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Editorial – On the Diversity of Cultural Landscapes and the Implications for Management

The concept of ‘cultural landscape’ is a powerful tool for heritage conservation. Cultural landscapes allow the relationships of cultural heritage items to be recognised and conserved and for the cultural heritage to be conserved in its setting. Cultural landscapes also recognise the diverse and complex relationships across the cultural and natural domains, allowing the dynamic interplay between human activity and the natural environment to be appreciated.

The conservation of ‘cultural landscapes’ can perhaps be seen as a ‘cultural systems’ conservation approach, with different types of cultural landscape representing, what in biological terms are recognised as, different ecologies. Such an approach provides benefits for cultural heritage conservation that are far outweighed, and cannot be reproduced, by the conservation of individual heritage items, even collectively.

Such systems are extremely complex and dynamic. They are generally not bounded, so are difficult to define; they contain multitudinous and diverse elements; due to changes over time, they may be palimpsests (i.e., have elements and patternings from different time periods); and because of the complex interrelationships, they are rarely patterned in an easily recognisable way.

Cultural landscapes have the same qualities, albeit to different degrees depending on the individual cultural landscape, and this poses a range of challenges for their recognition, definition, assessment and long term conservation. There are additional challenges in conserving cultural landscapes, including the changing nature of a cultural landscape due to ongoing, changing use; to environmental transformation; and to the management and political context in which the cultural landscape occurs.

Further, given the longevity and diversity of human cultures and the variability of the environment, cultural landscapes will inevitably have diverse natures. Although the ‘cultural landscape’ concept has a European foundation of highly modified, land-based landscapes, there has been growing recognition that cultural landscapes can include a diversity of environments (e.g., water, the sky/outer space). Varying amounts, and different types, of natural environment within a landscape also contribute to the recognition of increasingly diverse cultural landscapes. This diversity also poses challenges for cultural landscape protection and management.

The aim of the Australia ICOMOS Symposium Cultural Landscape Diversity and the Implications for Management held in Hobart, Tasmania, on the 10th November 2018, was to explore this diversity and complexity by focussing on the implications of these aspects for the successful conservation of cultural landscapes. A short film, milaythina pakana (Aboriginal land), produced by the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre, and ten papers were presented at the Symposium. The presentations explored various examples of cultural landscapes, their nature and diversity, and the success or otherwise of their management frameworks. A number of presentations evaluated existing cultural landscape conservation frameworks.

Nine of the papers presented at the symposium are reproduced here.
In the first paper, Steve Brown introduces some of the multiple meanings of cultural landscape and considers the usage of the concept with regard to the UNESCO World Heritage List and the Australian National Heritage List. He outlines some of the challenges for identifying, documenting, and managing cultural landscapes – such as better incorporating Indigenous/First Nations values and improving connections across nature cultures. Brown highlights the broadening challenges for heritage conservation, as most recently incorporated into the 2015 World Heritage Sustainability Policy, including calls for achieving gender equality, implementing rights-based approaches, and fostering peace and security.

Focusing on the heritage of towns and cities, Elizabeth Vines asks if the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) approach is applicable and useful in the Australian context? Vines finds that there has been some progress made in implementing key components of the approach, yet much remains to be done. In Australia, the HUL approach has been used successfully in Ballarat since 2013 and is being explored for Canberra. Vines is also of the view that ‘in Australia, the HUL model is being promoted as a tool to assist in the retention of the special character of a wide range of urban heritage areas, expanding beyond Burra Charter methodology, to provide the flexibility and wide ranging, creative solutions to urban heritage challenges.’

Turning to lutruwita/Tasmania, Anne McConnell uses four very different local cultural landscapes examples, to explore how different planning and management contexts affect the recognition and preservation of cultural landscapes. McConnell argues for the importance of properly embedding cultural landscape concepts and approaches into the various formal planning contexts. McConnell’s review suggests that considerably more work is required to recognise and adequately provide for cultural landscape conservation at the local government planning level and at the Tasmanian state government heritage conservation level; and that strengthened planning is also required where cultural landscapes occur in conservation contexts, such as national parks.

In an examination of the history and heritage of the wheat industry in New South Wales (NSW), Iain Stuart argues that landscapes of wheat production and transport should be considered as industrial landscapes, as such recognition assists in understanding their heritage significance. Through an outline of the history of the wheat industry in NSW, including in relation to changing patterns of land ownership, scientific studies of wheat genetics, changing technologies and expanding transport networks, Stuart concludes that there has been a lack of systematic heritage study of the wheat industry at a range of levels, including as cultural/industrial landscapes, and that this has resulted in a lack of recognition of this significant aspect of NSW history and heritage, which has further led to their under representation in the various heritage registers.

Moving from the cultural landscape framework studies, the papers turn to focus on the management of diverse cultural landscape values. Flavia Kiperman begins this second part of the edited volume by examining the challenge of incorporating all forms of urban heritage into the World Heritage listed cultural landscape of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. In particular, Kiperman provides a history of the favela, largely illegal settlements associated with poverty, segregation, violence and drugs, but also places of solidarity and sociability, charity and community among disadvantaged Brazilians. The paper explores the inter-relationship between the diverse heritage values of the favelas and the low income
neighbouring communities in which they occur, including their positive influences on the local economy and society.

Taking us from one southern hemisphere urban cultural landscape to another, Hector Abrahams writes of the challenges faced in retaining the Indigenous-colonial cultural landscape of Parramatta (land of the Burramattagal peoples), Sydney. Abrahams presents and illustrates a number of key strategies, drawn from an urban cultural landscape perspective, for ameliorating the impact of rapidly increasing high rise development, including assessing impact for all developments in all parts of the city; ensuring a positive setting and appropriate surrounding space for statutory heritage items; maintaining the rhythm of the landscape and readability of early 19th century subdivision patterns; ensuring the footprint for new structures, no matter what height, sit within the historic urban grid; and avoiding overshadowing of important heritage places.

Travelling to Australia’s capital city, Canberra - ‘the bush capital’, Juliet Ramsay examines the challenges of conserving the heritage attributes and values of Lake Burley Griffin and its associated lakeshore landscape – a 20th century ‘modern picturesque’, designed landscape, which is the visual centrepiece of Canberra. Ramsay provides an historical account of the creation of Lake Burley Griffin and subsequent ‘battles’ over the protection and conservation of the Lake and its setting. The paper details the most recent development proposal, that of infill apartment development and partial Lake infill in West Basin, which will impact on the form of the lakeshore and the Lake’s design, as well as result in the loss of open space on the Lake Edge and broader visual impacts. Using the work of the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians, a local advocacy group, as a basis, Ramsay also touches on advocacy and direct action approaches that might be enacted by communities concerned with protecting the cultural/natural heritages of urban parklands.

Gwenda Sheridan’s paper shifts the focus of the volume from urban to rural cultural landscapes, specifically that of the historic (established in 1821) Cambria estates, a complex of several adjacent historic farming properties on the east coast of Tasmania. Sheridan details the broad landscape values derived from the setting and layout of the Cambria estates within its larger landscape context, as well as the numerous micro-landscape values. Sheridan argues that the early 19th century land grant pattern of the Cambria colonial landscape, as well as many finer grained designed landscape elements, remain largely intact (echoing similar observations by Anne McConnell for the Bagdad Valley early colonial rural cultural landscape, Tasmania, and Hector Abrahams for the cultural landscape of Parramatta, NSW). As with these two latter landscapes, the Cambria Estate landscape is under threat from proposed development and a local council seemingly unwilling to respect the landscape character of this colonial estate, as well as local community concerns to see this landscape remain essentially rural.

In the final paper in the volume, Ursula de Jong examines the task for Parks Victoria of implementing the 2018 master plan for the 560 hectare Point Nepean National Park. De Jong finds that implementing the Point Nepean National Park Master Plan will be an onerous responsibility because of the many competing priorities. These include issues associated with separating natural and cultural heritage; better connecting tangible and intangible heritage; and the demands and expectations on the part of communities wanting involvement in heritage conservation and interpretation processes and practices. In fact, these are challenges echoed, to varying degrees, across all of the papers in this volume.
We hope that this collection of reflections on cultural landscape offers useful insights into the nature and management complexities of cultural landscapes, and will assist an increasing and broader recognition of cultural landscapes, and their protection.

We also take this opportunity to thank all those who participated in the Symposium, in particular the presenters who transformed their presentations into papers for these Proceedings, as well as those colleagues who kindly reviewed the papers. The Symposium also relied heavily on volunteer assistance, and we thank those Australia ICOMOS and Cultural Heritage Practitioner Tasmania members who volunteered their time. The Symposium was held under the auspices of the Australia ICOMOS National Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes and Cultural Routes, and we particularly thank Kieran Davies and Sue Rosen, Co-convenors of the National Scientific Committee, for their support and assistance.

**Anne McConnell and Steve Brown**

Editors
Biographical Notes
[Alphabetical Order]

Hector Abrahams
B. Sc. (Architecture) (Hons), B. Architecture, FRAIA, M ICOMOS

Hector Abrahams is a Sydney based architect with many years’ practice in the areas of conservation, heritage, cultural projects, master planning and adaptive re-use. His interest in cultural landscapes began at university. Hector is immediate past Chair of the Heritage Committee for the Australian Institute of Architects (NSW) and serves on Australia ICOMOS Heritage Fabric Conservation Reference Group. He is the principal of the Sydney based firm, Hector Abrahams Architects.

Steve Brown
Ph. D., M. ICOMOS

Steve Brown is an honorary associate with the Museum and Heritage Studies Program at the University of Sydney, Australia. His research interests include: conceptualising and operationalising place-attachment in heritage theory and practice; the integration of naturecultures in the heritage management of protected areas; and the material culture of domestic homes and gardens. Steve is the author of Cultural Landscapes: A Practical Guide for Park Management (2010) and co-editor of Object Stories: Artifacts and Archaeologists (2015), Cultural and Spiritual Significance of Nature in Protected Areas: Governance, Management and Policy (2018), and a forthcoming Rutledge volume, Handbook on Cultural Landscape Practice. He is a member of Australia ICOMOS and the immediate past-president of the ICOMOS/IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes. Steve is a member of the IUCN-WCPA CSVPA and Specialist Group on Protected Landscapes.

Ursula de Jong
Ph. D., M. ICOMOS

Ursula de Jong is Associate Professor in the School of Architecture and Built Environment at Deakin University, Geelong where she works in architectural history and place. Between 2014 and 2018 she was Associate Head of School (Teaching and Learning); and she is now Director of GEDI – gender, equity, diversity and inclusion. Ursula is also Deputy Chair of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria); a member of the Victorian National Parks Advisory Council; a member Point Nepean National Park Management Advisory Committee; President of the Nepean Conservation Group Inc.; and a member National Liturgical Architecture and Art Board. She is a full international member of ICOMOS and founding member of SAHANZ.
Flavia Kiperman  
M. ICOMOS

Flavia is the current Western Australian representative of the Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee and has been a member of the Australian National Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes and Cultural Routes since 2014 and has recently become a member of the International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes. Flavia’s international experience has led her to take a holistic approach to assessing cultural values. In the past, she has worked on many sites in Rio de Janeiro that today form part of Rio’s World Heritage Cultural Landscape, such as the Santa Cruz Fortress, Valongo Wharf and Gardens and Sugar Loaf. Currently, as Principal - Heritage at Element Advisory in Western Australia, she is working on the Cossack Cultural Landscape Management Plan and the ‘New Museum Perth’ among many other projects in Western Australia.

Anne McConnell  
B. Sc., M. B. Lit. (Archaeology), M. Sc. (Quaternary Geoscience), M. ICOMOS

Anne is a Tasmanian based heritage consultant working in both Aboriginal and historic heritage with over 30 years cultural heritage management experience. Anne’s working interest in cultural landscapes started in the early 1990s when, as Senior Archaeologist with the then Tasmanian Forestry Commission, she explored the notion of historic mining fields as historic landscapes. Since then Anne has worked on a number of projects with a cultural landscapes component or on places with cultural landscape values or important setting values. These, and a long term involvement in protected area management, have allowed her to work on Aboriginal landscapes, convict landscapes, early colonial landscapes, orcharding landscapes, historic mining landscapes, scenic tourism and recreational landscapes and science research landscapes.

Juliet Ramsay  
M. ICOMOS

Juliet Ramsay trained in landscape architecture and worked for 16 years in heritage for the Australian Commonwealth Government. She is an honorary member of the ICOMOS-IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes and collaborated with members of the committee to prepare The Aesthetic Value of Landscapes Background and Assessment Guide. Together with Sandy Blair, Juliet formed a heritage group on cultural landscapes and cultural routes that later became the first Australia ICOMOS National Scientific Committee. Although retiring from employment in 2009, Juliet continued to be active in heritage landscape issues. In 2015, she formed, and continues to be highly active in, an advocacy group to protect the heritage values of Lake Burley Griffin.
Gwenda Sheridan
M. ICOMOS

Gwenda Sheridan was part of the teams that documented the heritage values that resulted in ‘Brickendon’ and ‘Woolmers’, Tasmania, being included in the *Australian Convict Sites* inscription on the World Heritage List in 2006-2007. Gwenda has been a corporate member of the Planning Institute of Australia for 28 years; and is a member of Australia ICOMOS and a member of Australia ICOMOS’ National Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes and Cultural Routes. Gwenda has twenty two years’ experience of consultant research and report writing for various organisations in Tasmania on planning, historical landscape planning, historical research, historical garden research and botanical history. She has published reports and in journals and books; delivered a great many talks and lectures on such subjects; and continues to research Tasmanian rural properties.

Iain Stuart
Ph. D., M. ICOMOS

Iain is a Partner in JCIS Consultants and Principal of Artefact Heritage Services. He has over 25 years’ professional experience in historical archaeology, history, heritage management, historical research, industrial archaeology, cultural landscapes and maritime archaeology. He has worked for Government and in private industry and is on a number of committees. He has a long term interest in rural landscapes and in industrial landscapes.

