. It also enclosed the adjoining garden ‘room’ and disguised the adjacent service yard. In its construction it bore definite relation to the house, Cornish repeating for its columns those used in the adjoining portico, it was covered with wisteria, \textit{Wisteria floribunda}, and had an associated garden planting of roses, \textit{Rosa} spp.\textsuperscript{148}

The structure at ‘Broadlees’, a combined pergola/colonnade-like structure, still conformed to much of the prevailing advice, but less overtly so. The pergola sections acted as both entrance and exit to the rose terrace from either the broad path or from the central staircase that linked the rose and perennial garden terraces. Although a

\textsuperscript{139} Lawrence Weaver, \textit{The Garden} cited in Dillistone, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{140} Kellaway, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{141} Kellaway, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{142} Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 193-206.
\textsuperscript{144} Agar, p. 182. As it provided a structure for climbing roses.
\textsuperscript{145} Rogers, p. 177. As in herbaceous borders.
\textsuperscript{146} Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 194-203.
\textsuperscript{148} See sections 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3 and 3.5.3.2 for detailed information.
comparatively lighter structure than the pergola at the Darling residence, the
‘Broadlees’ pergola did still provide a sense of privacy to the rose terrace without
overtly enclosing the space, which would have perceptibly reduced its size. Sited in
the rose garden it too did not ‘strain’ for a reason to exist and the selection of
wooden poles for it posts was appropriate in that they provided the necessary
lightness but not flimsiness of structure as was suitable for its removed location from
the house.\footnote{See sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.2 for detailed information.}

The pergola-like structure at ‘Holmfield’ was not so much a covered walk but more
arbour-like in that it provided a place for shaded repose.\footnote{See section 3.2.1 for detailed information.} All three of Cornish’s
structures provided this important element, shade, within the garden. The structures
at ‘Holmfield’ and the Darling residence were more successful in this respect but
then it is likely that this was not as significant a consideration of the structure at
‘Broadlees’ where the terrace gardens had to be carved from considerable mature
tree plantings.\footnote{See sections 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3 and 3.5.3.2 for detailed information.}

Cornish’s known pergolas and colonnades were comparable to that of Walling and
Brown’s and possibly better than Mellor’s although without any images of Mellor’s
completed structures it is difficult to undertake a comparison. Like Walling and
Brown, Cornish’s structures closely associated with the house, displayed a high
degree of architectural formality in the selection of their materials; refined masonry
columns that were often a replica of those used in the house. Substantial wooden
beams created the roof framework with lighter weight timbers linking the
crossbeams. Where Cornish’s pergolas differed from Walling’s was in those
structures not directly linked with the house. Walling’s structures in these cases,
although less formal than those connected to the house, were significantly more
substantial structures. Walling often used her favoured large plastered rubble
columns. While the structure at ‘Broadlees’ was not flimsy in appearance, the
timbers were comparably lighter than Walling’s typical timber pergolas constructed
away from the house. In their siting, Cornish used her pergolas and colonnades in a
very similar manner to that of Walling, Mellor and Brown.\footnote{See sections 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3, 3.5.3.2, 4.2.2.5, 4.3.2.5 and 4.4.2.5 for detailed
information and elaboration about this topic.}

With the similarity in climate between Italy and Adelaide, it is interesting that they
were not more widely discussed in the gardening pages and pictorially illustrated in
the popular media. The most likely explanation for the apparent lack of these
structures in a local context was the numerous and often extensive verandahs that
surrounded many of the older houses. These structures clad in vines and climbing
plants provided the same necessary shade, places of repose and garden vistas that
where commonly provided by the pergola. Similarly, to the verandahs of the older
Adelaide cottages and villas, porticos and loggias were a dominant feature of the new
houses being built in neo-Georgian and Italian modes. While these latter structures
were not often clad in climbing plants they did also create places of shade and repose
and did have a visual impact similar to that of a pergola but often of a more dominant
note. Verandahs, porticos and loggias were also more weather proof during
inclement and cooler periods.
The authors of many of the gardening pages in the popular media were horticulturists and most of their references to the pergola were in association to its ability to provide a support for various climbing plants and in the case of Oliver as a structure upon which to train fruit trees, very much in a similar vein to that of Jekyll and Weaver. Both ‘Homebird’ and McClure mentioned rustic pergolas. However, the example image does not depict a rustic structure per se. See figure 5.2.4.2.5a. Although it was obviously made from unworked timbers, except for the removal of bark, it was of a similar nature to that illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver and used by Cornish in the design of the ‘Broadlees’ pergola. Comparisons in relation to these writers preferred siting of the pergola within the garden is difficult to make but generally it seems that they were not sited in the typical manner recommended by those sources probably consulted by Cornish. Quarrell felt that the pergola would make a good entrance to a rock garden, McClure thought it would look good either side of a rustic bridge, and in one of the plans included by ‘Agricola’ the pergola ran horizontally across the block and driveway where it was terminated by the boundary hedge. The position of the hedge in relation to the driveway left not space for the inclusion of a seat or other device that would have adequately terminated this vista, formed by the pergola, from the main house terrace.

Of Cornish’s local garden design contemporaries, only Hartshorne was known to have included pergolas within the traditional sense in his designs. Both Parkhouse and Ellis did include pergola-style structures over their terraces. Hartshorne’s use of the pergola was very similar to that of Walling’s and as such were comparable to Cornish’s in relation to siting. Any conclusions about Hartshorne’s selection of materials for the construction of his pergolas were difficult to draw as only one of these intended structures was illustrated in such a way as to be able to determine this aspect of its design. This pergola, intended for the McDonough residence, was to have been constructed from substantial round columns and timber beams. See figures 5.4.1.2a-c and 5.4.1.3.6. Pergolas illustrated within the pages of South Australian Homes and Gardens, that were located in the large gardens owned by the Adelaide social elite, generally conformed to the Arts and Crafts styles of pergola illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver.

---

153 See sections 5.2.2.2, 5.2.2.3.7, 5.2.3.2.3, 5.2.3.2.7, 5.3.2.2, 5.3.2.3 and 5.3.2.4.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
154 See sections 5.4.2.2.2, 5.2.4.2.5 and 5.3.2.2 for detailed information.
155 See section 5.4.1.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
156 See sections 5.4.2.3.5 and 5.4.3.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
157 See sections 5.4.2.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
158 See sections 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3, 3.5.3.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 4.2.2.5 and 5.4.1.3.5 for detailed information.
159 See section 5.4.1.3.5 for detailed information.
These two examples of pergolas show better-executed but typical examples of these structures in an Arts and Crafts style in Adelaide gardens.

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens March 1932, p. 36.)

Cornish was responsible for the design of three known garden-houses: one each at the Darling and Wilcox residences and one as part of her 1933 model garden design. The one element common to all three of Cornish’s garden-houses was their openness; all were composed from unclad frames with a single rear wall. This made these frames an integral decorative element of all of her garden-house designs. The style of all three garden-houses can also be directly attributed to illustrations of structures contained in Arts and Crafts Gardens. The garden-houses of her model garden and at the Darling residence can be directly linked to garden-houses in that work, while that at the Wilcox residence is a roofed variation of the pergola frame taken from Jekyll and Weaver and also used at ‘Broadlees’. See figures 3.4.1a, 3.4.2.6a, 3.5.2.6, 3.6.2.5b and 6.3.5c.

161 Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 26, 195, 229, 231. Also see sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.6, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.6, 3.6.2.5 and 3.6.3.6 for detailed information and elaboration about Cornish’s garden-houses.
Of garden-houses Jekyll and Weaver wrote:

'The success of summer-houses and pavilions, considered as elements of garden design, depends as much upon their skilful placing as upon their form and materials. It may be laid down that, in cases where the pavilion is near the main house and related to it by path or pergola, it should have the same architectural treatment.'

The garden-house at the Darling residence did exactly that; it was sited close to the house and connected to it by a path. Cornish replicated the columns used in the houses portico and balconies for the framework and roofed the structure with the same red tiles. Interestingly, Cornish did not follow this advice for the garden-house at the Wilcox residence even though in its siting it was more closely related to the house than that at the Darling residence. It would be fair to state that she even did the exact opposite. Only those garden-houses that were located remotely from the main house were allowed to be designed in such a way as to bear 'no definite relation to the main house'. Cornish's use of the timbre frame and brushwood roof definitely bore no relation to the house, the only similarity between both structures being their hipped roofs. The contradictory nature of this garden-house can be partially explained by both its purpose and its immediate setting.

Agar wrote of these structures that they were:

'accessories and not principle objects. The architect is inclined to design these and look to the garden to display his work, but the garden designer will aim for strong and simple structures appropriate to their purpose, and not obtrusive.'

The garden-house in the garden at the Wilcox residence was located in the least formal section of this garden but still adjacent to the formal terrace gardens. It was located next to the tennis court and it was aligned so as to allow a viewer or awaiting...

---

162 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 223.
163 See sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.6 for detailed information about this topic.
164 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 226.
165 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.6 and 3.4.3.5 for detailed information.
166 Agar, p. 146.
player to watch the current game. It was not necessarily a place of repose from which
to view the garden. A more architecturally designed structure next to the formal
garden but obviously sited within a comparatively informal section of the garden
would have seemed incongruous, so its design in unobtrusive, simple and appropriate
for its purpose. The climbing roses that covered this structure and assisted in helping
to disguise the garden-house from the formal garden further substantiated this.\(^{167}\)

Other than the garden-houses ‘utility as a natural terminus’ Rogers, whose book
dealt solely with the small garden, felt that the garden-house should be ‘an obvious
element in the garden picture’. Roger’s recommended that it should be sited either at
the boundary of the garden or in association with a tree and shrub border located
internally within the garden and that the arrangement of the vista afforded from the
garden-house was to be ‘one of the most picturesque peeps the garden can afford’.\(^{168}\)
The garden-house of Cornish’s 1933 model garden and at the Darling residence both
afforded lovely garden vistas and were set on the garden boundary and within tree
and shrub borders. The small size of the model garden precluded it from being set
within a tree and shrub border \(\text{per se}\) but the feeling of such was still created through
the use of a few select trees and shrubs and massed perennial and annual plantings.
While the garden-house at the Darling residence did terminate the path this was not
the case with the model garden design. The lack of an appropriate terminal point of
the path in this design has been previously commented upon in section 3.6.2.5 and
was one of the blatantly noticeable deficiencies in Cornish’s design of this garden.
The other immediately noticeable deficiency of this garden was the heaviness of the
structure; the primary cause of this being Cornish’s use of heavy Corinthian columns
for the structures framework.\(^{169}\) However, this choice of column may have been in
response to local fashions as this style of column was used in various garden
structures illustrated in South Australian Homes and Gardens.\(^{170}\)

Walling tended not to include garden-houses in the style that Cornish did within her
gardens, Walling more commonly used a pergola or reconfigured pergola to fulfil the
function of the garden-house.\(^{171}\) Proudfoot described Brown’s garden-houses as
‘modest affairs’\(^{172}\) but as none of Brown’s garden-houses were illustrated it is not
possible to draw any stylistic comparison between Cornish and Brown’s work. In
relation to their siting within the design, both women followed similar precepts in
that their garden-houses generally terminated a vista, were axially aligned, were used
in conjunction with tennis courts, and where associated with the house drew the
design of the garden-house from the architectural treatment of the house.\(^{173}\) Mellor
and Cornish’s garden-houses essentially differ in that Mellor’s garden-houses were
generally secluded within the garden.\(^{174}\)

---

\(^{167}\) See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.6 and 3.4.3.5 for detailed information.
\(^{168}\) Rogers pp, 163-4.
\(^{169}\) See sections 3.6.2.5 and 3.6.3.6 for detailed information about this topic.
\(^{170}\) ‘A colonnaded Portico’, Australian Homes and Gardens August 1931, p. 27.
\(^{171}\) See section 4.2.2.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\(^{172}\) Proudfoot, p. 24.
\(^{173}\) See section 4.4.2.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\(^{174}\) See section 4.3.2.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
In a local context only Ellis included garden-houses within his designs, both were formal little structures of which one, that for his design of the garden for the six-roomed house, was very similar to Cornish’s garden-house for the Darling’s. Ellis’ garden-houses were generally, when considered in relation to their surroundings, more formal in nature than Cornish’s. Although there was some discrepancy between Ellis’ plan and representative drawing for the garden-house in the five-roomed house garden design, that was somewhat misleading about its intended surroundings.\(^{175}\) See figures 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.

While little was written about garden-houses, they were pictorially better represented in the pages of *South Australian Homes and Gardens* than pergolas were. Most of these structures tended to be variations of brushwood, brushwood with timber frame, and brushwood with rustic timberwork. Very occasionally more formal garden-houses, very reminiscent of those illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver, were illustrated and these structures tended to be located in the gardens of architects.\(^{176}\) The local propensity for brushwood and timber constructions for garden-houses, in both large and small gardens, places Cornish’s structure at the Wilcox residence into greater context. Cornish either chose to follow local fashion or did so at the request of the owner. Many of the local garden-houses were sited either nestled into the planting scheme or next to the tennis court as a shelter.\(^{177}\) See figures 6.3.5b and 6.3.5d-e.

![Figure 6.3.5d](image1.png) A garden-house clad in lattice and brushwood in a Parkside garden.

![Figure 6.3.5e](image2.png) A garden-house constructed from rustic timberwork.

**Typical garden-houses of the period.**

(Source: *South Australian Homes and Gardens* February 1940, p. 23.)

(Source: *South Australian Homes and Gardens* March 1933, p. 31.)

\(^{175}\) See section 5.4.2.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

\(^{176}\) Phillips, ‘Garden Pictures The Home of Mr. & Mrs. Eric McMichael at Crafers’, pp. 24-7.

Cornish included one known significant piece of treillage work in her gardens; that at the Darling residence. Cornish very much used this section of treillage as a 'room' divider in the way that a hedge would have been traditionally used. It was this kind of treillage use that Agar disparagingly referred to as the result of 'modern impatience' and thought was often unsuitably placed and treated. The revival of treillage work in the formal garden was considered an art and the treillage was not to be totally smothered with climbing plants. Cornish's design of her structure alleviated that sense of unsuitability, albeit that it was densely planted, in that she created a double treillage wall. This created a degree of depth and solidity that more closely resembled a hedge once densely planted. Furthermore, rather than 'modern impatience' it allowed her to immediately divide the large sweep of front lawn thereby creating both a private perennial garden and an appropriate setting for the house. To leave the space undivided would have been to impair the frame that this subsequent lawn space created for the house, with a disassociated little corner that appeared tacked onto the main space.

Cornish also used small panels of treillage for decoration, as a point of interest, and as a structure for climbing plants against the houses at the Wilcox and Darling residences. She also used trellis panels as a means of creating a background for the flower borders in a number of her model garden designs. These more simple uses of trellis panels were more typical of their use in the local context.

Of Cornish's interstate contemporaries, only Brown used significant amounts of treillage within her garden designs. Brown's use of this feature was more in keeping with the intent of the period garden authors than Cornish's. See figure 4.4.2.1a. However, this did not make Cornish's use of treillage at the Darling residence any less successful.

In a local context the use of treillage and trellis panels were generally recommended as screens to disguise unpleasant aspects and divide the front and back gardens. Ellis used trellis panels as decorative features against a fence and 'A Professional Women Gardener' recommended them as a suitable background for the flower border. See figures 5.4.2.3.1a and 5.4.2.3.7a.

Of Cornish's known garden associations three had tennis courts: one each at the Darling and Wilcox residences and one at 'Holmfield'. Of these Cornish can only be conclusively linked to the tennis courts at the Darling and Wilcox residences. In an age where 'the desire to own a court has caused all ideas of beauty in the lawn and home surroundings to be abandoned', Cornish managed in both gardens to site the tennis courts so as to minimise their impact upon the garden; to as closely as possible

178 Agar, p. 143.
180 See sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
181 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.8, 3.6.2.5 and 3.6.2.6 for detailed information and elaboration on this topic.
182 See section 4.4.2.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
183 See section 5.3.2.4.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
184 See sections 5.3.3.4.2, 5.4.2.3.4 and 5.4.2.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
185 Kellaway, p. 62.
achieve the recommended north-south alignment of the playing surface; and to be within easy reach of the house.  

In positioning the tennis court within the garden, the designer had two obvious choices: the first was to enclose it and keep it out of sight and the second was to make it a feature of the design. On which treatment was considered the better option greatly depended on how well the surface was kept, which authors opinion you subscribed to, and the style of both the tennis court and the garden. Cornish more or less achieved both. The tennis court at the Darling residence in its siting and treatment is more concealed while the tennis court at the Wilcox residence was an unobtrusive but important feature of the garden. Even though both were similar in that they were sited in a corner of their blocks and had their external boundaries concealed with tall hedges.  

The tennis court at the Darling residence was placed in the rear of the allotment, adjacent to the service and utility wing of the house. The fence along the only section of the tennis court to adjoin a garden space was totally covered in a thick mat of climbing plants. The only gaps in the vegetation were where the tennis court was accessed from the garden. It seems likely that were two gates along this side of the tennis court, each was aligned to a path that terminated at the tennis court fence. Glimpses through the planting that lined those paths and through the gap in the climber covered fence to the lawn surface of the tennis court and the hedging beyond, almost created the impression that a secret garden could have been located on this site rather than a tennis court. See figure 3.5.1.  

Conversely the tennis court at the Wilcox residence was an open part of the garden and provided, with its adjoining lawn, the only large expanse of open space within the garden. This complemented and balanced the enclosed nature of the adjoining terrace gardens. Although there were climbing plants upon the fence of the tennis court they only lightly covered this structure. The garden beds sited against the fence and within the adjoining lawn were planted with low plantings that contributed to the feeling of openness.  

Cornish’s siting and treatment of her tennis courts were generally comparable to both the interstate and local garden designers. However, Cornish could be considered lucky in that her two known examples were located upon blocks that easily facilitated the inclusion of a tennis court, almost naturally in the recommend alignment without having to overtly impact on the potential design for the rest of the garden. Given the same situation it seems unlikely that any of the other designers would have sited tennis courts any differently to Cornish. While Cornish’s treatment of the surrounds of these courts was highly successful it would be interesting to see

---

186 Agar, p. 109. Kellaway, p. 63. Also see sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1, 3.4.2.6, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8 and 3.5.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about the tennis courts at the Wilcox and Darling residences.


188 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1, 3.4.2.6, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8 and 3.5.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

189 See sections 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8 and 3.5.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

190 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1, 3.4.2.6 and 3.4.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
how she would have dealt with a more difficult site and to see if this would have been as successfully accomplished.  

To draw any conclusions about how Cornish treated garages as a component of her designs is not possible. Of the known complete private gardens that she designed, all four had garages but they were designed and sited by the architects responsible for the design of the houses and generally located in such a way that they had little if any impact upon the actual garden. Added to this, their utilitarian nature meant that they were poorly documented or pictorially recorded so that even if Cornish did undertake any significant design in relation to associated planting schemes this aspect of her design work is unknown.

6.3.6 Level Change – Walls, Terraces, Stairs & Sunken Gardens

Level change was a consistent theme of Cornish’s garden designs; she included some form of level change in nearly all of her known garden commissions. The only exceptions were ‘Holmfield’, ‘Glannant’, the 1929 model garden and probably her own residence and, even though the two rock gardens have been listed as exceptions, in reality they too were composed from a series of level changes.  

Terraces were her preferred method for dealing with sloping sites and sunken gardens for the introduction of level variation on flat sites. As such stairs and retaining walls were an important feature of her gardens; Cornish frequently used both dry-stone and mortared walls while embankments and slopes were only an occasional feature of her designs.

Cornish designed two terrace gardens at ‘Broadlees’, one at the Wilcox residence and included terraces as a component of her designs for three of her six model gardens. With the exception of the 1931 and 1932 model gardens all were formed from a succession of two to three terraces. Jekyll felt that successions of terraces provided a better opportunity for gardening as it allowed for a wider horticultural treatment without spoiling the architectural effect of the terrace.

Cornish tended to design formal terraces of a regular and geometrical nature as subscribed to by Jekyll and Weaver. ‘It is a dangerous enterprise to plan a terraced garden on irregular lines in order to follow an erratic contour, and a geometrical, or at least a symmetrical, shape will almost always be best’.  

The only irregularities that Cornish allowed in her formal terrace gardens were the extended length of the last and least formal of her terraces at the Wilcox residence and the curved shape of the lawn terraces and segmented shape of the rose terrace at ‘Broadlees’. However, these were not erratic in form and retained their geometry and symmetry. Each of the terraces in these gardens were planned and planted as separately themed, although connected, typically formal gardens, that provided the visitor with a place of repose and quite contemplation.  

The only informal terrace, that of her 1932 ‘Pool of Narcissus’ model garden with its angled rockery wall was treated more as a level

---

191 See sections 4.2.2.5, 4.3.2.5 and 4.4.2.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
192 See sections 3.2, 3.6.2.1, 3.9 and 3.13 for detailed information and elaboration about these gardens.
194 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 109.
195 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 103.
change than a true terrace garden. The most formal of Cornish’s terrace gardens was probably her 1931 ‘Springtide’ model garden entry. It was the only one of her terrace gardens to possess a balustrade even though the heights of the retaining walls at the ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox residence terrace gardens were sufficient to warrant the inclusion of a parapet wall.196 Although, in fairness to Cornish, she did install visual cues in some instances to indicate the terrace edge, such as the planters at the Wilcox residence and an edging to the path and pergola structure on the rose terrace at ‘Broadlees’. She may also have been overly wary as Jekyll and Weaver had recommended ‘delicate handling’ of wall balustrades for smaller gardens noting the difficulty in achieving the correct scale and proportion.197 As such, Cornish may have felt that the visual cues that she used were both sufficient and more appropriate for the size and situation of her gardens.198 See figures 3.3.1.a, 3.3.2.5b, 3.4.1a, 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.5b.

The sunken garden was a means by which it was possible to obtain the variety and interest provided by level change in an otherwise flat garden.199 Cornish included sunken gardens within the otherwise level gardens at the Darling residence, ‘Eringa’, and her 1934 model garden. At the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, Cornish used the inverse of the sunken garden creating the raised platform that accommodated the statue, to provide variety and interest. Although the platform was an appropriate base for the statue, it was also sufficiently large that it was a feature in its own right and as a part of Cornish’s original concept for the garden it therefore predated the statue. Cornish tended to use simple circular and square forms for her less formal sunken gardens, that at ‘Eringa’ and her 1934 model garden, only using a more complex formal shape in the larger Darling residence garden. All three of her sunken gardens contained a central feature, small statues at ‘Eringa’ and the 1934 model garden and a pool that replicated the shape of the sunken garden at the Darling residence. All were axially arranged. Cornish used both lawn and crazy paving as the ‘flooring’ in her sunken gardens; lawn in those of a formal design and crazy paving in those of a less formal nature. Trees were used to enclose the sunken garden at the Darling residence and partially enclose the sunken garden at ‘Eringa’. While the planting scheme of the sunken garden at the Darling residence was of a minimalist nature that enhanced the gardens formality the two smaller sunken gardens were used as a means of displaying a range of flowering plants.200 See figures 3.5.3.6, 3.6.2.6, 3.8.1, 3.11.1e and 6.3.6b.

Cornish used a limited variety of materials and construction techniques for her retaining walls including; dry-stone and mortared; and Mintaro slate, Carey Gully sandstone and red brick. This was in accordance with Jekyll’s subscribed preference for walls to be constructed from stone local to the area first and then red brick second.201 Cornish seems to have had a preference for dry-stone walls as these

196 Agar, p. 132. Recommended that any terrace retaining wall over three feet (approximately 90cm) have a parapet wall to provide a sense of security, other acceptable options were low hedges and posts connected by chains.
197 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 124.
198 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1-3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.5, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.3.4, 3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1-3.4.2.5, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.4, 3.6.2.3-3.6.2.5 and 3.6.3.7 for detailed information and elaboration about Cornish’s terraces.
200 See sections 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.3.4, 3.6.3.6, 3.6.3.7, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.3.2, 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 for detailed information and elaboration about Cornish’s sunken gardens.
201 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 146.
feature more prominently. Jekyll and Weaver gave precise instructions and illustrations on how to construct dry-stone walling of which Cornish appears to have followed.\textsuperscript{202} Cornish appears to have only planted the actual wall face itself where they occur within the less formal areas of her gardens, these included the walls of the rose and perennial gardens at 'Broadlees', the rockery style wall of the 1932 'Pool of Narcissus' model garden, and the wall of the 'pleasance' at the Wilcox residence. In the more formal areas of the garden the wall is left bare or 'clothed' with carefully placed prostrate and/or creeping plants that were encouraged to cascade over the wall and by plantings at the foot of the wall. Cornish constructed low, mortared retaining walls from red brick and from cut and tooled regularly sized pieces of sandstone.\textsuperscript{203} See figures 3.3.2.2b, 3.3.2.3a, 3.6.3.2 and 6.3.6a.

Of freestanding walls as a design feature, Cornish only had two known examples, that of her 1930 model garden and the wall that enclosed the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden. While the wall of the model garden was actually constructed without mortar, so as to be expedient in its construction and removal from the model gardens site, it was actually intended to be mortared. Cornish constructed this wall as a double wall, filling the resultant gap with earth, that allowed her to follow Jekyll’s recommended planting of brick retaining walls. Small gaps were left in the brickwork that allowed for the insertion of plants into the earth behind.\textsuperscript{204} See figure 3.6.2.2a. The small decorative wall that enclosed the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden was constructed as both the boundary of the garden and as a decorative element that also assisted in creating the physical form of the garden. Simply designed wall and gate piers were included to provide structural strength, a decorative element, and to denote entrances. Small concrete balls were used to adorn and finish the gate piers.\textsuperscript{205} See figures 3.11.1c, 3.11.1e, 3.11.2a and 3.11.3b.

Cornish’s inclusion of the reasonably steep grass bank, against the foot of the first wall in the Wilcox residence terrace garden, is curious, particularly in its location on the most formal and closest terrace to the house.\textsuperscript{206} See figure 3.4.1a. Jekyll was adamantly opposed to grass banks stating ‘how many gardens on sloping ground are disfigured by profitless and quiet indefensible steep banks of mown grass! Hardly anything can be so undesirable in a garden. Such banks are unbeautiful, troublesome to mow, and wasteful of spaces that might be full of interest.’\textsuperscript{207} Agar did acquiesce to the use of grass banks in terrace gardens and although she felt they were not the ‘most effective method for finishing a terrace’, they were allowable when the house was of no architectural merit or when it was used on the lower terraces in a succession of terraces.\textsuperscript{208}

\textsuperscript{203} See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.5, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1-3.4.2.5, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.3.4, 3.6.2.3-3.6.2.7, 3.6.3.7, 3.7.1.1, 3.7.2.1, 3.7.2.2, 2.7.2.2, 3.7.3.1, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.3.1, 3.10.2, 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 for detailed information about Cornish’s retaining walls.
\textsuperscript{204} Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 146-7, 150.
\textsuperscript{205} See sections 3.6.2.2, 3.6.3.7, 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 for detailed information about Cornish’s free standing walls.
\textsuperscript{206} See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2 and 3.4.3.1 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\textsuperscript{207} Jekyll, Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{208} Agar, p. 133.
The inclusion of a grass bank in this instance is difficult to comprehend, especially when considered in light of the care and effort taken to level the rest of the terraces in this formal part of the garden. While to have fully excavated and built a higher wall would have cost more than a grass bank, it seems unlikely that the extra cost, when considered in light of what alone was spent in the provision of the Mintaro slate and its laying, would have been so exorbitant as to proffer a reasonable explanation for it not being done. The resulting bed at the foot of the wall might not have been wide enough to accommodate shrub roses, *Rosa* spp, but would have been sufficient, as it was on the lower two terraces, to have still been effectively planted either with climbing roses, *Rosa* spp, or some form of complementary massed planting such as flag iris, *Iris germanica*. The retained slope in the eastern lawn was more acceptable as this section of the garden was not designed as a formal garden and its leveling and the building of retaining walls would have resulted in potentially significant cost.²⁰⁹

While Cornish may not have dealt effectively with the bank in the Wilcox residence, she did so with great skill at the University of Adelaide in creating the highly regarded Embankment Garden. While most of the form of this garden existed prior to her involvement, it was actually her talent in planting that made this garden so ‘full of interest’. Cornish did employ a number of small, probably no higher than one metre, slate retaining walls to assist in supporting the embankment at various points and to accommodate the path that ran along the base of the middle section of the embankment.²¹⁰ See section 6.4.7 for further comment on the planting scheme of the Embankment Garden.

Cornish did include amongst her known garden commissions a further acceptable grass bank: that at the Darian Smith residence. It seems likely that most of this small slope was already in existence and that Cornish finished it, enhancing the natural division of spaces within this small garden. It is not possible to determine why a small wall was not chosen instead of the slope: maybe the owners preferred the idea of a slope to that of a wall or the expense of such was not something they wished to finance.²¹¹

Cornish appears to have had a limited number of favoured designs and set patterns for her stairs that included:

- rectangular and segmented forms, the latter only used on short runs of up to three stairs;
- a propensity for the use of the same material as the wall in the construction of the stairs including sandstone, slate, concrete and brick;
- the abutment of stairs against vertical or only slightly sloping walls;
- the inclusion of the stairs within the wall cavity where the wall had a more substantial degree of slope;
- the infrequent use of piers, that tended to be very low and constructed from the same stone as used in the wall and stairs;
- the use of small additional walls to provide an edge to short runs of stairs buttressed against a retaining wall, the additional wall being constructed from the same materials as the stairs and retaining wall;

²⁰⁹ See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2 and 3.4.3.1 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
²¹⁰ See sections 3.7.1.1, 3.7.2.1, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.1 for detailed information about this topic.
²¹¹ See sections 3.12.1 and 3.12.2.3 for detailed information about this topic.
For part of the terrace provided 'opportunity been afforded by the 'Weaver, Cornish's and illustrations Cornish's the larger woodland illustrations stairs. Many Mellor has used and location. While Cornish's change formality was not sometimes 'e particular pertinent to smaller gardens and therefore assisted in directing Cornish's design of her stairs. A similar direction upon Cornish's design of stairs was afforded by the type of wall with which they were associated. Jekyll and Weaver, Agar, and Milner all provided specifications on: stair riser and runner height and width; the use of landings; whether to include a railing or not; the ease with which they should be traversable; and other similar specifications that provided Cornish with the fundamental basics of stairs design. It was probably the illustrations included throughout Jekyll and Weaver and Jekyll's Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens that provided Cornish with the most design inspiration for her stairs. Many of Cornish's favoured patterns and designs can be found within these illustrations albeit often in a more complex, decorative and formal form as beffitted the larger and more elaborate styles of gardens illustrated within these books. See figures 3.3.2.3b, 3.4.2.3a, 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.5b, 3.6.2.6, 3.8.1 and 3.11.1e.

Cornish's use of level change within her gardens was comparable to that of Walling, Mellor and Brown when considered in relation to their gardens of a similar size and location. While the influence of Jekyll in relation to the various components of level change was particularly apparent in the work of Cornish, Walling and Brown, each has used and modified that influence, to various degrees, to suit the size, location and formality of their gardens.

---

212 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.2-3.4.4, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.5, 3.5.3.4, 3.6.2.3-3.6.2.7, 3.6.3.7, 3.8.1, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.3.1, 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 for detailed information and elaboration about Cornish's stairs.
213 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 101.
214 Agar, p. 132.
215 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 123.
216 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 118.
218 Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 32, 34, 52, 58, 75, 78-9, 81, 89, 116, 118, 207, 224.
219 See sections 4.2.2.6, 4.3.2.6, 4.3.4.1, 4.4.2.6 and 4.4.4.1 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
Level change was not a significant factor of Cornish’s local contemporaries’ designs or advice. Hartshorne’s terrace garden for the McDonough’s at Springfield was really the only comparable use of level change to that of Cornish. Hartshorne’s terrace garden with decorative balustrade, pergola and multiple staircases per terrace, when considered purely on a structural basis, was more formal than Cornish’s designs, but still used the same Arts and Crafts influences that Cornish’s gardens similarly relied upon. The difference in the success of Hartshorne and Cornish’s terrace gardens was that Cornish oversaw the planting of her gardens, whereas Hartshorne only gave vague specifications for the type of planting for his. This has allowed Hartshorne’s ideas to be more easily corrupted and as a result was detrimental to the overall desired effect of his design. Both Parkhouse and Ellis included small terraces attached to the house in their garden plans for the garden competition. These spaces seemed to have been treated in a more informal manner of a nature similar to Walling’s piazzas.

Pictorially, those gardens shown in South Australian Homes and Gardens that included some form of level change did so predominantly as a means of dealing with an uneven site. This limited the preponderance of these gardens to the Adelaide Hills and foothills. The more successful use of the features associated with level change and often of the Arts and Crafts style, tended to be either linked with a property owned by an architect or for a new large or redeveloped property owned by a member of the Adelaide social elite. Cornish’s designs when compared to those of a similar size and location were commensurate. However, artificial level change was less frequently represented. When it was represented it was most typically in the form of a sunken garden. A number of these appear so similar in appearance to Cornish’s work and that fact in combination with another association, such as Bagot...

---

220 See section 5.4.1.3.6 for detailed information about this topic.
21 See sections 4.2.2.2, 5.4.3.2 and 5.4.3.3.2 for detailed information about this topic.
being involved with the building, suggests the possibility of her actually being the designer of those gardens.\(^\text{223}\)

\[\text{Figure 6.3.6c The sunken garden at 14 Robe Terrace, Medindie. The renovations to the house where undertaken by Bagot and the sunken garden with pool is stylistically very similar to that of Cornish's known work.}
\]

(Source: South Australian Homes and Gardens May 1939, p. 23.)

### 6.3.7 Rose Gardens

Cornish designed three rose gardens amongst her known garden commissions. These were located at 'Broadlees', and the Wilcox and Darling residences. All three rose gardens were formally but simply designed and were composed from a series of geometrical beds. Two of the rose gardens, those at ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox residence, were the dominant component of one of the terraces in a series of terrace gardens, through which the main garden axis passed and as such the bed configuration was mirrored either side of that axis. The rose garden at the Darling residence was designed as a series of three long borders. Borders of trees and shrubs provided a background to the rose plantings but did not totally enclose or separate these ‘rooms’ from the adjoining garden and although each rose garden was in its design an integral ‘room’ it was also a part of and contributed to a larger garden space.\(^\text{224}\) See figures 3.3.2.2a, 3.3.2.2c, 3.3.3.2, 3.4.2.2a and 3.5.1.