Elizabeth Vines
OAM, Ph. D., M. ICOMOS,

Elizabeth Vines is a conservation architect, and past President of Australia ICOMOS (2012 – 2015). She is passionate about heritage conservation and has worked throughout Australia and Asia on many different conservation projects. In 2016 she was a Getty Scholar for three months in Los Angeles researching Creative Heritage Cities; and in 2015 spent two months in Myanmar on an EU Conservation Project. She consults to UNESCO, the Getty Conservation Institute and other agencies in Asia on conservation issues. Elizabeth has written three books about urban heritage issues – *Streetwise* (1996), *Streetwise Asia* (2006) and *Streetwise Design* (2018 – resulting from her research at the Getty), in addition to her book *Broken Hill - A Guide to the Silver City* (2008). She is a partner in the firm McDougall & Vines (based in Adelaide) and regularly travels the globe to keep up with the latest in heritage conservation practice.
Cultural landscapes, World Heritage, and Australia’s National Heritage List: some reflections

Steve Brown
© The author, 2020

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of the idea of cultural landscapes and considers the usage of the concept with regard to cultural landscapes inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List (there are 114 out of 1,121 properties) and on the Australian National Heritage List. While the category of cultural landscapes is not typically specified on the latter register, I suggest that there is room on the National Heritage List for utilising the category to a greater degree – and in ways that correspond to, but do not necessarily follow, the World Heritage system; as well as to better link the diversity of Australia’s cultural landscapes to the Australian Historic Themes Framework. Finally I make some remarks regarding the Policy on the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2015) and its potential application to, and expansion of, Australia’s heritage management approaches. Amongst other points, the Sustainable Development Policy calls for achieving gender equality, implementing rights-based approaches (in particular with reference to Indigenous peoples), and fostering peace and security.

Experiencing Hobart

On a sunny day, central Hobart is an experiential landscape of delight. This is nowhere more affective than being in Franklin Square (refurbished in 2016), taking in the vista to the 1866 Hobart Town Hall, into Constitution Dock, and across Sullivan’s Cove and the Derwent River to the Bellerive Peninsula. In November, the city’s urbanscape is dotted with trees cascading with greener-than-green new foliage; the sandstone of 19th century facades radiating solidity and signifying long-time colonial presence; while the waters sparkle and shimmer as sunlight dances across rippled surfaces. It is a sight to behold. This was the welcoming setting, buffer zone even, for the 2018 Australia ICOMOS symposium on cultural landscapes.

Situating Cultural Landscapes

I begin with a very short overview of the idea of cultural landscapes. As Australian cultural geographer Lesley Head notes, cultural landscape is not just one idea, but ‘the concept of cultural landscape has changed over time and evokes a range of contrasting understandings in different regions of the world, different academic disciplines, and different government contexts’ (Head 2010, p.427). While there is a vast literature on the subject, cultural landscapes can be considered to encompass three meanings.
First, cultural landscape as object. In this tangible sense, cultural landscape can apply to a selected region of the earth that has been transformed by human-ecological intra-action. This usage is commonly applied in constructing heritage registers in order to list landscapes. An essential component of such listing is the need to inscribe boundaries (e.g., a water catchment boundary or delineated land parcels) in order that a circumscribed area is determined to be a cultural landscape (e.g., Budj Bim Cultural Landscape [Gunditjmara; Australia], Tongariro National Park [Ngāti Tūwharetoa; New Zealand]; Pimachiowin Aki [Anishinaabe / Canada]). To my mind, this is a legitimate use of cultural landscape though it is also an artificial selection process because all parts of the world’s surface are potentially cultural landscapes (and here I include seascapes and waterscapes), since the entirety of the earth’s surface has been transformed by human-ecological intra-action, as evident in the geological term Anthropocene. In this sense, the use of cultural landscape as an object (or ‘thing’) is only useful where the construct advances the understanding or integrated management of a heritage place.

Second, cultural landscape is a concept and process. While this usage incorporates cultural landscape as a tangible physical locale (or object), it is also broader and can encompass, for example, associative or symbolic landscapes, virtual spaces (Harrison 2009), and Historic Urban Landscapes. That is, cultural landscape as a concept is an intellectual construct that can be used to understand human-ecological systems that go beyond settlement patterns, land use patterns, and physical systems. This view is linked to the concept, arising in the late-1980s within ‘newer’ cultural geographies and archaeology and influenced by cultural studies, of landscape as process with a focus on the cultural meaning of the ordinary and everyday rather than necessarily the ‘monumental’ and extraordinary.

Third, cultural landscape can be considered a set of methods and tools. While such approaches may not be as explicit as the Historic Urban Landscape approach (UNESCO 2016), for example, there is a wide range of practices applied in landscape studies. These include landscape characterisation (Fairclough, Herlin and Swanwick 2018), landscape archaeology (David and Thomas 2008), biographical and biohydrological approaches (Kolen, Renes and Bosma 2018), literary representation (Kerridge 2019), aesthetics (Brook 2019; Ramsay 2017), a World Heritage approach (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2009), IUCN’s Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit (Hockings et al. 2008), approaches to protected areas (Brown, Mitchell and Beresford 2005; Brown 2010), and to which I would add approaches to cultural landscapes of outer space (Gorman 2019).

These three meanings can be applied in identifying an enormous diversity of cultural landscapes (adopting the first and second meanings described above) and are relevant to the ways in which they might be managed or safeguarded (the third meaning). Therefore, in considering the theme of the cultural landscape symposium – Cultural Landscape Diversity and the Implications for Management, I argue that thinking about cultural landscapes in the ways outlined above is useful because the different meanings link cultural landscape identification with a diversity of management tools.

1 Intra-action refers to the idea that people and ecology, nature and culture, are entangled and intertwined – thus inseparable - in their being and history. By contrast, interaction implies that cultural landscapes are the product of mixing of separate cultures and natures.
World Heritage and Cultural Landscapes

The notion of cultural landscape, which has a history extending back to 19th century Western thinking, came to global prominence through dialogues associated with matters related to World Heritage (WH). On 16 November 1972, the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) adopted the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972). The Convention is regarded as the first international doctrinal text to encompass ‘cultural and natural’ heritage. It did so, however, by drawing a sharp divide between these two categories (evidenced in the Convention by the separate and discrete definitions of cultural and natural heritage, for example).

In December 1992, after eight-years of global deliberations concerning rural landscapes, which then morphed into the broader concept of cultural landscapes – and following an expert meeting in La Petite Pierre in France in October 1992, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee adopted the category of ‘cultural landscape’ in December 1992 (for an historical perspective on this process, see Brown 2019). It did so however by recognising cultural landscape as a category of ‘cultural site’ – that is, as a category required to meet one of the six World Heritage cultural criteria, rather than being recognised for its equivalence across cultural and natural values. It should be noted, therefore, that this categorisation is out of step with much subsequent literature on cultural landscapes, which views them as expressing the interconnections, entanglements, and/or intra-actions between nature and culture (Brown 2017; Mitchell, Brown & Barrett 2017). For example, in 2001, Nora Mitchell and Susan Buggey proposed that:

\[ \text{A cultural landscape perspective explicitly recognises the history of a place and its cultural traditions in addition to its ecological value... A landscape perspective also recognises the continuity between the past and with people living and working on the land today.} \]


The report from the expert meeting at La Petite Pierre was largely adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1992, and continues to be used in the World Heritage Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2017, Annex 3). These guidelines use the following description:

\[ \text{Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the "combined works of nature and of man" } [\text{sic}] \text{ designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.} \]

(UNESCO 2017, paragraph 47).

This definition – though heavily influenced by environmental deterministic perspectives – aligns with the two meanings of cultural landscape described earlier in the paper; that is, cultural landscape as object (or in WH terminology, a nominated or listed property) and cultural landscape as a process (processes by which culture is influenced by nature and processes of change over time).

In the WH system, three categories of cultural landscape are recognised (Table 1). I have argued elsewhere (Brown 2019) that the nomenclature adopted for the WH cultural landscape categories in 1992 reflect a mix and combination of existing terms and derivative meanings, in turn linked to the disciplinary backgrounds and personal experience of those individuals participating in the La Petite Pierre expert meeting. In brief, ‘clearly defined landscape’ is primarily linked to Western notions of historic gardens and parks and the
discipline of landscape architecture as promoted by IFLA (International Federation of Landscape Architects); the phrase ‘organically evolved landscape’ owes much to vocabulary and antecedents in use at the time by IUCN in relation to national parks and protected areas; ‘relict (or fossil) landscapes’ (largely associated with the discipline of archaeology) and ‘continuing landscape’ hark back to existing terminology that was used widely, if somewhat variably, across the English-speaking heritage world in 1992; and the ‘associative landscape’ category is recognised for its originality and scope – largely linked to the contribution of Australian archaeologist Isabel McBryde (1984, 1987, for example).

Table 1  World Heritage cultural landscape categories (UNESCO 2017, Annex 3). (Source: Brown 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clearly Defined Landscape</td>
<td>The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by people. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (UK); West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou (China); Medici Villas &amp; Gardens in Tuscany (Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organically Evolved Landscape</td>
<td>The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two subcategories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Relict (or fossil) landscape</td>
<td>A relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan); Blaenavon Industrial Landscape (UK); Rock shelters of Bhimbetka (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Continuing landscape</td>
<td>A continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.</td>
<td>Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines); Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia (Colombia); Richtersveld Cultural &amp; Botanical Landscape (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associative Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.</td>
<td>Tongariro National Park (New Zealand); Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia); Papahānaumokuākea (USA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As at July 2019, there are 114 properties (of 1,121) designated as cultural landscapes on the UNESCO World Heritage List. This figure represents about 10% of all listed properties. It was noted as early as 2002 (Fowler 2003) that there are many other inscribed properties that fit the definition of cultural landscape (e.g., Kakadu National Park), though they have not been designated as such on the World Heritage List.
Australia has 20 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (12 natural, 5 mixed including the ‘Tasmanian Wilderness’, and 4 cultural sites – with Port Arthur, Coal Mines Historic Site, Cascades Female Factory, Darlington Probation Station, and Brickendon and Woolmers Estates forming part of the serial listing for the Australian Convict Sites). Two Australian properties are inscribed as cultural landscapes – Uluru-Kata Tjuka National Park (inscribed in 1994 as an associative landscape) and Budj Bim Cultural Landscape (inscribed in 2019; and the first Indigenous-led nomination from Australia; see Figure 1).

I turn now to examine two issues that are relevant to the identification, documentation, and management of World Heritage cultural landscapes, though note that these matters are also relevant to cultural landscapes designated under different thresholds (i.e., local, state, regional, national, as well as world heritage).

1. The separation of nature and culture

The 1972 World Heritage Convention was founded on the European-centred dichotomy or separation between nature and culture (on the latter, see Brown and Verschuuren 2019; Byrne, Brockwell and O’Connor 2013). Despite 47 years of operation, the work of the Convention continues to treat these domains as separate and divided. This situation remains in spite of the introduction of the cultural landscape category in 1992 and the creation of a single list of World Heritage criteria in 2005 (Buckley 2014; Buckley and Badman 2014).

However, recent collaborations by IUCN and ICOMOS have been undertaken that aim, ‘to explore, learn and create new methods that are centred on recognising and supporting the interconnected character of the natural, cultural and social values of highly significant land and seascapes’. These are the Connecting Practice project and the various ‘Nature-Culture/Culture-Nature Journeys’. The Connecting Practice project, launched in October 2013, has comprised three phases, each based on working with site managers and communities at specific World Heritage listed properties (Leitão and Badman 2015; IUCN-ICOMOS 2015, 2017). The ‘journeys’ comprise a continuing set of dialogues between IUCN and ICOMOS. These commenced with a Nature-Culture Journey at the IUCN World Conservation Congress (Hawaii, 2016) followed by a Culture-Nature Journey at the ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium (Delhi, India; 2017; McIntyre Tamwoy 2019). Both produced texts summarising the outputs of the work, discussions, and thinking undertaken (IUCN 2016; ICOMOS 2017). Subsequently, there has been a number of journey-style events held at different meetings across the globe, notable for a flow-down effect from the global to national and local levels. A milestone event in this project will take place at the 20th ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium in Sydney (1-10 October 2020) at which an agreement or memorandum will be signed between IUCN and ICOMOS.

So why is this work important? Of the many reasons, I will focus on two. First, the separation of nature and culture in Western thought and philosophy is widely recognised as having damaging impacts on non-Western, including First Nation, communities. Chinese

---

3 These are: **Phase I** - Petroglyphic Complexes of the Mongolian Altai (Mongolia), Konso (Ethiopia), Sian Ka’an (Mexico); **Phase II** - Hortobágy (Hungary), Maloti-Drakensberg (South Africa/Lesotho); **Phase III** - Cultural Sites of Al Ain (United Arab Emirates); Saloum Delta (Senegal), Cultural Landscape of Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice Terraces (China).
scholar Feng (Fran) Han (Han 2012) provides a good example. Han describes how the concept of cultural landscape has experienced difficulty in the areas of theory and practice in China, and with particular reference to the listing of the World Heritage properties of Lushan National Park (inscribed 1996; a spiritual mountain for Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism) and Mount Wutai (inscribed 2009; a sacred Daoist and Buddhist mountain). In essence, these listings as cultural landscapes (a form of ‘cultural site’, rather than as a ‘mixed site’ as originally proposed by China), severed ‘the inextricable connection of nature with landscape and cosmological beliefs’ (Han 2012, p. 91). In other words, inscribing such places as forms of cultural site served to work against Chinese philosophies of harmony and oneness with nature.

A second reason for the importance of the journeys is that they emphasise that the legislative, administrative, and field-based practices of natural and cultural heritage conservation are not well served by being managed separately. To use the example of the World Heritage listed Tasmanian Wilderness (sic), a mixed site inscribed under three cultural criteria and four natural criteria, a variety of legislation exists across natural and cultural (including the separation of Aboriginal and ‘historic’ cultural heritage) domains. These include the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, and Tasmanian State legislation including the Nature Conservation Act 2002, National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002, Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 and Aboriginal Heritage Act 1995. Ideally the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan (DPIPWE 2016) is the place where cultural and natural values are integrated. However, and typical of many such plans, cultural and natural values and management are treated separately (DPIPWE 2016, parts 2, 3, 5); though the plan calls for the recognition of the property as an ‘outstanding Aboriginal Cultural Landscape’ (DPIPWE 2016, pp. 103-104), in part to counter the use of the term ‘wilderness’ – a term meaning ‘empty’ and seen as denigrating of over 40,000 years of human occupation (Spence 1999). Thus in terms of legislative arrangements and management, natural and cultural values are treated as separate with minimal recognition of the entanglement of these categories and of significantly different Western and Indigenous cosmologies (on the latter, see tebrakunna country and Lee 2019).

2. Indigenous landscapes

A long-time challenge for WH practice has been the inability to recognise the heritage of First Nations as being of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) (UNESCO 2017, paragraphs 49-53), and thus being able to be inscribed on the WH List. Central to this issue is, first, the perceived difficulty of listing where significance to the local Indigenous nation/s will hold ‘precedence’ over OUV. That is, the typical Western hierarchy of thresholds (World as ‘highest’, local as ‘lowest’) is reversed in the sense that local significance can be greater to the relevant First Nation/s than exceptionality to all humanity. A second issue is resistance by First Nations groups to undertaking ‘comparative analysis’, an essential component of a WH nomination, which typically requires demonstration that a nominated property is the

5 ‘Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.’ (UNESCO 2017, paragraph 49).
6 ‘The comparative analysis shall explain the importance of the nominated property in its national and international context.’ (UNESCO 2017, paragraph 132)
most ‘stand out’ example of its type (Smith et al. 2019; UNESCO 2011, pp. 34, 67-73). Needless to say, First Nation communities have expressed a reluctance to argue that nominated parts of their home landscapes or territories demonstrate greater value/s, and are better conserved, than similar landscapes belonging to other such groups.

Nevertheless, and to the credit of the WH system, a number of properties are recognised for their Indigenous values and have been inscribed on the WH List. While early examples include Tongariro National Park (Ngāti Tūwharetoa / New Zealand; renomination 1993) and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Anangu / Australia; renomination 1994), both recognised as associative cultural landscapes, the greatest inroads in listing properties for their Indigenous values has been in recent times. In this regard Pimachiowin Aki (Anishinaabe / Canada, inscribed 2018, see Figure 2) was a significant milestone because the listing required the WH Committee to consider and address the two issues, amongst others, described above. Considerable work went into the dialogue between Anishinaabe communities, State Party (Canada), UNESCO WH Centre, and WH Committee over a number of years to work toward the successful inscription of the property. An outcome of this inscription, and the collaborative and innovative work undertaken to support its listing, has been that the precedent for the further listing of First Nation properties, many under the designation of cultural landscape, has been set. Thus, at the most recent WH Committee meeting (Baku, Azerbaijan, 30 June -10 July 2019) two further First Nation properties were added to the List – Budj Bim Cultural Landscape (Gunditjmara / Australia) and Writing-on-Stone / Áísínai’pi (Blackfoot / Canada).

In the case of Budj Bim Cultural Landscape, this inscription was notable as the first Indigenous-driven nomination from Australia (an aspiration expressed by the Gunditjmara as early as 1988), as well as being the only one of 20 Australian WH properties listed solely for its Indigenous values. I would note that ‘Indigenous values’ in this instance represents a complex cosmology of intertwined cultural/natural elements. While the framing of the nomination document (Commonwealth of Australia 2017) necessarily was made to fit two of the Western-derived, WH listing criteria – (iii) and (v), it is nevertheless significant for incorporating Gunditjmara world views; and thus a significant step in WH processes and practices.

While there is a tendency to see WH processes and practices as conservative and slow to change, the way in which the WH Committee has fostered and supported new understandings of heritage is remarkable. The work to more readily and respectfully enable the listing of First Nation properties is but one example of a long list of changes that application of the WH Convention has precipitated. These include: adoption of a WH Sustainability Policy in 2015 (Larsen and Logan 2018); fostering of rights-based approaches (Larsen 2018); efforts to better link natural and cultural heritage (discussed above); engagement with communities (Albert et al. 2012; Cameron and Rössler 2013, p. 122); changing notions of authenticity (ICOMOS 1994); and expanding definitions of heritage (e.g., historic gardens as dynamic forms of ‘monuments’ (ICOMOS 1982), and the introduction of conceptual categories such as cultural landscapes and cultural routes (Brown 2019; Gfeller 2013; UNESCO 2017, Annex 3).

Other important properties listed for their outstanding/local values include: Laponian Area (Sami / Sweden; inscribed 1996); Kuk Early Agricultural site (Kawelka customary owners / Papua New Guinea; inscribed 2008); and Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea (Inuit / Greenland, Denmark; inscribed 2018).
Australian National Heritage Places and Cultural Landscapes

The National Heritage List (NHL) is Australia’s list of natural, historic, and Indigenous places of outstanding significance to the nation. As at July 2019, there were 116 items inscribed on the list, being those places that have satisfied the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Energy, on the advice of the Australian Heritage Council, that they are assessed to have one or more national heritage values and meet a national significance threshold. That is, each place meets one of more of the nine NHL criteria and meets a threshold of ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’, a threshold that equates to being of ‘importance to the Australian community as a whole’. In accordance with the *Environment Protection Biodiversity and Conservation Act* 1999, any action that is likely to have a significant impact on a listed place must be referred to the Minister and undergo an environmental assessment and approval process.

In Tasmania, for example, there are 13 places on the NHL. In addition to the places that form part of Australia’s World Heritage serial listing of convict sites (i.e., Brickendon Estate, Cascades Female Factory and Cascades Female Factory Yard 4 North, Darlington Probation Station, Coal Mines Historic Site, Port Arthur Historic Site, and Woolmers Estate), they include the Jordan River Levee, Macquarie Island, Recherche Bay Area, Richmond Bridge, Tasmanian Wilderness, and Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape. Of these, it is only the latter that is designated as a cultural landscape. Drawing on the examples of the listings for Tasmania, I make two general comments regarding the NHL.

First, there is a discrepancy between the way in which UNESCO WH processes apply the concept of serial listing (i.e., a single WH property or site comprised of two or more unconnected areas (UNESCO 2017, paragraphs 137-139)), while the NHL does not. For example, the WH listed ‘Australian Convict Sites’ is a single property comprising 11 penal sites, which on the NHL are each individually registered places. Perhaps this is not such an issue for places with ‘many’ component parts (such as the Australian Convict Sites and Gondwana Rainforests of Australia), but it is messy when applied to places with only a few ‘serial’ components (Budj Bim Cultural Landscape and Cascades Female Factory, for example). To my mind, the NHL practice of separately listing interconnected places diminishes the significance of the collective of places over their individual importance (i.e., the capacity of the collective to demonstrate values greater than their individual parts).

Second, there is a lack of visibility of the heritage designation ‘cultural landscape’ on Australia’s NHL, which likely reflects the fact that the category is not always recognised in Federal or State/Territory heritage regimes (the category is widely used in Victoria for example, but less so in some other States/Territories). I suggest that there is greater room for the use of cultural landscape in the designation of nationally listed items; and that there is room for a diversity of cultural landscapes to be more closely linked to the *Australian*

---

11 The WH listing of Budj Bim Cultural Landscape comprises three separate areas, though these areas are yet to be added to the NHL so as to match the WH listed boundaries. See: UNESCO World Heritage List. ‘Budj Bim Cultural landscape’, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1577.
Historic Themes Framework (Australian Heritage Commission 2001). A key reason for this view, which links to an earlier point made in this paper, is that the idea of cultural landscapes can be used to better integrate natural, historic and Indigenous histories, values, and significance of places in ways that are not made readily visible for the NHL (and is a separation perpetuated in the Australian Heritage Strategy (Commonwealth of Australia 2015)).


The world is at a crucial point, faced as it is with daunting sustainability challenges ranging from climate change and resource depletion to growing social inequalities and massively destructive military conflicts. ... The Living Planet Index shows that species abundance declined by 58% between 1970 and 2012 (WWF 2012). In 2012, the wealthiest one per cent held 18 per cent of total household wealth, six times as much as the mere three per cent held by the 40 per cent poorest (Keeley 2015, p. 3). Armed conflict, war and polarization continue to destroy people and places, destabilizing large parts of the world and triggering refugee streams and misery. ... What does the fact that the globe is moving beyond its carrying capacity mean for efforts to hold on to remnants from the past, particularly places of heritage value to nations and local communities and to the World Heritage system? (Logan and Larsen 2018, p. 3).

In November 2015, the General Assembly of the State Parties of the World Heritage Convention adopted a new Policy on the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention (WH Sustainable Development Policy) (UNESCO 2015). The policy aims to bring the WH system into line with the United Nation’s sustainable development agenda (i.e., the Sustainable Development Goals12) and refers to all World Heritage processes, including nominations and inscriptions, site conservation, management and interpretation, and State of Conservation reports and other forms of monitoring (Logan and Larsen 2018, pp. 5-6). This policy is also broadly relevant to all heritage places, including those across Australia, because of the ways in which global heritage discourse typically filters down to national and local heritage systems.

The policy draws on three overarching principles – human rights, equality (including gender equality), and long-term sustainability. It also covers four main dimensions – environmental sustainability, inclusive social development, inclusive economic development, and fostering of peace and security. The policy calls on State Parties to not only protect the OUV of World Heritage properties, but also to ‘recognise and promote the properties’ inherent potential to contribute to all dimensions of sustainable development ... [and to] ensure that their conservation and management strategies are aligned with broader sustainability development objectives’ (UNESCO 2015, paragraph I.4). I suggest that these are goals that need to be considered and acted upon for all heritage places – inclusive of cultural landscapes. On a personal note, I am interested in the ways that ideas concerning human-rights approaches, gender equity, and peace and security, as well as nature-culture

integration, are considered in the management of all heritage places, landscapes, and collections.

The WH and Sustainable Development is a good topic on which to end this paper. The policy challenges practitioners to expand the range of management considerations typically covered in heritage practice, including by the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013). While the Charter emphasises ‘all aspects of cultural and natural significance’ (article 5.1), it gives less attention to the need to be inclusive of peace and security, human rights, and diversity. These topics are relevant to the theme Cultural Landscape Diversity and the Implications for Management – the topic of the Australia ICOMOS Symposium held in Hobart, and to the range of places and themes discussed at the Symposium. It aligns with the recent call by David Yencken (2019, pp. 206-217) for more enlightened national heritage policies, to which I would add also their creative application to all of Australia’s important cultural landscapes, regardless of threshold. With these thoughts in mind, it is time to once again visit Hobart’s Franklin Square.
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Abstract

This paper looks at the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) model in its current application, particularly focusing on the Australian context. The UNESCO Recommendation on HUL was adopted in 2011 and addresses “the need to better integrate and frame urban heritage conservation strategies within the larger goals of overall sustainable development”. The model proposes an integrated approach for the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes. It is about using a detailed and rich contextual understanding of a place to drive sustainable outcomes for cities and their communities. In Australia, is this a helpful additional tool, given that our framework of the Burra Charter has been guiding the process of conservation of places (including historic urban landscapes) for many years now? The paper looks at the evolution of the HUL approach and how it is being applied: its success or otherwise in its application, and its ongoing value for the management of urban heritage issues.

Introduction

The UNESCO ‘Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape’ (HUL)1 was adopted by the 36th Session of the UNESCO General Conference in 2011. This was six years after the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention adopted Resolution 15GA/7 (in October 2005) which called for the “preparation of a new international standard-setting instrument that would be based on the recognition and guidance of investment in the development of historic cities, while at the same time respecting the inherited values embedded in their spatial and social structures”.2

HUL addresses “the need to better integrate and frame urban heritage conservation strategies within the larger goals of overall sustainable development” (HUL Introduction, point 5). It states that a “historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting”. (HUL Definition 8). It “provides the basis for a comprehensive and integrated approach for the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework” (HUL Definition 10).

---

1 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, including a glossary of definitions, UNESCO, 10 November 2011.
The HUL approach:

- “considers cultural diversity and creativity as key assets for human, social and economic development, and provides tools to manage physical and social transformations and to ensure that contemporary interventions are harmoniously integrated with heritage in a historic setting and take into account regional contexts” (HUL Definition 12) and …...

- “implies the application of a range of traditional and innovative tools adapted to local contexts” (HUL Tools 24).

The HUL recommendation recommends that Member States of UNESCO (which includes Australia):

adopt the appropriate legislative institutional framework and measures, with a view to applying the principles and norms set out in this Recommendation in the territories under their jurisdiction; and also “recommends that Member States bring this Recommendation to the attention of the local, national and regional authorities, and of institutions, services or bodies and associations concerned with the safeguarding, conservation and management of historic urban areas and their wider geographical settings.

The HUL approach aims to provide a solution to the tendency of the current planning frameworks used to manage urban change to be limited in focus on tangible, place based assessments of heritage assets and cultural legacies, while ignoring important intangible values.

Explanatory Publications

The HUL approach as outlined in the November 2011 decision, has been further developed in two UNESCO guideline publications3 (2013 and 2016) to assist users of the HUL. These recommend a set of six critical steps to facilitate implementation of the HUL model, requiring practitioners to take into account the local context of each historic city and resulting in different approaches to management for different cities. The steps include the need to: 1) map the city’s resources (via comprehensive surveys); 2) determine the city’s values and attributes (via consensus building and participatory planning); 3) assess vulnerability of the attributes; 4) integrate urban heritage values into wider framework of the city’s development; 5) prioritise actions; and 6) establish partnerships and management frameworks (See Appendix for full list of steps).

The HUL approach provides a “robust and continually evolving toolkit for the management of urban heritage in complex environments” and “includes a range of interdisciplinary and flexible tools”, which can be organised into four different categories: Knowledge and planning tools, Community engagement tools, Regulatory systems, Financial tools (see the Appendix on page 28 for a full descriptions of tools outlined). The HUL Guidebook (2016)

---

outlines eight case studies where the HUL approach is being applied in practice - Ballarat (Australia); Shanghai and Suzhou (China); Cuenca (Ecuador); Rawalpindi (Pakistan); Zanzibar (Tanzania); Naples (Italy) and Amsterdam (Netherlands). Five of these are pilot cities (Ballarat, Shanghai, Suzhou, Cuenca, Rawalpindi and Zanzibar) which have signed Memorandums of Understanding with UNESCO under the auspices of WHITRAP (World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and Pacific Region). These pilot cities each demonstrate a variety of HUL tools suited to each local context.