Cornish’s design of her rose gardens generally followed the consistent preponderance of advice proffered by a number of the period garden texts that she had access to. That of simple formality and symmetry where the design ‘show(ed) a geometrical relation between their component beds’\(^\text{225}\) and were preferably set in lawn. Where paving had to be employed the addition of lawn verges and/or the use

\(^{223}\) The renovation to house and garden for the Buttfeld’s at 14 Robe Terrace, Medindie is a case in point. D. Darian Smith, ‘A reconstructed Home at Robe Terrace, Medindie’, South Australian Homes and Gardens May 1939, p. 23.

\(^{224}\) See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.6 and 3.5.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

\(^{225}\) Rogers, p. 123
of little plants in the paving joints was also recommended. Various architectural devices such as pergolas and ponds and the use of pillar roses provided points of interest to the design. In relation to planting the consensus was mixed as to whether the rose garden was for roses only, although the rose was considered one of the few flowers that 'can be grown in a place by itself without producing a monotonous effect.' This was due to the plants variety in form and colour and lengthy period of flowering. In relation to planting, colour harmonies were to be aimed for with each bed being planted with a single colour.  

Cornish’s rose gardens tended to be more formal than Walling’s, Mellor’s and Brown’s rose gardens; Mellor and Brown’s designs for these spaces were much more simply arranged than Cornish’s. While Walling designed rose gardens across the entire spectrum from formal through to highly formal, her treatment of the surrounding space that enclosed these gardens, gave them a certain degree of informality. Walling, Mellor and Brown’s rose gardens also tended to be more enclosed and divided from their adjoining garden ‘rooms’ than Cornish’s.  

Although roses were extremely popular in Adelaide during this period, Cornish’s local contemporaries tended not to discuss rose gardens per se. From the perspective of design, they only tended to provide the most basic of advice. Of the gardening authors published in the popular media, only ‘Agricola’ with his inclusion of an article by Ward actually include a design for a rose garden. This design was composed within a rectangular space that was divided by a straight path that widened into a circle at its mid point in the middle of which was a pillar rose. A series of four curved beds bordered the circular path feature and were surrounded by a panel of knucklebone shaped lawn; a series of curved beds along the gardens boundaries completed the design. See figure 5.3.2.2b.

Both Quarrell and Fairey discussed beds of roses and suggested that they were best located either surrounding or within the lawn. On the use of standard roses, their opinions were divided. While Quarrell tolerated the popular use of standard roses in a narrow bed under planted with annuals lining a panel of lawn, Fairey felt that this was the only way in which standard roses could or should be used in the garden. Interestingly, this type of planting was the most frequent type of rose planting illustrated in the pages of South Australian Homes and Gardens for which Quarrell was the garden editor. See figure 5.3.4.4.5a. As ‘Smallholder’, Quarrell did include one planting plan for a bed of roses where he attempted to achieve some

226 Rogers, p. 120
227 Agar, pp. 180-5. Dillistone, pp. 114-9. Rogers, pp. 120-4. Hole, pp. 168-9, 174, 176, 180. See also sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.6 and 3.5.3.5 for detailed information about Cornish’s rose gardens.
228 See sections 4.2.2.7, 4.3.2.7 and 4.4.2.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
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form of colour blending and harmony for twenty two differently coloured roses. Hartshorne included simply designed rose gardens similar to that of Brown and Mellor in three of his gardens while Ellis included rose beds to varying degrees of success in his two garden plans that were not comparable to Cornish’s work in this respect.

6.4 Planting Schemes

6.4.1 Colour, Texture, Scale & Form

The colour, texture, scale and form of Cornish’s planting schemes were important aspects of her garden designs and Jekyll’s works were particularly influential in this respect. Jekyll’s use of colour in the garden has been described as both ‘radical’ and ‘masterly’ and herself as a ‘visionary artist who happened to be using the medium of plants’. Jekyll’s seminal work on colour, Colour in the Flower Garden, outlined in detail her ideas on colour and colour usage at both the concept stage and as had been practically carried out in her own garden. However, while this one book elaborated specifically upon Jekyll’s use of colour in the garden, this aspect of design was also contained throughout her other works.

The paucity of contemporary colour images and detailed planting schemes for Cornish’s gardens makes it difficult to assess her work in relation to colour. However, from the few, relatively contemporary, colour images that existed of the garden at ‘Broadlees’, and the plant lists detailed by Cornish on the back of three photographs of her model garden entries, Cornish has left behind an idea of her abilities with and preferences for colour in the garden. Added to this were a few published descriptions of and/or incomplete plant lists for her other model gardens, the sunken garden at ‘Eringa’ and the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden. Some further limited aspects of her chosen colour schemes can partly be determined through plant identification from the black and white photographs of her gardens and the most likely flower colours for those plants.

While a glance at Cornish’s planting schemes tended to indicate a preference for blue, yellow and pink flower combinations a more detailed examination showed that Cornish’s planting schemes were actually more complex. Her ‘Springtide’ model garden was the more obvious example of this with its inclusion of oranges and browns within the planting scheme. See figure 3.6.4.1. It seems likely that Cornish was trying to replicate within the small confines of her model garden and the limitations of the plants that she had access to, the colours of Jekyll’s spring garden at Munstead Wood. Similarly, the colour scheme of the perennial garden at ‘Broadlees’ also seemed directly derived from Jekyll’s description of her June garden.
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and contained orange and orange-red or red-lead coloured flowers. See figures 3.3.2.6a, 3.3.3.2a and 3.3.3.3e. See Appendices 3C-3E.

Cornish was not averse to including strongly coloured flowers within her schemes or using them in contrast, as the transition period of the planting scheme for the sunken garden at ‘Eringa’ and the intended planting scheme for the Pioneer Women’s Memorial garden showed. The contrast of red and blue in the later example would have been particularly brilliant within its setting of green lawn and foliage, especially when lit by the intensity of the Adelaide sun. Of this combination of blue and red Brown wrote about Jekyll’s use of these colours that ‘In our most admired contemporary gardens bright reds and vivid blues vie with each other – something that was never allowed to happen at Munstead Wood’. Yet an autochrome photograph of Jekyll’s Spring Garden reproduced in Richardson’s English Gardens in the Twentieth Century showed exactly that, albeit that the blue is paler than vivid and the red more mahogany than bright. So while Cornish’s use of these bright contrasting colours in a contemporary mode may owe something to a particularly close study of Jekyll’s planting schemes, she may also have looked towards the modern art that was developing locally during this time through the return and correspondence of a number of primarily women artists, that were studying post-impressionists trends abroad. It was these artists that drove ‘this expressive burst of vastly different artistic direction’ and that undertook ‘experimentation with colour as well as form’. Cornish’s connection to Howie may have given her greater access and insight into this world although the use of these strongly contrasting colours were also popular and advocated by local horticulturist and garden writer Alfred Quarrell.

From Jekyll also came the idea of a green garden, a concept that Cornish employed to stunning effect in the water garden at the Wilcox residence. While Jekyll outlined a garden composed from glossy and feathery foliage that included a variety of contrasting textures and white or almost white flowers, Cornish opted for mass evergreen planting with a limited number of strong foliage contrasts, no flowers, although variegated foliage added touches of almost white, and an immense juxtaposition between forms, resulting in a strong contrast between the vertical and horizontal planes of the garden. This space could almost be considered modern in its form and planting. See figure 3.4.2.3a. Cornish’s other water garden, in the sunken garden at the Darling residence, was similarly treated primarily as a green garden. However, there is not the same degree of contrast in vertical and horizontal planes and the texture of the foliage in the adjoining boskets is softer. There was also the
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greater introduction of seasonal colour in the blooms of the iris, the autumnal foliage of the bosquet plantings and the introduction of at least one red-leaved plum, *Prunus* spp. See figures 3.5.3.4 and 6.4.1a. The siting of these green ‘rooms’ was such that they provided a period of refreshment from and preparation for the mass of colour associated with their adjoining perennial or rose gardens.

While Jekyll was able to precisely articulate her theories on colour, her attempts to similarly describe texture and form were described by Richardson as ‘inelegant and opaque’.251 However, this was never the true focus of her written work, Jekyll herself stating:

‘If in the foregoing chapters I have dwelt rather insistently on matters of colour, it is not that I underrate the equal importance of form and proportion, but that I think that the question of colour, as regards its more careful use, is either more commonly neglected or has had fewer exponents’.

These aspects of Jekyll’s planting schemes were however conveyed to those that studied her works through two means. The first and simplest was visually through the myriad of photographs that she selected to illustrate her books. The second required a more intimate knowledge of plants but such details could with this knowledge be determined through the mental composition of the detailed planting plans provided by Jekyll throughout her books. Jekyll was just as ‘masterly’ with these elements in the design of her planting schemes as she was with colour, the images of her planting at Munstead Wood show that they were both ‘sculptural’ and ‘pictorial’.

Cornish used a variety of trees, shrubs and hedges within her planting schemes to provide form, texture, and colour effects of a seasonal but more permanent nature than that of her perennial and rose gardens. These aspects of her planting schemes also provided a necessary scale element that balanced the dominance of the houses upon the garden, especially the larger houses and those that were sited above and overlooking the garden. Cornish included a careful mix of deciduous and evergreen specimens; the latter provided a deeper green to that of the deciduous specimens and
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generally a contrast in form. Cornish more frequently opted for the accent of the fastigiate Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, Italian poplar, *Populus nigra ' Italica',* and the smooth horizontal form of clipped cypress hedges, *Cupressus* spp. In winter this accent, with the exception of the poplar, *Populus nigra 'Italica',* was more pronounced and provided a feeling of solidity to as well as a contrast that emphasised the tracery of the branches of the deciduous trees. See figures 3.3.2.3a, 3.3.2.6a, 3.5.2.3, 3.5.3.4, 3.7.3.2, 3.8.1 and 3.11.3b.

Texturally finer leaves seem to have dominated Cornish’s selection of trees. However, Cornish was still able to create pictures of harmonious textural variation from this and to contrast these with the comparably smooth texture of the lawn, various *Cupressus* spp plantings, and the clipped forms of box, *Buxus* spp, and myrtle, *Myrtus communis*, amongst others. Contrasted against these masses of smoother textures were the mass strappy foliage plantings of flag *Iris*, *Iris germanica,* and *Phormium* spp. Very occasionally broad leaved plants were used in contrast to denote such aspects of the design as the end of a flower bed.

This preference for finer leaved specimens was also carried through into her other plantings where similar textural effects were created. Strappy foliage, grass-like tussocks and the more broad foliage of succulents all provided contrasts that were used more frequently within these plantings, than with that of her trees. See figures 3.3.2.3b, 3.3.2.5a, 3.3.2.2a, 3.3.3.3c, 3.3.3.6a, 3.4.2.3a, 3.4.3.4a, 3.6.2.3a, 3.7.2.2a, 3.7.3.1a-b, 3.8.1, 3.9.2a and 3.9.3b. While Cornish’s arrangement of her planting schemes was generally well thought out and placed, there were occasional mishaps these plantings appeared regimented and row like and did not follow the concept of planting in drifts as recommended by Jekyll. See figure 3.3.2.3a of the early planting in the ‘Broadlees’ perennial garden.

Cornish’s use of colour in the garden appears to be comparable to that of her interstate contemporaries each favouring slightly different aspects of Jekyll’s schemes. Each achieved a similar high degree of success in the composition of the colour, texture, form and scale of their flower borders when compared to that of Jekyll. However, none achieved quite the same brilliance as Jekyll, even though her philosophy and much of the actual composition of her borders were outlined in detail in her books. This failure is not however particular to these Australian designers, in fact, *‘the belief that Jekyll’s ideas can be replicated might be described as the greatest misconception of twentieth century gardening’.* While Jekyll was an obvious influence, both Cornish and Mellor also seem to have begun to have taken a more modern lead in regards to colour usage from their contemporaries within the art world.
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The texture of Cornish’s tree and shrub plantings, while highly effective and beautiful, lacked the same degree of complexity and detail of Walling’s and possibly Brown’s. Walling had a ‘consummate talent’ for the arrangement of trees and shrubs that was more easily facilitated by her more inclusive use of trees and shrubs throughout the garden. See figures 4.2.2.1a and 4.2.3.1. In not combining trees and shrubs in the same way as Walling and Brown and by planting her trees mostly at the periphery of the garden it would have been almost impossible for Cornish to have achieved the same level of effect as achieved by Walling and Brown.260

Cornish’s use of colour was definitely more sophisticated than that of most of her local contemporaries. Of the garden writers, Oliver seemed to be the only one that showed any degree of complexity in the advice delivered to his readers. Most of the colour combinations mentioned by the writers were simple contrasts or harmonies that usually involved little more than two or three colours. While Fairey’s combinations were similarly constructed from a limited number of colours, he did attempt to persuade his readers to think more carefully about their colour combinations.261

In relation to the three local designers, Parkhouse was the only one to display a significant level of thought in the development of a colour scheme for the garden. Similar thought was given to both the permanent and transient colour schemes. Both Ellis and Hartshorne, in providing only the most basic of planting schemes, left much of this aspect of their gardens design to the discretion of the owner. The detrimental effect that such an omission had on the overall design has already been noted in relation to at least one of Hartshorne’s commissions.262

While texture, scale and form were aspects of design covered to varying degrees by the various local garden writers, it was difficult to comprehensively contextualise their remarks against that of Cornish’s actual physical gardens. In many respects these important concepts were treated exactly as such, stated as important but with little actual practical explanation provided. However, some limited examples were given, and some of those did bear some similarity to those carried out by Cornish in her gardens. Some of these included Quarrell’s emphasis on the fastigate form of Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, and Italian poplar, *Populus nigra* ‘Italica’ and ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’s’ statements in relation to the textural nature of the foliage of natives.263

Similarly, while the drawn details of both Hartshorne and Ellis’ designs conveyed a sense of the importance of these aspects within their garden designs, their lack of specified planting, as with their colour schemes, leaves the success or failure of these components of the gardens design, and therefore the wholeness and harmony of the garden in its entirety, to the ability of its owner. This is not something that Parkhouse
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left to chance, much of the charm of her design originated from her well considered and composed planting scheme.  

6.4.2 Flower Borders  
Cornish included a number of flower borders within her known garden commissions and three of her model gardens, for the years 1931, 1933 and 1934 were designed specifically as such. Cornish’s flower borders did not generally take the form of a typical herbaceous perennial border, that of a long border bordered by lawn, but were rather smaller more intimate affairs best described as flower gardens. Only two of these flower gardens, that of her 1933 model garden design and the back garden of the Darian Smith residence were overtly derived from and could be considered as a form of the typical double herbaceous border. See figures 3.3.1a, 3.3.3.2a, 3.4.3.4a, 3.5.3.6, 3.6.2.3a, 3.6.2.5b and 3.6.2.6.

Provision for annuals beds were also frequently made, such as the circular beds set in the lawn at the Wilcox residence and the triangular bed created by the hedge-work at the front of the residence at ‘Broadlees’. These annual beds, although not necessarily technically planted with annuals, were treated as such and tended to be mass planted with a single plant type such as canna lilies, Canna x generalis hybrid cultivars, or dahlias, Dahlia hybrid cultivars, rather than a mixed conglomeration of plants. It also seems most likely that these annual beds were planted with a single flower colour. See figures 3.3.3.3c and 3.4.1a.

Typically Cornish’s flower gardens:  
- were constructed as a series of beds within a geometric and also often axial path system that included sundials and birdbaths at the path junctions;  
- were planted at the foot of a retaining wall, generally of dry-stone construction;  
- were planted as a terrace garden in conjunction with a significant dry-stone wall planting;  
- were designed as a series of borders that bounded the side of a ‘room’ where they provided a setting for a central feature, such as a pool or small statue;  
- were planted in bays amongst but more usually in front of larger tree and shrub plantings;  
- were composed from mixed plantings that included smaller shrubs, perennials, annuals and bulbs;  
- had carefully composed colour schemes; and,  
- had a background provided by either a wall, hedge, larger trees and shrubs or a densely covered treillage panel.

Jekyll was the common influence in the design of flower borders and flower gardens by Cornish, Walling, Mellor and Brown. Her detailed descriptions in her books Home and Garden, Wood and Garden, Wall, Water and Woodland Garden, Arts and Crafts Gardens and most significant Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden provided
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these Australian designers with a practical guide in the design and creation of their own planting schemes for flower borders and gardens. While the aspects of colour, texture, scale and form in relation to the planting of these gardens has been previously dealt with the most significant other aspect to come from these works, especially Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens and Gardens for Small Country Houses was the simplicity of the actual physical design of these gardens.

Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens was particularly pertinent to Cornish’s work on planting at the foot of the retaining walls at ‘Broadlees’ and the Wilcox residence and for the design of the perennial terrace at ‘Broadlees’. The plans and images illustrated in Arts and Crafts Gardens also appear to have had a direct influence upon Cornish’s designs for her flower gardens. While the images selected by Jekyll and Weaver where often of larger gardens, Jekyll and Weaver did state that all the examples chosen for inclusion in the book had been designed in such a manner that each would ‘be fitting in a small garden when reduced in scale’ and that all were appropriate for such reduction. The most overt example of this reduction could be seen in Cornish’s designs for her 1931 ‘Springtide’ model garden and her cross-axial perennial gardens. The many illustrations of various sunken, terrace and rose gardens when reduced and simplified readily lent themselves to Cornish’s designs for her perennial gardens.

Of Cornish’s interstate contemporaries Walling and Brown most successfully interpreted Jekyll into their perennial gardens; Brown more usually designed a perennial border while Walling incorporated both borders and perennial gardens into her designs. Mellor’s perennial borders in their design, probably own more to Rogers’ concept of the ‘rectilinear principle’ and his arrangement of the small garden, and as such lack the complexity of arrangement and planting scheme, found in Walling, Brown and Cornish’s perennial gardens. The most obvious difference between Cornish and that of her interstate contemporaries and the advice of Jekyll is Cornish’s lack of lawn as a foreground to most of her perennial gardens. The green of the lawn generally considered and used as a ‘foil’ to the colour of the flowers although she did generally achieve this ‘foil’ with her background treatment. See figures 4.2.1.c-d, 4.3.1a, 4.4.1a, 4.4.1c and 4.4.3.2a.

Cornish’s local contemporaries, particularly the horticultural writers, with the exception of Oliver who advocated the traditional formal perennial border, tended to recommend the placement of a series of rectangular beds around a lawn or either side of a path as the prominent forms of flower garden. These often narrow beds were predominantly mass planted with a single annual or ‘ribbon’ planted with a series of either harmonious or contrasting colours. These narrow beds had nothing in common
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with Cornish's designs. It is here that the appropriateness of Cornish's decision not to use lawn becomes apparent. By not incorporating lawn into many of her perennial gardens she ensured an adequate bed size that allowed her to create a more three dimensional planting scheme than those recommended by her contemporaries.274

Parkhouse and Ellis included mixed borders along the boundary fences of their designs that were similar to the mixed border planned by Cornish for the Darian Smith residence. Of Cornish's local contemporaries, only Hartshorne designed flower borders and gardens that were more generally of a similar style to Cornish's. In terms of layout they were very similar but it is difficult to compare them in relation to their planting as Hartshorne tended not to provide detailed planting schemes. The detrimental effect that this seems to have had upon his intent for these gardens has already been commented on.275 See figures 5.4.1.2a-b, 5.4.1.3b, 5.4.2.2a-b and 5.4.3.2a.

Pictorially, only very rarely were perennial borders or gardens of a size and complexity similar to that of Jekyll's, illustrated within the pages of South Australian Homes and Gardens. These gardens were generally the large hills summer residences of the Adelaide social elite who had access to the resources necessary to develop such borders. The best examples of these borders were of a similar quality to Cornish's known examples of a comparable size.276

6.4.3 Trees & Shrubs

In her town gardens, with the exception of her own garden, Cornish used rectilinear mixed borders or a belt of trees and shrubs, that also in some instances contained perennial plantings along a proportion of their front, to strongly define and enclose the boundaries of these gardens. This was in keeping with and contributed to the creation of the formal garden 'rooms' that these gardens were composed from.277

North American Landscape Architect Grace Tabor was of the opinion that in the small garden that the boundaries needed to:

't be marked-always. By this I do not mean simply defined as property limits, but marked defensively - aggressively if you will - as a beginning to the gradual process of home building which is to go on within them. They separate the home from the outside world and suggest its aspect of refuge and snug retreat, of safe and pleasant harbour. And the smaller the place and more thickly settled the neighbourhood, the more imperative the need for this defensive setting apart; the greater the gain from this resolute planting out of the big world and planting in of the little, individual one.'278
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Irrespective of the gardens size Tabor felt that there was always some form of suitable enclosure for it, be that of a hedge in a small garden or tree and shrub borders in a larger one. Tabor’s style of border planting was however, of a curvaceous nature and is therefore detailed later.

Although Jekyll and Weaver did not specifically mention the use of trees and shrubs in this manner they did occasionally illustrate plans where the boundary hedge or wall was replaced with this style of tree and shrub border planting. Godfrey, similarly felt that the best enclosure for the formal garden was either a hedge or wall:

‘Yet we shall do well to remember the immense value of forest tree and thick shrub, which by their association with the boundaries of the enclosed gardens give them a new beauty, add to their repose, and make effective contrast with their playful formalism and exactitude.’

Cornish’s use of a belt of trees and shrubs at the boundary of her gardens appears to have been her solution for determining how to ‘aggressively’ enclose her gardens creating places of privacy and retreat from the outside world. It also conformed to Agar’s advice to use the ‘severe line’ of the boundary fence as a ‘characteristic feature’ of the design while simultaneously following the formal design patterns of Jekyll and Weaver, and Godfrey who in their typically larger gardens, drew upon the trees and shrubs that were more generally found in an informal setting around their formal garden ‘rooms’. Cornish’s tree and shrub borders added to the repose of her gardens and provided contrast to the formalness of the plantings that they enclosed.

Further tree plantings within Cornish’s town gardens were limited, and comprised carefully positioned accent plantings and feature specimen trees associated with either a lawn space or a particular ‘room’ and/or less frequently bosquet-like plantings that created a ‘room’ division. The careful positioning of those accent and feature specimen trees also played an important role in the way that the architecture of the building was displayed and emphasised. See figures 3.4.2.6a, 3.5.2.3, 3.5.3.4 and 6.4.3a.
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In her hills gardens Cornish used a higher proportion of trees to shrubs that were massed throughout the garden. This gave the impression that open spaces and individual garden ‘rooms’ had been carved from the tree mass and gave the garden a wooded-effect as was befitting of the Adelaide Hills setting of these gardens. Individual specimens and small groups of specimen trees were added to link these open spaces and garden beds adjacent to the house, with the wooded portion of the garden. Accent plantings, such as the Italian cypress, *Cupressus sempervirens*, at ‘Broadlees’ were used to facilitate the transition from the house into the garden and to blur the distinction between these two designed spaces. See figures 3.3.1a, 3.3.2.3a and 3.3.2.5b.

Cornish often used existing tree specimens to her advantage, designing aspects of the garden around the retention of these trees, for example the olives, *Olea europaea*, along the western boundary of the Wilcox residence and the alternating row of silver birch, *Betula pendula*, and limes, *Tilia* spp, that influenced the shape of the terrace gardens at ‘Broadlees’.284

Cornish used trees and to much lesser degree shrubs:
- to define and frame or enclose the gardens boundaries;
- to occasionally divide garden ‘rooms’;
- of a fastigiate nature as accent points within the garden and to a lesser degree to screen and divide external features and areas within the garden;
- as a background to other feature plantings;
- to create a terminal point along an axis;
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• as lawn specimens;
• as a specimen within a garden ‘room’, predominantly planted as a specialised
garden for example a perennial garden;
• to create and define pathways;
• to enhance elements of the buildings architecture creating a link between house
and garden and to soften the architecture of the building;
• occasionally against the house foundations;
• borrowed from the external landscape to create either a secondary background or
to fill immediate gaps within her own composition;
• to provide an element of repose to the design; and,
• for their colour, texture, form and scale within the design of her planting
schemes.\textsuperscript{285}

The border-like nature of Cornish’s tree and shrub plantings in her town gardens
were comparably similar to that of her interstate contemporaries where they also had
enclosed rectilinear spaces. However, the comparable highly formal nature of
Cornish gardens as opposed to her interstate contemporaries meant that Cornish’s
gardens lacked the often informal spaces and therefore the associated informal border
treatment of trees and shrubs that were frequently associated with her interstate
contemporaries designs, of a comparable garden size to that of Cornish. As a result
Cornish’s dominant tree plantings, apart from specimen and accent trees, were
located predominantly at the boundary of the garden. Whereas Walling, Mellor and
Brown also created these rectilinear borders within the garden to create internal
divisions of space thereby drawing a greater tree mass internally into the garden than
Cornish. Cornish’s treatment of trees and shrubs within the garden therefore more
greatly adhered to the arts and crafts gardens influences in this respect than did
Walling’s and Brown’s who with their greater inclusion of trees internally within the
garden adapted these similar influences to better meet the needs of the Australian
climate. Mellor’s adaptation seemingly appears to have been sourced more directly
from Rogers rectilinear principle than from the arts and crafts gardens that influenced
Cornish, Walling and Brown. A further difference between Cornish and her interstate
contemporaries was her seemingly lesser use of shrubs within the garden.\textsuperscript{286}

Cornish’s placement of her tree and shrub borders at the boundary of the garden was
in general accord with the local garden writers and garden designers. While
Parkhouse and Ellis tended to use a greater proportion of creepers and climbers to
cover the boundary fence and fewer trees and shrubs as a part of that planting, the
local authors and Hartshorne tended to include more shrubs internally within the
garden than Cornish; Hartshorne as borders to create internal divisions within his
gardens and the writers as shrubberies that may or may not have acted as such a
divider. Cornish’s only known shrubberies designed and implemented as a feature
planting in their own right, seem to have been limited to the front boundary planting
adjacent to the entrance at the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, the slope
adjacent to the house at ‘Broadlees’, and the shrubbery beds designed and planted by
Cornish in the lower grounds at the University of Adelaide. Like ‘A Professional

\textsuperscript{285} See sections 3.3.3, 3.4.3, 3.5.3, 3.6.4.3, 3.7.3, 3.8.3, 3.9.3, 3.10.3, 3.11.3, 3.12.3 and 3.13.3 for
detailed information about this topic.
\textsuperscript{286} See sections 3.3.3, 3.4.3, 3.5.3, 3.6.4.3, 3.7.3, 3.8.3, 3.9.3, 3.10.3, 3.11.3, 3.12.3, 3.13.3, 4.2.3.3,
4.3.3.3 and 4.4.3.3 for detailed information about this topic.
Woman Gardener’ Cornish also used paired tree specimens at the front of the house to complement and enhance the architecture.  

The curved tree and shrub border in Cornish’s back garden was the only known use of this style of border within her gardens. See figure 3.13.1d. This style of curvaceous border was a trademark of her Melbourne contemporary Walling and was also often used by Mellor. Its derivation lay in the pages of the many garden books that proclaimed to be of the landscape-gardening style. Milner provided one of the clearer and more detailed planting guides that was applicable to both country and suburban villa garden. ‘The outlines of the groups should have strong prominences marked by detached trees that stand boldly in the group and they should present deep recesses...such an outline should be graceful’. In the villa garden fast growing trees were to be mixed amongst the shrubs to create a more immediate effect with the intention that the trees by removed once the shrubs had acquired sufficient growth. From Tabor’s analogous description it is possible to immediately visualise these border plantings.

‘The lines of a large border planting, or the forms enclosed by the lines, are very aptly likened to the land formation along a coast. There are promontories and peninsulas, capes and isthmuses, with now and then a deeply receding curve where some great bay or gulf sweeps in from the sea – the lawn being the “sea”’.  

Walling and Mellor’s borders were just this and in the smaller back garden of Cornish, and smaller gardens of Walling and Mellor these border plantings were condensed to a deep bay enclosed within its headlands. Of Cornish’s local contemporaries, Hartshorne was the only one to include tree and shrub borders of this style within his garden designs where they were associated with the informal parts of his designs, usually the front garden.  

6.4.4 Hedges
Cornish included mostly formal hedges, in a variety of sizes that were either straight or curved throughout her designs; deploying them within her gardens in a similar manner to those frequently described by a variety of pertinent gardening references. However, comparatively Cornish’s hedges were more simply designed and limited in occurrence than those references. This was in keeping with the smaller size of Cornish’s gardens. Cornish used hedges:
• to divide and define spaces;
• at the garden boundary both as the fence and/or in conjunction with a decorative fence;

See sections 5.2.2.3.3, 5.2.3.2.3, 5.3.2.4.3, 5.3.3.4.3, 5.4.4.4.3, 5.4.1.4.3, 5.4.2.4.3, 5.4.2.4.7, 5.4.3.4.3 and 5.4.3.4.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
See sections 3.13.1, 3.13.2.4 and 3.13.3.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
See sections 4.2.3.6 and 4.3.3.6 for detailed information.
Milner, pp. 50, 53.
Milner, pp. 55-6.
Tabor, p. 94.
See sections 3.13.1, 3.13.2.4, 3.13.3.3, 4.2.3.6, 4.3.3.6, 5.4.1.2 and 5.4.1.4.6 for detailed information about this topic.
as a replacement for a parapet wall;
• as an edging for garden beds and driveways;
• as a background for seats;
• as a background for flower borders; and,
• as a decorative element in its own right within the design.295

The majority of Cornish’s hedges were clipped to a simple box shape, the only exceptions were the more elaborately clipped hedges at ‘Broadlees’ and the intended hedge, at the back of the raised platform in the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden, that did not eventuate.296 Cornish’s most common hedge plants included cypress, *Cupressus macrocarpa* and *Cupressus torulosa*, Olive, *Olea europaeea*, and box, *Buxus* spp. Informal hedges were used comparatively infrequently and tended to be located at the garden boundary.297 See figures 3.3.2.6a, 3.3.3.3a-d, 3.3.3.4a, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.7.3.2c, 3.7.3.2e, 3.8.1, 3.10.2b and 3.11.1a.

An interesting hedge type described by Jekyll and Weaver and used by Cornish in place of a traditional hedge was the use of rows of fastigiate trees to frame and/or screen a particular vista and/or to divide the garden.298 Cornish used this device in the gardens at ‘Broadlees’ to screen the view on the far side of the terrace gardens and possibly twice at the Darling residence. Once definitely along both sides of the driveway to divide various garden spaces but also possibly against the north boundary wall.299

Cornish’s use of hedges, in comparison to that of her interstate contemporaries could be considered limited. Cornish had a tendency to place most of her hedges at the boundary of the garden. Her designs generally lacked the use of smaller hedges as a visual interruption within a horizontal plane; the effect being the division of space without enclosing it, as frequently used by her interstate contemporaries.300

Locally Cornish appears to have followed the prevalent fashion for the placement of a hedge along the front boundary of the property, even if local authorities such as Alfred J Quarrell attempted to minimise this.301 Her chosen hedge plants were frequently represented within the plant lists from the local popular gardening literature, even if she never used the flowering shrubs that most of the horticultural writers were trying to encourage their readers to adopt.302 See Appendices 5B-5C.

---

295 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.3.2-3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.3-3.4.3.5, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.5, 3.5.3.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.4.4, 3.7.3.2, 3.8.1, 3.8.3.2, 3.10.2, 3.10.3 and 3.11.1-3.11.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

296 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.3.2-3.3.3.5 and 3.11.1-3.11.3 for detailed information about the hedges at ‘Broadlees’ and the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden.

297 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.3.2-3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.3-3.4.3.5, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.5, 3.5.3.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.4.4, 3.7.3.2, 3.8.1, 3.8.3.2, 3.10.2, 3.10.3 and 3.11.1-3.11.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

298 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 161.

299 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3 and 3.5.3.2 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

300 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.4, 3.4.3.5, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.5, 3.5.3.7, 3.10.2, 3.10.3, 4.2.3.4, 4.3.3.4 and 4.4.3.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

301 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.4, 3.4.3.5, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.5, 3.5.3.7, 3.10.2, 3.10.3 and 5.2.2.3.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.

302 See sections 5.2.2.3.4, 5.2.3.2.4 and 5.3.4.4.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
that hedges, Hartshome, colourful plantings often found 5E-5G. However, this can be explained by the solemnity of colour provided by her hedges, that generally created an element of tranquillity within her green gardens, or that provided of a background to the more colourful flower borders or similarly colourful plantings often found adjacent. 303

Hartshome, Ellis and Parkhouse seem to have more universally adopted the use of smaller hedges within the garden as a means of dividing without enclosing, although not to the same extent as Walling, Mellor and Brown. All three Adelaide designers used front boundary hedges.304 Like Cornish, both Hartshome and Quarrell adopted the use of fastigiate trees as a replacement for a traditional hedge. Hartshome also seems to have preferred informal shrub hedges to that of the traditional hedge, thereby actually following the advice of the local horticultural writers.305

6.4.5 Topiary
Cornish used simple topiary forms within, and that were appropriately suited to, her larger formal gardens. Typical forms included ball on stick, conical and pillar although a more complex form of a square pillar topped with a ball was included at the Darling residence that, flanked the top of the stair cases to the sunken garden. Topiary specimens were used both potted and physically planted within the ground. Cornish’s most frequent use of topiary included flanking pairs to denote entrances be that to the house or between garden ‘rooms’. Cornish’s use of topiary in close association with the house tended to break large expanses of masonry wall, emphasise architectural elements of the house such as columns or windows, and create a formal interface between the house and the garden. Within the garden, topiary forms were used to add a note of formality, such as along the lower wall of the stepped cascade in the rose terrace at ‘Broadlees’, and/or to boldly draw the architectural formality of the house into the garden. Cornish exclusively used pillar forms to achieve the later using either clipped or naturally fastigiate specimens in bold groupings that often formed a strong accent between vertical and horizontal planes. These groupings also occasionally, such as at the Darling residence, effectively divided the garden into separate spaces but without overtly enclosing those spaces. 306 See figures 3.3.2.2b, 3.3.3.1a, 3.3.3.3a-d, 3.5.2.3, 3.6.2.3a, 3.7.3.2d, 3.11.1e and 3.11.3b.