Since 2011, but particularly in the last few years, there have also been many publications, considerable academic research and on-the-ground activity worldwide using the HUL model, and these collectively demonstrate both the achievements from adoption of the model and the challenges of urban heritage management in a variety of historic urban centres.\(^4\)

\textbf{Figure 1} The HUL model has been enthusiastically and successfully adopted in Ballarat, Australia. (Photo: the author).

\textbf{How Widely Used is the HUL Model in Australia?}

Despite these international applications of HUL in practice, it is apparent that until recently in Australia, HUL was more an object of academic research rather than applied practice. While the model is being successfully used in Ballarat (since 2013) and is being promoted and explored in Canberra, it does not as yet appear to have been embraced as a planning framework in any other city or town.

This was confirmed in 2018 when a survey was undertaken (as recommended in the 2015 UNESCO General Conference decision by the World Heritage Centre reporting on HUL). The survey was developed in consultation with experts of the World Heritage Centre and sent by the Director-General in February 2018 to UNESCO Member States, requesting the submission of national reports and focal points. The submission deadline was initially set for 30 August 2018, but later extended to 30 September 2018. The survey was accessible from the dedicated webpage on the HUL Recommendation (whc.unesco.org/en/hul/) in English and French languages.

As part of this consultation process, in April 2018 Australia ICOMOS was contacted by the Heritage Branch of the Federal Department of Environment and Energy seeking “information on ‘Australia ICOMOS’ engagement with the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL)’ in particular on ‘whether it has adopted or promoted the HUL approach as part of its leadership in cultural heritage management and conservation. [and] ... may include incorporating the HUL approach into any Australia ICOMOS documents, training activities or research.’"

In responding to this request, ICOMOS replied in May 2018:

Australia ICOMOS’ involvement in the implementation of the HUL approach has been limited. There are several reasons for this, including the limited information and

---

5 https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSefFY1TleRDQxRwoF1TrsyWwntYxZ2tyLanp6GEUQWEHaZA/viewform.
6 Correspondence to Ian Travers, Australia ICOMOS President, from Jennifer Carter, Acting Assistant Secretary, Heritage Branch, April 2018.
guidance that has been provided by UNESCO to Member States (and the community more generally) about the implications of the HUL approach and how it might be adopted and implemented by Member States and the various subsidiary levels of government” and continued…..

exposure to the HUL approach has been quite limited, often to a few individuals with expertise in heritage planning and/or cultural landscapes etc. To date within Australia ICOMOS there has been very little discussion about, or socialising of, the HUL concepts, save for papers presented at a handful of conferences by the few Australia ICOMOS members with good knowledge of the subject.7

In Australia, there are many urban conservation areas/heritage cities where the management of urban heritage assets has been well established for many years with supporting planning provisions in local planning schemes. Some of these places incorporate the tools outlined in the HUL recommendation, and follow the six steps of the HUL Guidebook – yet, do not consider themselves as HUL case studies. In fact, in Australia, the guidance provided by the processes outlined in the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013) is more widely used, not only for individual heritage places, but for precincts and cities as a whole. The Burra Charter process requires the values of a place to be fully understood and articulated (via detailed conservation plans or area-wide heritage surveys) before planning recommendations are formulated and implemented.

These urban heritage surveys have been undertaken in all capital cities of Australia and in many regional, and rural towns, to provide a basis for the development of heritage policies as part of the overall metropolitan or country planning schemes. These heritage surveys are (or are recommended to be) regularly updated and form the basis for heritage controls, which vary across Australian states and territories and between municipalities in each state or territory. There have been recent efforts to standardise heritage provisions to simplify the planning system implementation, but this has proved problematic when the outcome of simplification has been the weakening of heritage controls. For example, in South Australia current proposed ‘Planning Reform’ heritage provisions will weaken, not strengthen heritage protection for places within local heritage areas by the removal of schedules of contributory items. This is currently the subject of considerable community concern with representations being made for changes to these proposed provisions. While standardisation is proposed for heritage policies across the state, this should not result in placing local heritage at greater risk than already exists.

However, in more recent times in Australia, there has been an upsurge in interest in the use of the HUL model, in particular to provide a solution to the limitations of regulatory frameworks used to manage urban change. As one of the UNESCO member states that have endorsed UNESCO’s HUL Recommendation, the Australian Government has now committed to promoting and facilitating the implementation of this global approach in Australia. On 28 May 2019 a roundtable workshop was held in Ballarat to discuss and shape the implementation of the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) approach in Australia included a wide range of national and local government stakeholders. Ballarat is the leading test site for the HUL approach in Australia (and one of the global best practice examples) and, since 2013, the City has undertaken a range of initiatives to implement the

7 Correspondence to Jennifer Carter Acting Assistant Secretary Heritage Branch Department of the Environment and Energy from Ian Travers, Australia ICOMOS President, 26 May 2018.
HUL principles throughout Council’s planning and community development processes. This work has led to the development of a suite of tools which can be used by other local councils adopting the HUL approach. The workshop aimed to discuss and refine these tools and resources, and also identify other resources need to implement HUL in the Australian context.

The HUL model has been enthusiastically and successfully adopted in Ballarat, as suggested by the following comment by Susan Fayed, Coordinator Heritage and Cultural Landscapes, City of Ballarat:

> HUL is about the whole of city management, broadening beyond just heritage area and buildings, to embrace the identity of the city and people of the city. A new beneficial and positive cycle is created where heritage benefits from the change in the city, as a collaborative approach rather than the more standard adversarial regulatory framework. Ballarat is currently embarking on a new rebranding exercise.
which will embed HUL as the model with special local identity and distinctiveness of the city at the forefront.

A meeting was also held in August 2019 in Canberra at the ACT Region Heritage Symposium with discussions focusing on the adoption of the HUL framework for future planning initiatives in Canberra, in particular the protection and enhancement of the Griffin town planning legacy.

It is also evident, as development pressures increase in Australian cities and the value of land (particularly in inner city areas) continues to rise, there will be potential challenges for heritage management with the demand for increased densities in high rise buildings, often desired to be located in traditional townscapes which were envisaged as more intimate neighbourhoods (commercial and residential). These new buildings want to ‘borrow the amenity’ of the existing neighbourhoods, but at the same time rob this amenity by virtue of their often inappropriate scale or design. These buildings can quite correctly be called ‘parasite buildings’ – sucking out the qualities of the adjacent neighbourhoods, and destroying the amenity without being required to ‘give back’ for these benefits.

These conflicting planning objectives – the economic imperative for greater densification versus the retention of streetscapes to achieve a heritage agenda – can be assisted by the HUL model, but most importantly rely on political support for the retention of built cultural heritage. Short-term political imperatives often outweigh long term strategic and visionary planning, and it is often only when there are community objections to proposed specific development proposals or changes to planning legislative frameworks that built heritage is either retained or destroyed. The sustainability question of embedded energy of existing buildings, as part of the total development assessment process, is so often undervalued, indeed ignored in Australia (and indeed elsewhere).

2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) and New Urban Agenda (NUA)

At the international level, there are now new and urgent frameworks in which to consider HUL. At the United Nations General Assembly in 2015, 193 UN member states unanimously adopted the *Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals* to be achieved by 2030. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which came into effect in January 2016, are a universal set of goals, targets and indicators that set out quantitative objectives across the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance to HUL is SDG Goal 11 which recognises the central role of urbanisation in sustainable development, and calls for “mak[ing] cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”. Target 11.4 recommends to “Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage”.

In addition to the SDGs, the UNISDR *Sendai Framework*, with the ‘Ten Essentials for Resilient Cities’ and the UNESCO report *Culture: Urban Future; Global Report On Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDGs) and New Urban Agenda*;

---

8 Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDGs) and New Urban Agenda; http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2016/10/newurbanagenda/.

Culture For Sustainable Urban Development\textsuperscript{10} provided the groundwork for the UN Habitat III meeting in Quito in October 2016. These reports contributed to the formulation of the New Urban Agenda (NUA)\textsuperscript{11} which also built upon the 2015 Paris Agreement of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.\textsuperscript{12}

The New Urban Agenda mainstreams culture in the vision, acknowledging:

... that culture and cultural diversity are sources of enrichment for humankind and provide an important contribution to the sustainable development of cities, human settlements and citizens, empowering them to play an active and unique role in development initiative. It further outlines ... We commit ourselves to the sustainable leveraging of natural and cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, in cities and human settlements, as appropriate, through integrated urban and territorial policies and adequate investments at the national, subnational and local levels, to safeguard and promote cultural infrastructures and sites, museums, indigenous cultures and languages, as well as traditional knowledge and the arts, highlighting the role that these play in rehabilitating and revitalizing urban areas and in strengthening social participation and the exercise of citizenship.

International Evaluation and Assessment of the HUL Recommendation

The 2015 the World Heritage Centre Urban Heritage Study\textsuperscript{13} provides a discussion of urban heritage which includes “an area of a city, town, village that has value”. It suggests how the HUL model attempts to assist with the retention of the character of urban areas as they either face economic decline, or if World Heritage-listed, become subjected to the pressures of increased tourism and economic rejuvenation. Sometimes the outcome of World Heritage listing can lead to the destruction of the sometimes fragile values that the listing was sought to retain. In 2015, 42% of World Heritage monuments and sites were located within an urban context with 431 of the 1,031 properties within human settlements. Furthermore, due to the sharp increase in serial nominations in recent years, World Heritage properties include 1,631 human settlements that are managed at the local level.\textsuperscript{14} The 2015 study outlined the urgency of capacity building for those involved in management of urban heritage.

In March 2018 a meeting was held on the Implementation of HUL at the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and Pacific Region (WHITRAP) in Shanghai, China.\textsuperscript{15} This was attended by 38 participants, mainly from China and the Asian Region, and also a wide range of disciplines of international experts. This meeting provided

\textsuperscript{10} https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/d2hhdC1pcy.
\textsuperscript{11} Resolution adopted by the UNESCO General Assembly on 23 December 2016 71/256 (‘New Urban Agenda’).
\textsuperscript{12} https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/what-is-the-paris-agreement.
\textsuperscript{13} Turner et al. 2015.
\textsuperscript{14} Turner et al. 2015, p. 60. Note that the figures quoted above refer to 2015 statistics.
\textsuperscript{15} The Implementation of the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation - Proceedings of the International Expert Meeting, Shanghai, China, 26-28 March 2018 (Co organisers - World Heritage Centre and World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO, University of Tongji, China), https://whc.unesco.org/en/events/1426/.
case studies of the application of the HUL model and discussed the applicability or otherwise of the model. It recommended among other issues that the six steps outlined in the HUL model could be evaluated and revised after the period of application.

In April 2018, the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH) established an Asia-Pacific Subcommittee whose Operating Guidelines include “identifying methods for implementing the HUL approach in the Asia-Pacific region”. However, actual implementation of this model has not yet been actively and practically promoted by CIVVIH.

UNESCO is required to report to the Executive Board every four years on the implementation of the HUL Recommendation. The first report was in 2015. As outlined above in April 2018, a survey questionnaire was sent to all the Member States and responses sought. These responses were analysed and submitted to the Executive Board’s Spring session in March 2019 for tabling at the General Conference in November 2019. The online Member States survey resulted in a response rate of 55 out of 193 UNESCO Member States. The March 2019 report, the *UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape - Report of the Second Consultation on its Implementation by Member States* 16 provides considerable analysis of the findings of the online survey, and concluded:

The (HUL) Recommendation is more relevant today than ever as cities and their heritage continue to face a number of complex global challenges and seek sustainability, inclusion, and resilience. The HUL approach is a tool to manage change in historic urban areas facing current global challenges [item 77].

---

16 UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2019).
The data shows that there has been some progress made in implementing key concepts of the Recommendation, yet much remains to be done. Member States reflected that although the survey addressed national/federal authorities, the information requested was targeted to the local governments. Therefore, in implementation of the HUL approach, it is crucial to establish links between national/federal and local level decision makers at the country level [item 78].

... Educational programmes are limited for young professionals, therefore capacity building is necessary across regions and between diverse stakeholders including local authorities and communities. Better harnessing of digital technologies concerning urban heritage to reach out to youth and other under-represented groups should be examined [item 91].

The participation of local communities is reported to be limited, therefore more tools and methodologies are necessary for the systematic engagement of local communities in decision-making processes. [item 92].

The survey findings outline that a number of member states have translated the document into their national language. It was also revealed that actions have been taken by member states to integrate international urban conservation policies into national efforts to implement the SDGs, and more specifically to Target Goal 11.4 (‘make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’).

**Particular Challenges of the Six Steps of HUL**

There are many challenges in the implementation of the HUL framework, but a key practical challenge is related to Step 4, i.e., “To integrate urban heritage values ….. that require careful attention to planning, design and implementation of development projects”. Step 4 is critical to what happens ‘on the ground’ in the built environment arena. How is new development managed to protect heritage values? How closely does one control the design and details of new interventions into the built environment, and what are the key factors in doing so? Certainly, when poorly designed insensitive new development is inserted into otherwise consistent heritage townscapes, the heritage values of the place become quickly eroded. Yet architects (with their developer clients) can be the first to complain when constraints (via conservation guidelines or height controls) are imposed. Design guidance is critical to the development process, but so often this is not in place, or indeed new aggressive architectural styles are supported by proponents as being honest contemporary expressions – with relationship to context not considered important.

In Australia, design panels have been introduced to assist with the processing and decision-making related to the appropriateness or otherwise of new development. Publications have been produced with illustrated examples to assist the regulatory authorities in the assessment of new development proposals. A key issue is the compatibility of height of new development with the heritage context.

---

According to the *UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape Report of the Second Consultation on its Implementation by Member States* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2019), the largest group of respondents to the survey were from Group I (Western European and North American States) - 15 Member States by 27%; followed by Group II (Eastern European States) - 12 Member States by 22%; Group III (Latin American and Caribbean States) - 10 Member States by 18%; then Group Va (African States) - 8 Member States by 15%; Group IV (Asian and Pacific States) and Group Vb (Arab States) - 5 Member States each by 9%. Australia presented a report in the narrative format, which could not be incorporated into the analysis of the survey.
development and, when rear or internal extensions to existing buildings are proposed, what degree of visibility from the street or surrounds is acceptable. These issues can be addressed within the flexibility of the HUL model, and are key to the day-to-day management of urban heritage. New development of inappropriate height, bulk and materials disrupts and erodes heritage character, diminishing the heritage values of the place irrevocably. Issues of new design must relate to the values of the place – if the values incorporate many different layers and periods of development over time, then new design can continue this evolving design expression, so long as the design contribution respects basic parameters, such as height, materiality and form. When the values of an urban place are consistency of period of construction and design from a single period or design aesthetic, then new development ideally needs to continue this design expression, so as to not disrupt this continuity. Yet this is often challenged and out of context architectural solutions can damage the existing environment.

Conclusions

The Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) model can be a useful tool for managing change in heritage cities and towns particularly in countries where there is not an accepted understanding that cultural heritage goes beyond specific sites, and is inclusive of the setting and also intangible aspects of cultural heritage. In Australia, existing planning frameworks and the Burra Charter process do recognise the need for integrated planning. However, as shown in Ballarat, the use of the HUL model continues to be successful as it has to provide solutions beyond the limitations of existing regulatory planning frameworks with great flexibility which accommodates the wide range of issues related to the retention of the unique cultural heritage of Ballarat and its immediate environs.

Increasingly in Australia, the HUL model is being promoted as a tool to assist in the retention of the special character of a wide range of urban heritage areas, expanding beyond Burra Charter methodology to provide the flexibility and wide ranging, creative solutions to urban heritage challenges. With the growing numbers of World Heritage inscribed properties that are part of, or located within, urban heritage there is an ongoing and urgent need to provide practical guidance, facilitate research and implement training in areas of heritage management and technical materials training. There is also potential for the HUL model to be used as part of the Nomination Dossier for the World Heritage Inscription process, with changes to the Operational Guidelines developed to facilitate this.
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HUL SIX STEPS

1. To undertake comprehensive surveys and mapping of the city’s natural, cultural and human resources.
2. To reach consensus using participatory planning and stakeholder consultations on what values to protect for transmission to future generations and to determine the attributes that carry these values.
3. To assess vulnerability of these attributes to socio-economic stresses and impacts of climate change.
4. To integrate urban heritage values and their vulnerability status into a wider framework of city development, which shall provide indications of areas of heritage sensitivity that require careful attention to planning, design and implementation of development projects.
5. To prioritize actions for conservation and development.
6. To establish the appropriate partnerships and local management frameworks for each of the identified projects for conservation and development, as well as to develop mechanisms for the coordination of the various activities between different actors, both public and private.

THE RANGE OF INTERDISCIPLINARY AND FLEXIBLE TOOLS OUTLINED IN HUL

1. Knowledge and planning tools – should help protect the integrity and authenticity of the attributes of urban heritage. They should permit the recognition of cultural significance and diversity, and provide for the monitoring and management of change to improve the quality of life and urban space. Consideration should be given to the mapping of cultural and natural features, while heritage, social and environmental impact assessments should be used to support sustainability and continuity in planning and design.

2. Community engagement tools - should empower a diverse cross-section of stakeholders to identify key values in their urban areas, develop visions, set goals, and agree on actions to safeguard their heritage and promote sustainable development. These tools should facilitate intercultural dialogue by learning from communities about their histories, traditions, values, needs and aspirations and by facilitating mediation and negotiation between conflicting interests.

3. Regulatory systems - could include special ordinances, acts or decrees to manage tangible and intangible components of the urban heritage, including their social and environmental values. Traditional and customary systems should be recognised and reinforced as necessary.

4. Financial tools - should aim to improve urban areas while safeguarding their heritage values. They should aim to build capacity and support innovative income-generating development rooted in tradition. In addition to government and global funds from international agencies, financial tools should be deployed to promote private investment at the local level. Micro-credit and other flexible financing mechanisms to support local enterprise, as well as a variety of models of public-private partnerships, are also central to making the HUL approach financially sustainable.

---
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Abstract
Review of a small selection of Tasmanian cultural landscapes indicates the importance of properly embedding cultural landscape in planning, and that different planning contexts can significantly affect the recognition and preservation of cultural landscapes. Issues for effectively embedding cultural landscapes in planning include poor realisation of cultural landscape values; difficulties in providing for management of multiple values; difficulties in balancing the management of values and desired uses; and inadequate basic protections for landscape values. Drivers appear to be difficulties in translating heritage knowledge into management and planning; difficulties in translating values into the planning framework; and a seemingly universal prioritising of development and/or use over conservation.

The review suggests that considerably more work is required to recognise and adequately provide for cultural landscapes at the local government planning level and at the state government heritage conservation level; and that planning strengthening is required even where cultural landscapes occur in conservation contexts, such as national parks. Better use of existing mechanisms such as buffer zones and appropriate boundary delineation is also seen as important, as is more cooperative engagement of different levels of government so that there is more integrated use of different available mechanisms for heritage protection and a better sharing and through flow of information. Some of these issues and solutions apply to sites with landscape and setting values as well as to cultural landscapes.

Introduction
Lutruwita/Tasmania has a number of cultural landscapes which have recognition at different levels and are subject to different ownership, hence planning contexts. Review of the management of these cultural landscapes, and also sites with significant landscape values, indicates that different planning contexts can significantly affect the recognition, boundary definition and actual protection of these landscapes.

This paper looks at these issues via a small selection of Tasmanian landscapes with different planning and conservation contexts with which I have had a professional involvement – the Macquarie Harbour Penal Settlement landscape, the Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape, the Bagdad Valley early colonial rural cultural landscape, and the Cascades Female Factory, Hobart (refer Figure 1).
Figure 1  The location of the Tasmanian cultural landscapes discussed in the paper: 1. Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape; 2. Macquarie Harbour penal settlement landscape; 3. Bagdad Valley early colonial rural landscape; 4. Cascades Female Factory. (Source: map of Tasmania reproduced from Alexander, A. (ed.) 2005, *Companion to Tasmanian History*; annotated by the author).

Macquarie Harbour Penal Station Landscape

The Macquarie Harbour Penal Station Landscape (refer Figures 1 and 2) is an example of a highly significant cultural landscape which however is invisible at the planning and broader management level.

The Macquarie Harbour penal station was established in 1821 as a place of punishment and work for re-offending convicts from the then colonies of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. It was closed in 1833 when the Port Arthur penal station was established in southeastern Tasmania, but briefly re-opened as a convict probation station during 1846 - 1847. Sarah Island, the main settlement, was also a centre for shipbuilding and a base for the Huon pine harvesting to supply the timber for the shipbuilding. For the last 100 years Sarah Island and Macquarie Harbour have also been an important tourist destination, for both the history and the essentially natural landscape values of the area and, since 1983, as a part of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (McConnell et al. 2003).
Figure 2  Sarah Island and Macquarie Harbour:
Top - View to Macquarie Harbour and surrounding ranges and peaks from Sarah Island (image titled 'Le Havriel Macquariel' in Dumont D'Urville's Voyage autour du monde, original source – the Mitchell Library, NSW; taken from McConnell et al. 2003).
Centre – Present day Sarah Island, view north from the former shipyards to the former penitentiary (image – the author, 2003).
Bottom - View east across the eastern part of Macquarie Harbour and Sarah island (centre).

Figure 3  The central West Coast of Tasmania showing the location of Macquarie Harbour and the land tenure and management zoning. (Source: Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 2016).
Sarah Island, located toward the eastern (inland) end of Macquarie Harbour (refer Figures 2 and 3) formed the core of the Macquarie Harbour penal station, with ‘satellite’ work areas such as farms, a coal mine and brick works located on other islands or on parts of the Harbour shoreline within Macquarie Harbour and with the focus of the Huon pine logging along the Gordon River, which flows west into the Harbour.

The selection of Macquarie Harbour as the site of lutruwita/Tasmania's first convict settlement was deliberate (McConnell et al. 2003). As well as the area having natural resources needed for the running of the penal settlement and to enable it to generate an income for the government, its remote and isolated location in the ‘wilds’ (at least to the convicts) of western Tasmania, literally half a world away from what was known and familiar, was designed to reinforce, as punishment, the sense of isolation and deprivation of the convicts, and to also discourage escape (refer Figure 4).

The landscape setting was therefore an integral part of the penal station’s history and success. The landscape setting continued to be a critical element in the later appreciation of the area, with the remote and essentially natural and ‘wild’ landscape of Sarah Island, Macquarie Harbour and environs being both appreciated in its own right, but also as an evocative setting for the convict ruins of Sarah Island, with the regrowth vegetation of the Island and the surrounding waters and landscape of Macquarie Harbour also combining to present a Romantic landscape of great appeal (McConnell et al. 2003). These landscape values are acknowledged by McConnell et al. (2003, vol. 2, p. 163) who write “that Sarah Island, its related sites and setting, together comprise a cultural landscape of outstanding significance with respect to historic convict use and pining”.

Figure 4  Sarah Island and its location of in a global context demonstrating its distance from England and its remoteness generally. (Source: map prepared by the Dept. Tourism, Parks, Heritage and the Arts, taken from McConnell et al. 2003).

1 Lennon (2002) also concludes that the Gordon River – Macquarie Harbour area is a significant cultural landscape, although due to the history of Huon pine extraction rather than the convict history.
Although the importance of Macquarie Harbour and environs as the setting of Sarah Island and an early colonial convict cultural landscape was recognised in the conservation management planning for Sarah Island in the early 2000s (McConnell et al. 2003), there has been no formal recognition of this in broader planning or management subsequently. This is although Sarah Island and the eastern third of Macquarie Harbour (which includes most of the Penal Station) has high level conservation status as part of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (also listed on the Australian National Heritage List), and is also a designated Historic Site under the National Parks legislation. Sarah Island (and Grummet and Philip Islands) is also listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register for its convict history and archaeological values.

The management of Sarah Island and the broader Macquarie Harbour Penal Station is provided for by the statutory *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 2016*. Although the Management Plan does go some way towards acknowledging the landscape values of these places in its curiously restrained comment “Within the TWWHA, the Macquarie Harbour Historic Site would most closely match the definition of a historic cultural landscape” (Parks and Wildlife Service 2016, p. 179), it is not documented as a cultural landscape. Nor are the landscape values generally, or the heritage values of Sarah Island or the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station more generally, articulated or otherwise evident in the document.

The *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan* is the only statutory plan which can guide conservation, development and use for the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station. Under the Management Plan the key mechanism for providing for conservation and appropriate levels of development and use is the management zoning. If the zoning in the current 2016 Management Plan (Parks and Wildlife Service 2016) is reviewed, no indication can be found that this part of Macquarie Harbour has any heritage value, with the area being zoned as ‘Recreation’ with a ‘motorised access overlay’, and with Sarah Island being a designated ‘Visitor Services Zone’ (refer Figure 3).

Under the *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 2016* a ‘Recreation Zone’ allows for many uses and developments, including commercial development and a broad range of types of recreation, including the construction of mountain bike tracks. A ‘Visitor Services Zone’ allows for even more development. It is “generally an area that provides, or is anticipated to provide, the highest level of developed visitor facilities, and where the majority of visitors experience the TWWHA. This type of zone is generally a high-use area with mechanised access” and “Development may extend to tourist accommodation, staff housing, restaurant facilities, public-landing facilities, and the development of infrastructure services ... such as, sewerage, water supply and power” (Parks and Wildlife Service 2016, pp. 60-61).

---

2 The heritage values of Sarah Island however are not part of the recognised Outstanding Universal Values (i.e., World Heritage values) of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, although it has been argued (McConnell et al. 2003) that the convict heritage of Macquarie Harbour is of Outstanding Universal Value.

3 The Macquarie Harbour Historic Site.

4 The two other islands in Macquarie Harbour that were occupied by the Penal Station.

5 Interestingly, in the 2016 Management Plan, historic heritage is dealt with under a section titled ‘General Management’ rather than being included in the section on ‘Cultural Values Management’, further reducing the capacity of the Management Plan to provide for the recognition and protection of historic heritage.
Although the Management Plan also uses management overlays, not even this mechanism is used to identify the historic heritage values of the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station in the Plan for management purposes (refer Figure 3). In fact the Plan does not recognise a heritage overlay at all.

This is all made more concerning by the fact that the 2016 Management Plan has a much weaker development and new use approvals process, including a non-statutory approvals process, whereas the previous Management Plans had a statutory approvals process. When combined with the current Tasmanian government’s push for more development in Tasmanian National Parks, including the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, one might be forgiven for wondering how the cultural landscape values, or even the discrete historic sites, of the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station can be protected, even given its high level conservation status.

Although it is generally expected that the significant cultural values of most classes of reserved land in lutruwita/Tasmania (i.e., World Heritage Areas, National Parks, Conservation Areas, Nature Recreation Areas, State Reserves, Regional Reserves, Historic Sites and Private Sanctuaries) will be conserved given the purposes of reservation of the different classes of reserved land (refer UNESCO 1972 and the Nature Conservation Act 2000), this example demonstrates otherwise. The example of the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station suggests that it is a serious mistake to assume that, because a significant heritage site or cultural landscape is located in a conservation reserve, it is automatically protected by this status.

Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape

The Western Tasmania Aboriginal cultural landscape (refer Figure 1) provides another example of a well recognised cultural landscape, including through national heritage listing, where a failure to translate this status into planning and management leaves this landscape unprotected and at risk.

This landscape (refer Figure 5) was entered in the National Heritage List in 2013 for its Aboriginal cultural landscape values and to provide protection to “an extraordinary richness of Aboriginal cultural heritage”, in what has been described as “one of the world’s great archaeological regions” (Parks & Wildlife Service 2002, pp. iii & 17). The landscape, termed the Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape, covers a large section of the northern part of the West Coast of Tasmania, known as the takayna/Tarkine coast (refer Figure 6), and contains numerous and extensive Aboriginal sites, including middens, artefact scatters and hut depressions, rare rock engravings sites, and ceremonial stone arrangements.

The Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape listing is primarily in relation to its historical significance, in this case in relation to a particular historical lifeway, and the ability of the area to demonstrate this particular historical lifeway of the region, which has been described as follows:

The Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape represents the best evidence of an Aboriginal economic adaptation which included the development of a semi-sedentary way of life with people moving seasonally up and down the north west coast of Tasmania. ... During the late Holocene Aboriginal people on the west coast of Tasmania and the southwestern coast of Victoria developed a specialised...
and more sedentary way of life based on a strikingly low level of coastal fishing and [instead a] dependence on seals, shellfish and land mammals ... This way of life is represented [in takayna/the Tarkine] by Aboriginal shell middens which lack the remains of bony fish, but contain ‘hut depressions’ which sometimes form semi-sedentary villages. Nearby some of these villages are circular pits in cobble beaches which the Aboriginal community believes are seal hunting hides ... The Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape has the greatest number, diversity and density of Aboriginal hut depressions in Australia. The hut depressions together with seal hunting hides and middens lacking fish-bones on the Tarkine coast ... are a remarkable expression of the specialised and more sedentary Aboriginal way of life. (Australian Heritage Database Record, https://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/national/western-tasmania).

Figure 5 The different aspects of the Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape. (Photos: the author, 2014).

Although this level of recognition is well-deserved and helps celebrate this outstanding heritage landscape, as will be seen, the planning context is inadequate to properly protect the recognised values.

The Western Tasmania Aboriginal Cultural Landscape (WTACL), which encompasses an area of 21,000 ha, lies largely within the Arthur Pieman Conservation Area, forming a c.2km wide coastal ‘selvage’ to the Conservation Area; but also includes two State Reserves6 - all categories of reserved land managed under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002. It also includes one private property block which is a Private Nature Reserve, and five exclusion areas (Australian Heritage Database Record, https://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/national/western-tasmania).

No attempt was made to reclassify the land within the WTACL leading up to, or immediately following, the national listing of this cultural landscape in 2013, and no land reclassification or new planning has been undertaken since the formal recognition of the WTACL in 2013. This leaves the National Heritage List statement of significance as the only explicit statement of the cultural landscape values of the WTACL. As a consequence there is no current, overarching or integrated planning framework that recognises the WTACL.

6 State Reserve status allows a greater range of uses and provides less protection for natural and cultural values than a National Park.
It also leaves the 2002 Arthur Pieman Conservation Area Management Plan, which does not recognise the WTACL (and which is focussed solely on Aboriginal site protection) and does not apply to the full WTACL area, as the key planning and management tool for this nationally recognised cultural landscape. Although the 2002 Arthur Pieman Conservation Area Management Plan is clearly no longer fit for purpose, the management prescriptions within the Management Plan do provide adequately for Aboriginal ‘site’ protection; recognise the need for Aboriginal community involvement in management and planning; and the two key ongoing issues for Aboriginal site protection, 4WDs and cattle grazing, are also recognised.

An additional issue in relation to the planning is the inadequacy of the zoning of the 2002 Arthur Pieman Conservation Area Management Plan (APCA MP) for managing cultural landscape values. This is because the management zones in the Management Plan, all of which occur within the WTACL, are either use-based zones (i.e., a Visitor Services Zone and a ‘Recreation Zone’) largely determined by where existing use has been located or is desired; or the single generalised values protection zone, the ‘Natural Zone’, which provides no, to minimal, values protection.8 As is evident from their names, the purpose of the Visitor Services Zone and Recreation Zone is to provide for visitors, not conservation.

This might not be an issue if there was no active use of the full coastal margin of the Arthur Pieman Conservation Area (hence also of the WTACL) for recreational use by 4WDs. This is a use that has been ongoing for some decades, but which is becoming an increasingly accessible and popular form of recreation, resulting in the Natural Zone being treated as a Recreation Zone and hence putting the Aboriginal sites and landscape values of the area at risk. In spite of the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service having undertaken detailed

---

7 A ‘Natural (controlled access) Zone’ is also recognised, but this is used solely to define the major maintained access tracks in the Conservation Area, hence is in reality another use, as opposed to conservation, zone. The stated aim for this zone is “To provide room for works necessary to maintain and support vehicular access and/or minimise environmental and cultural heritage intrusion” (APCA MP 2002, 8).

8 It is the Natural Zone in which the extensive cultural landscape values of the WTACL are largely contained.
research on 4WD use and the risk to Aboriginal sites in the high use areas, and having implemented a good evidence based policy for restricted 4WD use to protect significant Aboriginal site heritage, there are ongoing demands to re-open the full coastal zone to 4WD use in contravention of the policy. Although the issue is being driven by 4WD users, it is the Tasmanian government who is spearheading this push to re-open the 4WD access, not only for the established users, but also for tourism, which it sees as a significant new potential use for the area (the author, personal observation).

The planning context is such that it provides no protection to the Aboriginal heritage from this inappropriate recreational and tourism use, particularly with the government being the major proponent for this use. This leaves the Commonwealth *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act 1999) as the only possible mechanism to protect the Aboriginal site and landscape values of the WTACL. The ability of this legislation to control the proposed new 4WD use however has been challenged by the Tasmanian Government, and the matter is still unresolved.  

**Bagdad Valley Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape**

The Bagdad Valley (refer Figure 1) is an example of a failure, even where the necessary planning mechanisms exist, to provide adequate protection for a significant cultural landscape.

The Bagdad Valley, in particular the southern half, has been assessed as a high quality and rare, hence significant, Tasmanian early colonial rural cultural landscape. It is one of four high quality such cultural landscapes recognised in lutruwita/Tasmania, and also a rare example in the Australian context (McConnell 2011). It is an organically evolved landscape representing European settlement and general farming from approximately ten years after British colonial establishment in lutruwita/Tasmania (one of the first areas outside the two main centres to be settled) through to the late 1800s, then a change to orcharding and mixed farming in the early 1900s, but with the early colonial rural settlement still strongly reflected in the landscape, particularly in the southern half of the valley (McConnell 2011) (refer Figure 7).

This early colonial landscape is manifest in the amount of early colonial heritage, the variety of rural heritage places, and their specific patterning in the valley in relation to the natural landscape and to each other. The small historical field sizes, which are well preserved (refer Figures 8 and 9), are particularly important as it is this finer grained field patterning that distinguishes Tasmanian early colonial rural landscapes from the evolved Australian farming, particularly pastoral, landscapes that became the norm from the 1830s. As might be expected, these historical small fields are focused along the Midlands Highway, the original route between Hobart and Launceston, lutruwita/Tasmania’s first two colonial centres (refer Figure 8). These field boundaries and a number of original property

---

9 In 2015 the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre successfully appealed against a decision that an EPBC Act 1999 referral was not required, but this was subsequently appealed by the Tasmanian Government. In 2017 the Tasmanian Government withdrew its appeal advising that they would make a referral under the EPBC Act. The Australian Department of Environment and Energy, who is reviewing the matter, has still not made a decision, as it is understood that they are waiting for the Tasmanian government to provide the further information they have requested on the potential impacts to the natural values.
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Bagdad Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape, view south.

Sayres Court on the Bagdad Rivulet, Bagdad Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape, view east.

LHS - Oakwood residence (view west); and RHS - Shene stables and other outbuildings (view south), southern Bagdad Valley.

**Figure 7** The Bagdad Valley Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape (images – the author, 2011).
boundaries are also visually evident due to the preserved historical tree rows and hedgerows (McConnell 2011).

Also important, and differentiating early colonial rural settlement from later rural regional development, is the generally smaller early scale of settlement with a number of major properties located in close proximity, and with the farmsteads of these properties being the foci of settlement in the Valley (operating in effect as small villages), rather than there being a regional centre as the focus. The complexity of the early colonial heritage landscape and its relatively high level of preservation (including that of individual elements), hence high level of integrity, contribute strongly to the significance of this landscape (McConnell 2011).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8** Land grants in the Bagdad Valley, 1813 (LHS) and 1830 (RHS). (Source: Terry 1998).

The cultural landscape values however were not widely recognised until 2006 when the owners of four adjoining properties at Mangalore in the south end of the Valley contested an adjacent subdivision proposal through the planning process. The key grounds of the appeal were the impact of the subdivision on the cultural landscape values of the properties and their setting (assessed by Sheridan (2006)). As a consequence the four properties were designated the ‘Heritage Mile Precinct Special Area’ under the Southern Midlands Planning Scheme 1998 (refer Figure 9).

In 2015, when throughout southern Tasmania a new series of planning schemes that provided for the recognition of cultural landscapes through ‘Cultural Landscape Precincts’ was introduced, the ‘Heritage Mile Precinct Special Area’ became the ‘Heritage Mile Cultural Landscape Precinct’ within the Heritage Code of the Southern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015.\(^\text{10}\) This 2015 listing explicitly recognises the cultural landscape and

---

\(^\text{10}\) This Planning Scheme includes two/three other Cultural Landscape Precincts – the Oatlands and Kempton townscapes and a rural landscape which includes the Pugin-designed St Patrick’s Church at Coalbrook.
other historic heritage values of the four properties in this precinct, including the four homesteads and their immediate setting; the relationship of, and views to, the homesteads from the Midlands Highway; and the pastoral landscape of grasslands and dispersed woodlands, with early property boundaries still evident, that has remained effectively unchanged since the 1830s.

Although the recognition of the ‘Heritage Mile Cultural Landscape Precinct’ is important in recognising and protecting cultural landscape values, this Cultural Landscape Precinct is only a small part of the broader and significant ‘Bagdad Valley Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape’ identified in 2011 (McConnell 2011) as part of a broader suite of heritage assessments undertaken for the environmental impact assessment of the proposed Bagdad Valley Midlands Highway bypass. The Bagdad Valley historic cultural landscape assessment (McConnell 2011) identified the Bagdad Valley as having extensive and significant cultural landscape values, particularly in the centre and southern half of the valley, and also looked at the potential threats to this cultural landscape from the proposed bypass.

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9** The southern Bagdad Valley. The Bagdad Valley Heritage Mile Cultural Landscape Precinct is shown as the purple hatched area. (Source: Listmap, www.thelist.tas.gov.au.Nov 2018).

The assessment identified both direct risks from constructing a new route through the valley, and also indirect risks from increased, probable, urban subdivision for commuter suburbs (given the likely increased ease of access to Hobart once the bypass was built). The assessment concluded that there would be increased subdivision on the section of the Midlands Highway that would be bypassed. It also concluded that this area was one of the most sensitive areas of the Bagdad Valley Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape as this
is where the earliest land grant patterns and the highest density of heritage fabric occur. The impact of subdivision from the mid-1900s onward on the land settlement pattern is evident if Figures 8 and 9 are compared, with new, dense residential subdivision being highly evident in Figure 9. The question therefore arises – why was only the Heritage Mile Cultural Landscape and not the broader, arguably more significant, later identified Bagdad Valley Early Colonial Rural Cultural Landscape recognised when the new 2015 Interim Planning Scheme was introduced, particularly given that the 2015 interim planning schemes specifically provide for cultural landscapes to be identified?

Two reasons, both speculative, come to mind. Firstly it is possible that Southern Midlands Council planners were unaware of the 2011 Bagdad Valley Cultural Landscape assessment which was commissioned by the State government Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources. The second possibility, and the more likely, is the real nervousness about designating large areas of land, particularly valuable agricultural land, as areas of heritage value on the assumption, largely incorrect, that such a designation will stop productive use of that land. This nervousness is also demonstrated at the State level by a reluctance to list historic cultural landscapes on the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The reluctance is evident in the fact that in almost 25 years no area termed a ‘cultural landscape’ has been included on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (although they technically can be included as ‘precincts’ as has been done in the interim planning schemes) and only one actual cultural landscape, and then only a small part of it, has been entered on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (as 14 separate places collectively termed d’Entrecasteaux Expedition Sites).11 12

This failure has put a significant historic cultural landscape at risk. It suggests that greater effort needs to be made to translate results from heritage identification studies into planning and management, and to fully recognise cultural landscapes rather than to make the mistake of assuming that protecting only parts of a cultural landscape is an adequate management response. This example also suggests that significant cultural landscapes need to be recognised and protected through listing at the State level in cases where State government decision making will potentially threaten a cultural landscape.

Cascades Female Factory and Setting

This example explores the setting and broader landscape values of the Cascades Female Factory in Hobart (refer Figure 1) and how these have been protected, or otherwise, through planning.

The Cascades Female Factory is situated on the Hobart Rivulet inland from the Hobart CBD, which is on the Derwent Estuary, in the foothills of kunanyi/Mt Wellington which rises steeply to 1,271m above sea level, providing a dramatic, prominent backdrop to Hobart (refer Figure 10). The Cascades Female Factory operated as a female convict prison from 1828 to 1856. During this time, of the nearly 13,000 convict women who came to Van Diemen’s Land, around two thirds would have passed through its doors. At its peak the

---

12 Even the listing of ‘heritage precincts’, explicitly provided for in the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995, has been limited, with only two designated ‘heritage precincts’ having been listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register to date (Tasmanian Heritage Register Listing 31/5/2019).
female factory\textsuperscript{13} accommodated about 1,200 people (including the children of convict women). From 1869 non-convict male inmates, mainly comprising the destitute rather than criminals, cultivated the paddocks on the slopes behind the factory or raised livestock. In 1876 the Cascades Female Factory also became the burial place for Truganini who was a highly significant Tasmanian Aboriginal woman and one of the most well known women in Tasmanian history (McConnell 2007).

Historically, the Cascades Female Factory comprised five conjoined rectangular sandstone compounds or ‘yards’ to house and reform convict women. The yards were constructed between 1828 and 1852 and contained a variety of infrastructure allowing the complex to remain almost totally self-sufficient in its day-to-day operation. The Cascades Female Factory also comprised related facilities erected outside the walls of the five main yards. These included a cemetery and morgue, a store/office, the superintendent’s house, a small constable’s barracks, a fulling mill and a blanket factory, a bridge and a drainage complex (Lovell Chen 2007).

Today, the heritage significance of the Cascades Female Factory is recognised by its inclusion in the \textit{Australian Convict Sites World Heritage} serial listing (it is one of the 11 places included), inscribed in 2010 on the UNESCO World Heritage List. Its inclusion was specifically to ensure that a colonial women convict’s prison was included in the listing.