Topiary was generally derided by the authors of the gardening texts that Cornish had access to. The level of derision varied from the vehemently opposed to the point of being abusive,307 to a less vehement position where, although new topiary work was unacceptable, serious thought would need to be given before removing good examples of older work308 through to, generally the architects, who did include it in

303 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.6, 3.3.2.3-3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.3-3.4.3.5, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.1, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.5, 3.5.3.7, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.4.4, 3.7.3.2, 3.8.1, 3.8.3.2, 3.10.2, 3.10.3 and 3.11.1-3.11.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
304 See sections 5.4.1.4.4, 5.4.2.4.4 and 5.4.3.4.4 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
305 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.3, 3.4.3.3, 3.11.1, 3.11.3, 3.11.11.3, 3.2.3.3, 3.2.2.4, 3.2.3.2.4, 3.3.4.4 and 3.4.1.4.4 for detailed information.
306 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.3-3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.2, 3.4.3.3, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.3.4, 3.5.3.8, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.4.5, 3.7.3.2, 3.11.1 and 3.11.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
308 Wright, pp. 90-1.
their garden designs. Jekyll was not effusive in her support but did think that if correctly used that topiary had a place within the garden ‘where there is the need for distinct punctuation’ and that ‘the design of the garden would be bettered by a certain form’.309 Most of the topiary work illustrated by Jekyll was connected to hedges where the most suitable form was that of a clipped ball placed on top of a clipped pillar; Jekyll employed this simple form in her own garden, in close connection with the house, albeit that the clipped ball was placed on top of a low stone pier.310 The other typically illustrated topiary form was of potted specimens containing a standard clipped to a ball form, or ball on stick.311

Of Cornish’s contemporaries, both interstate and locally, with the exception of Brown, most were either against topiary or used it in a very limited form. Where topiary was used, it was related to the formal sections of the garden or the interface between house and garden. There, it provided a small accent, took very simple forms, primarily that of a standard topped with a clipped ball, and was mostly accommodated in pots.312 Most of the local horticultural writers preferred natural plant forms to the point where they tried to encourage their readers to ensure that their plants were correctly spaced so as to avoid unnecessary pruning. Cornish’s less limited use of potted topiary in association with the house allowed her to achieve greater accent than that of her contemporaries; accent that was warranted and appropriate to the size and architectural style of the houses it was used in conjunction with.313

Only Brown seems to have used topiary within the garden in a similar manner to that of Cornish. However, based on the available images and plans of Brown’s gardens, Cornish’s use of these forms were probably more formal and reminiscent of the English Arts and Crafts garden than Brown’s.314

Walling was considered masterly in her use and placement of contrasting natural plant forms to provide a ‘punctuation mark’ within the design of her planting schemes and gardens.315 All of the garden designers profiled within this work used natural fastigate plant forms in either flanking pairs or rows to achieve effective and suitable accent within their designs. However, most of this work tended to lack the sophistication and/or subtlety of Walling’s.316 Cornish’s work in this respect had many examples that in description matched that of her contemporaries, yet in execution the effect was more striking. The Italian cypress, Cupressus sempervirens, on the water terrace at the Wilcox residence is an example. In comparison to Walling, Cornish’s work was more formal and overt, and was less removed from the original Arts and Crafts and Italian garden influences than was Walling’s.317

309 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 161.
310 Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 64-5, 153-161.
311 Find pages with ball on stick in pots.
312 See sections 4.2.3.5, 4.3.3.5 and 4.4.3.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
313 See sections 5.2.2.3.5, 5.2.3.2.5, 5.3.2.4.5, 5.3.3.4.5, 5.3.4.4.5, 5.4.1.4.5, 5.4.2.4.5 and 5.4.3.4.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
314 See section 4.4.3.5 for detailed information about this topic.
315 See section 4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.5 for detailed information.
316 See sections 4.3.3.3, 4.3.3.5, 4.4.3.3, 4.4.3.5, 5.4.1.4.3, 5.4.1.4.5, 5.4.2.4.3, 5.4.2.4.5, 5.4.3.4.3 and 5.4.3.4.5 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
317 See sections 3.3.3.4, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.3.2, 3.11.1 and 3.11.3 for detailed information about this topic.
6.4.6 Lawn

Of all of the aspects of the garden, the lawn was considered all important. It was the 'heart of the garden' it was ‘the joy and delight’ of the home owner ‘without it all effort at adornment seem futile’. It was 'the green canvas upon which the house, trees, shrubs and flowers depend for setting'. It was a 'mantle' that covered the 'cruditings of man's handiwork'. The 'charm' of the lawn was its 'freshness and even purity of colour which is a refreshment to the eyes and a perfect setting for every other colour'. The lawn was about quiescence, tranquillity, repose, dignity and a sense of space and well being. These were the attributes of Cornish’s lawn spaces.

Lawn was a dominant feature in Cornish’s garden designs, it was ‘the green canvas’ upon which she placed her other features. Cornish used lawn in very simple and generally formal ways and most of her panels of lawn with the exception of her own back garden were either rectilinear or nearly so. In this Cornish followed the written dictum of Godfrey and Rogers that the general shape of outline for the main ‘rooms’ of the garden be ‘rectilinear as far as possible’ this was pictorially corroborated by Jekyll and Weaver. In the larger gardens where there was the area to create a number of ‘rooms’, these panels of lawn were usually treated as a series of connected spaces. In the smaller gardens there was usually a single lawn panel each for front and back garden. Where this incorporated an entrance such as in the front garden at the Darian Smith residence and the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden this panel of lawn was usually divided with a solid, straight path.

Where Cornish used an expanse of lawn as a feature in its own right it was usually connected with and provided a setting for, an aspect of the house that had some form of dominant architectural treatment. The lawn in these instances were either bordered with a straight tree and shrub border that also often included perennial plantings or Cornish included either a single or limited number of strategically placed specimen trees, mostly at the periphery of the panel. 3.3.2.5b, 3.4.1a, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.3. Where lawn was used in conjunction with rose gardens it tended to take the form of paths. See figures 3.4.2.3 and 3.5.1. An expanse of lawn was also an important feature of Cornish’s water gardens with the simple formal pools set in the middle of and surrounded by a green sward that assisted in creating the ‘rooms’ setting and added

---

319 Kellaway, p. 55.
320 Rogers, p. 78
321 Agar, p. 232.
323 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.3, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.3.4-3.5.3.7, 3.6.2.5, 3.6.4.6, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.3, 3.13.1 and 3.13.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
325 Jekyll and Weaver, pp. 12, 17-9, 21, 25, 38, 46-7, 58, 66, 76, 84, 87-9, 91, 94, 96, 98-9, 102, 106, 155, 224.
326 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.3, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2 and 3.5.3.4-3.5.3.7 for detailed information.
328 See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.3.6, 3.12.1 and 3.12.3 for detailed information.
329 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.5, 3.6.2.5 and 3.6.4.6 for detailed information about this topic.
to the feeling of tranquillity within this space.\textsuperscript{330} See figures 3.4.2.3a and 3.5.1. Other than entrance paths, Cornish only infrequently marked the surface of her lawn panels with a path, choosing to use stepping-stones that minimised the effect that the path had upon the expanse of lawn.\textsuperscript{331} Cornish did occasionally include lippea lawns, \textit{Lippia phy lacenasens}, as a substitute to traditional grass types.\textsuperscript{332} She was not particularly fond of the grass type \textit{kikuyu} recommending to various students at the University of Adelaide to not use it in their gardens.\textsuperscript{333}

Cornish’s lawn usage was formal and mostly rectilinear and as such was more generally comparable to that of both Brown and Mellor. While Walling did include such spaces within her gardens her lawn areas were not generally so universally formal throughout the garden. Walling, in comparable garden sizes, tended to include a proportion of more informally treated lawn spaces typified by her palette-shaped lawns.\textsuperscript{334} Of this style of lawn, Cornish only included one known example that of her own back garden. The relative architectural insignificance of her own home as compared to that of her garden commissions suggests Cornish felt that such styles of informal treatment of the lawn were only applicable with small cottage-type homes.\textsuperscript{335}

Cornish seemed to be in apparent accord with the local horticultural authors, in regard to the retention of large expanses of unbroken lawn. However, she was less likely to place narrow flowerbeds around this expanse as was generally recommended but she did occasionally include the circular beds within the lawn, as advocated by those authors. Cornish was in accord with Fairey and discord with Quarrell in relation to the use of specimen trees. Cornish selected appropriately sized specimens for the space and placed them towards the periphery of the lawn unlike Quarrell who was a proponent for the central placement of a Canary Island date palm, \textit{Phoenix canariensis}, on the front lawn.\textsuperscript{336}

Of the architects and garden designers both Ellis and Parkhouse more closely followed Cornish’s lawn usage patterns, albeit that the general treatment of these spaces were more simple and less formal than Cornish’s, although this is largely due to the disparity in garden sizes.\textsuperscript{337} Hartshorne’s use of lawn was more redolent of Walling than that typified by either Cornish or her other local contemporaries.\textsuperscript{338} Most interesting was a comparison between Cornish’s own garden and the description of lawn usage as given by ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’ with Cornish’s garden appearing as a physical embodiment of that description. Cornish’s front garden, small enough for only a ‘handkerchief’ lawn was replaced with the cottage garden as recommended by ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’ and the back

\textsuperscript{330} See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.1 and 3.5.3.4 for detailed information about this topic.
\textsuperscript{331} See sections 3.3.1, 3.3.3.5, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.1-3.4.3.3, 3.4.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.3.4-3.5.3.7, 3.6.2.5, 3.6.4.6, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.11.1, 3.11.3, 3.13.1 and 3.13.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\textsuperscript{332} See sections 3.12.1 and 3.12.3.1 for detailed information about this topic.
\textsuperscript{333} Jones, Elsie Marion Cornish (1887-1946), p. 92.
\textsuperscript{334} See sections 4.2.3.6, 4.3.3.6 and 4.4.3.6 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\textsuperscript{335} See section 3.13.1 and 3.13.3 for detailed information about this topic.
\textsuperscript{336} See sections 5.2.2.3.6, 5.2.3.2.6, 5.3.2.4.6, 5.3.3.4.6 and 5.3.4.4.6 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\textsuperscript{337} See sections 5.4.2.4.6 and 5.4.3.4.6 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
\textsuperscript{338} See section 5.4.1.4.6 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
lawn secluded with its curvaceous border of trees and shrubs was large enough to sit or lie under the shade of a tree.339

6.4.7 Creepers & Climbers

Cornish used creepers and climbers throughout her garden designs in a number ways including, upon buildings, upon garden structures and for massed effect in the Embankment Garden at the University of Adelaide. Cornish included significant house plantings at ‘Broadlees’, her own residence as well as upon a number of the University of Adelaide buildings and lesser plantings at the Darling, Wilcox and Darian Smith residences.340

On the placement of climbing and wall shrubs, Rogers was of the opinion that ‘nothing helps to bring the house into harmony with its gardens surroundings so effectually as the treatment of its walls with climbers’.341 Houses with little architectural merit could be covered ‘from top to bottom if desired’342 where ‘a house of no special character may become a thing of beauty’.343 However, Jekyll and Weaver, and Dillistone were cautious to note that any building or built feature, such as a wall and gate pier, that had architectural merit were not to be ‘smothered’ or subsumed by plant material. Climbers and wall shrubs in these situations needed to be placed so as to enhance the architectural beauty rather than ‘obliterate’ it.344 Although Jekyll sounded a further note of caution in relation to buildings of a classical nature, she still felt that any house irrespective of ‘its size and style’ should have ‘some dominant note in wall-planting’.345

While climbers, wall plants and garden beds planted at the foot of the house walls were used in a number of her garden commissions Cornish was generally too cautious and restrained, possibly too respectful of the architecture when viewed in context with the gardening literature and influence of Bagot.346 This was particularly so in respect with the Darling residence, where the lack of wall planting might explain the significant numbers of potted plants placed around the base of this house. Although these plants, mostly topiaried, reflected the formal nature of the architecture, they also provided an immediate interface between house and garden.347

In context with her interstate contemporaries, Cornish was very circumspect in her use of wall planting and her range of plant material was very narrow, especially when compared with those plantings of her contemporaries upon houses that were also described as being of a neo-Georgian style.348 When viewed from the perspective of the local context, all of the remarks made in reference to her interstate contemporaries were still applicable. Perhaps this suggests a reticence to mar and/or a deference on Cornish’s behalf to the architecture of and architects that she was not

339 See sections 3.13 and 5.3.3 for detailed information about this topic.
340 See sections 3.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.3.8, 3.7.1, 3.7.3, 3.12.1, 3.12.3.2, 3.13.1 and 3.13.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
341 Rogers, pp. 161-2.
342 Dillistone, p. 124.
343 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 133.
344 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 133. Dillistone, pp. 124-5.
345 Jekyll, Colour Schemes for the Flower Garden, p. 248.
346 See section 7.3 for further information in respect to this topic.
347 See sections 3.4.1, 3.4.3.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2 and 3.5.3.8 for detailed information about this topic.
348 See sections 4.2.3.7, 4.3.3.7 and 4.4.3.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
as closely professionally associated with.\textsuperscript{349} In one area of wall planting Cornish was locally fashionable and that was in her use of Virginia creeper, \textit{Parthenocissus quinquefolia}.\textsuperscript{350}

While Cornish may have been reticent in her use of climbers to cover house walls, this was not the case when it came to garden structures because these were her structures rather than a second parties and the accommodation of climbing plants was a part of their inherent function. However, again the variety of climbing plants selected by Cornish was very limited. Those known included roses, \textit{Rosa} spp, wisteria, \textit{Wisteria floribunda}, Ivy, \textit{Hedera helix}, ornamental grape, \textit{Vitis} spp, and sweet pea, \textit{Lathyrus odorata}. Cornish employed the ivy, \textit{Hedera helix}, in the manner that Jekyll felt it should be more used, as a screen plant on treillage where its vigorous nature ensured `a large unbroken surface'.\textsuperscript{351} Cornish's use of climbing plants on these structures, apart from the paucity of choice, is similar to that of both her local and interstate contemporaries. Surprisingly, two areas of climber use, stood out as lacking within Cornish's repertoire. Other than the Virginia creeper, \textit{Parthenocissus quinquefolia}, used along the random rubble boundary wall at the Darian Smith residence no other known use of climbing plants upon boundary walls and fences can be conclusively linked to her gardens. Nor has she used them `to cover or screen something unsightly'\textsuperscript{352} as was generally recommended and practiced by her contemporaries.\textsuperscript{353}

There was one area in which Cornish's use of creeping and climbing plants was exceptional, and that was at the University of Adelaide Embankment Garden. Cornish's selection and mass planting of the succulents \textit{Lampranthus}, \textit{Aptenia}, and \textit{Carpobrotus} along with probably \textit{Cerastium tomentosum} and other unidentifiable creepers and climbers was a spectacular profusion of colour and texture. Allegorically this planting swirled and frothed around the clumps of \textit{Aloes}, \textit{Agaves} and \textit{Opuntia} in the same manner that the bubbling, froth of the sea does around rocks along the beach shoreline. See figure 3.7.3.1b. Not only was this planting highly beautiful and unusual for the period it was also eminently practical for the difficult site conditions. Of this type of planting, none of Cornish's contemporaries are known to have undertaken anything even remotely similar.\textsuperscript{354}

The concept for this planting owed much to Jekyll and especially her book \textit{Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens}. At its most basic, the Embankment Garden was little more than a very large rock garden. `A rock-garden may be anything between an upright wall and a nearly dead level. It is generally an artificial structure of earth and stones'.\textsuperscript{355} Generally the local horticultural writers and many of their English contemporaries upheld that rock gardens were a place to grow alpine plants only.

\textsuperscript{349} Cornish seems to have had little trouble with this aspect of the planting scheme with those buildings that Bagot was the architect for.\textsuperscript{350} See sections 5.2.2.3.7, 5.2.3.2.7, 5.3.2.4.7, 5.3.3.4.7, 5.3.4.4.7, 5.4.1.4.7, 5.4.2.4.7 and 5.4.3.4.7 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.\textsuperscript{351} Jekyll and Weaver, p. 136.\textsuperscript{352} Jekyll and Weaver, p. 137.\textsuperscript{353} See sections 3.1, 3.3.3.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.6.4.7, 3.13.1, 3.13.3, 4.2.3.7, 4.3.3.7, 4.4.3.7, 5.2.2.3.7, 5.2.3.2.7, 5.3.2.4.7, 5.3.3.4.7, 5.4.1.4.7, 5.4.2.4.7 and 5.4.3.4.7 for detailed information about this topic.\textsuperscript{354} See sections 3.7.1 and 3.7.3 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.\textsuperscript{355} Jekyll, \textit{Wall, Water and Woodland Gardens}, p. 32.
However, Jekyll recommended the use of succulents and cacti for rock gardens and walls in hot dry sites, both *Opuntia* and *Mesembryanthemum* were specifically listed as suitable and recommended for use together and although there was no mention of *Agave* or *Aloe*, texturally they were Cornish’s replacement for Jekyll’s favoured *Yucca*.

### 6.4.8 Natives

‘...but we are learning, too, the value and beauty of our native trees and flowers, and making better use of them. We have not known them very well, and they have been difficult to procure, and so have been neglected. However, a far wider range is now being made available to us.’

While natives were not a significant component of Cornish’s known planting schemes she did include natives in many of her gardens. Cornish utilised natives based on their beauty and suitability to meet the needs of a particular aspect of her design. Interestingly, while natives were not included in the brief description of her ideal garden, she did use this single piece of her known writing as a forum to subtly induce consideration for the ‘value and beauty’ of natives within the garden and to suggest that although ‘they may have been difficult to procure’ in the past that this was no longer necessarily the case.

Cornish was like Mellor in this respect, although it is unknown if Cornish ever designed planting schemes solely reliant on natives like Mellor did. It seems likely that these designers may have achieved greater lasting influence and understanding about natives and their potential for use in the garden through their careful promotion and suitable inclusion within their designs than Walling did with her fervent advocacy.

Cornish’s position upon natives from a local context was not new but the result of a similar persuasion by horticultural writers that stemmed as far back as her childhood and an adoption of the principles of such garden writers as Robinson, see below. This style of advocacy was also prevalent amongst her local contemporaries especially those that wrote within the popular media. The impact of this style of advocacy can be clearly seen in the gardens of Parkhouse and Ellis. Although natives in these gardens were a small proportion of total plant numbers, Parkhouse and Ellis’ selection and placement of a few key specimens actually had a significant impact upon the look of the garden as a whole.

---

357 Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 165.
358 Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 165. Also see sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2.1, 3.4.3.3, 3.6.4.8, 3.7.3, 3.10.1, 3.10.3, 3.11.3 and 3.13.1 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
359 As an example, during a visit to the Walling garden at Briar Avenue, Medindie Adelaide that is still owned by members of the family who originally commissioned the garden. The current owner discussed how Walling’s almost fanatical conversion to natives so upset and disillusioned the gardens original owner that she tore up all her correspondence in relation to the garden from Walling as she wanted nothing further to do with her. See also sections 4.2.3.8 and 4.3.3.8 for further information.
360 See sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2 for detailed information about this topic.
361 See sections 5.2.2.3.8, 5.2.3.2.8, 5.3.2.4.8, 5.3.3.4.8, 5.3.4.4.8, 5.4.1.4.8, 5.4.2.4.8 and 5.4.3.4.8 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.
Cornish’s success with natives was not something that should be judged by the numbers of natives used within her garden designs but rather upon how and where she used natives. Her selection, placement and use of new and existing native specimens within her designs indicated that from those natives available for use that she selected those that best suited her needs within the garden. Those needs included not only horticultural considerations but also suitability in regard to colour, texture, scale, form, fragrance and the provision of both harmony and contrast within her planting scheme when considered as a whole.

In The Garden Beautiful, Robinson wrote ‘we live in a time when the pursuit of things exotic is so attractive that the value of native trees is often forgotten’. Ironically the very next example exotic mentioned was the Norfolk Island Pine, Araucaria heterophylla, Robinson continued:

‘Wretched plantations these costly exotic trees often make, as all may see who watch them for a few years. While with the native tree on a suitable soil there is no going back, with the foreigner all is risk. The Native tree is ready to respond to every impulse of the season, is happy with our rainfall – often a slight one in some districts – and, given the soil right for it, soon makes in growth an end of all the pretensions of exotic rivals.’

Jekyll’s influence upon Cornish has already been established in relation to other aspects of design so it seems likely that this would have also extended to the use of natives. The distillation of that influence included the retention of existing native specimens, the use of natives and exotics together to enhance the beauty of both, and an appreciation of the beauty of natives. Robinson’s statements were just as applicable to Australia as they were to his intended English audience and coupled with Jekyll’s thoughts it would have been remarkable if a reader of Cornish’s obvious intelligence and education did not at the very least begin to think of these remarks within an overall Australian context.

6.4.9 Plant Selection

While, in general, Cornish’s selection of plants were typical of those frequently listed by the local horticulturists within their publications as being suitable for Adelaide climatic and soil conditions, there was one area where Cornish’s use of plants stood out: the frequency of her use of cacti and succulents as both accent specimens and in massed plantings. See Appendices 5B-5C, 5E-5G, 6A. Cornish’s extensive use of these plantings both preceded and was more encompassing than was generally adopted in Adelaide during the earlier part of the interwar period. While some cacti and succulents were generally individually mentioned, particularly by Quarrell within his plant lists for South Australian Homes and Gardens and in reference to possible planting schemes for the rock garden, it was not until 1934 that the first article dedicated to cacti or succulents appeared within the pages of the magazine. Cacti and succulents within Adelaide seem to have been generally relegated to the domain of the rock garden and by the 1940s were a popular planting scheme, as was

---

363 Jekyll and Weaver, p. 14.
attested by Oliver’s lament within his articles for South Australian Homes and Gardens for them to not be so used.\textsuperscript{365} Other than within Cornish’s gardens, cacti and succulents were only rarely seen pictorially outside of the rock garden.\textsuperscript{366}

In a slightly wider context the Melbourne based magazine The Australian Home Beautiful did publish a greater number of articles pertaining to cacti and succulents. One of earliest to include succulents was in late 1931 where the use of pigface, the common name for the group of plants originally classified as \textit{Mesembryanthemum}, was recommended for use in rockeries, massed general display and more significantly ‘\textit{on railway cutting cliffs}'.\textsuperscript{367} Cornish’s similar use of \textit{Mesembryanthemum} in her planting scheme for the Embankment Garden at the University of Adelaide, which was originally formed as a part of a railway cutting, predated this article.\textsuperscript{368}

The other aspects in which Cornish widely differed in her use of succulents and cacti was their use as potted specimen plants, as a major planting within dry-stone walls and more generally throughout any aspect of a planting scheme that was in any way associated with rockwork, be that a rock garden or more simply, areas of paving and stairs. See figures 3.3.2.2b-c, 3.3.2.3b, 3.3.2.5a, 3.3.3.3c-e, 3.3.3.4a, 3.7.2.2a, 3.7.3.1a-b, 3.8.1, 3.9.2b, 3.9.2g and 3.9.3a. It is also interesting to note that each written piece for \textit{The Book of South Australia}, the publication in which Cornish’s only known piece of writing was included, had a small lino printed image either at the beginning or end of that piece of writing: the image at the end of Cornish’s piece of writing were two potted cacti.\textsuperscript{369} This suggests local recognition for her extensive use of these plants within her planting schemes.

\section*{6.5 Graphic Style}

There is only a single known example of Cornish’s graphic style, the plan for The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden that was published in \textit{The Advertiser}. See figure 3.11.1a. The original plan appears as if it was drawn in pen and watercolour. The style in which the plan was executed is surprising considering Cornish’s association with at least two prominent Adelaide architects and her relationship with the artist Howie. The style of her plan was an amalgam between a plan format and a variant of almost an elevation that in appearance greatly resembled the contemporary style of garden image that was used to depict medieval and some renaissance gardens.\textsuperscript{370} See figure 6.5a. Interestingly though, Cornish was not the only person to replicate this style of plan during the interwar period. Jane Brown in \textit{The Pursuit of Paradise} illustrated two plans executed by Margaret Boden during the 1930s of an Herb and Bee garden that also drew upon Medieval drawing styles for these gardens.\textsuperscript{371}

\textsuperscript{365} See section 5.2.3.2.9 for detailed information and elaboration about this topic.


\textsuperscript{368} See section 3.7 for detailed information about this topic.

\textsuperscript{369} Cornish, ‘Her garden’, p. 165.


Figure 6.5a Circa 1565 image of a Medieval township that depicts a similar graphic style to that of Cornish’s only known plan.

(Source: Landsberg, p. 47.)

It is unknown if Cornish regularly used this style of graphic in her plans or even if she regularly used plans. It is possible that she chose this style of graphic for The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden plan on purpose, linking the symbolism that was imbued in her planting scheme with a period in time where those meanings were at their height and the plants themselves were an important part of any planting scheme.

In comparison with her contemporaries’ graphic styles - the artistry of Walling’s plans and the more architectural nature of Brown, Hartshorne, Ellis and Parkhouse’s plans could see Cornish like Mellor and her ‘cartoon-like’ plans ‘being taken less seriously than other designers’.372 This would be an unfortunate and erroneous perspective to take. Similarly, it would be unreasonable to detract from Cornish’s abilities as a landscape designer if she chose not to use plans at all. Paul Sorensen a noted Danish born Australian landscape designer who practiced circa 1920s-1980s rarely used plans and would only do so if the client was insistent.373

---

372 Pullman, p. 10.
Chapter Seven - Conclusion

7.1 Who Was Elsie Marion Cornish?

Elsie Marion Cornish was a prominent Adelaide interwar garden designer who greatly contributed to Adelaide’s landscape design culture. Cornish’s childhood spent firmly ensconced within the Adelaide middle classes and all that entailed provided her with a solid background in the basic premises of garden design and horticulture. Her personal and familial situation combined with societal upheavals due to the First World War provided the opportunities that enabled her to build upon her design and horticultural background and to undertake a career in landscape design. While her family and social connections may have initially facilitated her career, her wider acceptance and subsequent employment could only have been maintained over a thirty year period if her design work was widely held in high regard by the members of society that formed her clientele base. Nor is it likely that patrons such as the prominent Adelaide architect Walter Hervey Bagot and the Governor’s wife, Lady Hore-Ruthven would have endorsed Cornish as a landscape designer if they had not believed that she was talented in this regard. Alison Brookman, whose family commissioned Cornish to design and build a significant rock garden at their family home ‘Glannant’, stated that ‘Cornish was innovative as a landscape gardener’.¹

To determine exactly whom Cornish was without any form of documentation to provide some form of insight into her personality is difficult. However, it is possible to make some suppositions. Alison Brookman suggested that Cornish undertook garden design as a means of self-support rather than as a career, the inference being that it was something she had to do rather than something she wanted to do. While it is possible that Cornish may not have wished or desired to have to find gainful employment to support herself financially it is obvious that when left with little choice in the matter that she chose to do so within a field that allowed her to pursue her passion. While employment opportunities for women during this period were limited, there were other options that Cornish could have undertaken including her least desirable option, that of selling her single largest asset, her home, and moving in with one of her sister or brothers families.

It would be reasonable to suggest that Cornish was a highly intelligent and independent woman, as her personal and professional relationships could attest, and that her intellect must have been reasonably progressive as is suggested by the direction that her design work embraced. Coupled with this however, Cornish was still reasonably reserved, a product of her mid-Victorian middle class upbringing and that also befit her standing within her local church community. All of the images of her at work, usually planting, show that she always wore a skirt or dress. Alison Brookman remembered her always being in similar attire when working on the actual construction of their rock garden.

¹ Bird, ‘Interview with Alison Brookman’.
7.2 Where Should Cornish be Positioned in Australian Garden Historiography?

While Cornish’s contribution to designed landscapes outside of Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills region can not be considered to be extensive this does not preclude her from consideration as an important individual within the Australian landscape design historiography. Like Walling, Mellor and Brown, Cornish was one of the most influential designers for a particular class of clientele with the preponderance of those designs carried out within specific regions of Australia that were centred around major capital cities: Melbourne for Walling and Mellor, and Sydney for Brown. Admittedly these three women potentially reached a wider audience through their substantial body of written works than Cornish may have but Cornish in her own way managed to achieve a wider community recognition than may be initially supposed. See section 7.4.

Cornish, Walling, Mellor and Brown all drew upon similar influences particularly obvious were:

- English Arts and Crafts gardens, particularly through the works of Jekyll but also other period garden authors;
- Jekyll’s planting philosophies;
- the idea of the Italian garden as a model for Australian garden design; and,
- the interpretation of the integral nature of the house and garden as one combined unit rather than disparate components in design competition with each other.

For Walling and Mellor these last two points seem to have been established through literary study and observation alone. On the other hand, Cornish and Brown were associated with architects whom where developing and instituting these ideas at the conceptual stage and bringing them through to fruition through application in their architectural practice.

All four women’s designs were an Australian interpretation of the first three points, overlaid with the philosophy of the fourth. The degree to which their interpretation individually draws between the first three points varies, as does the degree from which they moved away from those original influences in their interpretations and the amount to which they subscribed or had to opportunity to subscribe to the philosophy of the fourth point. As would be expected, those variations differ between garden commissions, the stage of each designer within their respective careers and how closely associated their respective communities still were to the desire to capture an element of the English homeland or ‘old country’ within Australia.

In many respects, as was seen in Chapter Six, Cornish’s design work was equal to that of her interstate contemporaries. Of the four women, Cornish appears to have moved the least away from the original influences common to all four designers; this was actually in keeping with the desires of her client base. In those respects where Cornish’s work appeared less well executed, as opposed to a different interpretation of that particular component, it would be reasonable to suggest that part of the problem would be the limited number of her known garden designs from which to draw comparison. Cornish’s rock gardens are a good example of this. That is not to say that in some instances that Cornish did not quite achieve the finesse of her interstate contemporaries, especially Walling and Brown.
Cornish was in some respects an ‘innovative’ designer and was considered very much as such within Adelaide during the period. This was particularly true in respect to her choice of plant palette – one that was well suited to Adelaide’s difficult environment – the alkaline soils of the plains, the long very hot and dry summers and the intensity of the natural light. Walling, Mellor and Brown’s positions within the Australian garden historiography has been established and widely accepted. It therefore stands to reason that Cornish, as a landscape designer of equal merit, also deserves to be ascribed with a similar level of recognition and acceptance as her interstate contemporaries.

7.3 What was Cornish’s Contribution to Adelaide’s Landscape Design Culture?

Cornish’s known landscape designs typically followed many of the precepts of the English Arts and Crafts style garden. This was a style of garden that was popular amongst the wealthy Adelaide social elite and that indicated the beginning of a shift away from the informal garden designs that had typically predominated in Adelaide during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

While a number of leading architects and a few other individuals own gardens showed influences of the English Arts and Crafts garden style, Cornish was, with the exception of Bagot and Hartshorne, the only known individual to undertake landscape design commissions in this style within Adelaide during this period.

Cornish’s own initial garden design education was heavily influenced by the informal mode of design known as ‘Gardenesque’ that was widely and universally adopted in Adelaide during the nineteenth century and that continued in its appeal well into the twentieth century. The proliferation of garden texts to which Cornish had access to continue her education easily divided into two prominent design categories: those of the formal and informal schools of thought. Coupled with the predisposition of the horticulturists that wrote for the popular media during the first half of the twentieth century, Cornish could have easily have chosen to design gardens with an informal style and still found a significant client base willing to commission her to do so. Yet she chose not to.

‘The British Arts and Crafts Movement influenced the course of South Australian art and taste both directly and indirectly. In Adelaide its effects were felt from the late nineteenth century and its influence continued into the late 1930s’. With the significant uptake of Arts and Crafts objects by elements of Adelaide’s society

---

2 It is not nor ever was the intention of this thesis to delve into the debate that raged during the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries between English architects and landscape gardeners about the respective merits and suitability of the opposing schools of thought that surrounded formal and informal garden design. That Cornish must have been aware of this debate there is no doubt, she would have had to have be single mindedly obtuse, something she was not, not to have been so. It is also likely through her personal and professional relationships with Bagot and Makin and through Charles Bogue-Luffman’s book that she was also generally aware of the situation as it pertained to Australia. Marilyn McBriar in her thesis for a Graduate Diploma in Landscape Design, Gardens of Federation and Other Edwardian Houses in Melbourne circa 1890-1914 has dealt with this issue in the Australian context in detail.

3 Menz, p. 28.
during this period, it would have been unlikely that this expression would not also have eventually translated into other aspects of design. This would also have provided a ready clientele who desired this expression in other aspects of the designed components of their surroundings, such as their homes and gardens.

Cornish’s strong association with an Arts and Crafts expression in garden design lay in her initial exposure and understanding of the movement and its designs through her connection with Howie. Her association with architects Bagot and Makin, whether or not this was either and/or an initiative or facilitative relationship, would have provided support for Cornish to follow this expression within her garden designs. Cornish’s design style was greatly influenced by the works of Jekyll and her gardens obviously incorporated many of the stylistic ideas illustrated by Jekyll and Weaver in Arts and Crafts Gardens. While Jekyll and Weaver were immensely influential upon Cornish’s garden designs and the structures within those gardens, Jekyll’s influence can also been seen in Cornish’s use of colour, texture, scale and form in her planting schemes. However, it is also interesting to note that Cornish appears to have continued to draw upon the influences of post-impressionist art trends, as facilitated by a number of Adelaide women artists in relation to colour, and also interpreted them within her planting schemes.

While Cornish adopted a stylistic expression of the Arts and Crafts garden, it was more difficult to determine if she understood and subscribed to the philosophical principles that were an under pining feature across all aspects of the movement. Much of Adelaide society definitely did not subscribe to these principles, but rather sort to acquire fashionable designs that they found appealing, often creating combinations that when placed together in a room, were considered ‘uncharacteristic’ of the designers intended work.4

Bagot had a profound philosophical understanding of the interconnection between the house and garden and expressed his own vision of that relationship as affected by the environmental dictates of Adelaide. Bagot felt that ‘the design approach should draw inspiration from Mediterranean and Georgian architecture and space-making, and that the house and ground-plane should be considered together as one’. The design should be drawn from ‘sensitive siting relationships, climatic responsiveness, an appropriate planting palette, and colour and light. Simplicity, in design, was considered the answer’.5

Bagot himself wrote:

‘Architectural outlines need the caressing of trees to temper their hardness, masses of evergreens for contrast and shade, water for reflection, in addition to the greensward which must form the basis of any scheme of open space.’6

and:

'To accentuate, reveal, suggest or even suppress architectural masses is a function of the skillfully planned garden, and in doing so it gains emphasis, background and contrast for its own features. Shade, murmuring waters, seclusion, a hint of form in marble against the darkest greens; these are the notes, not that arrogant form or artifice, bristling with balustrades and statuary and hot with colour, which often usurps the title; but of the true Italian garden.\(^7\)

Jones states Bagot’s ‘quiet advocacy for the work of Elsie Cornish’ is a component of Bagot’s ‘legacy’ in relation to his philosophy of landscape design in South Australia.\(^8\) This legacy would be seen at its closest in Cornish’s work where the two had worked together on the same commissions; those known included ‘Broadlees’ and the University of Adelaide, North Terrace campus, lower grounds of which the embankment garden was the dominant feature. While this legacy may not be as overt in Cornish’s other commissions, especially those where she was responsible for a section of the garden only rather than its complete design, elements of it can still be found throughout her other complete garden commissions.