\textsuperscript{13}Female factories, which were to be found in colonial New South Wales and Tasmania, were prisons for convict women. They were termed ‘factories’ because the women were required to engage in productive work while imprisoned.
The selection of the site of the Cascades Female Factory in 1827 on the Hobart Rivulet beyond the Hobart Town boundary appears to have been deliberate – “Located outside Hobart the Female Factory was intended to remove the women convicts from the negative influences and temptations of the town, and also to protect society from what was seen as their immorality and corrupting influence” (https://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/national/cascade-female-factory). As Frost (2004, p. 5) notes, “It was near Hobart Town, but not too near ... Townsfolk could ignore the convict women – unless they needed servants”. Frost (2004) also notes that the location was not attractive to the convict women, located as it was in a shaded valley dominated by the impressive bulk of kunanyi/Mt Wellington. This aspect was not lost on the citizens of Hobart Town, one of whom described the situation of the Cascades Female Factory as ‘that dismal vale in the shadow of death’ (Frost 2004, p. 5).

The Cascades Female Factory was therefore a purpose-specific place for which the landscape setting was important. A study of the heritage landscape values of the Cascades Female Factory, undertaken to inform planning and management for the site in 2007 (McConnell 2007), identified three levels of landscape value and recommended that the approach of identifying landscape management units (or zones) be taken to manage the landscape values. The study recommended three units – 1. a Cascades Reserve Management Unit (for the Cascades Female Factory site landscape), 2. an Immediate Valley Management Unit (for the valley segment in which Female Factory is located and which has historical meaning, including giving the place its sense of physical enclosure), and 3. a Visual Catchment Management Unit (refer Figure 11). The approach was based on overseas approaches to recognising landscape setting and significant views for heritage places, and also that approaches to protecting these values need to be individually designed to suit the needs of each heritage place and its context.14

This approach was used at the Cascades Female Factory to provide a specific management regime for each of the landscape management units, and collectively to provide graded buffer zones for the protection of the site and its landscape values. The coincidence of the landscape management units and buffer zones was also seen to create an advantage by reducing management complexity. The scheme also allowed the different management units to be linked to different, applicable planning instruments which could provide heritage protection, with the key potential mechanism being the local government planning scheme, the main statutory planning regime covering the Cascades Female Factory and its setting.15

This direction had been foreshadowed, with the State government in consultation with the Hobart City Council determining that the buffer zone for the Cascades Female Factory16

---

14 Key studies influencing the approach were Akasaka (2005), Hongkui (2005) and O'Donnell (2005) who described, respectively - the identification of extremely large areas as the setting for a single site, with the setting encompassing the visual catchment; the Forbidden City in Beijing where its setting was used in a management sense as the buffer zone; and the use of a differentiated system of buffer zones ringing outward from a rural heritage site.

15 Buffer zones are not provided for in the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995.

16 The World Heritage nomination process requires a World Heritage Area to have a protective ‘buffer zone’ where necessary, which is defined by the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2017 as “an area surrounding the nominated property which has complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection” (Item 104). Under the Operational
could be provided by amending the area and nature of one of the ‘Heritage Areas’ recognised in the City of Hobart Planning Scheme Heritage Schedule (McConnell 2007, p. 1).

The planning and management outcome for the landscape values of the Cascades Female Factory however has fallen very far short of what has been advocated:

1. None of the heritage listings encompass the full Cascades Female Factory, let alone recognise the setting: The Tasmanian Heritage Register and City of Hobart Planning Scheme Heritage Schedule listings comprise the key site elements, but as discrete adjacent or nearby places, while the National Heritage List place comprises only three of the four ‘yards’ of the Factory (i.e., only the publically owned parts of the site) (refer Figure 12).

   1. The largest area with setting values that is recognised is the original site area only (i.e., mid-1800s Cascades Female Factory Reserve boundary), which has some protection through being included within the Hobart Rivulet Heritage Precinct (a designated ‘Heritage Precinct’) in the Heritage Code of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015. Explicitly included in this is “The significant former Female Factory complex of structures and features”, and it is also noted that these “are contained within an important visual and physical setting”. The included area is roughly equivalent to the proposed Cascades Reserve Management Unit (i.e., the site landscape), and represents the only translation to date of recommended protection of

   **Guidelines**, authenticity of place, which can be affected by location and setting, is an important attribute, as is integrity which is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the place.
the landscape values into planning (refer Figures 11 and 12).^17

1. No planning changes have occurred that provide improved protection for the immediate landscape and visual catchment landscape values (i.e., the proposed Immediate Valley and Visual Catchment Management Units).

Although it must be recognised that the Cascades Female Factory and its immediate setting are highly degraded, with only remnants of the original structures remaining and with considerable modern, mainly residential, development within the site, and also surrounding the site, there was in 2007 sufficient open land to demonstrate the landscape values and the scope to limit further degradation or even restore some parts of the site and its setting through careful management of development.

Further, the lack of formal recognition of the more extensive landscape values in statutory planning has meant that no gains have been made in restoring the connectivity of the site or its internal landscape character, and that significant setting values have been irrevocably lost due to new high density urban development on previously undeveloped areas overlooking the site. This has impacted on the views both to, and from, the site, and has

---

^17 It should be noted however that the recently updated site conservation management plan (Lovell Chen 2016) recommends a unifying curtilage that encompasses all the key elements of the Cascades Female Factory as recognised in the listings (refer Figure 12), in part to ensure that the landscape character of the site proper can be managed. This however is a smaller area than the original site boundary, and this curtilage does not yet appear to have been adopted in the site listings or in any other planning.
destroyed what was left of the sense of isolation from the world derived from its setting. The views to the west to kunanyi/Mt Wellington have survived, but are currently under threat from a proposed cable car up the eastern face of the Mountain, and could be threatened by new urban development on the western side if the large areas of bushland owned by the Cascades Brewery are sold, as has been foreshadowed.

Why has this situation arisen? Although there continue to be conceptual issues and complexities with listing and protecting cultural landscapes, this does not seem to be the issue here. Rather, it is in my view partly to do with the multiple levels of planning and heritage management (i.e., national, state and local) not working effectively together, suggesting that better meshing of these needs to be built into the system. I also believe that this particular example reflects a particular form of conservatism in the approach of government to cultural heritage protection and management, where management that involves multiple tenures, costs money, or includes extensive values such as landscapes is avoided. While this may be understandable, it is not in the interest of heritage conservation as it leads to poor outcomes for heritage, ultimately reducing heritage significance and making heritage less valuable socially and economically.

**Conclusion**

Cultural landscapes not only provide for the recognition of landscapes of cultural significance, they provide an important construct for the protection of culturally significant areas of land or of related heritage places connected by a landscape (or landscape values). Planning, along with legislative protection, are the key tools in Australia, as in many other places, for protecting cultural landscapes.

However it can be seen, at least in lutruwita/Tasmania, that there are many issues in translating values management effectively into planning, even where there are adequate existing planning mechanisms for cultural landscape conservation and protection. The examples discussed in this paper indicate that key issues preventing the effective embedding of cultural landscape protection in planning include:

- poor realisation of cultural landscape values;
- poor management of multiple values in planning;
- poor communication between agencies and different levels of planning;
- an inadequate understanding by planners and managers of what cultural landscapes are, and of the management options that exist for their conservation and the protection of the significant settings and visual catchments of individual heritage places (in particular the use of buffer zones);
- a seemingly universal prioritising of development and/or use over conservation; and
- inadequate planning tools, mainly at the state level (although some basic protections are provided at both the state and local level).

This manifests as poor translating of heritage knowledge into management and planning, and a failure to translate values information into the planning and management framework at all levels. The drivers for this appear to be – 1. a lack of knowledge about cultural landscapes and their management by managers and planners; 2. a lack of processes to guide the integration of cultural landscape protection into planning, including management planning, and to ensure that knowledge changes over time are also integrated; and 3. an
established culture that unquestioningly subordinates natural and cultural environmental values to economic values in planning.

While it is good news in lutruwita/Tasmania that cultural landscape values are being increasingly thought about and identified, albeit slowly, and there are planning provisions to recognise and protect cultural landscapes at the local level, the bad news is that cultural landscapes generally are not being well-managed and in many cases are not being protected at all (although we need time to tell what will happen with planning scheme Cultural Landscape Precincts).

This review suggests that considerably more work is required to recognise and adequately provide for cultural landscapes at the local government planning level and at the state and national government levels; and that planning strengthening is required even where cultural landscapes occur in conservation contexts, such as national parks. It also suggests that there is a need for more cooperative engagement between different levels of government and different levels of management and assessment, so that there is more integrated use of different mechanisms for protection, and better sharing and through-flow of information. These Tasmanian examples also suggest that it is important that cultural landscapes have clear values statements and fit for purpose conservation policies, and that these are clearly articulated in the planning that applies to them. Some of these issues and solutions will apply to sites with landscape and setting values as well as to cultural landscapes.
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Abstract

This paper discusses the wheat industry of NSW as examples of industrial landscapes and argues that identifying the industrial nature of the landscape helps understand why the wheat farming landscapes of NSW are of heritage significance. The paper outlines a brief history of the wheat industry in NSW and then focuses on changes to land law, genetics, farming technology and transportation as factors in the industry rapidly developing to be a major export industry and the creation of an industrial landscape. Finally it looks at heritage listings and concludes that they are not systematic and representative of the importance of the wheat industry to NSW and Australia.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to briefly discuss the wheat landscapes of New South Wales (NSW), Australia, and to argue that identifying the industrial nature of the landscape helps understand why the wheat farming landscapes of NSW are of heritage significance. Finally, the paper makes brief comment on the nature of NSW heritage listing, considers what should be listed and the issues that listings might raise.¹

There is a marked tendency, in the world of heritage at least, to see rural landscapes as separate from industrial landscapes. This is perhaps understandable with the aesthetic appeal of the classic Australian rural landscape where the sheep graze, the streams form mirrors and the voluminous gums grace the sky. In contrast industry rents the earth, forests disappear underground or into steam engines whose chimneys darken the sky and the streams become fetid pools.

Of course, this distinction is entirely a romantic one. In economic terms rural industry – the sheep and the grains (commemorated on the NSW Coat of Arms) – rivalled the economic output of the mines and the steelworks and were organising and producing on an industrial scale from the 1870s onwards. Yet the rural landscape is frequently viewed as being separate from industrial landscapes.

“My Harvest Home” one of John Glover’s classic landscapes painted in 1835 is an example of the romantic view of rural landscape (see Figure 1). It depicts the end of the harvest season on Glover’s farm in northern Tasmania. The wheat has been reaped and formed into stooks which are collected into the wains (wagons) for transport to the barns where they will be threshed. This is a wonderful painting full of emotion and wonderful light. The

¹ This paper brings together various strands of research that the author has undertaken since the 1990’s on aspects of the wheat industry. In particular, the distribution maps of the grain silos were an exercise in learning how to work with large data sets at a regional scale using a Geographic Information System. NSW is used as an example as this is where the data is available.
painting is well known as one of Glover’s key works and the nature of his landscape painting has been extensively discussed (e.g., Howell 2007). Looking with the eye of an industrial archaeologist the painting depicts a form of agriculture – wheat harvesting, that was still practiced in a traditional way across South-Eastern Australia, for a market that was still struggling to meet internal demand for grain by farmers who had problems finding arable land, cheap labour, transport to markets and cost pressures from imports (see Atkinson (1826, pp. 32-42) for a description of wheat farming in NSW).

“My Harvest Home” also documents the transfer of British technology in the form of grain seed, equipment such as wagons and tools as well as labour (the factors of production) from Britain to Australia and the resultant transformation of the Aboriginal landscape based on the hunter-gather mode of production to a form of capitalist production based on new forms of land ownership and economic relationships. Viewing Glover’s painting through the lens of the Whig view of history, Glover is documenting the improvement of the land from its previous unimproved state to its natural productive state which was seen as one of the virtues of settlement and displacement of the original occupants.

In contrast, Figure 2 – “Harvest Home”, c.1949 – shows a highly industrialised harvesting process – two “Sunshine Harvesters” pulled by tractors cut the genetically engineered grain and discharge it into hoppers (barely seen behind the tractor). The grain would be loaded into bulk handling facilities at a nearby railway station and then moved to coastal ports for export. All this reeks of industrialisation – the workers may own the farms, but the means of production, in particular the capital equipment, are machines or genetically modified plants. At its heart these are industrial processes and the landscape they are in is as much an industrial landscape as the Australian cities of Broken Hill or Newcastle.
The difference between the two Harvest Homes is of course an obvious change in technology and perhaps a less obvious one in environment. Figure 3, below, shows the extent of sheep and wheat farming in the 1920s and the expansion of wheat is clear although notable in that the map states “No wheat areas of importance in Tasmania”.

**Wheat production in NSW to the 1880’s**

The development of agriculture, in particular grain cultivation, was an urgent priority of the early Colonial government in Sydney as food supply from Britain or British colonies such as India was not really feasible in the long term (Davey et al. 1945). Lacking obviously fertile soils around Port Jackson, colonial settlement soon focused on the areas around Parramatta (where Ruse famously grew the first grain, a form of “bearded wheat”) and later the Hawkesbury where there were large pockets of alluvial soil (Jeans 1972, pp. 81-86; Perry 1963, pp. 17-25). The grain grown in this case was mostly maize (corn) as it was easier to cultivate with the limited tools available to the colonists (Dunsdorfs 1956, pp. 14-15).

From reading the early accounts of grain growing in NSW and what other commentators have said about them, it seems the transformation from the Aboriginal landscape consisted mainly of crude and minimal clearing, fencing and the planting of grain. Archaeological evidence of this activity is poor as the key sites – Ruse’s farm and the Crescent, both at Parramatta, have been heavily disturbed and probably do not retain a significant amount of archaeological evidence although the general form of the landscape can be seen. More
interesting is the evidence of drainage from two sites on George Street, Parramatta (101-103A and 105 George Street) where archaeologists have excavated drainage trenches which on stratigraphic grounds date to the convict period at Parramatta.\(^2\) This evidence points to greater effort being undertaken in ground preparation than historical accounts suggest.

![Figure 3 Sheep & Wheat, 1929, the new Oxford wall maps of Australia.](Source: National Library of Australia, retrieved via Trove).

However, one must be also cautious about the documentary evidence as writers looking back often characterise previous events as being less in order, so that current events look better or improved. Official reports may also emphasise progress and order to present a good picture to those in power in England.