While Cornish’s use of house plantings and wall plants was not as significant as the literature and her contemporaries, her use of trees with in the garden and against sections of the Darling, Wilcox and Darian Smith residences did ‘accentuate, reveal, suggest and suppress’ elements of the architectural mass of the building. She did use masses of evergreens to provide contrast within the garden and in a complementary mode to the architecture. Greensward was the basis of her open spaces; water was a significant element of her designs, Cornish’s preference for still water and reflection over that of it playing has been well documented. Shade and seclusion were both elements of her gardens, and her lack of statuary and balustrades in these larger gardens has also been addressed.

The one significant departure from Bagot was in respect to colour. Cornish did use colour – sometimes, hot colour – in her gardens but it is important to note how that colour was used. Cornish generally placed her colour within specific ‘garden rooms’, the rest of the garden largely devoted to the colour, textural and form variation created by the foliage and form of trees. Green gardens, as has already been commented upon, were a significant feature, especially within the Wilcox and Darling residences.

So, while Cornish did stylistically include many Arts and Crafts garden features within her designs and follow much of the works of Jekyll, Bagot’s influence also saw some of the philosophy behind the Italian garden within her work. Cornish’s garden designs could then be best described as an amalgam of both Arts and Crafts and Italian garden modes. However, more precisely, Cornish’s gardens should be viewed as being designed in the stylistic pattern of the Arts and Crafts garden overlaid with the philosophy of Bagot’s concept of the Italian and neo-Georgian design of space.

---

\(^7\) Bagot quoted in Jones ‘A Plea for Tradition’, p. 96.

7.4 What Impact and Influence did Cornish Have?

Cornish had a considerable impact and influence upon the accepted garden design modes within her particular clientele base, in Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills. She embraced and facilitated a new direction in the style of garden design in Adelaide and to a degree the philosophical concepts that were associated with that shift and implemented them for the most part within her landscape commissions. Her garden designs were well suited to the architectural types that could be attributed to the associated houses of those gardens. More so than the informal gardens that had until this point in time dominated garden design in Adelaide.

As one of only a few professionals in Adelaide to design gardens of this mode in Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills, Cornish was able to meet the dual needs of the gardens owners. The most obvious was the aesthetic desires of the garden’s owner to possess a fashionable English Arts and Crafts style garden that would have been considered by some sections of the upper echelons of society as de rigueur. The other, lesser-acknowledged need was for the house and garden to be more philosophically entwined through the way that both were designed. This was something Cornish brought, with varying degrees of success, to the homes of her clients through her garden designs. Whether she was able to work as closely with the architects that designed those other homes as she was able to with Bagot is unfortunately unknown but with the further possible exception of Makin, does seem unlikely at this stage.

While Cornish’s impact and influence within her client base can be more easily ascertained, she did also have some limited influence over the wider community. The identity of ‘A professional Woman Gardener’ the author of the ‘Garden Lover’ column for the women’s pages of The Observer is unknown and may possibly have been Cornish. The descriptions provided within the column when viewed against that of Cornish’s own garden make for an interesting comparison.9

Cornish’s model gardens at the Royal Adelaide Show were extremely popular with the public as was shown by the images of those gardens, surrounded by crowds of people. The model gardens were also featured within the popular media of the period which gave them a much wider coverage throughout Adelaide and the State in general. There were also two of her commissions that were sited within the public domain: The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Garden and the University of Adelaide Lower Grounds with its spectacular and noted Embankment Garden. Through these avenues some of Cornish’s stylistic expression would have been interpreted by and incorporated into the gardens of the wider community, even if her philosophical understanding of the garden’s role within the home landscape was not so interpreted.

Elsie Marion Cornish was a talented South Australian landscape designer who mostly undertook garden commissions, within Adelaide and its immediate surrounds. She designed her gardens in an English Arts and Crafts garden style, interpreted for Australian conditions and to meet the desires of her clientele. Overlaid upon the stylistic design of her gardens was a philosophical understanding of the interconnection between house and garden and the need for the space to be designed as an intertwined whole. The degree to which she was able to employ this throughout

---

9 See sections 3.13 and 5.3.3 for detailed information about this topic.
all of her garden designs was limited depending on the client, architect and the extent to which she was engaged. Cornish’s influence was considerable within the socioeconomic group from which her client base emanated. This influence was less within the wider community, although it was still present. In terms of Australia’s garden design historiography, Cornish is as important as other noted Australian landscape designers such as Edna Walling, Olive Mellor and Jocelyn Brown and as such deserves a similar degree of recognition and understanding of her work as has been attributed to those designers.
# Appendix 2A - Selected Gardening Books From the Collection of the State Library of South Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Entry into the SLSA Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thonger</td>
<td>The Book of Rock and Water Gardens</td>
<td>January 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebert J Kellaway</td>
<td>How to Lay Out Suburban Home Grounds</td>
<td>September 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Dillistone</td>
<td>The Planning and Planting of Little Gardens</td>
<td>February 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter H Godfrey</td>
<td>Gardens in the Making</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Philip Martineau</td>
<td>Gardening in Sunny Lands</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline Agar</td>
<td>Garden Design in Theory and Practice</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Steele</td>
<td>Design in the Little Garden</td>
<td>March 1926?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Stebbing</td>
<td>Colour in the Garden</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ernest Milner</td>
<td>The Art and Practice of Landscape Gardening</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG Davis</td>
<td>The Home Grounds</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs FA Bardswell</td>
<td>The Book of Town and Window Gardening</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Rogers</td>
<td>Garden Planning</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Tabor</td>
<td>The Landscape Gardening Book</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thonger</td>
<td>The Book of Garden Furniture</td>
<td>November 1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2B - Selected Gardening Books from the
Library of Sir Samuel James Way Bequeathed to the
Barr Smith Library, University of Adelaide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Entry into the Barr Smith Library Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter P. Wright</td>
<td>Beautiful Gardens How to Make and Maintain Them</td>
<td>February 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thonger</td>
<td>The Book of Garden Design</td>
<td>March 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>The Garden Beautiful Home Woods, Home Landscape</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Blomfield &amp; F Inigo Thomas</td>
<td>The Formal Garden in England</td>
<td>June 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Standish Nichols</td>
<td>English Pleasure Gardens</td>
<td>May 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR Guilfoyle</td>
<td>Australian Plants Suitable for Gardens, Parks, Timber Reserves, Etc</td>
<td>not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>Alpine Flowers for English Gardens</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Jekyll</td>
<td>Home and Garden</td>
<td>June 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>The Subtropical Garden; or, Beauty of Form in the Flower Garden</td>
<td>October 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>The Wild Garden or Our Groves &amp; Shrubberies Made Beautiful</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hallsham</td>
<td>Every Man His Own Gardener</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Rolf Boldrewood</td>
<td>The Flower Garden in Australia</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Campbell</td>
<td>The Garden, You, and I</td>
<td>May 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Reynolds Hole</td>
<td>Our Gardens</td>
<td>April 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon Mrs Evelyn Cecil</td>
<td>Children's Gardens</td>
<td>June 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Jekyll</td>
<td>Wood and Garden</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bogue-Luffman</td>
<td>The Principles of Gardening for Australia</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Watson</td>
<td>Flowers and Gardens</td>
<td>June 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Henry N Ellacombe</td>
<td>In My Vicarage Garden and Elsewhere</td>
<td>April 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Jekyll</td>
<td>Colour in the Flower Garden</td>
<td>March 1917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3A - Cornish’s Annotations for the Western Border at the Wilcox Residence

Image of the planting as referred to by Cornish.

Cornish’s hand written annotation.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)
Appendix 3B - List of Judges for the Model Garden Competition 1929-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Years Judged</th>
<th>Gardening Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JF Bailey</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden &amp; Member of RAHSS Horticulture Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Loader</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Member of RAHSS Horticulture Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Stuart</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW Pelzer</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Landscape Gardener &amp; Gardener to the City of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ Quarrell</td>
<td>1930-32, 1935-37</td>
<td>Gardening Editor of the <em>South Australian Homes and Gardens</em> Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Hurcombe</td>
<td>1930-33, 1938</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Waite</td>
<td>1931-33</td>
<td>Owner and collaborative designer with Cornish of the Jekyll inspired garden at ‘Broadlees’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA Lienau</td>
<td>1933-38</td>
<td>Owner of a large garden in Unley Park and the President of the Unley Horticultural and Floricultural Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs later Lady Mabel Hudd</td>
<td>1934-35, 1938</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Hackett</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Prominent South Australian Nurseryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Greaves</td>
<td>1935, 1937</td>
<td>Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3C - Cornish's Annotations for the Planting Scheme of her 1931 Model Garden Entry 'Springtide'

Image of the planting as referred to by Cornish.

Cornish's hand written annotation.
Cornish annotated a second photograph of the same image wishing her family a Happy Christmas.

Image of the crowds of people that flocked to see the Model Gardens.

Cornish's comments about the crowds.
The ‘admiring crowd’.

Cornish’s description of how she had to protect her Model Garden from the crowds of people.

Image of the garden showing the Cypresses, *Cupressus* spp.
Cornish’s reference to the Cypresses, *Cupressus* spp.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)
Appendix 3D - Cornish's Annotations for the Planting Scheme of her 1932 Model Garden Entry 'Pool of the Narcissus'

Image of the planting as referred to by Cornish.

Cornish's hand written annotation.
A second image annotated with planting notes.

Cornish's hand written notes detailing further aspects of the planting scheme.
An image of the crowd. The jet fountain in the pool was in operation when this image was taken.

Cornish’s comment about the crowd.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)
Appendix 3E - Cornish’s Annotations for the Planting Scheme of her 1933 Model Garden Entry ‘Portico’

Image of the planting as referred to by Cornish.

Cornish’s hand written annotation.

(Source: Dr Peter Cornish)
Appendix 3F - Map of the 'Stangate' Grounds as Laid-out by the Camellia Society of South Australia

Note: The House is located at the map reference for 'Refreshments'.

(Source: Adelaide Hills Branch of the Australian Camellia Research Society)
Appendix 4A - Edna Walling's articles for The Australian Home Beautiful 1925-1946

‘Planning the Garden to Suit the House’, October 1925, p. 49.
‘This is the House that I Built’, March 1926, pp. 22-5.

‘Our Garden Plan’, May 1927, p. 43.
‘In the Garden Some Random Notes’, December 1928, p. 64.
‘Have You Thought of a Blue Garden’, May 1929, pp. 34-5.
‘We Have Built a Concrete pergola’, September 1929, p. 46.
‘The Beauties of the Silver Birch’, October 1929, pp. 12, 22.
‘A Garden of Changing Scenes - What are the characteristics of an ideal suburban garden?’, January 1930, pp. 33-6.
## Appendix 4B - Walling's Client List

### Australian Gardens Designed by Edna Walling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client List</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Mr A.P.</td>
<td>Gigi Station, Nagambie, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allansvale</td>
<td>Great Western, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Mrs H.G.</td>
<td>Kallarurna, Crawdad Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Mrs Stanley</td>
<td>Darrell, Mount Macedon, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Mrs Ringland</td>
<td>Chunston, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdown, Mr &amp; Mrs G.</td>
<td>Markdale, Bardsa, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton, James H.</td>
<td>Millthorpe, Mandurama, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Mrs Claude</td>
<td>William, Grange, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bage, Miss J.</td>
<td>Orong Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballieu, Mrs Arthur</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballieu, Mr G.</td>
<td>Fawcett Creek, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Mr H.B.</td>
<td>Mt Eliza, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbee, Mrs Irvine</td>
<td>Plan for south east terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates, Mr B.W.</td>
<td>Linthorpe Rd, Hawthorn, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street garden</td>
<td>Bay St, Brighton, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice, J.C.</td>
<td>Power Ave, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedgrove</td>
<td>Res. late Governor La Trobe, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beggs, Mrs Theo</td>
<td>Eumambung, Headport, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berruti, Mr A.K.</td>
<td>tracing of driveway and colour plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Mrs A.G.</td>
<td>Toorak Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddle, Mrs L.A.</td>
<td>Hawthorne Rd, Caulfield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, Mrs</td>
<td>Blair Island, Brighton, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowes, Mr A.K.</td>
<td>Merricks, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowes, Mrs A.K.</td>
<td>Alexandra Headlands, Qld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow, Dr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>Most Alberts Rd, Camberwell, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughan, Mrs W.</td>
<td>Chesterfield Ave, Malvern, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright, Mrs</td>
<td>Riversdale Rd, Caulfield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breamham, Miss E.</td>
<td>Riversdale Rd, Caulfield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breton, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>Riverdale Rd, Camberwell, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhill Ave Ave, P/L</td>
<td>Port Kennedy, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhill Ave Ave, P/L</td>
<td>Port Peter, SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Dr G.</td>
<td>Colac, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Mrs A.J.</td>
<td>East Caulfield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley, Mrs David</td>
<td>Channow, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindell, Miss Isabel</td>
<td>Edmunds Rd, Lilydale, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brion, M.E.C.</td>
<td>Mentaico Ave, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Mr C.</td>
<td>Wood, ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Mr E.D.</td>
<td>Kintyre, Hevington Pl, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberran Grammar School</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy, Mr C.N.</td>
<td>East Kenmore, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill, F.G.</td>
<td>Glenbrae Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington, Mrs Douglas</td>
<td>Grant Ave, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carney, F.</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Miss Justin</td>
<td>St Kilda St, Brighten. Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entwisle to flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Mr Justin</td>
<td>Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, W.E.</td>
<td>Kurnell Rd, St Kilda St, Brighton, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, Miss J.</td>
<td>Glenbrook, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catto, I.A.</td>
<td>Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, Mrs Una</td>
<td>Easy Acres, Olinda, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers, Dr W.</td>
<td>Moonee Rd, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmwood garden</td>
<td>Channow, Sydney NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clematis garden</td>
<td>Burswood, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Mr H.J.R.</td>
<td>Black St, Mount Albert, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, G.J.</td>
<td>Kenning Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Mr George</td>
<td>Melbourne, Mt Eliza, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Sir Stanley</td>
<td>Garden Grove, South Yarra, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville, Dr H.C.</td>
<td>Richmond Rd, Hawthorn, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville, Dr B.H.</td>
<td>Avonlea, Bayside Rd, Highton, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbold, Sir Cyril</td>
<td>Kohoma, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Miss Jessie</td>
<td>Penny Green, Boroora, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Mrs</td>
<td>Keen, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Dr L.A.</td>
<td>Fully Yours, Olinda, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 colour plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Mrs. W.</td>
<td>Mountview, Eumundi, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranor, Mr. T.C.</td>
<td>Hill St, North Melbourne, SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranor, Mrs. M.S.</td>
<td>Wanneroo Rd, Harvey Hills, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross, Mr. R.P.</td>
<td>Gin Gin, Queensland, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossland, Mrs A.</td>
<td>Mallow Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, J.</td>
<td>Seaton Circle, Tatura, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, S.</td>
<td>Swanston St, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie, Mrs. E.</td>
<td>Seven Circles, Elwood, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, Rev. J.</td>
<td>La Trobe Picture Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart, C.</td>
<td>Yarraville, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart, R.C.</td>
<td>Jollie Rock, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort Dr, VIC.</td>
<td>Glencoe, Lower Plenty, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay, Mr. H.G.</td>
<td>Blackburn, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond, Mrs Andrew</td>
<td>Winna Rd, Caufield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draydale, Mr. J.A.</td>
<td>Burns Rd, Waverley, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadie, A.A.</td>
<td>Struan St, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore, Mr. R.</td>
<td>St Kilda, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everingham Lewis, Mrs</td>
<td>Plan of Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearley, Mrs Keith</td>
<td>Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrer, Dr.</td>
<td>Gooroo, Daily, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firth, Dr.</td>
<td>Ruby St, Hawthorn, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink, Mrs. H.</td>
<td>Weerung, Lorne Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>抗击战争的勇气</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Garden</td>
<td>Johnstone Rd, Kew, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest, R.</td>
<td>Malvern, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest, Mr. R.</td>
<td>Berwick, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth-Bollong, Mrs</td>
<td>Marchfield, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Mrs. J.S.</td>
<td>South Yarra, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwood, Mrs. T.</td>
<td>Caroline Ave, South Yarra, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Grove</td>
<td>Yarraline Rd, Kew, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Mr. Mark</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Walk</td>
<td>Design for cottage &amp; villa gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, Mr. Douglas</td>
<td>Silver Birch, Yarraville, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore, Road garden</td>
<td>Gilmore Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giveck, Mr. &amp; Mrs A.R.</td>
<td>Woodland, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenock, Mr. F. &amp; Winifred</td>
<td>Appleworth, Heidelberg, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell, Mrs John</td>
<td>St Georges Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell, Mrs. Sophia</td>
<td>St George Rd, South Yarra, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallant, W.</td>
<td>St Georges Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggard, Mrs Geoffrey</td>
<td>Parklea, Woolden, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hames, Mrs F.R.</td>
<td>Cawley, Waverley, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henshall, Mr. J.H.</td>
<td>Hill St, Box Hill, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwick, Mr. A.H.</td>
<td>Strathmore Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Mrs S.H.</td>
<td>Elaborate, Eumundi, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, Mr. D.H.</td>
<td>Greenack, Sandy Bay, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwood, Mrs. G.</td>
<td>Malvern, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, Mrs E.T.</td>
<td>Crocker Rd, Ballarat, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebel, Mr. L.</td>
<td>Lillipilli Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking &amp; McIntyre, Mrs</td>
<td>Warrandyte Rd, Ringwood, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, Mr.</td>
<td>Ampley Rd, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hekartan, Mr. &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>Woodstock, Eumundi, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg, Mr. John</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes-Hunt, P.C. Esq.</td>
<td>Douglas St, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, Mrs W.</td>
<td>Pondhurst, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H拿出来什么, Mrs.</td>
<td>Yumble Free Reserve, Albury, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes-Jones, Mrs</td>
<td>Southbourne, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Mrs J.</td>
<td>Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Mr &amp; Mrs J.J.</td>
<td>Berkeley Park, Toorak, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobsen, Mr. E.</td>
<td>Snowgoose, Melbourne, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Miss</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Dr W.W.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Mr Seaman</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilpatrick garden</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, F P</td>
<td>Roadhouse, Qld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnear, Dr L</td>
<td>Malaga, East Malaga, Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles garden</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacon, Miss Francis</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Mrs Carriage</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legge, Mrs L</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legge, Mrs H</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees, Mrs Newton</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leggate, Mrs D.M.</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leitch, Mr Walter</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenon, Miss H.</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillydale Reserve</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillicrap, Mrs</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard, Mrs V.</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipton, Mrs Frank</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucken, Mrs T.</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay, Miss E.H.</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon, Mr Dept</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm, C. &amp; H.</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield family</td>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning, Mrs C.W.</td>
<td>23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, Mr George</td>
<td>24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Mrs E.</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Mrs G.</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, Mrs</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKellar, Rev A.</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKellar, Mrs R.</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan, Mrs</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meagher, Mrs</td>
<td>31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbs, Mrs Nuffie</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcllroy, Mrs M.</td>
<td>33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcllroy, Mr</td>
<td>34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcllroy, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounts, W. &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murch, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murnane, Mrs</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murchinson, Mrs W.</td>
<td>40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield, Mrs &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanwell, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, Mr &amp; Mrs C.</td>
<td>43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, Dr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, Mr &amp; Mrs F.</td>
<td>45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, Mr &amp; Mrs J.</td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs A.</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs B.</td>
<td>49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs C.</td>
<td>50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs D.</td>
<td>51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs E.</td>
<td>52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs F.</td>
<td>53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs G.</td>
<td>54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs H.</td>
<td>55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs I.</td>
<td>56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs J.</td>
<td>57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs K.</td>
<td>58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs L.</td>
<td>59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs M.</td>
<td>60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs N.</td>
<td>61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs O.</td>
<td>62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs P.</td>
<td>63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs Q.</td>
<td>64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs R.</td>
<td>65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs S.</td>
<td>66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs T.</td>
<td>67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs U.</td>
<td>68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs V.</td>
<td>69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs W.</td>
<td>70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs X.</td>
<td>71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs Y.</td>
<td>72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr &amp; Mrs Z.</td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footscray Golf Club .......................... Frankston, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Fry, G. ........................................... Williamstown, Victoria, Vic. .......................... 1913. La Trobe Picture Collection
Frye, H. R. (Ed) .................................. Cheltenham. Vic. .......................... 1932. La Trobe Picture Collection
Ried, Mrs A ......................................... Armadale, Vic. .......................... 1932. La Trobe Picture Collection
Richardson, F. ................................... Mount Gambier, Torana, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rigbyland Anderson, Sir R. Mrs. .......... Cheshunt, Torana, Vic. .......................... 1930. Private collection; copy La Trobe
Rigbywell gardens .............................. Ringwood, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Riker, Mrs R ........................................ Delatine, Manifold, Vic. .......................... 1929. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rousso, Sir E ...................................... Mortlake East, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rouse, Mrs E.N. .................................. Strathaven Court, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rous, Minn ......................................... Ridge House, Kalamunda, Vic. .......................... 1927. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rous, Mrs W ......................................... Nairanga, Cape Clear, Vic. .......................... 1927. La Trobe Picture Collection
Rousley, Mrs E.N. ............................... Amery St, South Yarra, Vic. .......................... 1926. La Trobe Picture Collection
Schuchard, Mrs R.A. ............................. East Keer, Vic. .......................... 1924. La Trobe Picture Collection
Scott Williams, Mrs ............................. Odd_clone, Moor St, South Yarra, Vic. .......................... 1926. La Trobe Picture Collection
Shannon, Mrs F. .................................. Geelong, Vic. .......................... 1928. La Trobe Picture Collection
Shaw, Mrs J.H. .................................. Beechworth Park, Whittlesea, Vic. .......................... 1921. Private collection
Singleton, Mr ..................................... South Yarra, Vic. .......................... 1922. La Trobe Picture Collection
South, Mrs J.H. .................................. South Yarra, Vic. .......................... 1923. La Trobe Picture Collection
Sonneveld garden .............................. Moorabool Park, Vic. .......................... 1938. The Attractive Home Beautiful
Sonneveld subdivision ........................ Moorabool Park, Melbourne, Vic. .......................... 1939. The Attractive Home Beautiful
Southey, Mrs A.M. .............................. Hepburn Rd, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1938. La Trobe Picture Collection
Southey, Mrs E ..................................... Strathaven Ct, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1940. La Trobe Picture Collection
Sower, Mrs H. Lee ............................... Balnivron Ave, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Stephens, Miss Nancy .......................... Baulk, Albury, NSW .......................... 1938. La Trobe Picture Collection
Stephens, Dr C.A. ............................... Fellow Court, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1941. La Trobe Picture Collection
Stawell, Miss E .................................. Moonlight Cote, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1932. La Trobe Picture Collection
Norman, Mrs T .................................. Salkern, Glenferrie Rd, Vic. .......................... 1929. Private collection; copy La Trobe
St John's Wood Golf Links ..................... St John's Wood, Mount Waverley, Vic. .......................... 1927. La Trobe Picture Collection
Soner, Miss E.K. ................................. Henderson Ave, Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Stott, Mrs Abigail ............................... Wheelers Hill, Vic. .......................... 1931. Private collection
Stuart, Miss K.A. ............................... Toorak, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Sussex, Mrs J.G. .................................. New, Vic. .......................... 1937. La Trobe Picture Collection
Edes, Sir George ............................... Frankston, Vic. .......................... 1935. La Trobe Picture Collection
Thompson, Mr & Mrs A ....................... Eyeshock, East St Kilda, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Thompson, Mr C ................................. Eyeshock, East St Kilda, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Thompson, Miss J. M. .......................... Lavender Lawn, Fenton Cott, Frankston, Vic. .......................... 1941. La Trobe Picture Collection
Tours College ................................. Frankston, Vic. .......................... 1925. La Trobe Picture Collection
University Women's College ................. Melbourne University, Parkville, Vic. .......................... 1934. Private collection
Vasco, E.S. ...................................... Lughragh Vale, Moorabool, Vic. .......................... 1931. La Trobe Picture Collection
Wallace, Mrs L.A. ............................. Napier's Arm, Upside, Vic. .......................... 1936. Private collection (2)
Watson, Mr A.H. .................................. Baulk, Albury, NSW .......................... 1939. La Trobe Picture Collection
Weld, Miss Irene ............................... Church Lawn, Vic. .......................... 1930. The Attractive Home Beautiful
White, Mr C ....................................... Concordia, Vic. .......................... 1936. La Trobe Picture Collection
Williams, Mrs Scott ............................. Oakhurst, Marine St, South Yarra, Vic. .......................... 1927. La Trobe Picture Collection
Williams Road garden ....................... Brackenbury Drive, North Adelaide, SA .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
Williams, E ....................................... Kingston Terrace, North Adelaide, SA .......................... 1928. La Trobe Picture Collection
Winy addition .................................. Releigh Vale, Moorabool, Vic. .......................... 1928. La Trobe Picture Collection
Woolcock, Mrs J .................................. Baulk, Albury, NSW .......................... 1927. La Trobe Picture Collection
Youngman, Mr H .................................. Ascott, Strathfield, Vic. .......................... 1930. La Trobe Picture Collection
zoo plan ........................................... Zoological Gardens .......................... 1928. La Trobe Picture Collection (1)
Zoological Gardens ............................. Melbourne, Vic. .......................... 1928. La Trobe Picture Collection (1)

Design for fountain inside new aviary.
Plan for Nursery garden, 30 April 1928.
Plan of suggested improvements to lawn west of lawn area, 1 June 1928
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Greenes, Mr Ulus, Vic ......................................................... Mrs Gray Smith .........................................................
Grygovics, Mr Macedon Rd, Mt Macedon, Vic ................................. Mr R.K. McArthur .........................................................
Hansford garden, Court St, Benalla, Vic ........................................ Mr H. Hansford .........................................................
Herbert garden, Yarra, Vic ....................................................... Mrs C. Herbert .........................................................
Horticultural garden, Cliffs Road, Toorak, Vic ................................. Mr Hurd .........................................................
Hopetoun Road garden, Toorak, Vic ............................................... Mrs C. Ballieu .........................................................
Kawana Road, St George's Rd, Toorak, Vic ........................................ Mrs C. R. R. R. R .......................... c.1935
Kemalbuge Reserve, Manvel, Vic ................................................... Mr D. Cameron .........................................................
Kildonnan, Hollinwood, NSW ...................................................... Dr & Mrs J. Badenhorst .....................................................
Kilmore, Hay St, Coolangatta, Vic .................................................. Dr & Mrs J. Badenhorst .....................................................
Kingscote garden, Maroona Rd, Toorak, Vic .................................... Mr H. Kingscote .........................................................
Koongara, Malvern, Vic .......................................................... Mr & Mrs L. E. L. A. .........................................................
Lewis garden, Lourido St, New Lambton, NSW .................................. Mr & Mrs M. Lewin .........................................................
Lindosmary garden, Sheerwater, Vic ............................................... M.C.E. Thomas .........................................................
Lydon's Lea, Poets Lane, Sheeburn, Vic ......................................... Mr & Mrs D. Stephenson ...................................................
Marcus Martin garden, Wahroonga, South Yarra, Vic ..................... Mrs Marcus Martin .........................................................
Meadow, Main Rd, Mt Macedon, Vic ............................................. Mrs D. Sculley .........................................................
Meganga, Orrong Rd, Toorak, Vic ................................................ Mr & Mrs S. A. Scopelle ...................................................
Mena, Ankenman St, Templestowe, Vic .......................................... Miss A. H. C. .........................................................
Mitchell garden, Ellerw Rd, Engadine, Vic ...................................... Mr & Mrs E. Mitchell ......................................................
Minta, South Rd, Berwick, Vic ....................................................... Mrs J. J. Balint .........................................................
Moralla, Skipper, Vic ............................................................ Mrs U. A. Christoff .........................................................
Meyer garden, Clarendon Rd, Toorak, Vic ....................................... Mrs S. J. Meyer .........................................................
Neville Street garden, Langwarrin, Vic ............................................ Mr & Mrs T. Neville ......................................................
Orange Road garden, Toorak, Vic .................................................. Mrs Denis .........................................................
Otawa Road garden, Toorak, Vic ................................................... Mrs Y. T. R. R. .........................................................
Prideaux, Kallara, Vic ............................................................ Mrs E. R. A. .........................................................
Schneider garden, Biberym, Vic ..................................................... Mr & Mrs S. Schneider ......................................................
Sea Gates, Williamstown, Vic ...................................................... Miss S. W. .........................................................
Steel garden, Leathery Court, Toorak, Vic ...................................... Sir C. & Lady Steele .........................................................
Steele garden, Alexander Ave, South Yarra, Vic ............................... Mrs J. E. Steele .........................................................
Steen Hayes, Mt Eliza, Vic ........................................................ Mrs S. McAllister .........................................................
Stewart garden, Knares Court, Toorak, Vic ..................................... Mrs Stewart .........................................................
Tang, Finnemore, Vic ............................................................. Mrs F. J. Lang .........................................................
Tunna, Freemantle Rd, Cambewell, Vic ......................................... Mr J. E. Doyle .........................................................
Upham, Lysaght Rd, Toorak, Vic ................................................... Mr J. E. Doyle .........................................................
Ward Estate, Caversham, Vic ....................................................... Mr & Mrs White .........................................................
Weller garden, St Leonards Court, South Yarra, Vic ......................... Mrs S. E. Webber .........................................................
Willow, Sackley Rd, Hawthorn, Vic ............................................. Mr & Mrs White .........................................................
White garden, Birkwood Ave, Wahroonga, NSW .............................. Mr & Mrs White .........................................................
Williams garden, Hastings Rd, Kooyong, Vic ................................ Mr & Mrs J. Williams ......................................................
Williams garden, The Boulevard, Northcote, Vic ............................. Mr J. W. Williams .........................................................
Wyn呖, Orrong Rd, Toorak, Vic .................................................... Mr & Mrs J. Williams ......................................................
Wynyard garden, Hambro Rd, Hawthorn, Vic ................................ Mr J. W. Williams .........................................................
Woodlands garden, Killmore, Vic ................................................ Mrs E. J. Staddon .........................................................
Yarraby, Ross Road, Lower Plenty, Vic ........................................... Mr & Mrs J. Williams ......................................................

(Source: Dixon and Churchill, pp. 140-45.)
Appendix 4C - A List of Mellor’s Garden Commissions as Presented in The Australian Home Beautiful

**Note:** This is not a comprehensive list of Mellor’s clients but rather those plans that she either published from private commissions or undertook especially for the readers of the magazine. What information that can be ascertained about the gardens owner and its location has been linked to the relevant article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Garden Owner</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-modelling an Old Garden</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Interesting Garden Plan</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Dr &amp; Mrs Allan Hailes</td>
<td>Avoca subdivision, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting an Awkward Garden Site</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden for a Corner Block</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Unusual Layout</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Average Suburban Layout</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Planned for Modern Home</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Mr. W. H. Merritt?</td>
<td>Armadale, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Reconstructed Garden</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Mr R. H. Begg</td>
<td>Yarradale Road, Toorak, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Suggested Layout for a Country Home</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Marnoo in the Wimmera, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Garden Layout</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Mrs Geoffrey Cohen</td>
<td>Crn Grange Road and Hill Street, Toorak, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens for Dwellers in Flats</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Northbrook Estate, High Street, East Malvern, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Garden on the Murray</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Murray River, Country Victoria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Garden Design How the Layout is Reflected by the Position of the Drive</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Country Garden</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Mrs Allan Hailes</td>
<td>Marysville, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout for Another Country Garden</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Old Time Garden Reconstructed for a Busy Man</td>
<td>January 1938</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Unknown old estate division, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Appropriate Garden for the Seaside Dr. &amp; Mrs. J. W. Grieve's New Home at Mount Martha</td>
<td>April 1938</td>
<td>Dr &amp; Mrs J. W. Grieve</td>
<td>Mount Martha, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Homes Gardener's Problems</td>
<td>September 1938</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities of a Native Garden</td>
<td>November 1938</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Garden in New South Wales</td>
<td>December 1938</td>
<td>Mr F.C. Cox</td>
<td>Maroubra, New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Garden for a Small House</td>
<td>May 1939</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for a Country Garden</td>
<td>August 1939</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout for a Tasmanian Garden</td>
<td>May 1940</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Hobart, Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Small Country Garden</td>
<td>June 1940</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>St Arnaud, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Garden for the Times With Utility as a Keynote and Beauty for a Background</td>
<td>August 1940</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ten Acres&quot; An Interesting Home with an Uncommon History</td>
<td>November 1940</td>
<td>Mrs &amp; Mrs Bruce Pearce</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A South Gippsland Garden</td>
<td>October 1941</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>South Gippsland, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout for a Country Garden</td>
<td>November 1941</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Ararat, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for Suburban Garden Coping with a Site that had its Difficulties</td>
<td>October 1942</td>
<td>Mr F Carter</td>
<td>River View Road, North Balwyn, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a Peace-Time Garden</td>
<td>June 1945</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Outer Suburb of Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Thyme by the Forelock</td>
<td>July 1945</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Outer Suburb of Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden for a Frankston Home A Suggested Layout and Planting List</td>
<td>January 1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Frankston, Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Suburban Garden-to-be</td>
<td>February 1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Garden for a Soldier</td>
<td>March 1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework of a Garden</td>
<td>May 1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting with an Eye on the Future</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden for Another Serviceman</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help for the Amateur Gardener Suggested Layout for a Nursery School Playground</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Wagga, New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Country Garden</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>unknown &quot;Wirilda&quot;</td>
<td>Craigieburn, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help for the Amateur Gardener</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>R.F.W. Preston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4D - Olive Mellor's Articles for The Australian Home Beautiful 1934-1946

'Re-modelling an Old Garden', April 1934, p. 52.
'Lawns and Their Management', October 1934, p. 51.
'The Iris Garden', May 1935, pp. 32-3.
'Planting an Awkward Garden Site', May 1935, p. 33.
'Garden for a Corner Block', August 1935, pp. 56, 58.
'An Average Suburban Layout', October 1935, p. 28.
'Garden Planned for Modern Home', November 1935, p. 18.
'A Reconstructed Garden', January 1936, pp. 29, 36.
'Gardens and Gardening', March 1936, p. 8.
'Gardens for Dwellers in Flats', September 1936, pp. 19, 54.
'Principles of Garden Design How the Layout is Reflected by the Position of the Drive', December 1936, p. 22.
'Spraying Time', July 1937, p. 35.
'Planting Time', August 1937, p. 47.
'An Appropriate Garden for the Seaside Dr. & Mrs. J. W. Grieve's New Home at Mount Martha', April 1938, pp. 16-7.
'An Alpine Lawn in the Garden', May 1938, p. 20.
'Hedges and Edges', August 1938, pp. 16-7.
'Possibilities of a Native Garden', November 1938, pp. 20-1.
'Plan for a Country Garden', August 1939, p. 16.
'Layout for a Tasmanian Garden', May 1940, pp. 16-7.
'A Small Country Garden', June 1940, pp. 37, 39.
'A Garden for the Times with Utility as a Keynote and Beauty for a Background', August 1940, pp. 41, 43.
'Springtimely Suggestions for Home Gardeners', September 1940, p. 18.
'Mary...How Does Your Garden Grow? First; Because the Soil is Treated Properly", November 1940, p. 39.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening II. Water and Watering', December 1940, p. 16.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening IV. Light and Warmth are Essentials', February 1941, p. 19.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening VI. The Root System in Plants', April 1941, pp. 36, 38.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening VII. Stems and Leaves', May 1941, p. 31.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening VIII. Pruning for Amateurs', June 1941, p. 16.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening IX. Spraying for Amateurs', July 1941, p. 33.
'Try Cascading Chrysanthemums', August 1947, p. 36.
'BASIC PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GARDENING How and Why Flowers are Produced', September 1941, p. 38.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening How Plants are Propagated', October 1941, p. 40.
'Layout for a Country Garden', November 1941, p. 18.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening How Plants are Propagated, Part II', November 1941, pp. 34, 36.
'A Christmas Corner In Your Garden', December 1941, p. 15.
'With a Free and Open Mind', December 1941, pp. 18-9.
'The Basic Principles of Good Gardening How to Grow Your Own Vegetables', February 1942, pp. 16-7, 36.
'Garden Plan', April 1942, p. 21.
'Now is the Time to Plant Fruit Trees Continuing Our Series on Home Gardening', June 1942, pp. 33-5.
'How to Succeed with Potatoes Continuing a Series on Vegetable Gardening for Amateurs', July 1942, pp. 34-5.
'The Use of Lime in the Garden Continuing a Series on Vegetable Growing for the Amateur', August 1942, pp. 31-2.
'Plan for Suburban Garden Coping with a Site that had its Difficulties', October 1942, pp. 16-7.
'December is Always A Busy Month in the Garden Continuing a Series of Articles for Amateur Gardeners', December 1942, pp. 34-5.
'Everyone Should Make a Herb Garden', March 1943, pp. 14-5.
‘Cactus Gardens’, February 1944, p. 36.
‘Pot Plants for Indoor Decoration Flowering Plants have Followed the Late Lamented Aspidistra’, March 1944, pp. 16, 17.
‘Pot Plants for Indoor Decoration Perennials, Bulbs and Annuals’, April 1944, pp. 22-3.
‘Beautiful Bulbs Make Good Gifts’, December 1944, p. 32.
‘Color In The Garden’, February 1945, pp. 24, 34.
‘Wall Shrubs and Climbers For All The Year Round’, September 1945, p. 30.
‘Principles Of Garden Layout Three Essentials to Success’, November 1945, p. 15.
‘Garden for Another Serviceman’, August 1946, pp. 16, 44.
‘Details of Trees and Shrubs’, September 1946, pp. 25-6, 45.
## Appendix 4E - A List of Brown's Garden Commissions Including Her Own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Original Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croyden Garden</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Featured in <em>The Home</em> March 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Garden</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Featured in <em>The Home</em> March 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘St Aubins’, Scone</td>
<td>WJ Smith</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wandanian’, Turramurra</td>
<td>Mrs J Hamilton</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Blue Mist’, Killara</td>
<td>Mrs T Old</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittwater Rd, Pymble</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Charles F Walton</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst St Woollahra</td>
<td>Mrs William Craig</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lindesay’, Darling Point</td>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Coolibah’, Young</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Goodall</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Checkers’, Cargo</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Robert Ashton</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Fountains’, Killara</td>
<td>Alfred &amp; Jocelyn Brown</td>
<td>1937-1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Greenwood’, St Ives</td>
<td>Alfred &amp; Jocelyn Brown</td>
<td>1941-1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Proudfoot)
Appendix 4F - Jocelyn Brown's Articles for The Home 1939-1942

'Rock Gardening is an Art', December 1939, pp. 27-31, 64.
'The Garden at Eryldene', January 1940, pp. 28-32.
'Replanning the Garden', March 1940, pp. 56, 64.
'Where'er You Walk', April 1940, pp. 16-19.
'Topiary', May 1940, pp. 52-3, 68.
'How We Use Colour Schemes in the Flower Garden', June 1940, pp. 54, 69.
'Succulents', July 1940, pp. 41-3.
'Wall Gardens', August 1940, pp. 20-1.
'The Moraine, an Adventure in the Rock Garden', September 1940, pp. 46-7, 67.
'Pot Shots in the Garden (Pot-Gardening)', October 1940, pp. 52-3, 63.
'The Herb Garden', December 1940, pp. 32-2, 62.
'Many are Culled but Few are Chosen', January 1941, pp. 28, 59.
'Sterling Values in Silver Foliage', February 1941, pp. 44-5.
'Flowers for the Connoisseur', April 1941, pp. 42-3.
'More Flowers for the Connoisseur', May 1941, pp. 36-7, 54.
'Still More Flowers for the Connoisseur', June 1941, pp. 36-7.
'Planting for Autumn Colour', July 1941, pp. 46-7.
'Garden Oddments and Oddities', August 1941, pp. 42-3.
'Leaves from the Garden', September 1941, pp. 24-5.
'Garden Blues (Blue Flowers)', October 1941, pp. 46-7.
'The Midas Touch (Golden Flowers)', November 1941, pp. 52-3.
'Christmas Gifts for the Garden', December 1941, pp. 36-7.
'It’s All in the Approach', January 1942, pp. 34-5.
'New Year in the Garden', February 1942, pp. 32-3, 35.
'Making the Most of a Small Garden', March 1942, pp. 50-1, 56.
'Garden Creepers Common and Rare', April 1942, pp. 32-33.
'White Flowers', April 1942, p. 34.
'Autumn Leaves from my Garden Scrap-Book', June 1942, pp. 44-5, 50.
'Sweet Violets', August 1942, pp. 34-5.
'Garden Landscape with Trees', September 1942, pp. 42-3.

(Source: Proudfoot, Gardens in Bloom, p. 109.)
Appendix 4G - Edna Walling's Signature Plants as Composed by Watts, Dixon & Churchill

Trees for Shrub Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer campestre</td>
<td>Hedge Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acmena smithii</td>
<td>Lilly-pilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopterus glandulosa</td>
<td>Tasmanian Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula pendula 'Darlecarlica'</td>
<td>Cutleaf Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula Pendula 'Laciniata'</td>
<td>Swedish Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula pendula 'Purpurea'</td>
<td>Purple-leaf Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>American Hornbeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana 'Triomf van Boskoop'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinus coggygria</td>
<td>European Smoke Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus carrierei</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus crusgalli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus durobrivensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus phaenopyrum</td>
<td>Washington Thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus pubescens</td>
<td>Mexican Thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus tanacetifolia</td>
<td>Tansy-leaf Thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus x smithiana</td>
<td>Red Mexican Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus arizonica</td>
<td>Smooth Arizona Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus spp</td>
<td>Eucalyptus or Gums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacaranda mimosifolia</td>
<td>Jacaranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td>Crepe Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus 'Aldenhamensis'</td>
<td>Aldenham Purple Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus angustifolia</td>
<td>Violet-scented Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus 'Eleyi'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus floribunda</td>
<td>Japanese Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ioensis</td>
<td>Prairie Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus 'Sonningensis'</td>
<td>Sonning Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus sylvestris</td>
<td>Common Crab Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morus alba</td>
<td>White Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus alba</td>
<td>White Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus nigra italica</td>
<td>Lombardy Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi'</td>
<td>Purple-leaved Plum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus dulcis</td>
<td>Almond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus mume</td>
<td>Japanese Apricot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus spinosa 'Purpurea'</td>
<td>Purple-leaved Blackthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus amygdaliformis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia</td>
<td>Chinese Elm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fastigiate Trees for Vertical Contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betula pendula</td>
<td>Fastigiata' (Pyramid Birch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callitris glaucophylla</td>
<td>White Cypress Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus betulus</td>
<td>Fastigiata' (Fastigiate Hornbeam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens</td>
<td>'Gracilis' (Slender Italian Cypress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus torulosa 'Cashmeriana'</td>
<td>(Bhutan Cypress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus communis</td>
<td>Common Juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus robur fastigiata</td>
<td>Cypress Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus carpinifolia sarniensis</td>
<td>(Jersey or Wheatley Elm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specimen Trees in Lawns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Buttonwood or American Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus alba</td>
<td>White Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus nigra italica</td>
<td>Lombardy Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus ursuiriensis</td>
<td>Manchurian Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata</td>
<td>(Japanese Zelkoca or Keaki)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trees for Copse Planting
Betula Pendula (Silver Birch)
Leptospermum laevigatum (Coastal Tea-tree)
Liquidambar styraciflua (Sweet Gum)

Plants for Walls, Fences and Trellises
Berberis x stenophylla (Rosemary Barberry)
Buddleja alternifolia (Fountain Buddieia)
Buddleja salvifolia (Winter Buddleia)
Ceanothus x edwardsii (Edwards Ceanothus)
Ceanothus rigidis (Monterey Ceanothus)
Ceanothus x vieitchianus
Chaenomeles speciosa 'Moerloosii' (Japónica)
Cotoneaster franchetii (Franchet Cotoneaster)
Cotoneaster simonsii (Simons Cotoneaster)
Escallonia x rockii cv. Freytheyi (Freythey Escallonia)
Forsythia suspensa (Golden Bells)
Jasminum grandiflorum (Large-flowered Jasmine)
Jasminum nudiflorum (Winter Jasmine)
Pyracantha spp (Firethorns)

Medium to Large Shrubs
Abelia x grandiflora (Abelia)
Amelanchier canadensis (Shad Bush)
Camellia sasanqua (Sasanqua Camellia)
Chimonanthus praecox (Allspice)
Choisyia ternata (Mexican Orange-blossom)
Crataegus laevigata (Smith Hawthorn)
Cystisus x praecox (Warminster Broom)
Escallonia 'Edinensis'
Forsythia x intermedia 'Spectabilis'
(Showy Golden Bells)
Ilex spp (Holly)
Jasminum nudiflorum (Winter Jasmine)
Kalmia latifolia (Mountain Laurel or Calico Bush)
Kolkwitzia amabilis (Chinese Beauty Bush)
Leptospermum lanigerum (Woolly Tea-tree)
Leptospermum rotundifolium (Round-leaf Tea-tree)
Leptospermum scoparium (Manuka)
Lonicera japonica (Japanese Honeysuckle)
Magnolia denudata (Yulan)
Magnolia grandiflora (Laurel Magnolia or Bull Bay)
Magnolia x soulangeana (Saucer Magnolia)
Olearia phlogopappa 'Coerulea' (Blue Dusty Daisy-bush)
Philadelphus mexicanus (Mexican Mock-orange)
Prostanthera ovalifolia (Oval-leaf Mint-bush)
Pyracantha crenulata (Nepal Firethorn)
Syringa spp (Lilac)
Viburnum carlesii (Korean Viburnum)
Viburnum farreri (Fragrant Viburnum)
Viburnum tinus (Laurustinus)
Viburnum x burkwoodii (Burkwood Viburnum)

Small Shrubs
Abelia chinensis (Chinese Abelia)
Baeckeak ramosissima (Rosy Heath-myrtle)
Berberis 'Rubrostilla'
Berberis thunbergii var. atropurpurea (Purple Japanese Barberry)
Berberis vulgaris 'Atropurpurea' (Purple-leaf Barberry)
Boronia meulleri (Tree or Forest Boronia)
Calytrix tetragona (Common Fringe-myrtle)
Ceanothus rigidis (Monterey Ceanothus)
Chaenomeles (Japonica)
Cistus spp (Rock Rose)
Correa alba (White Corea)
Cytisis purpureus (Purple Broom)
Daphne odora alba (White Winter Daphne)
Erica spp (Heaths)
Erioccephalus africanus (White Woolly-head)
Eriostemon myoporoides (Long-leaf Waxflower)
Grevillea confertifolia (Dense-leaf Grevillea)
Hebe spp (Veronica)
Hydrangea quercifolia (Oak-leaf Hydrangea)
Kalmia latifolia (Mountain Laurel or Calico Bush)
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Lithodora diffusa 'Heavenly Blue'
Micromyrtus ciliata (Heath-myrtle)
Prunella grandiflora (Large-flowered Self-heal)
Raoulia tenuicaulis
Rosmarinus x lavandulaceus (Prostrate Rosemary)
Salvia azurea (Blue Sage)
Samolus repens (Creeping Brookweed)
Thymus serpyllum (Wild Thyme)
Veronica prostrata (Matted Speedwell)
Vinca minor (Lesser Periwinkle)

Ground Cover Plants
Ajuga reptans (Bugle)
Brachyscome multifida (Cut-leaf Daisy)
Campanula spp (Bell-flowers)
Cerastium tomentosum (Snow-in-summer)
Frankenia spp (Sea-heaths)
Hypericum calycinum (Aaron's Beard)
Solenopsis auxillaris (Rock Isotome)
Nierembergia caerulea (Cup Flower)

Free-Growing Hedges
Berberis spp (Barberries)
Cotoneaster spp (Cotoneasters)
Lonicera spp (Honeysuckle or Woodbines)
Prostanthera spp (Montbushes)
Pyranantha spp (Firethorns)
Spirea spp (May or Spireas)
Syringa spp (Lilacs)
Vaccinium spp (Whortleberries)
Viburnus spp (Viburnums)
Weigela spp (Weigelas)

Climbing Plants
Clematis x jackmanii (Large-flowered Clematis)
Clematis montana (Anemone Clematis)
Clematis montana var. rubens (Pink Anemone Clematis)
Gelsemium sempervirens (Carolina Jessamine)
Hardenbergia comptoniana (WA Coral-pea)
Hedra helix 'Tricolour' (Three-coloured Ivy)
Muehlenbeckia complexa (Maidenhair Creeper)
Rosa banksii (Banksia Rose)
Vitis vinifera 'Purpurea' (Teinturier Grape)
Wisteria spp (Wisteria)

Herbaceous Perennials
Achillea spp (Yarrow or Milfoil)
Anchusa spp (Alkanets)
Anemone x hybrida (Japanese Windflower)
Aquilegia (Columbine)
Aster spp (Perennial Aster or Michaelmas Daisies)
Auricula spp
Campanula spp (Bell-flowers)
Delphinium spp (Delphiniums)
Dianthus spp esp. 'Mrs Sinkins'
(Ipks)
Digitalis spp (Foxgloves)
Iris spp (Irices)
Lupinus spp (Lupins)

Osteospermum ecklonis (Daisy-of-the-Veldt)
Penstemon spp (Penstemons)
Primula spp (Primulas)
Saxifraga spp (Saxifragas)
Trachelium caeruleum
Verbascum spp (Mulleins)

Plants for Small Pots
Aethionema spp (Rock-cress)
Androsace lanuginosa
Anthemis aizoon
Campanula garganica
Campanula isophylla
Galanthus spp (Snowdrop)
Narcissus bulbocodium (Hoop-coat Daffodil)

Quick-Growing Nurse Plants
Abelia spp (Abelia)
Ceanothus spp (Ceanothus or Californian Lilacs)
Psoralea spp (Scurf-peas)
Robinia pseudoacacia (False Acacia or Black Locus)
Spirea spp (Spireas or May)
Virgilia capensis (Cape Lilac)
Weigela spp (Weigelas)

Appendix 4H - Native Plant List with Accompanying Garden Plan for Olive Mellor’s Design of a Native Garden

1. Acacia myrtifolia (9 specimens).
2. Acacia curviformis.
3. Acacia saligna.
4. Acacia pycnantha.
5. Acacia Balleiana (Cootamundra wattle).
6. Acacia pravissima.
7. Eucalyptus niphophila.
8. Callitris arenacea.
10. Acacia podalyriifolia.
11. Agonis flexuosa.
12. Thryptomene Mit- chelliana.
15. Melia azedarach.
17. Stenocarpus sinuatus.
18. Boronia megastigma (several).
19. Eucalyptus pauciflora.
20. Melaleuca leucadendra.

PLANTING LIST AND PLAN FOR A NATIVE GARDEN

(Source: The Australian Home Beautiful, November 1938, p. 21.)
Appendix 41 - Typical Plants Used by Olive Mellor in Her Garden Designs

Note: This list of plants has been composed solely from the planting lists that accompanied Mellor’s garden plans in The Australian Home Beautiful and does not include plants that she may have otherwise referred to in her articles. This ensures that this is a true reflection of the plants she actually intended for use in her gardens. In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Mellor referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

Abelia rupestris
Abelia schumannii syn Abelia
longituba (Schumann's Abelia)
Abutilon 'Aurea Variegata'
Abutilon 'Golden'
Acacia baileyana (Cootamundra Wattle)
Acacia cultriformis (Knife-leaf Wattle)
Acacia drummondii (Drummond's Wattle)
Acacia podalyriformia (Queensland Wattle)
Acacia prominens (Gosford Wattle)
Acacia spectabilis (Mudgee Wattle)
Acer negundo (Box Elder Maple)
Acer negundo 'Silver'
Acer negundo 'Variegatum'
Acer palmatum (Japanese Maple)
Acmena 'Cyanospera'
Acmena 'Floribunda'
Acmena 'Pendula'
Acmena smithii syn. Eugenia smithii (Lillypilly)
Acmena 'Ventenatii'
Agonis flexuosa (Peppermint Tree, Willow Myrtle)
Alyogyne huegelli syn. Hibiscus huegelli (Blue Hibiscus)
Angophora costata syn. Angophora lanceolata (Rusty Gum, Sydney Red Gum)
Arbutus unedo (Irish Strawberry Tree)
Berberis darwinii (Darwin Barberry)
Berberis thunbergii (Japanese Barberry)
Berberis thunbergii 'Atropurpurea'
Betula pendula (Silver Birch) Mellor often referred to it as Betula alba

Brachychiton acerifolius syn.
Sterculia acerifolia (Ilawarra Flame Tree)
Brugmansia candida 'Knightii'
Buddleja salviifolia (Winter Buddleja)
Caesalpinia gilliesii syn. Poinciana gilliesii (Dwarf Poinciana)
Caesalpinia pulcherrima syn.
Poisetia pulcherrima (Peacock Flower)
Callistemon citrinus syn. Callistemon lanceolatus (Crimson Bottlebrush)
Callistemon macropunctatus syn.
Callistemon coccineus (Scarlet Bottlebrush)
Callitris columellaris syn. Callitris arenosa (Bribie Island Pine)
Callitris rhomboidea syn. Callitris cupressiformis (Port Jackson Cypress Pine)
Calodendrum capense (Cape Chestnut)
Camellia japonica 'The Czar'
Camellia sasanqua
Cantua buxifolia syn. Cantua dependens
Cassia candolleana (Golden Senna)
Ceanothus divaricatus
Ceanothus spp
Ceanothus x veitchianus
Cedrus atlantica (Atlantic Cedar, Atlas Cedar)
Cedrus deodara (Deodar Cedar)
Ceratonia siliqua (Carob)
Ceratostigma griffithii
Ceratostigma willmottianum (Chinese Plumbago)
Cestrum auranticum (Orange Cestrum)
Cestrum elegans
Chaenomeles japonica syn. Cydonia japonica 'Winter Cheer' (Japanese Flowering Quince)

Chaenomeles 'Scarlet' (Japonica)

Chamaecyparis lawsoniana
'darleynsis' syn. Cupressus lawsoniana 'Darleynsis'

Chamaecyparis obtusa 'Aurea' syn Retinospora 'Aurea'

Chamaecyparis pisifera 'Plumosa' syn. Retinospora 'Plumosa'

Chamaecyparis spp 'Alba Picta' syn. Retinospora 'Alba Picta'

Chamaecyparis thyoides 'Ericoides'
syn. Retinospora 'Ericoides'

Chamaecyparis thyoides 'Leptoclada' syn. Retinospora 'Leptoclada'

Chamaecyparis thyoides 'Broadleaf'

Chamelaucium uncinatum (Geraldton Waxflower)

Chimonanthus praecox syn.

Calycanthus praecox (Wintersweet)

Choisya ternata (Mexican Orange Blossom)

Chorizema cordatum (Heart-leafed Flame Pea)

Cinnamomum camphora (Camphor Laurel)

Citrus japonica (Cumquat)

Citrus limon (Lemon)

Citrus sinensis (Orange)

Clethra arborea (Lily-of-the-Valley Tree)

Clethranthus puniceus (Kaka Beak, Parrot's Bill)

Corymbia citriodora syn. Eucalyptus citriodora (Lemon Scented Gum)

Corymbia ficifolia syn. Eucalyptus ficifolia (Red-Flowering Gum)

Cotoneaster franchetti

Cotoneaster frigidus (Himalayan Tree Cotoneaster)

Cotoneaster horizontalis (Rock Cotoneaster)

Cotoneaster horizontalis 'Variegata'

Cotoneaster microphyllus (Small-leaved Cotoneaster)

Cotoneaster pannosa (Silver-leaved Cotoneaster)

Cotoneaster salicifolius

Cotoneaster serotinus

Cotoneaster simonsii

Crataegus laevigata (English Hawthorn)

Crataegus laevigata cvs. (Crimson Hawthorn possible either 'Crimson Cloud' or 'Paul's Scarlet')

Crataegus mexicana

Crataegus phaenopyrum syn.

Crataegus cordata (Washington Hawthorn)

Crataegus x lavallei syn. Crataegus carrierei (Lavalle Hawthorn, Carriere Hawthorn)

Crotalaria laburnifolia

Cryptomeria japonica (Japanese Cedar)

Cryptomeria plumosa

Cuphea spp

Cupressus arizonica (Arizona Cypress)

Cupressus horizontalis

Cupressus macrocarpa 'Bruniana'

Cupressus sempervirens 'Stricta' (Italian Cypress)

Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)

Cydonia oblonga (Quince)

Cytisus 'Donard Seedling' (Broom)

Cytisus filipes

Cytisus 'Lilac Time'

Cytisus 'Lord Lambourne' (Broom)

Daphne indica

Daphne spp

Diervillia 'Eva Rathke'

 Diospyros kaki (Persimmon)

Dombeya tiliae syn. Dombeya natalensis (Natal Wedding Flower)

Echium candicans (Pride of Madeira)

Elaeagnus pungens 'Aurea Variegata'

Erica melanthera (Heath)

Eriobotrya japonica (Loquat)

Erythrina coralloidendron

Erythrina x sykesii syn. Erythrina indica (Coral Tree)

Escallonia 'Langleynensis'

Escallonia rubra

Escallonia rubra var. macrantha

Eucalyptus caesia (Gungurru)

Eucalyptus torquata (Coral Gum)

Euonymus japonica 'Aurea'

Euphorbia characias subsp. Wulfenii
Fagus sylvatica 'Atropunicea' (Copper Beech)
Feijoa sellowiana (Pineapple Guava)
Forsythia spp
Fraxinus americana (White Ash)
Fraxinus angustifolia 'Raywood'
(Clarat Ash)
Fraxinus excelsior (European Ash)
Fuchsia spp
Gardenia intermedia
Garrya elliptica (Siltassel Bush)
Genista 'Lilac Time'
Genista 'Lord Lambourne'
Genista tinctoria
Ginkgo biloba (Maidenhair Tree)
Grevillea aspleniifolia (Fern-leaf Grevillea)
Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak)
Grevillea rosmarinifolia (Rosemary Grevillea)
Hakea laurina syn. Hakea eucalyptoides
Heliotropium arborescens cultivars
Heliotropium arborescens 'Lord Roberts'
Heliotropium arborescens 'President Garfield'
Hibiscus 'Alba Plena'
Hibiscus rosa-sinensis (Hawaiian Hibiscus)
Hibiscus spp
Hydrangea 'Goliath'
Hydrangea spp
Hymenosporum flavum (Native Frangipani)
Hypericum x moserianum
Inga pulcherrima
Jacaranda mimosifolia syn.
Jacaranda ovalifolia (Jacaranda)
Juglans spp (Walnut)
Juniperus bermudiana (Bermuda Juniper)
Kalmia spp
Koelreuteria paniculata (Golden Rain Tree)
Kolkwitzia amabilis (Beauty Bush)
Lagerstroemia eavesii (Crape Myrtle)
Lagerstroemia indica (Crape Myrtle)
Lagerstromia indica 'Rubra' (Crape Myrtle)
Lantana 'Gol Gol'
Lantana spp
Larix decidua syn. Larix europaea
(European Larch)
Lavandula 'Vera'
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Lavandula 'Nana Atro-purpurea'
Leptospermum 'Keatleyii'
Leptospermum scoparium 'Nichollsii'
(Manuka)
Leptospermum scoparium 'Sandersii'
(Manuka)
Ligustrum spp (Privet)
Liquidambar styraciflua
(Liquidambar)
Liriodendron tulipifera (North American Tulip Tree)
Lonicera grandiflora 'Rosea'
Luculia gratissima
Macadamia tenuifolia (Macadamia)
Magnolia grandiflora
Magnolia littiflora syn. Magnolia purpurea
Magnolia soulangeana
Magnolia spp
Malus pumila 'Floribunda Purpurea'
syn Prunus Malus 'Floribunda Purpurea'
Malus pumila syn. Pyrus malus
(Apple)
Malus spectabilis 'Atropurpurea'
Malus x purpurea 'Aldenhamensis'
(Crab Apple)
Melaleuca hypericifolia (Tea-tree)
Melaleuca lateritia (Tea-tree)
Melaleuca nesophila (Showy Honey Myrtle)
Melia azedarach (White Cedar)
Metrosideros excelsus syn.
Metrosideros tomentosus
Michelia figo syn. Magnolia fuscata
(Port Wine Magnolia)
Myrtus communis (Myrtle)
Nandina domestica (Sacred Bamboo)
Nerium oleander 'Splendens
Variegatum' (Oleander)
Nothofagus fusca (New Zealand Red Beech)
Paeonia lactiflora (Herbaceous Peony)
Paulownia fortunei (White-flowered Paulownia)
Paulownia tomentosa syn. Paulownia imperialis (Hairy Paulownia, Empress Tree)
Pavonia coccinea
Philadelphus HC 'Grandiflora'
Philadelphus HC 'Virginal'
Photinia glabra 'Rubens'
Photinia serratifolia syn. Photinia serrulata (Chinese Hawthorn)
Pistacia chinensis (Chinese Pistachio)
Pittosporum crassifolium 'Variegatum'
Pittosporum spp
Pittosporum undulatum (Sweet Pittosporum)
Podalyria 'Grandiflora'
Populus canadensis 'Serotina Aurea'
(Chinese Poplar)
Populus nigra 'Lombardy' (Lombardy Poplar)
Populus deltoides (Cottonwood)
Populus x canadensis 'Aurea'
(Canadian Poplar)
Prostanthera ovalifolia (Purple Mint Bush)
Prostanthera rotundifolia
Protea mellifera
Prunus armeniaca (Apricot)
Prunus armeniaca 'Moorpark'
Prunus cerasifera 'Krauter's Vesuvius'
Prunus cerasifera 'Nigra' (Purple-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi' (Red-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus mume 'Rosea' (Flowering Apricot)
Prunus serrulata (Japanese Flowering Cherry - white and pink flowering forms)
Prunus triloba (Dwarf Flowering Almond)
Prunus x amygdalo-persica 'Pollardii'
syn. Prunus amygdalus 'Pollardii'
Prunus x blireana (Double Pink Flowering Plum)
Prunus x domestica (Plum)
Psidium cattleianum (Cherry Guava)
Psoralea spp
Punica granatum (Pomegranate)

Pyracantha angustifolia syn.
Crataegus angustifolia (Orange Firethorn)
Pyracantha crenulata syn. Crataegus crenulata (Himalayan Firethorn)
Pyracantha leylandii
Pyrus communis (Pear)
Quercus coccinea (Scarlet Oak)
Quercus ilex (Evergreen Oak, Holm Oak)
Quercus palustris (Pin Oak)
Rhododendron spp (Rhododendron & Azalea Mollis & Indica Hybrids)
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Rondeletia spp
Rosa spp (Miniature, Weeping, Shrub Roses)
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)
Rothmannia globosa syn. Gardenia globosa (Tree Gardenia)
Russelia equisetiformis syn. Russelia juncea (Coral plant)
Salix babonica (Weeping Willow)
Sambucus nigra 'Aurea' (European Elder)
Sapindus mukorossi (Chinese Tallow Tree)
Sequoiadendron giganteum (Giant Sequoia)
Sophora tetraptera (Kowhai)
Sorbaria kiriloww syn. Spirea assurgentis (False Tree Spirea)
Spartium junceum (Spanish Broom)
Spirea japonica 'Anthony Waterer'
Spirea prunifolia 'Flore plena' (Bridal Wreath)
Spirea thunbergii (Thunberg Spirea)
Stenocarpus sinuatus (Firewheel Tree)
Symphoricarpus 'Variegata'
Syringa oblata subsp. dilatata (Broadleaf Lilac)
Syringa pinnatifolia
Syringa vulgaris (Lilac)
Tamarix gallica (French Tamarix)
Tecoma x Smithii
Tibouchina 'Grandiflora' syn.
Lasiandra 'Grandiflora'
Toona sinensis syn. Cedrela sinensis (Chinese Toon)
Tristania (Water Gum)
Ulmus parvifolia? syn. Ulmus chinensis (Chinese Elm)
Veronica cupressiformis
Viburnum lantana (Wayfaring Tree)
Viburnum opulus (Guelder Rose)
Viburnum opulus 'Roseum' syn.
'Sterile' (Guelder Rose)
Viburnum plicatum var. tomentosum
(Japanese Snowball)
Viburnum sieboldii
Virgilia oroboides syn. Virgilia capensis (Cape Lilac)
Weigela 'Rosea'

Hedging Plants
Bougainvillea spp
Cestrum spp
Cotoneaster spp
Crataegus spp
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)
Escallonia spp
Genista x spachiana syn. Genista fragrans
Grevillea rosmarinifolia (Rosemary Grevillea)
Hardenbergia violacea syn.
Hardenbergia ovata (False Sarsaparilla, Native Sarsaparilla)
Hibiscus spp
Hydrangea spp
Jasminum officinale syn. Jasminum grandiflorum (Jasmine)
Lavandula 'Vera'
Ligustrum ovalifolium 'Aureum'
(Golden Privet)
Ligustrum sinense 'Variegatum'
(Chinese Privet, Small-Leaved Privet)
Ligustrum spp (Privet)
Lonicera nitida (Box Honeysuckle)
Melaleuca spp (Tea-tree)
Myoporum acuminatum (Boobialla)
Nepeta spp
Pittosporum spp
Pyracantha angustifolia syn.
Crataegus angustifolia (Orange Firethorn)
Pyracantha crenulata syn. Crataegus crenulata (Himalayan Firethorn)
Pyracantha crenulata var. Rogersiana syn. Pyracantha rogersiana
Rosa 'Sunny South' (Rose)
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)

Climbers
Clematis HC
Ficus Pumila syn. Ficus Stipulata
(Creeping Fig)
Ipomoea spp.
Parthenocissus quinquefolia (Virginia Creeper)
Passiflora edulis (Passionfruit)
Passiflora mollissima (Banana Passionfruit)
Rosa spp (Climbing Rose)
Solanum rantonnetii syn. Solanum azureum (Blue Potatoe Creeper)
Tecoma spp.
Vitis 'Alicant Bouchet'
Vitis spp
Wisteria sinensis (Chinese Wisteria)
Wisteria spp.

Annuals, Perennials & Bulbs
Agapanthus spp.
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Antirrhinum majus (Snapdragon)
Aquilegia Long Spur Hybrids (Columbine)
Armeria spp syn. Armeria gigantica
(Thrift)
Aster spp. (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
Begonia spp.
Campanula medium (Canterbury Bells)
Campanula rotundifolia (Bluebell, Harebell)
Ceratostigma plumbaginoides syn.
Ceratostigma larentinae (Chinese Plumbago)
Cineraria spp. but probably Pericallis x hybrida (Cineraria)
Chianthus damperii (Sturt's Desert Pea)
Convallaria majalis (Lily-of-the-Valley)
Convolvulus spp
Coreopsis spp
Cynoglossum amabile (Chinese Forget-Me-Not)
Dahlia spp
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'
Delphinium spp
Dianthus spp (Pinks)
Diascia barbaraeh
Digitalis spp (Foxglove)
Dimorphotheca ecklonis (Cape Marguerite)
Echium candicans (Pride of Madeira)
Erigeron spp
Eryngium 'Violetta' (Sea Holly)
Erysimum spp (Wallflower)
Felicia amelloides syn. Agathea caelestis (Blue Marguerite Daisy)
Felicia petiolata
Ferns various
Freesia spp
Gaillardia spp
Gaura lindheimeri
Gentiana acaulis
Geranium sanguineum (Bloody Cranesbill)
Geranium spp Cranesbill)
Helenium spp (Sneezeweed)
Helianthemum spp Rock Rose)
Heuchera spp
Iris spp
Iris unguicularis syn. Iris stylosa (Algerian Iris)
Lachenalia spp (Cape Cowslip)
Leucanthemum x superbum syn. Chrysanthemum maximum (Shaster Daisy)
Lilium henryii
Lilium lancifolium syn. Lilium tigrinum (Tiger Lily)
Lilium pardalimum (Leopard Lily)
Lilium speciosum
Lilium regale (Regal Lily)
Lithodora diffusa syn. Lithospermum prostratum
Lobelia spp
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Lupinus spp (Lupin)
Lycnis chalcedonica (Maltese Cross)
Lycnis spp (Catchfly, Campion)
Matthiola spp (Stock)
Monarda 'Gem' (Bergamot)
Muscaria spp (Grape Hyacinth)
Narcissus jonquilla (Jonquil)
Narcissus Poeticus (Daffodil)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Nemophila menziesii syn. Nemophila insignis (Baby Blue-eyes)
Nepeta spp.
Nepeta x faassenii syn. Nepeta mussini
Nierembergia spp (Cupflower)
Nigella damascena 'Miss Jekyll'
Papaver nudicaule (Iceland Poppy)
Penstemon spp
Perovskia atriplicifolia (Russian Sage)
Phlox paniculata (Perennial Phlox)
Phlox paniculata syn. Phlox decussata (Perennial Phlox)
Physostegia virginiana (Obedient Plant)
Platycodon grandiflorus var. mariesii (Balloon Flower)
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Primula vulgaris (Primrose)
Ranunculus spp
Reseda odorata (Mignonette)
Salvia farinacea (Mealy Sage)
Salvia leucantha (Mexican Bush Sage)
Sanguisorba obtusa syn. Poterium obtusum (Japanese Burnet)
Scabiosa caucasica
Scabiosa columbaria
Scutellaria indica (Skullcap)
Tanacetum syn. Pyrethrum
Thalictrum delavayi syn. Thalictrum dipercarpum (Lavender Shower)
Thalictrum spp
Thymus herba-barona (Caraway Thyme)
Thymus x citriodorus Lemon-Scented Thyme)
Trachymene coerulae syn. Didiscus coeruleus (Blue Lace Flower)
Tulipa (Tulip)
Verbena erinoides
Verbena spp
Veronica incana (Silver Speedwell)
Veronica spicata
Viola odorata (Violet)
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Plants for Rock Pocket Walls

*Ajuga reptans* 'Tricolour' (Bugle)

*Aubretia* spp

Cacti various

*Cerastium tomentosum* (Snow in Summer)

*Ceratostigma willmottianum* (Chinese Plumbago)

*Chamaecyparis obtusa* 'Nana Aurea'
syn. *Retinospora obtusa* 'Nana Aurea'

*Chorizema cordatum* (Heart-leaved Flame Pea)

*Gentiana* spp (Gentian)

*Helianthemum* spp (Rock Rose)

*Nepeta* spp

*Portulaca grandiflora* (Rose Moss)

*Punica granatum* var. *nana* (Dwarf Pomegranate)

*Saxifraga* spp (Saxifrage)

*Veronica lobii* probably *Veronica wormskjoldii* (American Alpine Speedwell)

*Viburnum opulus* 'Nanum' (Dwarf Snowball or Guelder Rose)
Appendix 4J - Typical Plants Used by Jocelyn Brown in Her Garden Designs

Note: This list of plants has been composed solely from the plant annotations on Brown’s garden plans and from the lists of plants that Helen Proudfoot recorded as being included in Brown’s own gardens. It does not include plants that Brown may have otherwise referred to in her articles for The Home, with the exception of rock garden plants, which were generally illegible upon the plans reproduced by Proudfoot in Gardens in Bloom. This ensures that this is a true reflection of the plants she actually intended for use in her gardens. In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Brown referred to the plant.

**Trees & Shrubs**

*Abelia schumannii* syn. *Abelia longituba* (Schumann's Abelia)
*Abutilon* spp
*Acacia mearnsii* (Late Black Wattle)
*Acacia podalyriifolia* (Queensland Wattle)
*Acacia spectabilis* (Mudgee Wattle)
*Acacia* spp
*Acanthus mollis* (Oyster plant)
*Acer palmatum* (Japanese Maple)
*Acer* spp (Maple)
*Agonis flexuosa* (Peppermint Myrtle)
*Ardisia* spp
*Artemisia* spp (Wormwood)
*Bambusa* spp (Dwarf Variety)
*Bambusa* spp (Small leaved variety)
*Bauhinia* spp
*Bauhinia* spp 'Alba'
*Begonia* spp
*Berberis* spp
*Betula pendula* (Silver Birch) Brown often refered to it as *Betula alba*
*Brachychiton acerifolius* (Ilawarra Flame Tree)
*Brachychiton* spp (Kurrajong)
*Buddleja* spp
*Buxus sempervirens* (English Box)
*Callistemon macropunctatus* syn.
*Callistemon coccineus* (Scarlet Bottlebrush)
*Callistemon* spp
*Callitris glaucophylla* syn. *Callitris glauca* (White Cypress Pine)
*Camellia* spp
*Cassia* spp
*Catalpa bignonioides* (Bean Tree)
*Ceanothus* spp
*Ceanothus x edwardsii
*Ceanothus x veitchianus
*Cedrus atlantica* 'Glauc'a (Atlantic Cedar, Atlas Cedar)
*Cedrus deodara* (Deodar Cedar)
*Cedrus* spp (Cedar)
*Ceratostigma willmottianum* (Chinese Plumbago)
*Chaenomeles speciosa* 'Nivalis' syn.
*Cydonia* 'Nivalis'
*Chaenomeles* spp 'Sargentii' syn.
*Cydonia* 'Sargentii'
*Chaenomeles* spp syn. *Cydonia* (Flowering Quince)
*Chamaecyparis* spp syn. *Retinospora* spp
*Choisya ternata* (Mexican Orange Blossom)
*Citrus japonica* (Cumquat)
*Citrus Limon* (Lemon)
*Citrus sinensis* (Orange)
*Clerodendrum ugandense* (Blue Butterfly Flower)
*Coleonema* spp syn. *Diosma* spp
*Cotoneaster henryana
*Cotoneaster* spp
*Cotoneaster* spp (Prostrate Cotoneaster) probably *Cotoneaster horizontalis
*Crataegus* spp
*Crataegus* spp (Hawthorn)
*Cryptomeria* spp
*Cupressus arizonica* (Arizona Cypress)
*Cupressus* spp
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)
Daphne spp
Dracaena spp
Echium spp
Epacris microphylla (Coral Heath)
Escallonia spp
Euonymus japonica
Eupatorium spp
Ficus carica (Edible Fig)
Fraxinus angustifolia 'Raywood'
(Fract Ash)
Fraxinus excelsior (European Ash)
Fuchsia spp
Gardenia spp
Genista monospermum (Broom)
Gordonia spp
Grevillea asplenifolia (Fern-leaf Grevillea)
Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak)
Grevillea spp
Hakea sericea (Silky Hakea)
Hakea spp
Hebe spp 'Crimson'
Heliotropium spp
Helleborus spp
Hibiscus spp
Hydrangea spp
Hymenosporum flavum (Native Frangipani)
Ilex spp (Holly)
Isopogon anemonifolius (Broad-Leaf Drumstick)
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Juniperus communis 'Hibernica'
Juniperus communis (Irish Juniper)
Juniperus spp (Prostrate Juniper)
probably Juniperus horizontalis
Kerria japonica
Koelreuteria paniculata (Golden Rain Tree)
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Ligustrum spp (Privet)
Liquidambar styraciflua (Liquidambar)
Liquidambar styraciflua 'Festeri'
Magnolia grandiflora
Magnolia spp
Malus pumila 'Spectabilis' syn Prunus
Malus 'Spectabilis'
Maranta spp (Prayer Plant)
Melia azedarach (White Cedar)
Michelia figo syn. Magnolia fuscata
(Port Wine Magnolia)
Murraya paniculata (Orange Jessamine)
Nerium oleander (Oleander)
Olea spp (Olive)
Ophiopogon jaburan 'Variegatus'
(Giant Variegated Mondo Grass)
Osmanthus fragrans (Sweet Osmanthus)
Paeonia spp (Peony)
Parrotia persica (Persian Witch Hazel)
Persoonia pinifolia (Pineleaf Geebung)
Phormium spp (New Zealand Flax)
Pinus catibacca
Pinus radiata syn. Pinus insignis
(Radiata Pine)
Pistacia chinensis (Chinese Pistachio)
Platanus orientalis (Oriental Plane)
Platanus spp (Plane Tree)
Populus nigra 'Lombardy' (Lombardy Poplar)
Populus alba (Silver Poplar)
Populus deltoides (Cottonwood)
Protea spp
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi' (Red-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi Nigra'
Prunus cerasus (Sour Cherry)
Prunus Chinensis Rosea probably
Prunus glandulosa 'Sinensis' syn.
'Rosa Plena'
Prunus jesteri
Prunus persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus serrulata (Japanese Flowering Cherry)
Prunus serrulata 'Hokasai' (Japanese Flowering Cherry)
Prunus spp
Punica granatum (Pomegranate)
Pyracantha spp
Rhododendron spp (Rhododendron & Azalea)
Rosa spp (Rose)
Salix babylonica var. pekinensis
'Tortuosa' syn. Salix matsudana
'Tortuosa' (Corkscrew Willow)
Sambucus nigra 'Aurea' (European Elder)
Schinus terebinthifolius (Brazilian Pepper Tree)
Spathodea campanulata (African Tulip Tree)
Spirea 'Arguta' (Bridal Wreath)
Stenocarpus sinuatus (Firewheel Tree)
Sterculia spp
Strelitzia spp
Stroblanthes anisophylla (Goldfussia)
Swainsona galgajolia
Syringa spp (Lilac)
Syringa vulgaris (Lilac)
Tibouchina spp syn. Lasiandra spp
Ulmus procera 'Louis van Houtte' (Yellow-leaved English Elm)
Veronica spp
Viburnum carlesii (Korean Spice Viburnum)
Viburnum spp
Viburnum tinus (Laurustinus)
Virgilia oroboides (Cape Lilac)

Annuals, Perennials and Bulbs
Achillea spp (Yarrow)
Agapanthus spp
Ajuga spp (Bugle)
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Allium schoenoprasum (Chives)
Amaryllis spp (Naked Ladies)
Anemone spp (probably Anemone hupehensis var. japonica Japanese Windflower)
Anigozanthus viridis (green Kangaroo Paw)
Anthriscus sylvestris (Cow Parsley)
Antirrhinum majus (Snapdragon)
Aquilegia (Columbine)
Armeria spp (Thrift)
Armoracia rusticana (Horseradish)
Artemesia dracunculus (French Tarragon)
Aspidistra spp
Aster spp (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
Audubertia spp (Sage)
Babiana spp (Baboon Flower)
Begonia spp (Tall Varieties)
Boltonia spp (False Chamomile)
Borago officinalis (Borage)
Campanula spp
Cerastium tomentosum (Snow-in-Summer)
Ceratostigma plumbaginoides (Plumbago)
Chamaemelum nobile (Chamomile)
Clivia spp
Convallaria majalis (Lily-of-the-Valley)
Convulvulus sabatius syn.
Convulvulus mauritianus
Crocus spp
Cyrtanthus elatus syn. Vallota speciosa (Scarborough Lily)
Dahlia spp
Delphinium spp
Dianthus (Carnation)
Dianthus spp (Pinks)
Digitalis spp (Foxglove)
Erigeron karwinskianus
Erysimum spp (Wallflower)
Felecia spp syn. Agathea spp (Marguerite Daisy)
Ferns various
Freesia spp
Gazania spp
Geranium spp (Cranesbill)
Gerbera spp (probably Gerbera jamesonii Barberton Daisy)
Gladiolus spp (Gladioli)
Hemerocallis HC (Day Lily)
Herniaria glabra (Rupturewort)
Heterocentron elegans (Creeping Lasiandra)
Iris HC (Bearded Iris)
Kniphofia (Red-Hot Poker)
Leucanthemum x superbum (Shaster Daisy)
Leucanthemum x superbum 'Esther Reid' (Shaster Daisy)
Lilium spp
Linum spp (Flax)
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Lupinus spp. (Lupin)
Matthiola spp (Stock)
Mentha spp (Mint)
Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)
Narcissus bulbocodium (Hoop Petticoat Daffodil)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Nasturtium officinale (Watercress)
Nigella damascena (Love-in-the-Mist)
Ocimum spp (Basil)
Origanum majorana (Marjoram)
Petunia spp
Phlox paniculata (Perennial Phlox)
Platycodon grandiflorus var. 'Mariesii'
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Primula vulgaris (Primrose)
Ranunculus spp (Buttercups)
Ruta graveolens (Rue)
Salvia officinalis (Sage)
Salvia spp
Salvia uliginosa (Bog Sage)
Santolina spp
Silene spp (Campion)
Silene uniflora syn. Silene vulgaris subsp. maritima (Bladder Campion)
Thalictrum syn. Pyrethrum
Thalictrum spp
Thymus spp (Thyme)
Tulipa (Tulip)
Verbena spp
Viola odorata (Violet)
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Yucca spp
Zantedeschia spp (Calla Lily)
Zinnia spp

Climbing Plants
Akebia quinata (Chocolate Vine)
Bougainvillea spp 'Mrs Butt'
Clematis montana
Clematis montana var. rubens
Clematis spp
Hedera helix (English Ivy)
Jasminum grandiflorum
Jasminum spp
Lonicera japonica 'Aurea-reticulata'
(Yellow-net Honeysuckle)
Quisqualis indica (Rangoon Creeper)
Rosa spp (Rose Climbing)

Rosa banksiae (Banksia Rose)
Vitis 'Alicante Bouchet'
Wisteria spp

Hedges
Atriplex spp (Saltbush)
Citrus sinensis (Orange)
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)
Diosma spp
Hibiscus spp
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capense (Cape Leadwort, Plumbago)

Water Plants
Azolla filiculoides var. rubra (Fairy Moss)
Cyperus papyrus (Papyrus)
Eichhornia crassipes (Water Hyacinth)
Hydrocleys nymphoides (Water Poppy)
Iris ensata syn. Iris kaempferi
(Japanese Water Iris)
Lemma minor (Lesser Duckweed)
Nyphaea spp (Water Lily)
Pontederia cordata

Rock Garden Plants
Acer palmatum (Japanese Maple)
Achillea tomentosa
Aethionema (Stone Cress)
Aethionema 'Warley Rose' syn.
Aethionema warleyensis
Aptenia spp syn. Mesembryanthemum spp
Arabis alpina 'Lissadell'
Arabis spp (Rock Cress)
Armeria alpina
Armeria caespitosa
Armeria spp (Thrift)
Aubretia spp
Bambusa spp (Small or Dwarf Bamboo)
Buxus spp (Box)
Campanula cochlearifolia 'Miss Willmott' syn. Campanula pusilla
'Miss Willmott' (Fairies' Thimbles)
Campanula festivellata subsp. istriaca syn. Campanula istriaca (Window Bellflower)
Campanula gargancia
Campanula portenschlagiana syn. Campanula muralis
Campanula pulla (Austrian Hairbell)
Carpobrotus spp syn.
Mesembryanthemum spp
Cerastium spp
Chamaecyparis spp syn. Retinospora spp
Convulvulus sabatius syn.
Convulvulus mauritanicus
Cotula spp (Brass Buttons)
Dianthus alpinus
Dianthus deltoides (Maiden Pink)
Dianthus 'Loveliness'
Dianthus plumarius (Pink)
Dianthus plumarius Single Variety (Scotch pink)
Dianthus squarrosus
Geum borisii
Geum montanum (Alpine Avens)
Herniaria spp
Iris spp
Iris suaveolens syn. Iris rubromarginata (Dwarf Bearded Iris)
Lampranthus spp syn.
Mesembryanthemum spp
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Lithodora coerulescens syn.
Lithospermum coerulescens
Lithodora spp syn. Lithospermum spp
Magnolia stellata (Star Magnolia)
Phlox subulata 'G. F. Wilson' (Moss Phlox, Mountain Phlox)
Phlox subulata 'Vivid' (Moss Phlox, Mountain Phlox)
Potentilla dickenii
Potentilla megalantha syn. Potentilla fragiformis
Potentilla recta 'Macrantha'
Primula auricula
Primula bulleyana
Primula denticulata (Drumstick Primula)
Prunus glandulosa 'Sinensis' syn.
Prunus sinensis
Punica granatum var. nana (Dwarf Pomegranate)
Rhododendron spp (Azalea)
Rosa 'Rouletti'
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)
Saxifraga callosa syn. Saxifraga lingulata
Saxifraga cotyledon
Saxifraga hostii
Saxifraga paniculata syn. Saxifraga alpina
Saxifraga 'Mrs Piper'
Sedum spurium
Silene spp (Campion)
Spergula spp (Spurrey)
Strobilanthes anisophylla (Goldfussia)
Thymus spp (Thyme)
Veronica bidwillii
Veronica repens (Creeping Speedwell)
Vittadina spp

(Source: Proudfoot, pp. 33, 35, 41, 43, 47-9, 51, 54-83.)
Appendix 5A - Edna Walling's Articles for South Australian Homes and Gardens 1938-1942

‘Garden Design....From the Point of View of Maintenance’, September 1938, pp. 32-3.
‘Garden Walls and Walks....’, November 1938, pp. 34-5.
““Churston” A Melbourne Garden...’, February 1939, pp. 28-30.
‘Cottages in the Country’, March 1939, pp. 32-33, 54.
‘A Wall Fountain...A Thyme Lawn...and Campanula Isophylla Alba’, May 1939, pp. 30-1.
‘The Approach and the Front Fence’, October 1939, pp. 26-7,
‘Spring Crescendo’, December 1939, p. 38.
‘Incidents In Garden...and Churston Again’, February 1940, pp. 24-5.
‘Foundation Planting’, April 1940, pp. 24-5.
‘Ground Cover in Garden Design’, May 1940, pp 23, 55, 62.
‘Water...The Liveliest of All Garden Features’, February 1941, pp. 22-3, 45.
‘On Potting...’, April 1941, pp. 28, 42.
‘The Landscape Gardener’s Paint Box’, December 1941, pp. 31, 60.
‘Landscaping the Window Box’, May 1942, p. 23.
Appendix 5B - Typical Plants Recommended by Alfred J Quarrell in South Australian Homes and Gardens

Note: In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Quarrell referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs
Abelia spp 'Hendersonii'
Abutilon spp 'Eclipse', 'Golden Variegated', 'Vexillarium', 'Souvenir de Prince Albert', 'Vexillarium Variegated'
Acacia baileyana (Cootamundra Wattle)
Acacia calamifolia (Wallowa)
Acacia decurrens (Black Wattle)
Acacia elata (cedar wattle)
Acacia leprosa
Acacia oblique
Acacia podalyrifolia (Queensland Wattle)
Acacia pruinosa
Acacia riceana (Rice's Wattle)
Acacia terminalis syn. Acacia discolour (Sunshine Wattle)
Acacia verniciflua
Acer negundo 'Variegatum'
Acmena Kingii syn. Eugenia kingii
Acokanthera spectabilis syn. Toxicophlaea spectabilis
Alyxia daphnoides
Arbutus unedo (Irish Strawberry Tree)
Arduina bispinosa (Cape Plum)
Baeckea camphorata (Camphor Bush)
Banksia spinulosa syn. Banksia collina (Hairpin Banksia)
Barleria cristata (Philippine Violet)
Beaufortia sparsa (Swamp Bottlebrush)
Berberis darwinii (Darwin Barberry)
Berberis thunbergii 'Atropurpurea'
Berberis vulgaris (Barberry)
Berberis vulgaris 'Purpurea'
Berberis wilsoniae (Wilson's Barberry)
Boronia megastigma (Brown Boronia)
Bougainvillea glabra 'Cypheri', 'Sanderinana'
Brachychiton acerifolius (Ilawarra Flame Tree)
Brachychiton spp syn. Sterculia spp (Kurrajong)
Brachychiton x roseus syn. Sterculia hybrida (Hybrid Kurrajong)
Browallia 'Jamersoni'
Brugmansia candidia 'Knightii'
Buddleja davidii syn. Buddleia variabilis magnifica
Buddleja spp 'Veitchi'
Caesalpinia gilliesii syn. Poinciana gilliesii (Bird of Paradise Bush)
Callistemon citrinus syn. Callistemon lanceolatus (Crimson Bottlebrush)
Callistemon macropunctatus syn. Callistemon coccineus (Scarlet Bottlebrush)
Callistemon salignus (Willow Bottlebrush)
Calodendrum capense (Cape Chestnut)
Calothamnus spp (Claw Flower)
Calycanthus floridus (Allspice)
Cantua buxifolia syn. Cantua dependens
Carissa macrocarpa syn. Arduina bispinosa grandiflora (Cape Plum)
Ceanothus divaricatus
Ceratostigma willmottianum (Chinese Plumbago)
Cercis siliquastrum (Judas Tree)
Chaenomeles japonica syn. Cydonia japonica (Japanese Flowering Quince)
Chamelaucium uncinatum (Geruldton Waxflower)
Choisya ternata (Mexican Orange Blossom)
Chorizema ilicifolium (Holly Flame Pea)
Chorizema spp
Cinnamomum camphora syn. Camphora officinatis (Camphor Laurel)
Cordyline australis 'Stricta' (Club palm)
Correa reflexa syn. Correa speciosa
Correa spp
Correa spp 'Scarlet'
Corymbia calophylla 'Rosea' syn. Eucalyptus calophylla 'Rosea'
Corymbia citriodora syn. Eucalyptus citriodora (Lemon Scented Gum)
Corymbia ficifolia syn. Eucalyptus ficifolia (Red-Flowering Gum)
Cotoneaster microphyllus (Small-leaved Cotoneaster)
Cotoneaster pannosa (Silver-leaved Cotoneaster)
Daphne odorata 'Rubra'
Deutzia crenata
Deutzia spp
Diplacus glutinosus puniceus
Dombeya tiliacea syn. Dombeya natalensis (Natal Wedding Flower)
Duranta plumieri
Eremophila maculata (Spotted Emu Bush)
Eriobotrya japonica (Loquat)
Eriostemon crowei
Eriostemon myoporoides (Long-Leaf Wax Flower)
Eriostemon obovalis (Northern Fairy Wax Flower)
Erythrina bidwillii syn. Erythrina camdeni (Camden Coral Tree)
Erythrina cristagalli (Common Coral Tree)
Escallonia bifida syn. Escallonia montevidensis (White Escallonia)
Escallonia rubra var. macrantha syn. Escallonia macrantha
Eucalyptus globulus (Tasmanian Blue Gum)
Eucalyptus nutans (Red-Flowered Moort)
Eucalyptus torquata (Coral Gum)
Euonymus japonica
Euonymus japonica 'Aurea Varigata'
Eupatorium weinmannianum
Euphorbia pulcherrima syn. Poinsettia pulcherrima (Poinsettia)
Euryops spp (Golden Daisy Bush)
Exochorda racemosa 'Alberti' syn. Spirea grandiflora 'Alberti'
Feijoa sellowiana (Pineapple Guava)
Felicia angustifolia
Forsythia spp
Fraxinus americana (White Ash)
Fraxinus excelsior (European Ash)
Fraxinus excelsior 'Aurea Pendula' (Golden Weeping Ash)
Garrya elliptica (Silktassel Bush)
Genista aetnensis (Mt Etna Broom)
Genista 'Lilac Time'
Genista monospermum (Broom)
Genista monospermum 'Pendula' (White Weeping Broom)
Genista x spachiana syn. Genista fragrans
Goodia lotifolia (Clover Tree)
Grevillea alpina (Grampians Grevillea)
Grevillea banksii (Bank's Grevillea)
Grevillea banksii 'Fosterii'
Grevillea hilliana (White Silky Oak)
Grevillea ilicifolia (Holly Grevillea)
Grevillea oleoides (Olive-leaf Grevillea)
Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak)
Grevillea rosea (Rosemary Grevillea)
Grevillea victoriae (Royal Grevillea)
Hakea grammatophylla
Hakea multilineata (Grassleaf Hakea)
Hardenbergia violacea (Native Sarsaparilla)
Hebe andersonii syn. Veronica andersonii
Hebe andersonii variegata syn. Veronica andersonii variegata
Hebe decorosa syn. Veronica decorosa
Hebe diosmifolia syn. Veronica diosmaefolia
Hebe lindleyana syn. Veronica lindleyana
Helianthemum 'Fire Ball'
Heliotropium arborescens HC
Hibiscus heugelii (Sturts Desert Rose)
Hibiscus rosa-sinensis (Hawaiian Hibiscus) 'General Courtegis', 'Splendens', 'Island Empress', 'Hardwood', 'Tango Queen'
Hibiscus syriacus (Syrian Hibiscus)
Hovea chorismitifolia (Holly-leaved Hovea)
Hovea pugens (Devil's Pins)
Hovea trisperma (Common Hovea)
Hydrangea spp 'Goliath', 'Deutschland', 'Matador', 'La Marne'
Hypericum x moserianum
Hypocalymma robustum (Swan River Mrytle)
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Jasminum grandiflorum (Spanish Jasmine)
Jasminum mesnyi syn. Jasminum primulinum (Primrose Jasmine)
Laburnum anagyroides 'Quercifolium' syn. Laburnum quercifolium (Oak-leaved Laburnum)
Lagerstroemia eavesii (Crape Myrtle)
Lagerstroemia indica (Crape Myrtle)
Lagerstroemia indica 'Alba' (Crape Myrtle)
Lanceolatum (Possibly Symphyotrichum lanceolatum (White Panicle Aster))
Lantana camara 'Chelsea Gem', 'Drap d'Or', 'La Neige', 'Imperiatrice Eugenie'
Lantana montevidensis syn. Lantana sellowiana (Trailing Lantana)
Laurus nobilis (Bay)
Leonotis ocymifolia syn. Leonotis leonurus
Leptospermum laevigatum (Coastal Tea-Tree)
Leptospermum scoparium 'Nichollsii' (Manuka)
Leptospermum scoparium 'Chapmanii' (Manuka)
Leschenaultia biloba
Lonicera caprifolium (Italian Honeysuckle)
Luculia gratissima
Malus floribunda syn. Pyrus malus floribunda (Japanese Flowering Crabapple)
Malus spp syn. Pyrus malus (Flowering Crabapple)
Melaleuca bracteata syn. Melaleuca genistifolia
Melaleuca decussata
Melaleuca gibbosa (Slender Honey Myrtle)
Melaleuca hypericifolia (Tea-Tree)
Melia azedarach (White Cedar)
Nandina domestica (Sacred Bamboo)
Nerium oleander (Oleander) 'Jena Glen', 'Madame Martini', 'Mrs Roeding', 'Splendens Variegata', 'Punctatum'
Ochna multiflora
Olearia pannosa
Olearia rudis
Pavonia coccinea
Philadelphus HC
Philadelphus coronarius (Sweet Mock Orange)
Photinia serratifolia syn. Photinia serrulata (Chinese Hawthorn)
Pimelea decussata (Cross-leaved Pimelea)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Podolyria calyprata var. grandiflora
Podolyria calyprata (Sweet Pea Bush)
Polygala x dalmaisiana syn. Polygala grandis
Populus spp (Poplars various)
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi' (Red-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi Nigra'
Prunus cerasifera 'Vesuvius'
Prunus Chinensis Rosea probably Prunus glandulosa 'Sinensis' syn. 'Rosa Plena'
Prunus mume (Flowering Apricot)
Prunus serrulata (Japanese Flowering Cherry)
Prunus x amygdalo-persica 'Pollardii' syn. Prunus amygdalus 'Pollardii'
Prunus x amygdalo-persica syn. Prunus amygdalus
Prunus x blireana (Double Pink Flowering Plum)
Prunus x blireana 'Moseri' (Flowering Plum)
Punica granatum (Pomegranate)
Punica granatum 'Nana' (Dwarf Pomegranate)
Pyracantha leylani syn. Crataegus pyracantha leylani
Quercus ilex (Evergreen Oak, Holm Oak)
Quercus spp (Oak various)
Rhaphiolepis indica syn. Raphiolepis (Indian Hawthorn)
Rhus succedanea
Rhus typhina 'Laciniata'
Ribes odoratum syn. Ribes aureum (Clove Currant)
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Robinia hispida 'Rosea' (False Acacia)
Roldana petasitis syn. Senecio petasitis (Winter Flowering Cineraria)
Russelia equisetiformis syn. Russelia juncea (Coral plant)
Salix rubra (Pussy willow) (Probably Salix caprea but could be Salix x rubra (Green-leaf Willow))
Sapium sebiferum (Chinese Tallow Tree)

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Agapanthus spp

Ageratum houstonianum syn. Ageratum mexicanum (Floss Flower) 'Mauve Beauty', 'Little Dorrit'

Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)

Amaranthus melancholicus ruber
Amaranthus tricolor var. salicifolius (Joseph's Coat)

Anchusa azurea syn. Anchusa italica (Dropmore varieties)

Anemone coronaria 'St Brigid'
Anemone hupehensis var. japonica (Japanese Windflower)
Antirrhinum majus 'Majestic' strain, 'Intermediate' strain 'Fascination', 'Flame', 'The Fawn', 'Golden Queen' (Snapdragon)
Aquilegia spp 'Mrs Scott Elliot' strain
Aster spp (annual) 'Giant Crego', 'Beauty'
Aster spp (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster) 'White Cloud', 'Blue Gem', 'Lil Fardell', 'Pink Perfection', 'JS Baker', 'Beauty of Colwall', 'Wonder of Cowell'
Astimbe spp (False Spirea)
Babiana spp (Baboon Flower)
Bellis perennis (English Daisy)
Boltonia spp (False Chamomile)
Calceolaria spp (Slipper Flower)
Campanula carpatica (Carpathian Bellflower)
Campanula carpatica alba
Campanula celtidifolia
Campanula garganica
Campanula grandiflora
Campanula medium (Canterbury Bells, Cup and Saucer)
Campanula medium 'Calycanthema' (Cup and Saucer)
Campanula persicifolia (Peach-Leaved Bellflower)
Campanula speculum-veneris syn. Campanula speculum
Campanula spp 'Miss Willmott'
Campanula spp 'Telphon Beauty'
Canna Hybrid Cultivars 'Madame Alfred Conrad', 'Souvenir de President Carnot', 'Orange Bedder', 'King Humbert', 'Winslows Colossal', 'Hungaria', 'Fred Benary'
Centaurea cineraria syn. Centaurea candidissima (Dusty Miller)
Centaurea cyanus (Cornflower)
Chionodoxa spp (Glory of the Snow)
Chrysanthemum indicum
Chrysanthemum x grandiflorum (Refered to as Chinese, Japanese and Single varieties)
Convallaria majalis (Lily-of-the-Valley)
Coreopsis tinctoria syn. Calliopsis
Coreopsis verticillata 'Grandiflora' syn. Coreopsis grandiflora
Crinum spp
Crocus spp
Cyclamen persicum
Cyclamen spp
Cytanthus elatus syn. Vallota (Scarborough Lily)
Dahlia spp
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'
Delphinium spp 'Belladonna'
Dianthus spp (Pinks)
Dicentra spectabilis (Bleeding Heart)
Digitalis spp (Foxglove)
Dimorphotheca ecklonis
Doronicum plantagineum excelsum (Leopards bane)
Erigeron spp
Eryngium spp (Sea Holly)
Felecia amelloides syn. Agathea caelestis (Blue Marguerite Daisy)
Gaillardia spp 'Kelway' strain, 'Mrs T Marriott', 'Dazzler', 'John Stormouth', 'The Monarch'
Galanthus spp (Snowdrops)
Gerbera jamesonii (Barberton Daisy)
Geum HC 'Mrs Bradshaw', 'Lady Stratheden', 'Orange Queen'
Gladiolus spp (Gladioli)
Gypsophila paniculata (Baby's Breath)
Habranthus spp
Hedychium spp (Ginger lily)
Helenium spp 'Riverton Gem' (Sneezeweed)
Helianthus annus var. globosus fistulosus syn. Helianthus globosus fistulosus
Helianthus x multiflorus 'Soliel d'Or', 'Grandiplenus' (Perennial Sunflower)
Hemerocallis Hybrid Cultivars (Day Lily)
Heuchera Sanguinea 'Graultiana', 'Pink Supreme', 'Splendens Oculata'
Incarvillea spp
Iris Bearded Hybrids
Iris ensata syn. Iris kaempferi (Japanese Iris)
Iris germanica (Tall bearded)
Ixia paniculata syn. Morphixia (Corn Lily)
Kniphofia spp syn. Tritoma spp (Red Hot Pokers)
Leucanthemum x superbum syn. Chrysanthemum maximum 'Mrs Arthur Chapman', 'Chiffon', Mrs Lothian Bell' (Shasta Daisy)
Leucocymum vernum (Snowflake)
Lilium formosanum
Lilium auratum (Golden-Rayed Lily)
Lilium batemmannial
Lilium croceum
Lilium davuricum
Lilium elegans (Thunbergianum)
Lilium giganteum
Lilium hansonii
Lilium henryii
Lilium lancifolium syn. Lilium tigrimum (Tiger Lily)
Lilium longiflorum
Lilium pardalinum (Leopard Lily)
Lilium philippinense
Lilium regale (Regal Lily)
Lilium speciosum
Lilium tenuifolium
Limonium bellidifolium syn. Statice caspia (Sea Lavender)
Limonium sinuatum syn. Statice sinuata
Limonium spp 'Purple Cloud' syn. Statice 'Purple Cloud'
Linaria spp (Toadflax)
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Lupinus Hybrid Cultivars
Lupinus perennis (Blue Lupin)
Lycoris spp (Spider Lily)
Mimulus spp (Monkey Flower)
Muscari spp (Grape Hyacinth)
Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)
Narcissus spp 'King Alfred', 'Emperor', 'Sir Watkin' (Daffodil)
Nemesia spp
Nerine sarniensis (Guernsey Lily)
Paeonia officinalis (Common Peony)
Paeonia spp (Paeony)
Papaver orientale (Oriental Poppy)
Penstemon spp
Petunia x hybrida 'Blue Bedder', 'Blue Velvet', 'Feltham Beauty', 'Giants of California', 'Superbissima', 'Rosy Morn', 'Rose Queen'
Phlox decussata (Perennial Phlox)
Phlox drummondii 'Carnea', 'Splendens', 'Dazzler', 'Sutton's Scarlet', 'Coccinea', 'Alba')
Phlox paniculata (Perennial Phlox)
Physostegia virginiana (Obedient Plant)
Polianthes tuberosa (Tuberose)
Polygonatum odoratum syn. Polygonatum vulgare (Solomons seal)
Polygonatum spp (Solomon’s Seal)
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Primula vulgaris (Primrose)
Ramunculus asiaticus
Rehmannia elata syn. Rehmannia angulata (Chinese Foveglove)
Rudbekia spp (Black-Eyed Susan)
Rudbekia spp 'Golden Glow'
Salpiglossis sinuata (Painted Tongue)
Salvia farinacea (Mealy Sage)
Salvia patens (Gentian Sage)
Salvia splendens 'Bonfire', 'Glory of Stuttgart' (Scarlet Sage)
Scabiosa caucasica
Scabiosa columbaria
Schistostylus spp (Kaffir lily)
Senecio cineraria syn. Cineraria maritima (Dusty Miller)
Solidago canadensis (Goldenrod)
Sparaxis spp
Staticia marcophylla
Staticia spathulata (Possibly Limonium binervosum)
Swainsona formosa syn. Clianthus formosa (Sturt's Desert Pea)
Tagetes erecta (African Marigold) 'Guinea Gold'
Tagetes tenuifolia (French Marigold)
Tanacetum parthenium (Feverfew)
Tanacetum syn. Pyrethrum
Thalictrum delavayi syn. Thalictrum diperocarpum (Lavender Shower)
Thalictrum spp (Meadow Rice, Meadow Rue)
Tigridia spp (Tiger Flower)
Tothonia rotundifolia syn. Tithonia speciosa (Mexican Sunflower)
Trachelium coeruleum
Trillium spp (Wood Lily)
Tropaeolum majus (Nasturtium)
Tulipa spp (Tulip)
Verbena spp (Annual varieties)
Viola odorata (Violet)
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Watsonia spp (Bugle Lily)
Zantedeschia aethiopica syn. Richardia (Arum Lily)
Zantedeschia elliotiana syn. Richardia elliotiana (Calla Lily, Golden Arum Lily)
Zantedeschia spp (Calla Lily)
Zea mays 'Rainbow Maize'
Zinnia angustifolia syn. Zinnia linearis
Zinnia elegans

**Climbers**

*Antigonon leptopus* (Mexican Mountain Rose)
*Asparagus setaceus* syn. *Asparagus plumosa* (Asparagus Fern)
*Bougainvillea glabra* 'Sanderiana', 'Traili'
*Bougainvillea spectabilis* 'Thomasii', 'Lateritia'
*Bougainvillea x buttiana* 'Mrs Butt'
*Campsis grandiflora* syn. *Bignonia grandiflora* (Chinese Trumpet Creeper)
*Clematis Jackmanii Group* (Adelaide Hills only)
*Clematis montana*
*Clematis montana* var. *buchani* syn. *Clematis buchani*
*Clematis montana* var. *rubens* syn. *Clematis montana rubra*
*Cobea scandens* (Cup and Saucer Vine)
*Dolichos spp* (possibly *Macrotyloma spp*)
*Ficus pumila* syn. *Ficus stipulata* (Climbing Fig, Creeping Fig)
*Ficus pumila* 'Variegata' syn. *Ficus repens* 'Variegata' (Variegated Climbing Fig)
*Hardenbergia violacea* 'Alba' syn. *Hardenbergia ovata alba* (White Native Sarsaparilla)
*Hardenbergia violacea* 'Rosea' syn. *Hardenbergia ovata rosea* (Pink Native Sarsaparilla)
*Hardenbergia violacea* syn. *Hardenbergia ovata* (Native Sarsaparilla)
*Hedera canariensis* 'Variegated' (Canary Island Ivy)
*Hedera colchica* 'Dentata Variegata' (Persian Ivy)
*Hedera helix* (English Ivy)
*Ipomea horsfalliae* syn. *Ipomea cardinales* (Cardinal Creeper)
*Ipomea indica* syn. *Ipomea learii* (Morning Glory)
*Ipomea tricolor* syn. *Ipomnea* 'Heavenly Blue'
*Jasminum grandiflorum* (Spanish Jasmine)
*Jasminum mesnyi* syn. *Jasminum primulinum* (Primrose Jasmine)
*Lapageria rosea* (Chilean Bellflower, Copihue)
*Lathyrus latifolius* (Perennial Pea)
*Lathyrus latifolius* 'Albus' (White Perennial Pea)
*Lathyrus latifolius* 'Roseus' (Pink Perennial Pea)
*Lathyrus odoratus* (Sweet Pea)
*Lathyrus pubescens*
*Lonicera aurea reticulata*
*Lonicera confusa* (De Candolles Honeysuckle)
*Lonicera splendida* syn. *Lonicera splendens*
*Lonicera spp* (Honeysuckle)
*Lonicera spp* syn. *Lonicera elgantea*
*Lonicera spp* syn. *Lonicera splendens*
*Lonicera tatarica* (Tartarian Honeysuckle)
Macfadyena unguis-cati syn. Bignonia tweediana (Cat's Claw)
Mandevilla suaveolens
Parthenocissus henryana syn. Ampelopsis henryana
Parthenocissus quinquefolia syn. Ampelopsis hederacea (Virginia Creeper)
Parthenocissus tricuspidata 'Veitchii Purpurea' syn. Ampelopsis veitchii purpurea
Parthenocissus tricuspidata 'Veitchii' syn. Ampelopsis veitchii (Boston Ivy)
Passiflora edulis (Passionfruit)
Passiflora mollissima syn. Tacsonia mollissima (Banana Passionfruit)
Passiflora racemosa (Red Passionflower)
Passiflora x belotti syn. Passiflora 'Empress Eugenie'
Pelargonium HC (Ivy Geranium)
Phaseolus caracalla (Snail Flower)
Pyrostegia venusta syn. Bignonia venusta (Flame Vine)
Quisqualis indica (Rangoon Creeper)
Rhyncospermum jasminoides 'Alba'
Rosa spp (Climbing Rose)
Solanum seaforthianum (St Vincent Lilac)
Solanum wendlandii (Giant Potato Creeper)
Stephanotis floribunda
Stigmaphyllon ciliatum (Golden Vine)
Thunbergia grandiflora (Blue Trumpet Vine)
Vitis 'Alicante Bouchet'
Wisteria floribunda 'Alba' syn. Wisteria multijuga 'Alba' (Japanese Wisteria)
Wisteria floribunda 'Multijuga' syn. Wisteria multijuga (Japanese Wisteria)
Wisteria sinensis (Chinese Wisteria)
Wisteria sinensis 'Alba' (Chinese Wisteria)
? syn. Bignonia chiere
? syn. Bignonia mackeni

Hedges
Arduina bispinosa (Cape Plum)
Callistemon citrinus syn. Callistemon lanceolatus (Crimson Bottlebrush)
Ceanothus divaricatus
Ceratonia siliqua (Carob)
Coprosma lucida
Cupressus macrocarpa 'Horizontalis' syn. Cupressus lambertiana horizontalis (Lambert Cypress)
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)
Duranta ellisii
Duranta erecta syn. Duranta plumieri
Escallonia rubra var. macrantha
Hibiscus rosa-sinensis (Hawaiian Hibiscus) 'General Courtegis', 'Splendens'
Lantana camara 'Chelsea Gem', 'Drap d'Or'
Ligustrum ovalifolium 'Aureum' (Golden Privet)
Ligustrum sinense 'Variegatum' (Chinese Privet, Small-Leaved Privet)
Lonicera nitida (Box Honeysuckle)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Pyracantha crenulata syn. Crataegus crenulata (Himalayan Firethorn)
Quercus ilex (Holm Oak)
Rhamnus spp (Buckthorn)
Rosa spp (Rose) 'Lorraine Lee', 'Sunny South', 'Red Letter Day', 'General Macarthur', 'Gruss', 'Teplitz'
Spartium junceum (Spanish Broom)
Tecoma capensis (Cape Honeysuckle)
Viburnum tinus (Laurustinus)
Many ornamental flowering shrubs were recommended for use as hedges see list for trees and shrubs.

Rock Gardens
Ageratum spp
Aloe spp,
Alonsoa warscewiczii (Mask Flower)
Alpines various, recommended that a selection be based upon local nursery lists as there were too many to list.
Antirrhinum spp (Dwarf types)
Aptenia spp syn. Mesembryanthemum (Pigface)
Bassia scoparia (Kochia)
Bellis perennis (English Daisy)
Cacti various
Campanula carpathica (Carpathian Bellflower, Tussock Bellflower)
Campanula garganica
Campanula medium (Canterbury Bells)
Carpobrotus syn. Mesembryanthemum (Pigface)
Cotyledon spp
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'
Dianthus spp (Pinks)
Dicentra spectabilis (Bleeding Heart)
Dimorphotheca ecklonis
Doronicum plantaginum excelsum (Leopards bane)
Echeveria spp
Erigeron spp
Eryngium spp (Sea Holly)
Eschscholzia spp (California Poppy)
Ferns various
Heuchera Sanguinea
Ipomopsis spp
Lachenalia spp (Cape Cowslip)
Leucanthemum x superbum syn. Chrysanthemum maximum (Shasta Daisy)
Linaria spp (Toadflax)
Linum spp (Flax)
Lobelia spp
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Lychnis viscaria (Viscaria)
Malcolmia maritima (Virginia Stock)
Malephora crocea syn. Mesembryanthemum (Pigface)
Mimulus spp (Monkey Flower)
Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)
Nemesia spp
Nemophila spp
Nigella damascena (Love-in-the-Mist)
Petunia x hybrida
Phacelia spp (Scorpion Weed)
Phlox decussata (Perennial Phlox)
Phlox drummondii
Physostegia virginiana (Obedient Plant)
Portulaca grandiflora (Rose Moss, Sun Plant)
Primula malacoides (Fairy Primrose)
Reseda odorata (Mignonette)
Sedum spp (Stonecrop)
Sempervivum spp (Houseleek)
Silene spp (Campion)
Tradescantia spp (Spiderwort)
Tropaeolum majus (Nasturtium)
Ursinia spp
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Zinnia angustifolia syn. Zinnia linearis

Ponds

Cabomba caroliniana
Eodea canadensis (Anacharis)
Iris ensata syn. Iris kaempferi (Japanese Water Iris)
Myriophyllum spp (Water Milfoil)
Nitella spp
Nymphaea lotus (Lotus)
Nuphar spp (Water Lily)
Sagittaria spp (Arrowhead)
Vallisneria spp
? syn. Potomogaria

Appendix 5C - Typical Plants Recommended by John Oliver in South Australian Homes and Gardens

Note: In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Oliver referred to the plant.

**Trees & Shrubs**

*Acacia baileyana* (Cootamundra Wattle)

*Acacia* spp (Wattle)

*Acmena* spp and/or *Syzygium* spp syn. *Eugenia* spp

*Aesculus hippocastanum* (Common Horse Chestnut)

*Aesculus x carnea* 'Briotii' syn. *Aesculus briotii*

*Aesculus x carnea* syn. *Aesculus carnea* (Red Horse Chestnut)

*Amelanchier canadensis* (Juneberry)

*Aronia arbutifolia* syn. *Aronia floribunda* (Chokeberry)

*Banksia* spp

*Berberis darwinii* (Darwin Barberry)

*Berberis vulgaris* (Barberry)

*Berberis vulgaris purpurea* (Barberry)

*Berberis wilsoniae* (Wilson's Barberry)

*Berberis x stenophylla* syn. *Berberis stenophylla*

*Boronia* spp

*Brachychiton acerifolius* (Ilawarra Flame Tree)

*Brugmansia candida* 'Knightii'

*Brunfelsia* spp

*Buddleja* spp

*Callistemon* spp (Bottlebrush)

*Calytrix* spp

*Camellia* spp

*Ceanothus* spp

*Ceratopetalum gummiferum* (NSW Christmas Bush)

*Chaenomeles japonica* (Japanese flowering quince)

*Chмелaeacium uncinatum* (Geraldton Waxflower)

*Chorizema* spp

*Citrus japonica* (Cumquat)

*Clerodendrum trichotomum*

*Clerodendrum trichotomum* var. *fargesii*

*Cornus mas* (Cornelian Cherry)

*Cornus sanguinea* (Common Dogwood)

*Cornus sericea* subsp. *baileyi* syn. *Cornus baileyi*

*Correa* spp (Native Fuchsia)

*Corymbia ficifolia* syn. *Eucalyptus ficifolia* (Red-Flowering Gum)

*Cotoneaster* spp

*Crataegus laevigata* syn. *Crataegus oxyacantha* (English Hawthorn) 'Paul's Scarlet', 'Plena', 'Rosea Flore Plena'

*Daphne mezereum* (February Daphne)

*Daphne odorata* (Winter Daphne)

*Daphne x napolitana* syn. *Daphne napolitana*

*Duranta* spp

*Elaeocarpus reticulatus* (Blueberry Ash)
Embodarium coccineum (Chilean Fire Bush)
Epacris spp
Eriostemon (Wax Flower)
Erythrina crista-galli (Common Coral Tree)
Eucalyptus spp
Euonymus europaeus (Spindle Tree)
Feijoa sellowiana (Pineapple Guava)
Forsythia suspensa var. fortunei syn. Forsythia fortunei (Weeping Forsythia)
Forsythia viridissima (Golden Bells)
Fuchsia spp
Gardenia augusta (Gardenia)
Gaultheria hispidana (Snowberry)
Grevillea spp
Hakea spp
Hedychium coronarium (White Ginger)
Hedychium gardnerianum (Ginger Lily)
Hedychium spicatum
Hydrangea macrophylla (French Hydrangea)
Ilex spp (Holly)
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Kolwitzia amabilis (Beauty Bush)
Laburnum spp
Lagerstroemia spp (Crape Myrtle)
Leucothoe fontanesiana syn. Andromoea catesbaei (Switch Ivy)
Leycesteria formosa (Himalayan Honeysuckle)
Lonicera periclymenum (Woodbine)
Lonicera spp (Honeysuckle)
Magnolia campbellii (Campbell's Magnolia)
Magnolia grandiflora (Bull Bay, Great Laurel Magnolia)
Magnolia stellata (Star Magnolia)
Magnolia x soulangeana syn. Magnolia soulangeana (Tulip Magnolia)
Malus x purpurea syn. Pyrus malus (Crabapple) 'Eleyi'
Michelia figo syn. Magnolia fuscata (Port-wine Magnolia)
Paeonia lactiflora (Herbaceous Peony)
Paeonia suffruticosa (Tree Peony)
Philadelphus spp (Mock Orange)
Pieris formosa syn. Andromeda formosa
Plectranthus spp
Plumbago auriculata (Plumbago)
Prostanthera spp
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi Nigra'
Prunus persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus serrulata (Japanese Flowering Cherry)
Prunus x blireana (Flowering Plum)
Punica granatum (Pomegranate)
Punica granatum 'Nana' (Dwarf Pomegranate)
Pyracantha coccinea (Scarlet Firethorn)
Quercus coccinea (Scarlet Oak)
Rhododendron spp (Azalea and Rhododendron)
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Rothmannia globosa syn. Gardenia globosa (September Bells, Bell Gardenia)
Solenostemon spp (Coleus)
Spirea spp
Symplocarpus albus (Snowberry)
Syringa vulgaris (Lilac)
Telopea oreades (Gippsland or Victorian Waratah)
Telopea truncata (Tasmanian Waratah)
Thryptomene spp
Viburnum brevipes
Viburnum hupehense
Viburnum japonicum
Viburnum opulus (Guelder Rose)
Virburnum opulus (Guelder Rose)
Weigela florida syn. Weigela amabilis, Weigela rosea
? syn. Berberis minuta

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Aconitum spp (Monkshood)
Actinotis helianthi (Flannel Flower)
Alceo rosea (Hollyhock)
Allium spp
Amaryllis belladonna (Naked Ladies)
Anchusa azurea (Anchust Gentian)
Anemone coronaria
Anemone hupehensis var. japonica syn. Anemone japonica (Japanese Windflower)
Anigozanthos spp (Kangaroo Paw)
Anthemis tinctoria 'Kelwayi' (Yellow Chamomile)
Aptenia spp syn. Mesembryanthemum (Pigface)
Aster spp (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
Babina spp (Baboon Flower)
Blandfordia punicea (Tasmanian Christmas Bells)
Calendula officinalis (Pot Marigold)
Camphorosma spp (Mariposa Lily)
Campanula rotundifolia (Harebell)
Campanula spp (Perennial Bellflower)
Canna HC
Carpobrotus syn. Mesembranthes (Pigface)
Centauera cyanus (Cornflower)
Chionodoxa spp (Glory of the Snow)
Cimicifuga simplex (Bugbane)
Clarkia spp (Godetia)
Colchicum byzantinum (Meadow Saffron)
Colchicum speciosum (Meadow Saffron)
Colchicum speciosum 'Album' (Meadow Saffron)
Coreopsis verticillata
Crocus spp (Montbretia)
Crocus spp
Dahlia HC
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'
Delphinium spp 'Belladonna'
Dianthus barbatus (Sweet William)
Dianthus spp (Pinks)
Digitalis spp (Foxglove)
Erigeron spp (Fleabane)
Eriophorum vaginatum (Hare's Tail Grass)
Erythronium spp (Dogtooth Violet)
Eschscholtzia spp (California Poppy)
Fritillaria imperialis (Crown Imperial)
Gaillardia spp
Galtonia candidans (Summer Hyacinth)
Gazania spp
Geum HC
Gladiolus spp (Gladioli)
Gomphrena globosa (Globe Amaranth)
Gypsophila paniculata 'Bristol Fairy' (Baby's Breath)
Hedera spp (Ivy)
Helenium spp (Sneezeweed)
Hemerocallis HC (Day Lily)
Heuchera spp (Coralbells)
Hyacinthoides spp syn. Scilla (Wood Hyacinth, Bluebell)
Hyacinthus spp (Hyacinth)
Impatiens balsamina (Balsam)
Iris Californian Hybrids
Iris Dutch Hybrids
Iris ensata syn. Iris kaempferi (Japanese Iris)
Iris Hybrid Cultivars (Bearded)
Iris japonica syn. Iris fimbriata
Iris pumila (Dwarf Bearded Iris)
Iris unguicularis syn. Iris stylosa (Algerian Iris)
Iris xiphioides (English Iris)
Iris xiphium (Spanish Iris)
Ixia spp (African Corn Lily)
Kniphofia ensifolia (Winter Poker)
Lachenalia spp (Cape Cowslip)
Lampranthus spp syn. Memembyanthemum (Pigface)
Leucanthemum x superbum (Shaster Daisy)
Lilium auratum (Golden-Rayed Lily)
Lilium elegans
Lilium elegans (Thunbergianum)
Lilium henryii
Lilium lancifolium syn. Lilium tigrinum (Tiger Lily)
Lilium pardalinum (Leopard Lily)
Lilium regale (Regal Lily)
Lilium speciosum
Linaria spp (Perennial Linaria)
Lobelia cardinalis (Cardinal Flower)
Lobelia siphilitica (Blue Cardinal Flower)
Lobelia speciosa
Lobelia x gerardii 'Queen Victoria', 'Snowball'
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Lotus peliorhyncus
Lupinus HC
Lycnis chalcedonica (Maltese Cross)
Lycnis viscaria 'Splendens' (German Catchfly)
Macleaya cordata syn. Bocconia corata (Plume Poppy)
Malephora crocea syn. Mesembranthemum (Pigface)
Matthiola incana (Brompton Stock)
Matthiola incana 'Annua' (10 Week Stocks)
Mentzelia lindleyi (Golden Bartonia)
Muscaris spp (Grape Hyacinth)
Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)
Narcissus bulbocodium (Hoop-Petticoat Daffodil)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Nemesia spp
Nemesia versicolor f. compacta syn. Nemesia compacta
Nepeta cataria (Catmint)
Nicotiana spp (White Tobacco Flower)
Nigella damascena (Love-in-the-Mist)
Nigella damascena 'Miss Jekyll'
Ornamental grasses
Ornithogalum nutans
Ornithogalum umbellatum (Star of Bethlehem)
Papaver nudicaule (Iceland Poppy)
Papaver rhoeas 'Shirley' (Shirley Poppy)
Pelargonium peltatum (Ivy-leaved Geranium)
Pentstemon spp
Pericallis x hybrida (Cineraria)
Phlox drummondii (Annual Phlox)
Phlox paniculata (Perennial Phlox)
Primula auricula
Primula florindae (Giant Cowslip)
Primula malacoides
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Primula veris (Cowslip)
Primula vulgaris (Primrose)
Reseda odorata (Mignonette)
Salpiglossis sinuata (Painted Tongue)
Salpiglossis sinuata 'Emperor' strain
Salvia involucrata 'Bethellii' syn. Salvia bethelli (Roseleaf Sage)
Salvia leucantha (Mexican Bush Sage)
Salvia verbascifolia
Sparaxis spp
Tagetes erecta (African Marigold)
Tagetes tenuifolia (French Marigold)
Thalictrum flavum subsp. glaucum (False Rhubarb, Yellow Meadow Rue)
Thalictrum spp (Meadow Rice, Meadow Rue)
Trachymene coerulea (Blue Lace Flower)
Tulipa spp (Tulip)
Verbascum spp
Veronica spp
Vinca spp (Periwinkle)
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Zinnia elegans 'Mammoth', 'Robusta' & 'Liliput' Series
Zinnia haageana

Climbers
Bauhinia scandens
Clematis spp
Hedra spp (Ivy)
Lathyrus latifolius 'Albus' (White Perennial Pea)
Lathyrus latifolius 'Roseus' (Pink Perennial Pea)
Lathyrus pubescens
Lonicera spp (Honeysuckle)
Passiflora spp (Passionfruit & Passionflower)
Rosa spp (Climbing Rose)
Solanum spp (Potato Creeper)
Thunbergia gibsonii (Golden Glory Vine)
Vigna caracalla (Snail Flower)
Wisteria spp

Hedges
Bougainvillea spp
Buxus sempervirens (English Box)
Duranta spp
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Rosa spp (Rose) Polyanthus Group and 'Radiance', 'Red Radiance', 'Red Letter Day', 'Sunny South'
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)

Rock Garden
Alyssum spp (Yellow Alyssum)
Aquilegia spp (Columbine)
Arabis spp (Rock Cress)
 Arenaria spp (Sandwort)
Armeria spp (Thrift)
Aster spp (Perennial)
Aubretia spp
Campanula cochlearifolia syn. Campanula pusilla (Fairies' Thimbles)
Campanula portenschlagiana syn. Campanula muralis
Campanula rotundifolia (Harebell)
Dianthus alpinus
Dianthus arvernensis (Auvergne Pink)
Dianthus deltoides (Maiden Pink)
Dianthus pavonius syn. Dianthus neglectus
Dianthus superbus nanus
Erigeron spp (Fleabane)
Erysimum linifolium (Alpine Wallflower)
Geranium sanguineum (Bloody Cranesbill)
Geum montanum (Alpine Avens)
Gypsophila repens
Herniaria glabra
Heuchera spp
Hypericum spp
Iberis spp (Perennial Candytuft, Evergreen Candytuft)
Kennedia spp (Coral Pea)
Linum spp (Yellow Flax)
Lotus bertholetti (Coral Gem, Parrot's Beak)
Meconopsis spp (Himalayan Poppy, Blue Poppy)
Nymphaea tetragona syn. Nymphaea pygmaea (Pygmy Waterlily)
Oxalis lobata
Papaver spp (Poppy)
Phlox subulata (Moss Phlox)
Primula japonica
Primula rosea
Saxifraga cochlearis (Snail Saxifrage)
Saxifraga paniculata 'Lutea' syn. Saxifraga aizoon lutea
Saxifraga x salmonica 'Jenkinsii' syn. Saxifraga jenkinsii
Saxifraga x urbium (London Pride)
Thymus serpyllum (Creeping Thyme)
Thymus spp (Crimson Thyme)
Veronica prostrata syn. Veronica rupestris
Viola hederacea (Native Violet)
Wahlenbergia spp (Native Bluebell)

(Source: See Reference List for entries under Oliver.)
Appendix 5D - A Representative List of Book Reviews from *The Observer*, 1920-1930, related to Garden Design or Gardening.

Allan Ross MacDougall, *Arts and Decoration*
Marie Luise Gothein, *A History of Garden Art*

Appendix 5E - Typical Plants Recommended by 'Agricola' in The Observer

Note: In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which 'Agricola' referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

*Abelia x grandiflora* syn. *Abelia rupestris*
*Abutlon* spp
*Acacia baileyana* (Cootamundra Wattle)
*Acacia cultriformis* (Knife-leaf Wattle)
*Acacia dealbata* (Silver Wattle)
*Acacia decurrens* (Black Wattle)
*Acacia elata* (cedar wattle)
*Acacia longifolia* (Sydney Golden Wattle)
*Acacia maidenii* (Maidens Wattle)
*Acacia melanoxylon* (Blackwood Wattle)
*Acacia myrtifolia* (Myrtle Wattle)
*Acacia notabilis* (Flinders Wattle)
*Acacia podalyriifolia* (Queensland Wattle)
*Acacia pruinosa* (Frosty Wattle)
*Acacia pycnantha* (Golden Wattle)
*Acacia retinodes* (Swamp Wattle)
*Acacia saligna* (Golden Wreath Wattle)
*Acacia spectabilis* (Mudgee Wattle)
*Acmena Kingii* syn. *Eugenia kingii*
*Acmena smithii* syn. *Eugenia smithii* (Lillypilly)
*Adina multiflora*
*Agathis robusta* (Queensland Kauri)
*Ageratum houstonianum* syn. *Ageratum mexicanum* (Floss Flower) 'Mauve Beauty', 'Little Dorrit'
*Agonis flexuosa* (Peppermint Tree, Willow Myrtle)
*Araucaria bidwillii* (Bunya Pine)
*Araucaria cunninghamii* (Hoop Pine)
*Araucaria heterophylla* (Norfolk Island Pine)
*Arbutus unedo* (Irish Strawberry Tree)
*Arduina bispinosa* (Cape Plum)
*Barleria cristata* (Philippine Strawberry Tree)
*Bauhinia variegata* (Orchid Tree)
*Berberis darwinii* (Darwin Barberry)
*Berberis wilsoniae* (Wilson's Barberry)
*Betula pendula* (Silver Birch)
*Bougainvillea glabra* 'Cyheri', 'Sanderinana'
*Bouvardia* spp
*Brachychiton acerifolius* (Ilawarra Flame Tree)
*Brachychiton populneus*
*Brugmansia* spp
*Buddleja* spp 'Veitchi'
*Caesalpinia gilliesii* syn. *Poinciana gilliesii* (Bird of Paradise Bush)
Callistemon citrinus syn. Callistemon lanceolatus (Crimson Bottlebrush)
Callistemon spp (Bottlebrush)
Calodendrum capense (Cape Chestnut)
Cantua buxifolia syn. Cantua dependens
Ceanothus divaricatus
Cercis silquastrum (Judas Tree)
Cestrum spp (Fiddlewood)
Coleonema album syn. Diosma alba
Corymbia calophylla syn. Eucalyptus calophylla (Marri)
Corymbia citriodora syn. Eucalyptus citriodora (Lemon Scented Gum)
Corymbia ficifolia (Red-Flowering Gum)
Corymbia maculata syn. Eucalyptus maculata (Spotted Gum)
Crataegus laevigata syn. Crataegus oxyacantha (English Hawthorn)
Creutzia laburnifolia
Daphne spp
Dimorphotheca ecklonis
Dimorphotheca spp
Diospyros kaki (Persimmon)
Diplacus glutinosus puniceus
Duetzia crenata
Duranta plumieri
Eriostemon nerifolium
Eriostemon spp
Erythrina spp
Eucalyptus grandis (Flooded Gum)
Eucalyptus torquata (Coral Gum)
Eupatorium spp
Euphorbia pulcherrima syn. Poinsettia pulcherrima (Poinsettia)
Exochorda racemosa syn. Spirea grandiflora
Feijoa sellowiana (Pineapple Guava)
Felicia amelloides syn. Agathea caelestis (Blue Marguerite Daisy)
Felicia angustifolia
Fuchsia spp
Garrya elliptica (Silktassel Bush)
Genista aetnensis (Mt Etna Broom)
Genista x spachiana syn. Genista fragrans
Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak)
Hakea spp
Hebe diosmifolia syn. Veronica diosmaefolia
Hibiscus heugelii (Sturts Desert Rose)
Hibiscus spp
Hydrangea spp
Hypericum x moserianum
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Jasminum mesnyi syn. Jasminum primulinum (Primrose Jasmine)
Lagerstroemia spp (Crape Myrtle)
Leptospermum scoparium 'Nichollsii' (Manuka)
Linum trivagnum (French Flax)
Lophostemon confertus syn. Tristiana conferta (Queensland Box)
Magnolia grandiflora
Melaleuca leucadendron (Northern Paperbark)
Melia azedarach (White Cedar)
Nerium oleander (Oleander)
Pittosporum undulatum (Sweet Pittosporum)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Podalyria calytrata var. grandiflora
Polyscias elegans syn. Panax elegans (Celery Wood)
Prunus cerasifera 'Nigra' (Purple-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi' (Red-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus mume (Flowering Apricot)
Prunus persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus x blireana (Double Pink Flowering Plum)
Punica granatum 'Nana' (Dwarf Pomegranate)
Rhaphiolepis ovata
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Rosa spp
Russellia equisetiformis syn. Russelia juncea (Coral plant)
Sapium sebiferum (Chinese Tallow Tree)
Schefflera actinophylla (Queensland Umbrella Tree)
Schinus molle (Peppertree)
Senna x floribunda syn. Cassia floribunda
Sesbania tripetala (Brazilian Glory Pea)
Solanum rantonnetii syn. Solanum azureum (Blue Potato Bush)
Sophora japonica (Japanese Pagoda Tree)
Spartium junceum (Spanish Broom)
Spirea betulifolia var. corymbosa
Spirea cantoniensis (Reeves' Spirea) syn. Spirea reevesiana flore plena
Spirea japonica 'Anthony Waterer'
Spirea spp
Stenocarpus sinuatus (Firewheel Tree)
Symphoricarpus racemosus (Snowberry)
Syzygium paniculatum syn. Eugenia myrtifolia
Tabebuia rosea syn. Tecoma rosea
Tecoma capensis (Cape Honeysuckle)
Tecoma stans var. velutina syn. Tecoma velutina
Tecoma x Smithii
Tetradenia riparia syn. Iboza riparia
Thrytomene calycina (Mitchelliana, Grampians Heath Myrtle)
Tristania neriifolia (Dwarf Water Gum)
Tristaniopsis laurina syn. Tristiana laurina (Water Gum)
Viburnum opulus (Guelder Rose)
Viburnum tinus (Laurustinus)
Virgilia oroboides syn. Virgilia capensis (Cape Lilac)
? syn. Tecoma mackeni
Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs

*Amaranthus* spp
*Anemone coronaria*
*Antirrhinum majus* (Snapdragon)
*Aquilegia* (Columbine)
*Aster* spp (annual)
*Aster* spp (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
*Begonia* Tuberous Group
*Campanula medium* (Canterbury Bells, Cup and Saucer)
*Canna* spp (Canna Lily)
*Celosia* spp
*Centaurea cyans* (Cornflower)
*Chrysanthemum* x *grandiflorum*
*Clarkia* spp (Godetia)
*Clarkia damperii* (Sturt's Desert Pea)
*Consolida* spp 'Alba', 'Bicolour'
*Consolida* spp (Larkspur)
*Convolvulus* spp
*Coreopsis tinctoria* syn. *Calliopsis*
*Cosmos* spp
*Crinum* spp
*Crocus* spp
*Dahlia* spp
*Delphinium* spp
*Dianthus barbatus* (Sweet William)
*Dianthus caryophyllus* (Carnation)
*Dianthus* spp (Pinks)
*Digitalis* spp (Foxglove)
*Erysimum cheiri* 'Paris Market' (Annual Wallflower)
*Erysimum* spp (Wallflower)
*Gaillardia* spp
*Gladiolus* spp (Gladioli)
*Gomphrena globosa* (Globe Amaranth)
*Helianthus annus* (Sunflower)
*Hyacinthoides* spp (Bluebells)
*Hyacinthus orientalis* (Hyacinth)
*Iberis* spp (Candytuft)
*Impatiens* spp (Balsam)
*Iris* spp
*Ixia paniculata* syn. *Morphisia* (Corn Lily)
*Senecio jacobea*? (Jacobea)
*Leucanthemum* x *superbum* (Shasta Daisy)
*Linaria* spp (Toadflax)
*Linum grandiflorum* 'Rubrum' (Scarlet Flax)
*Linum narbonense* (Blue Flax)
*Lobelia* spp
*Lupinus polyphyllus* (Perennial Lupin, Blue-Pod Lupin)
*Malcolmia maritima* (Virginia Stock)
*Matthiola* spp (Stock)
*Myosotis sylvatica* (Forget-Me-Not)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Nemesia spp
Papaver nudicaule (Iceland Poppy)
Papaver rhoeas (Shirely Poppy)
Papaver spp (Poppy)
Pelargonium spp
Penstemon spp
Pericallis x hybrida (Cineraria)
Petunia x hybrida
Phlox drummondii
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Primula vulgaris (Primrose)
Ranunculus spp
Reseda odorata (Mignonette)
Salpiglossis sinuata (Painted Tongue)
Salvia spp
Schizanthus spp (Poor Man's Orchard)
Solenostemon spp (Coleus)
Sternbergia spp (Autumn Crocus)
Tagetes erecta (African Marigold)
Tagetes tenuifolia (French Marigold)
Tanacetum syn. Pyrethrum
Tulipa spp (Tulip)
Verbena spp
Vinca minor 'Alba' syn. Vinca alba
Vinca spp syn. Vinca oculia
Viola odorata (Violet)
Viola HC (Viola, Pansy)
Zinnia spp

Climbers
Bougainvillea glabra 'Sanderiana', 'Traili'
Bougainvillea spectabilis 'Thomasii', 'Lateritia'
Campsis grandiflora syn. Tecoma grandiflora (Chinese Trumpet Vine)
Clematis spp
Lathyrus odoratus (Sweet Pea)
Lathyrus pubescens (Blue Perennial Pea)
Pandorea pandorana syn. Tecoma australis (Wonga Wonga Vine)
Parthenocissus quinquefolia syn. Ampelopsis hederacea (Virginia Creeper)
Passiflora edulis (Passionfruit)
Wisteria spp (Wisteria)
? syn. Bignonia chiere
? syn. Tecoma gracillis
? syn. Tecoma guilfoylei

Hedges
Coprosma spp
Rock Garden Plants Listed from the Adelaide Botanic Garden Rock Garden

*Aloe* spp
*Aptenia* spp syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Armeria* spp (Thrift)
*Aster* spp
*Begonia* spp
*Carpobrotus* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Celosia* spp
*Cerastium tomentosum* (Snow-in-Summer)
*Cotyledon* spp
*Crassula* spp
*Cycads*
*Dianthus* spp (Rock Pinks)
*Echeveria* spp
*Erigeron speciosus*
*Felicia amelloides* syn. *Agathea caelestis* (Blue Marguerite Daisy)
*Fragaria vesca* (Alpine Strawberry)
*Guem* HC 'Mrs Bradshaw'
*Hemerocallis* HC (Day Lily)
*Lantana* spp
*Lilium* spp
*Lippia nodosa* probably *Lippia phylacanescens*
*Lithospermum* spp
*Lobularia maritima* (Alyssum)
*Lotus peliornynchus* (Pigeon Beak)
*Malephora crocea* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Polygonum capitatum*
*Potentilla* spp
*Saxifraga* spp (Saxifrage)
*Sedum* spp
*Sempervivum* spp (Houseleek)
*Senecio cineraria* syn. *Cineraria maritima* (Dusty Miller)
*Verbena* spp
*Veronica spicata*
*Yucca aloifolia* (Dagger Plant)
*Zinnia* spp
(Brazilian Beet)

(Source: See Reference List entries for ‘Agricola’)
Appendix 5F - Typical Plants Recommended by 'A Professional Woman Gardener' in The Observer

Note: In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which 'A Professional Woman Gardener' referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

Bambusa spp
Buddleja spp
Ceanothus spp
Citrus sinensis (Orange)
Coleonema pulchellum (Diosma)
Cupressus sempervirens (Italian cypress)
Deutzia spp
Duranta spp
Genista x spachiana syn. Genista fragrans
Heliotropium arborescens HC
Hydrangea spp
Laburnum spp
Lavandula angustifolia (English Lavender)
Lavandula stoechas (French Lavender)
Lonicera periclymenum (Woodbine)
Malus pumila (Apple)
Philadelphus spp
Pittosporum spp
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Rhododendron spp (Azalea)
Rosa spp (Rose)
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)
Salix caprea (Pussy Willow)
Spartium junceum (Spanish Broom)
Weigela spp

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs

Ageratum houstonianum syn. Ageratum mexicanum (Floss Flower) 'Mauve Beauty', 'Little Dorrit'
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Antirrhinum majus (Snapdragon)
Aster spp (Annual Aster)
Aster spp (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
Campanula spp
Dahlia spp
Delphinium spp
Dianthus perennial (Carnation)
Erysimum cheiri 'Paris Market' (Annual Wallflower)
Felicia amelloides syn. Agathea caelestis (Blue Marguerite Daisy)
Freesia spp
Gladiolus spp (Gladioli)
Helianthus annus (Sunflower, miniature)
Hyacinthoides spp (Hyacinth)
Iris Dutch Hybrids (Dutch Iris)
Iris ensata (Japanese Iris)
Iris germanica (Iris)
Iris unguicularis syn. Iris stylosa
Iris xiphium (Spanish Iris)
Linaria cymbalaria
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Matthiola spp (Stock)
Mirabilis jalapa (Four-O'Clock Flower refered to as Two O'Clocks)
Petunia spp
Phlox drummondii (Annual Phlox)
Phlox paniculata (Perennial Phlox)
Polygonum spp
Portulaca spp
Reseda odorata (Mignonette)
Ricinus communis (Castor Beans)
Salpiglossis spp
Solidago canadensis (Goldenrod)
Thymus spp (Thyme)
Tropaeolum majus (Nasturtium)
Verbena erinoides
Verbena x hybridia (Garden Verbena, Scented Verbena)
Zinnia spp

Climbers
Jasminium spp (Jasmine)
Lathyrus odoratus (Sweet Pea)
Lonicera spp (Honeysuckle)
Vitis spp (Grape Vine)

Natives
Banksia spp
(Scarlet Native Hibiscus) could possibly by Hibiscus spp, Alyogyne spp or
Abelmoschus spp
Alyogyne huegelii syn. Hibiscus heugelii (Blue Hibiscus)
Casuarina spp
Clematis aristata (Australian Clematis)
Clianthus damperii (Sturt's Desert Pea)
Coprosma spp
Erythrina spp
Hovea longifolia (Rusty Pod)
Ipomea spp syn. Colvolvulus spp
Ozothamnus diosmifolius or Pimelea spp (Mellow Rice Flower)
Pandorea pandorana syn. Tecoma australis (Wonga Wonga Vine)
Pittosporum spp
Santalum acuminatum (Quandong)
Viola hederacea (Native Violet)
Westringa fruticosa (Australian Rosemary)
Succulents

*Aptenia* spp syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Carpobrotus* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Lampranthus* spp syn. *Mesembryanthemum*
*Malephora crocea* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)

Rock garden

(Brazilian Beet)
*Aptenia* spp syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Carpobrotus* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Cymbalaria muralis* syn. *Linaria Cymbalaria* (Ivy-leafed Toadflax)
*Gompholobium latifolium* (Golden Glory Pea)
*Malephora crocea* syn. *Mesembryanthemum* (Pigface)
*Plumbago auriculata* (Cape Plumbago)
*Polygonum* spp
*Primula* spp (Primrose)
Succulents various
*Thymus* spp
*Viola hederacea* (Native Violet)

Pond

*Alisma natans*
*Alisma plantago*
*Aponogeton distachyon*
*Calthus palustris* (Marsh Marigold)
*Drosera* spp
*Jassiaeae* spp
*Limnanthemum* spp
*Mimulus gracilis*
*Nymphaea alba* (European White Waterlily)
*Nymphaea odorata* (Fragrant Waterlily)
*Nymphaea* spp (Waterlily)
*Nymphaea tetragona* syn. *Nymphaea pygmaea* (Pigmy Waterlily)
*Pontederia crassipes*

(Source: See Reference List entries for ‘A Professional Woman Gardener’)
Appendix 5G - Typical Plants Recommended by Frank Fairey through his ‘Mrs Brown and Greenleaf’ column in The Observer & The Gardening Bulletin

Note: In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Fairey referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

*Abelia* rupestris
*Acacia* baileyana (Cootamundra Wattle)
*Acacia* podalyriifolia (Queensland Wattle)
*Ageratum houstonianum* syn. *Ageratum mexicanum* (Floss Flower)
*Berberis darwinii* (Darwin Barberry)
*Bigonia* spp syn. *Tecoma* spp
*Ceanothus* divaricatus
*Ceanothus* x *veitchianus*
*Cercis* siliquastrum (Judas Tree)
*Bignonia* spp or *Genista* spp (Yellow Broom, White Weeping Broom & Yellow Weeping Broom)
*Deutzia crenata*
*Deutzia gracilis* (Slender Deutzia) Recommended for the Adelaide Hills only
*Deutzia scabra* 'Pride of Rochester' (Fuzzy Deutzia)
*Diospyros kaki* (Persimmon)
*Erythrina* spp
*Escallonia rubra* var. *macrantha* syn. *Escallonia macrantha*
*Eucalyptus leucoxylon* (South Australian Blue Gum)
*Eucalyptus torquata* (Coral Gum)
*Exochorda racemosa* syn. *Spirea grandiflora*
*Feijoa sellowiana* (Pineapple Guava)
*Felicia* spp
*Genista aetnensis* (Mt Etna Broom)
*Genista x spachiana* syn. *Genista fragrans*
*Psidium* spp (Guava)
*Hibiscus* spp
*Hydrangea macrophylla* 'Parsival', 'Goliath', 'Peer Gynt', 'Prince', 'Elmar', 'Pomotor', 'Lancelot'
*Hypericum x moserianum*
*Lagerstroemia indica* (Crape Myrtle)
*Lantana* spp
*Lavandula angustifolia* (English Lavender)
*Leptospermum scoparium* (New Zealand Crimson Tea-Tree)
*Leptospermum scoparium* 'Nichollsii' (Manuka)
*Ligustrum japonicum* (Japanese Privet)
*Linum trigynum* (French Flax)
*Olearia tertiflora*
Philadelphus coronarius (Sweet Mock Orange)
Philadelphus HC 'Grandiflora'
Pittosporum undulatum (Sweet Pittosporum)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Podalyria calypttrata var. grandiflora
Prunus mume (Flowering Apricot)
Prunus persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus spp (Flowering Plums)
Rhododendron spp 'Pink Pearl' (Rhododenron)
Rhus spp
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Rosa spp (Bush and Standard Roses)
Russelia equisetiformis syn. Russelia juncea (Coral plant)
Spirea spp
Syringa vulgaris (Lilac)
Viburnum tinus (Laureustinus)
Virgilia oroboides syn. Virgilia capensis (Cape Lilac, Tree-In-A-Hurry)
Weigela florida
Weigela spp

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Adiantum capillus-veneris (Maidenhair Fern)
Ageratum spp
Alcea rosea 'Emperor' (Hollyhock)
Amaranthus spp
Anemone coronaria
Antirrhinum majus 'Vesuvius', 'The Fawn', 'Orange Prince', 'Rose Dore', 'Fascination',
'Cottage Maid', Coral Pink', 'Maize Queen', 'Commimea', 'Bonfire', Golden Morn'
(Snapdragon)
Aquillegia (Columbine)
Aster spp (annual) 'Giant Crego'
Bellis perennis (English Daisy)
Celosia spp (Cockscomb)
Dahlia HC 'Coltness Gem', 'Dwarf Scarlet', 'Sunshine', 'Squirrel', 'Jewel'
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'
Delphinium x belladona
Dianthus perennial (Carnation)
Erysimum cheiri 'Paris Market' (Wallflower)
Geum HC 'Mrs Bradshaw', 'Lady Stathdene', 'Karkoo'
Gladiolus HC 'Marie Leon', 'America', 'Beatrice Marion'
Gypsophila paniculata (Baby's Breath)
Heuchera sanguinea
Iberia amara (Candytuft)
Ixia spp
Linaria spp (Toadflax)
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Matthiola incana 'Beauty of Nice', 'Mammoth'
Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)
Narcissus spp 'Princep', 'Emperor', 'Lord Roberts', 'King Alfred', 'Volunteer',
'Victoria', 'Golden Bell', 'Avelot', 'Lord Kitchener', 'Michael', 'Van Wauerens Giant',


'Empress', 'Conspicuous', 'Beauty', 'Gwyther', 'Poeticus', 'Gloria Mundi', 'Mrs Walter Ware',
*Nemesia* spp
*Nemophila* spp
*Nephrolepis cordifolia* (Sword Fern)
*Papaver nudicaule* (Iceland Poppy)
*Papaver rhoeas* (Shirley Poppy)
*Pelargonium* spp ‘Nurse Cavells’
*Pericallis* x *hybrida* (Cineraria)
*Petunia* x *hybrida* 'Blue Velvet' and 'Feltham Beauty' strain, 'Lavender Queen', 'Rose Queen'
*Phlox drummondii* (Annual Phlox)
*Phlox paniculata* (Border Phlox)
*Portulacca* spp
*Primula* malacoides
*Primula* Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
*Primula* spp ‘Princess Mary’ (Primula)
*Ranunculus asiaticus*
*Reseda odorata* (Mignonette)
*Salpiglossis* spp (Painted Tongue)
*Salvia* spp
*Scabiosa columbaria* (Scabious)
*Tagetes* spp 'Guinea Gold' (Marigold)
*Tulipa* spp
*Verbena* spp.
*Viola odorata* 'King' (King Violets)
*Viola* HC (Viola, Pansy) 'Blue Papilio Viola', 'Lutea Viola', 'Snow Queen Viola'
'Scotch Exhibition Pansy', 'Lord Beaconsfield Pansy'
*Zea* spp (Rainbow Maize)
*Zinnia angustifolia* syn. *Zinnia linearis*
*Zinnia elegans*

**Climbers**
*Clematis montana*
*Clematis montana* var. *rubens* syn. *Clematis montana rubens*
*Lathyrus odoratus* (Sweet Pea)
*Lathyrus pubescens* (Blue Perennial Pea)
*Parthenocissus quinquefolia* (Virginia Creeper)
*Wisteria* spp.

**Hedges**
*Ceanothus* spp
*Coleonema* spp syn. *Diosma* spp
*Coprosma* spp
*Cupressus macrocarpa* ‘Horizontalis’ syn. *Cupressus lambertiana horizontalis*
*Cupressus torulosa* (Bhutan Cypress)
*Dovyalis caffra* (Kaffir Apple)
*Genista* spp, *Cytisus* spp (Yellow Broom)
*Ligustrum ovalifolium* 'Aureum' (Golden Privet)
*Lycium* spp (Box-Thorn)
Olea spp (Olive)
Pittosporum spp
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Rhamnus spp (Buckthorn)
Rosa spp 'Orleans' (Rose)
Tecoma capensis (Cape Honeysuckle)

Appendix 5H - Typical Plants used by Herbert Sydney Hartshorne

Note: This plant list has been compiled from the planting lists that accompanied Hartshorne’s garden plans. In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Hartshorne referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

*Abelia* spp
*Acer* spp (Maple)
*Bambusa* spp (Bamboo)
*Berberis thunbergii* 'Atropurpurea' (Purple-leaved Japanese Barberry)
*Berberis wilsoniae* (Wilson Barberry)
*Brugmansia candida* 'Knightii'
*Brugmansia x insignis* syn. *Brugmansia sanguinea* 'Rosea'
*Buddleja veitch* (Probably a *Buddleja davidii* variety (Butterfly Bush))
*Buxus* spp (box)
*Ceanothus* spp
*Cercatoctis willmottianum* (Chinese Plumbago)
*Cercis siliquestrum* (Judas Tree)
*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* 'Pendula Aurea'
*Choisya ternata* (Mexican Orange Blossom)
*Chorizema cordatum* (Heart-leafed Flame Pea)
*Chorizema* spp
*Cotoneaster microphyllus* (Small-leaved Cotoneaster)
*Cotoneaster* spp
*Cupressus horizontalis* 'Aurea'
*Cupressus sempervirens* (Italian Cypress)
*Cupressus sempervirens* 'Stricta' (Italian Cypress)
*Cupressus torulosa* (Bhutan Cypress)
*Deeringia* spp
*Deutzia crenata*
*Duranta ellesi*
*Duranta erecta* syn. *Duranta plumerri* (Golden Bead Tree)
*Duranta* spp
*Elaeagnus pungens* (Silverberry)
*Escallonia rubra* var. *macrantha*
*Escallonia* spp
*Eucalyptus* spp (Gum)
*Euonymus fortunei* var. *radicans* syn. *Euonymus radicans*
*Euonymus* spp
*Exochorda racemosa* 'Alberti' syn. *Spirea grandiflora* 'Alberti'
*Fabiana imbricata* (Pichi)
*Feijoa sellowiana* (Pineapple Guava)
*Felecia angustifolia*
*Fraxinus* spp (Ash)
*Fucshia* spp
*Genista ? smithii*
*Genista monospernum*
Genista x spachiana syn. Genista fragrans
Grevillea spp
Hebe hulkeana syn. Veronica hulkeana
Hebe x andersonii syn. Veronica andersonii
Hypericum spp
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Juniperus spp (Juniper)
Lagerstromia spp (Crape Myrtle)
Lantana camara 'Chelsea Gem'
Lantana camara 'Gol Gol'
Lantana spp 'T de C'
Lantana spp 'Vanusta'
Leptospermum scoparium 'Nichollsii' (Manuka)
Ligustrum ovalifolium 'Elegant' (Oval-Leaved privet)
Lonicera nitida (Box Honeysuckle)
Lonicera tartarica (Tatarian Honeysuckle)
Luculia gratissima
Malus spp (Crab Apple)
Melia azedarach (White Cedar)
Nandina domestica (Sacred Bamboo)
Nerium oleander (Oleander)
Pavonia spp
Pittosporum undulatum (Sweet Pittosporum)
Plumbago auriculata syn. Plumbago capensis (Cape Plumbago)
Podalyria 'Grandiflora'
Populus alba var. bolleana
Populus nigra (Italian Poplar)
Populus nigra 'Lombardy' (Lombardy Poplar)
Prostanthera rotundifolia
Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardi' (Red-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus serrulata (Japanese Flowering Cherry)
Prunus x blireana (Double Pink Flowering Plum)
Psidium spp (Guava)
Pyracantha 'August' syn. Crataegus pyracantha 'August'
Pyracantha crenulata syn. Crataegus crenulata (Himalayan Firethorn)
Pyracantha leylindii syn. Crataegus leylandii
Pyracantha rogersiana flava syn. Crataegus pyracantha rogersiana flava
Quercus robur (English Oak)
Quercus spp (Oak)
Rhus succedanea
Ribes sanguineum (Flowering Currant)
Rosa spp (Rose - Bush, Standard, Rambler)
Sesbania spp
Solanum capsicastrum (False Jerusalem Cherry)
Spirea spp
Spirea thunbergii (Thunberg Spirea)
Sterculia spp 'Aurea'
Syzygium paniculatum syn. Eugenia myrtifolia (Brush Cherry)
Tecoma capensis (Cape Honeysuckle)
Tetradenia spp syn. Iboza spp
Tibouchina 'Grandiflora' syn. Lasiandra 'Grandiflora'
Viburnum tinus (Laurustinus)
Weigela 'Rosea'
Wigandia spp

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Agapanthus spp.
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Felecia spp syn. Agathea spp (Marguerite Daisy)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Sternbergia spp (Autumn Crocus)
Tropaeolum majus (Nasturtium)
Watsonia spp (Bugle Lily)

Hedges
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)

Climbers
Solanum azureum

(Source: Herbert Sydney Hartshorne, 'Herbert Hartshorne'. Business records. State Library of South Australia, Archival Database.PRG 771, PRG 771/1/7, PRG 771/2/2, PRG 771/2/4, PRG 771/2/5, PRG 771/2/8, PRG 771/2/9, PRG 771/2/10/1, PRG 771/2/14, PRG 771/2/15, PRG 771/2/16, PRG 771/2/17, PRG 771/2/18, PRG 771/2/19, PRG 771/2/23, PRG 771/3/3, PRG 771/7/1, PRG 771/7/2.)
Appendix 5l - Typical Plants used by Russell S Ellis

Note: This plant list has been compiled from the planting lists that accompanied Ellis’ garden plans for the South Australian Homes and Gardens ‘Ideal Homes Garden Competition’. In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Ellis referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs
Acer spp (Maple)
Betula spp (Birch)
Cupressus sempervirens 'Stricta'? (Pine)
Eucalyptus spp (Gum)
Lavendula spp (Lavender)
Rosa (Rose standard and shrub)
various fruit trees

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Begonia spp
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Delphinium spp
Hyacinthus orientalis (Hyacinth)
Iris spp
Lobelia spp (Lobelia)
Petunia spp
Primula spp probably Polanthes Group (Primrose)
Ranunculus asiaticus (Ranuncula)
Viola HC (Pansy)
Zinnia spp

Climbers
Bougainvillea spp (Bougainvillea)
Clematis spp (Clematis)
Jasminum officinale (Jasmine)
Ipomoea purpurea (Morning Glory)
Rosa (Rose)
Vitis spp (Grape)

Appendix 5J - Typical Plants used by Mary A Parkhouse

Note: This plant list has been compiled from the planting list that accompanied Parkhouse’s garden plan for the South Australian Homes and Gardens ‘Ideal Homes Garden Competition’. In composing this list current plant names have been used where possible. Where a synonym is provided this is the name by which Parkhouse referred to the plant.

Trees & Shrubs

Abelia spp 'Hendersonii'
Acer tegundo 'Variegatum'
Bambusa puberula (Bamboo)
Bambusa textilis 'Gracilis' (Clumping Bamboo)
Berberis darwintii (Darwin Barberry)
Berberis thunbergii 'Atropurpurea'
Buxus spp (Box)
Ceratostigma spp
Chaenomeles japonica syn. Cydonia japonica 'Flore Plena' (Japanese Flowering Quince)
Chamaecyparis spp syn. Retinospora spp. (Dwarf form)
Chameliaucium uncinatum (Geraldton Waxflower)
Citrus Limon (Lemon)
Citrus reticulata (Mandarin)
Citrus sinensis (Orange)
Cotoneaster pammosa (Silver-leaved Cotoneaster)
Crataegus phaenopyrum syn. Crataegus cordata (Washington Hawthorn)
Daphne indica
Eucalyptus erythronema (Red-Flowering Mallee)
Eucalyptus torquata (Coral Gum)
Fraxinus ornus (Flowering Ash)
Fuschia spp
Hibiscus spp 'Conqueror'
Hydrangea spp
Hymenosporum flavum (Native Frangipani)
Hypericum spp
Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda)
Lagerstroemia indica (Crape Myrtle)
Lonicera nitida (Box Honeysuckle)
Luculia gratissima
Luculia spp
Malus pumila 'Eleyi' syn. Pyrus malus 'Eleyi' (Crab Apple)
Nandina domestica (Sacred Bamboo)
Pavetta caffra
Prunus armeniaca (Apricot)
Prunus persica (Peach)
Prunus x blireana 'Moseri' (Double Pink Flowering Plum)
Pyracantha angustifolia syn. Crataegus angustifolia (Orange Firethorn)
Pyracantha crenulata syn. Crataegus crenulata (Himalayan Firethorn)
Pyracantha leylandii
Rhaphiolepis umbellata syn. Rhaphiolepis ovata (Yeddo Hawthorn)
Rhus succedanea
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)
Royena lucida
Sophora japonica (Pagoda Tree)
Sorbus aucuparia (Rowan)
Spirea betulifolia var. corymbosa
Spirea thunbergii (Thunberg Spirea)
Viburnum tinus

Perennials, Annuals & Bulbs
Alcea rosea (Hollyhock)
Anemone coronaria (Florist's Anemone)
Aquilegia spp (Columbine)
Armeria spp (Thrift)
Aster spp 'October Dawn' (Michaelmas Daisy, Perennial Aster)
Boltonia spp (False Chamomile)
Canna x generalis 'Wyoming' (Canna Lily)
Chrysanthemum spp
Cynoglossum amabile (Chinese Forget-Me-Not)
Dahlia HC 'Star' and 'Charm'
Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly' (Blue Butterfly Delphinium)
Delphinium spp
Echinops spp
Gerbera spp
Gomphrena spp 'Aurea'
Hemerocallis HC (Daylily)
Heuchera sanguinea (Coral Bells)
Hyacinthoides spp syn. Scilla spp (Bluebell)
Hyacinthus orientalis (Hyacinth)
Iris ensata (Japanese iris)
Iris sibirica (Siberian Iris)
Iris unguicularis syn. Iris stylosa (Algerian Iris)
Lobularia maritima (Alyssum)
Muscari spp (Grape Hyacinth)
Narcissus spp (Daffodil)
Nemesia spp
Papaver nudicaule (Iceland Poppy)
Petunia spp 'Silver Lilac'
Phlox spp annual
Primula Polyanthus Group (Polyanthus)
Ranunculus asiaticus (Ranuncula)
Tagetes spp (Marigold)
Thalictrum spp
Thymus serpyllum (Creeping Thyme)
Viola HC 'Celestial Queen' (Pansy - Blue)
Zinnia spp
Climbers

Parthenocissus tricuspidata 'Veitchii' syn. Ampelopsis veitchii (Boston Ivy)
Clematis montana var. buchani
Distictis buccinatoria syn. Bignonia cherere
Hedera spp (Ivy)
Lonicera japonica 'Aurea-reticulata' (Yellownet Honeysuckle)
Mandervillea sauveolens
Passiflora edulis (Passionfruit)
Phaeseolus vulgaris (Climbing Bean)
Rosa spp (Climbing Rose 'Daily Mail', 'Lord Charlemont', 'Madame Abel Chatenay',
'Mabel Morse', 'Flying Colours', 'Jessie Clark')
Solanum wendlandii (Giant Potato Creeper)
Vitis spp
Wisteria spp

Hedges

Ceanothus divaricatus
Duranta ellisii
Lonicera nitida (Box Honeysuckle)

Rock Garden

Aquilegia (Columbine)
Campanula spp
Cotoneaster microphyllus (Small-leaved Cotoneaster)
Dianthus spp (Rock Pink)
Ferns various
Hebe hartiana syn. Veronica hartiana (Purple Veronica)
Penstemon heterophyllus (Foothills Penstemon)
Primula spp (Primrose)
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary prostrate form)
Thalictrum spp

(Source: Mary A. Parkhouse, 'A Garden All the Year Round', South Australian Homes and Gardens March 1935, pp. 28-9.)
Appendix 6A - Typical Plants used by Cornish

Note: This list of plants has been composed from annotated photographs, period media reports, period photographs and from the series of interviews conducted with individuals whose families had commissioned Cornish to design their gardens. It is therefore not an exhaustive list but rather an indicative one and includes plants suited to both Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills.

Trees & Shrubs

Acer palmatum (Japanese Maple)
Aesculus spp (Horse Chestnut)
Bambusa spp (Bamboo)
Betula pendula (Silver Birch)
Boronia spp
Boronia megastigma (Brown Boronia)
Brachychiton acerifolius (Illawarra Flame Tree)
Brachychiton populneus (Kunajong)
Buxus spp (Box)
Buxus sempervirens (English Box)
Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca' (Atlas Cedar)
Cedrus spp (Cedar)
Celtis australis (Hackberry)
Cercis siliquastrum (Judas Tree)
Chaenomeles japonica
Cinclus limon (Lemon)
Corymbia citriodora syn. Eucalyptus citriodora (Lemon-scented Gum)
Corymbia maculata syn. Eucalyptus maculata (Spotted Gum)
Cryptomeria spp
Cupressus macrocarpa 'Horizontalis'
syn. Cupressus lambertiana horizontalis (Lambert Cypress)
Cupressus macrocarpa syn. Cupressus lambertiana (Lambert Cypress)
Cupressus sempervirens 'Italica' (Italian Cypress)
Cupressus spp (Golden Cypress)
Cupressus torulosa (Bhutan Cypress)
Cytisus spp (Broom)
Eucalyptus dalrympleana (Mountain Gum)
Eucalyptus microcarpa (Grey Box)
Fagus sylvatica (European Beech)
Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)
Fuchsia spp
Genista spp (Broom)

Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak)
Hibiscus syriacus
Hydrangea macrophylla
Hydrangea spp
Jacaranda mimosifolia
Laurus nobilis (Bay Tree)
Lavandula spp (Lavender)
Lonicera spp (Honeysuckle)
Magnolia grandiflora (Magnolia)
Melia azedarach var. australasica (White Cedar)
Myrtus communis (Myrtle)
Nerium oleander (Oleander)
Platamis x acerifolia (London Plane Tree)
Populus nigra 'Italica' (Lombardy Poplar)
Prunus cerasifera (Purple-leaved Flowering Plum)
Prunus spp (Flowering)
Prunus x amygdalo-persica (Flowering Peach)
Prunus x blierana (Pink Flowering Plum)
Quercus coccinea (Scarlet Oak)
Quercus ilex (Holm Oak)
Quercus robur (English Oak)
Rhus succedanea
Robinia pseudoacacia (False Acacia)
Rosa (Rose) 'Crimson Glory'
Rosa spp (Shrub, Dwarf, Standard, Pillar, Climbing Roses)
Rosmarinus officinalis (Rosemary)
Syringa vulgaris (Lilac)
Taxus baccata (Yew)
Tilia spp (Lime)
Ulmus procera (European Elm)
Veronica spp (Mistletoe)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perennials, Annuals &amp; Bulbs</th>
<th>Primula Polyanthus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acanthus mollis (Oyster Plant)</td>
<td>Primula vulgaris (Primrose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agapanthus spp</td>
<td>Ranunculus asiaticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone coronaria</td>
<td>Ranunculus spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone spp</td>
<td>Salvia spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antirrhinum majus (Snapdragon)</td>
<td>Sansevieria cylindrica (Cylinder Snake Plant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tango'</td>
<td>Santolina chamaecyparissus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegia spp (Columbine)</td>
<td>Schizanthus spp (Poor Man's Orchid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellis perennis (English Daisy)</td>
<td>Thymus spp (Thyme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campanula spp</td>
<td>Tropaeolum majus cvs (Nasturtium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna x generalis (Canna Lily)</td>
<td>Viola HC (Pansy, Viola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna HC (Canna Lily)</td>
<td>Viola HC ('Papilio' Violas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerastium tomentosum (Snow-in-Summer)</td>
<td>Viola odorata (Violet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocus vernus (Dutch Crocus)</td>
<td>Zantedeschia aethiopica (Arum Lily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclamen spp</td>
<td>(Alpine Daisies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium grandiflorum 'Blue Butterfly'</td>
<td>Climbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianthus spp (Pinks)</td>
<td>Hedera helix (English Ivy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigaea repens (Ground Laurel)</td>
<td>Ipomoea spp (Morning Glory Vine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erigeron spp</td>
<td>Lathyrus odoratus (Sweet Pea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erysimum cheiri (Wallflower)</td>
<td>Parthenocissus quinquefolia (Virginia Creeper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferns Various</td>
<td>Rosa spp (Climbing Rose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladiolus spp (Gladioli)</td>
<td>Vitis spp (Grape Vine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuchera spp</td>
<td>Wisteria floribunda (Japanese Wisteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyacinthoides spp (Bluebell)</td>
<td>Succulents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris spp</td>
<td>Aeonium spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachenalia spp (Cape Clowslip)</td>
<td>Agave americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linaria spp (Toadflax)</td>
<td>Agave attenuata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippia philacanecens (Lippia)</td>
<td>Agave spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobularia maritima (Sweet Alyssum)</td>
<td>Aloe spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus spp (Lupin)</td>
<td>Aupertia spp syn. Memembryanthemum (Pigface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolmia maritima (Virginia Stock)</td>
<td>Argyroderma delaeitii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscaria spp (Grape Hyacinth)</td>
<td>Pelargonium spp (Geranium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myosotis sylvatica (Forget-Me-Not)</td>
<td>Pennisetum spp (Fountain Grass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus bulbocodium (Hoop-Petticoat Daffodil)</td>
<td>Penstemon spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus spp (Daffodils)</td>
<td>Pericallis x hybridra (Cinereria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepeta cataria (Catmint)</td>
<td>Petunia spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrolepis cordifolia (Fishbone Fern)</td>
<td>Phlox paniculata (Border or Summer Phlox)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelargonium spp</td>
<td>Phormium spp (New Zealand Flax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primula malacoides</td>
<td>Primula malacoides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carpobrotus spp syn.
Memembryanthemum (Pigface)
Copiapoa tenuissima
Dinteranthus microspermums
Echeveria spp
Lampranthus spp syn.
Memembryanthemum (Pigface)
Mølephora spp syn.
Memembryanthemum (Pigface)
Opuntia spp

Sempervivum spp
? syn. Agave fourcroya gigantea variegata

Ponds
Iris spp
Isolepis nodosa (Knobby Clubrush)
Nymphaea spp (Waterlily)
Typha latifolia (Bullrush)

(Source: See Chapter Three and Appendices 3A, 3C-3E for detailed references to each of these plants.)
Appendix 6B - ‘Her Garden’ by Elsie Marion Cornish

HER GARDEN.

Elsie M. Cornish.

"O, come with me and we will go among green things."

This call, holding out to us as it does such promise of good things—rest, beauty, healing—proves irresistible and we drop our work and find our way to the garden in search of these longed-for blessings. Through an open window we step down on to a paved terrace beautified with hydrangeas and standard roses growing in green painted tubs. Trees from the avenue which form the drive throw a welcome shade across one end, and here is a seat where we will rest for a few moments in full enjoyment of the scene. The house is partly covered with creepers, giving a soft green effect. Crossing the terrace, which is separated from the Rose Garden by a low balustrade, we descend a few steps and find ourselves on a lovely lawn set with beds of roses and delphiniums. In the centre of the paved path, which runs through this rose garden, is an old-world sundial, and on either side is a wide shrubbery with trees in the background. We gaze on all ere continuing our way through a rose-covered arch, and here we make a pause before descending some more steps. Sheer delight makes us catch our breath. What is it that is so arresting? A still pool of shining water set in vivid green grass. Clumps of iris are grouped round the paved margin, and a tree grows nearby, its reflection thrown back in added glory. We are now facing westwards at eventide and the crimson glow of the sunset breaking through the tree on to the water makes a never-to-be-forgotten picture. Iris bloom in the beds against the low retaining walls, iris of every shade, filling us with wonder and delight. On our right and facing us there is still the shrubbery backed with tall trees forming a secluded enclosure.

It always seems to me that no part of a garden is more satisfying, more “answering,” as A. A. Milne uses the word, than a well-planned water garden surrounded by trees—cool, quiet, lovely. At all hours of the day, and of the night, too, the water has something to show us—blue sky, feecy clouds, storm clouds, moon breaking through, and above all the vivid sunsets with which we are so often blest. Their reflections come back to us glorified, forming an ever-varying succession of pictures.

On our left, stepping-stones direct us to an archway in a cypress hedge, and passing through we find ourselves in a little dell with daffodils all a-blow. They look so happy and gay in their sheltered corner as we leave and turn to look back at their friendly faces, which seem to watch us as we go. In a leafy walk bordered with primroses there are forget-me-nots everywhere. This leads us in a gradual ascent through the shrubbery, and so back to the house. This walk had been so carefully planned that we had
not realised its existence as we went down the garden. It has a beauty all
its own, and though hidden away, forms a very real part of the garden.
There is great charm in coming unexpectedly on hidden gardens, but it is
very important that the approaches to them should be natural, and we
should be able to say of them that they were needed to complete the whole.

Ere we turn on to the Terrace, a glimpse is caught through an open-
ing in another hedge, of beds of gaily-coloured flowers; and again more trees
beyond form a background.

It has all been very satisfying, and we re-enter the house refreshed
mentally and spiritually, our cares forgotten. Such a garden as this is not
for one country or clime alone. It is universal. South Australia is growing
even as a garden grows, and we may have gardens like this one we have
tried to describe. It might be in the hills in a setting of English trees, or
somewhere amongst gums and other native trees, many of them of
great beauty. We have found that most of the beautiful trees of other lands
have almost naturalised themselves here, and we are planting them more
and more, but we are learning, too, the value and beauty of our native trees
and flowers, and making better use of them. We have not known them very
well, and they have been difficult to procure, and so have been neglected.
However, a far wider range is now being made available to us. We have,
indeed, wonderful opportunities for garden-making, for surely in no other
climate will such an endless variety of plant life flourish in a given space.

This, our Centenary Year, will be marked in many different ways,
but it is to our gardens we must look to provide the great pageant of the
Spring.

(Source: Brown, Louise, et al (eds), A Book of South Australia Women in the First
Hundred Years. Adelaide, Rigby, 1936, pp. 164-5.)
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