Expansion of the settlement at Sydney outwards to areas such as the Southern Tablelands, the Hunter Valley and Bathurst, as well as Tasmania, began from 1801. Much of the land was taken up for grazing, but the government settled small farmers and encouraged free settlers in these areas for agricultural purposes (Jeans 1972, pp. 89-90; Perry 1963, p. 41). The area of wheat production expanded with settlement from the 1820s, particularly as squatting opened new areas. Jeans (1972) points to the problem of the high cost of land within the limits of location (where land was sold rather than squatted on) which put owning a small farm beyond the economic power of the small farmer, leading to the development of tenanted farms in some areas. Some archaeological remains of the cultural landscape from this later period have been reported from Windmill Farm near Appin (Taylor and Winston-Gregson 1992).

\(^2\) Based on my experience having dug part of Ruse’s Grant and at 101-103 George Street.
Although farming technology developed with the wider adoption of the plough and better strains of wheat, labour shortages remained due to the labour-intensive nature of the work and increasing labour costs. These issues were coupled with poorly developed transport infrastructure for a bulk commodity, and the lack of a developed market. These factors made wheat farming a marginal proposition at this time (see Dunsdorfs 1956, Chapters 2 and 3).

Poor transport facilities resulted in the development of flour mills in local areas such as Yass (which had four) which turned the grain into the more easily transportable, but more perishable product, flour (Jeans 1972, p. 126; Pearson 1998). In turn the development of local markets encouraged wheat production around the location of milling facilities or good transport such as coastal shipping (Robinson 1969, p. 48). However, as Dunsdorf (1956) notes, local producers were subject to competition from imported cheap grain and flour (imports included grain and flour from Tasmania) and there was a considerable debate about the need for protection via duties on imports (Dunsdorf 1956, pp. 58-62; Jeans 1972, p. 124).

By the 1860’s the wheat industry had slowly expanded, but was still limited in its extent and was not producing sufficient wheat to satisfy local demand within NSW (Robinson 1969, p. 94). Reviewing statistical evidence in 1864, Rolleston (1864, p. 239) noted that ‘whilst the extent of land sown in wheat has increased by 32 per cent, over the average of the first five years, the average yield of our own crops has not kept pace with this increase, nor with the increase of the population. This result is owing, for the most part, to the disasters of the last two years. Excepting the year 1854 the crop of last season was far below any year of the decade. The largest yield was in 1856, viz. 1,756,964 bushels off 106,124 acres; the smallest was in 1863, 808,919 bushels off 103,962 acres; ... the smallest was in 1863, 808,919 bushels, off 103,962 acres’. In other words, while the area cultivated for grain increased, yields of grain as expressed in bushels per acres decreased.

In a later paper published in 1868, Rolleston reviewed statistics showing changes in the wheat industry on a district by district basis in NSW and discovered a static industry with slowly declining yields. What was not particularly emphasised (probably masked by the nature of his statistical divisions) was a change in the locations of the NSW “wheat belt” in the decade of the 1860s marked by ‘the formerly highly localised and relatively unimportant centres on the high tablelands and the southwestern slopes expanded production at an unprecedented rate, while the principal wheat growing districts on the coast declined to complete insignificance’ (Robinson 1970, p. 44).

Robinson has argued that the incident of stem rusts (a parasitic fungus) effectively destroyed the wheat industry in the coastal areas – the traditional location of wheat production. Large outbreaks of rust were reported in 1863 and the infections were widespread, destroying crops on an annual basis. Robinson (1969, pp. 119-120) points out the farmers had no defences against rust, indeed there was no real knowledge about rusts until pioneering research in 1892. The only limited defence was the development of rust resistant wheats and hope that, like a rust outbreak in 1803, the disease would stop. Both failed. Coastal farmers turned to the cultivation of maize for economic survival (Robinson 1970, p. 55). It is also not clear why the rust outbreaks in the 1860s were worse than those in 1803.
Meanwhile there was an on-going expansion of the wheat industry on the tablelands and slopes of NSW which saw a doubling of acreage under cultivation between 1870 and 1880 and a 50% increase in acreage in the following decade to 1890. This was followed by a further 360% increase to 1,531,000 acres from 1890 to 1901, at which point NSW became a net grain exporter (Jeans 1972, p. 202). In the broader Australian context, the industry was transformed from the 1870s when the key grain producers, South Australia and Victoria, supplied the domestic markets in New South Wales and Queensland to one where there was a large Australian surplus for export to the world market and wheat became a dominant export industry for Australia (Dunsdorf 1956, p. 186).

The industrial landscapes of wheat farming 1880 onwards

This remarkable change in the wheat industry in NSW demonstrates the industrial nature of the wheat industry and consequently the landscapes created by wheat production. Some of the factors involved in creating and maintaining these landscapes are briefly discussed below.

Land

One of the classic factors of production, changes in land cultivated for wheat both in its environmental location and availability, was a critical factor in kicking off the expansion of the wheat industry. The development of land policy in NSW has been discussed in a number of publications (Roberts (1968) still being the most detailed). In relation to the wheat industry it has already been noted that much of the industry was centred in the coastal districts which is where land alienation was most advanced so that land was expensive for the small wheat farmer as they were purchasing on the free market. Elsewhere squatting runs on Crown land took up much of the land preventing the establishment of small farms. Politically this was countered by the introduction of free selection under the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1861.

The principle of free selection without survey was established by the Crown Lands Alienation Act. From 1st Jan 1862 any person (or their agent) could select from 40 to 320 acres of Crown land prior to survey in areas other than town or suburban land or areas in a proclaimed gold field or under mining lease or land containing improvements on leased land (Section 13). A selector could apply to select Crown land (less certain exceptions) by tendering a written application on Land Office day (Thursday) for land between 40 and 320 acres. The selector could only make one conditional purchase of up to 320 acres, but could make an additional conditional purchase up to the total of 320 acres if frontage conditions were not exceeded. The land was sold on condition that the purchaser resided on the land for one year (beginning within a month of selection) and improvements of not less than £1 per acre were made. At the end of the three years the purchaser or alienee could either pay off the balance or pay 5% interest on the amount owing at the start of each year (see Stuart 2000, pp.104-106).

Selections allowed the small farmer to establish a farm on land held by squatters or otherwise vacant Crown land. One of the many difficulties about the selection process was the small size of selections, 320 acres may be a largish dairy farm on the coast, but 320 acres in western NSW would hardly be noticed let alone provide enough land for a viable farm. The Lands Acts Amendment Act (1875, 39 Vic c13) raised the maximum area of land

---

3 I.e., someone to whom the original selector may have sold the land.
able to be selected to 640 acres, however whether this made for viable wheat farms is
doubtful.

Following the defeat of the Robertson government in the elections of January 1883 the new
Stuart government instigated an inquiry into the Lands Act and, following this, introduced a
new Lands Act. The inquiry, known as the Morris-Ranken Report after its authors, was
completed in record time and one of its basic principles which was later instituted in the
_Crown Lands Act_ 1884 (48 Vic c.18) was the division of NSW into three divisions or
districts – the Eastern, Central and Western. The Morris-Ranken report identified the
Central division as the area where most problems arose from selection and noted that in the
Western Division the lack of rainfall made selection unviable (see Figure 4).

Under the _Crown Lands Act_ 1884 only one conditional purchase was to be made by each
person. In the Eastern Division, applications were to be between 40 and 640 acres, in the
Central Division between 40 and 2560 acres and in the West selection was abandoned
(Stuart 2000, pp. 201-215). This allowed for the selection of larger farms in the Central
Division which comprised the Tablelands and slopes west of the Great Dividing Range.

The environment of the Central Division was also different from the coastal area and rust
was less of a problem. At the same time, it was suitable for wheat growing particularly if
the wheat chosen was suitable to dryer environments. The precise boundaries of the Central
Division are a little difficult to re-create as they underwent minor changes over time, but
Figure 4, below, shows the location of the Central Division as best it can be understood.
The district boundaries are overlain on a colour image of NSW which gives a general clue
as to the major environmental divisions.

![Figure 4](https://example.com/figure4.png)

**Figure 4** The three divisions of NSW under the _Lands Act_ 1884. Note how they correlate with
broad environmental zones. (Source: base aerial image – Six Maps; divisions drawn by the
author).
Technical innovation (R&D)

The wheat industry developed on the back of significant developments in plant breeding which introduced new wheat strains such as William Farrer’s “Federation strain” that increased resistance to disease, better suited dryer conditions and produced grain better situated for use in roller mills. It was the wheat industry’s equivalent of the operationalisation of “Froth-floatation” at Broken Hill or Abraham Darby’s experiments with coke as a fuel at the smelters at Ironbridge in England.

There had been previous attempts to improve the quality of wheat. Robinson (1969, p. 122) discusses the work of one Pratt in the early 1870s. Pratt was a farmer who through cross-breeding claimed to eliminate rust in some plants which pre-dates Farrer by 20 years. There was also some work from various Government Botanists, but William Farrer is held to be the pre-eminent and most successful researcher. Born in 1845 and well-educated, he emigrated to Australia in 1870. He was tutor to the family of George Campbell, of Duntroon Station. In 1873 he published on ‘Grass and Sheep Farming’ and he must have met Leopold de Salis around this time. De Salis was similarly well educated and possessed an enquiring mind and a marriageable daughter. Farrer worked as a surveyor from 1875 until 1886, marrying Nina de Salis in 1882. After leaving the Lands Department he and Nina settled at Lambrigg, a farm cut out of the extensive de Salis squatting runs. At Lambrigg he began experiments in plant breeding, continuing until his death in 1906 (Guthrie 1922; Wrigley 1981).

The problem which Farrer set himself was the systematic improvement of wheat by cross-breeding and selection, particularly with the aim of producing types which should resist both rust and drought and maintain a high milling standard for use in the new roller mills then being adopted (Guthrie 1922). The context in which he was working was the need to combat rust and his work was presented at the various Inter-Colonial Rust-in-Wheat Conferences.

Farrer stated that the idea of systematic crossing breeding for rust-resistance first came to him in a controversy on this subject between himself and the Australasian newspaper in 1882. He commenced experimental work on his farm at Lambrigg in 1886 and by 1896 he had created “Bobs” — the first commercially successful “Farrer” variety. The famous “Federation” was the result of a cross between “Purple Straw” and “Yandilla” with the object of improving the variety of wheat then most popular by imparting to it the high milling excellence and other good qualities such as rust-resistance, high-yielding and a strong straw plant. Distribution of “Federation” wheat began in 1903 (Guthrie 1922). From 1910 to 1925, “Federation” was the most widely planted wheat in Australia.

But Farrer was not alone in his research. The NSW Government had scientists in a section of the Mines Department dealing with agriculture and in 1890 established a stand-alone Department of Agriculture. The main aim of the Department was to engage in the collection and dissemination of 'all useful information in regard to agriculture in its many branches'. ‘The department was to ‘introduce and distribute new seeds and cuttings’, analyse soils, investigate fruit production and animal husbandry, and send samples of wheats and other cereals and crops to a number of farmers for field trials. Importantly, the department was also to investigate plant and stock diseases, along with the insect life of the colony, to assess on a scientific, rather than anecdotal, basis which of the insects were to be classed as pests.

---

4 There are also references to Farrer in the diaries of George De Salis.
and which were the ‘farmer's friends’” (Spenneman 2000, p. 179, quoting contemporary sources).

Farrer had a close connection with Nathan Cobb, the Department of Agriculture's consulting pathologist, and with the Department’s chemist Frederick Guthrie who was instrumental in testing wheat varieties for their suitability for milling.

In 1898 Farrer was offered and accepted the position of “Wheat Experimentalist” which he retained for the rest of his life. Following on from Farrer’s initial work there was an ongoing and continual research program into wheat, largely funded by Government. In particular the Wagga Wagga Experimental Farm was established in October 1892, and students were accepted from 1 October 1896. Being also a research station for improvement in cereal strains, it was intended that the students would be provided with the practical knowledge of farm operations as well as being up to date with current research.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture established various outreach programs to educate farming communities. There was a central facility to answer farmers questions and in July 1890 a new monthly journal was launched – the New South Wales Agricultural Gazette. Cobb may have initiated the concept of field days, but irrespective of origins, the Department of Agriculture established field days as a vital educational process. Education of younger farmers began through farm schools and agricultural colleges.

The key point to grasp is that there was a process of research and development that accompanied, and was interrelated with, the transformation of the wheat industry and its rapid expansion. This was instigated by a small group of scientists and reinforced by technical training much in the same way the professions of engineering developed. Without this effort the wheat industry of NSW would not have achieved its rapid expansion in yields and areas farmed.

Introduction of mechanisation
Mechanisation was one way of overcoming the manual tasks of sowing, reaping, threshing and moving grain around. Although mechanisation began in the 1840s, progress in adopting new technology and the demand for new technology was slow to develop (see Raby 1996; Wheelhouse 1973).

Serious mechanisation in farming machinery began in the 1890’s with a pronounced growth from 1909-1915 and from 1919 to 1929 although the actual details are difficult to track due to different and ambiguous statistical categories. There also seems to be a lack of information on how all the mechanisation was financed, although it is presumed that farmers did this through loans.

In the latter 1800’s, there was a variety of ploughs in use and farmers had moved from the single furrow plough to ploughs of multiple furrows and more specialist ploughs. Some were of local designs and many were imported.

Then in 1876 the iconic stump-jump plough was invented by agricultural machinery apprentice Richard Bowyer Smith, and later developed and perfected by his brother, Clarence Herbert Smith. The plough consisted of any number of hinged shares – when the blade encountered an underground obstacle like a mallee stump, it would rise out of the ground. Attached weights forced the blade back into the ground after the root was passed,
allowing as much of the ground to be furrowed as possible. This invention allowed greater areas to be cleared for cultivation (Simpson and Simpson 1988, pp. 18-20).

Later, around 1900, the disc plough began to be imported from America and this was adapted into a stump jump plough by H.V. McKay (Simpson & Simpson 1988, p. 18). The disc plough uses a large concave revolving steel disc to dig the soil. The disc plough was more suitable for the hard, dry Australian soils than earlier ploughs – they were faster and better able to break up heavy soils and stubble (Wheelhouse 1973, pp. 28-29).

Harvesting the grain involved the process of reaping, binding the crop into stooks and then threshing the wheat and winnowing the grain to remove impurities. The reaper-binder machines were first introduced into NSW in 1879 and were subject to a vigorous improvement program by local inventors. Threshing machines, typically powered by portable steam engines, were used in Australia from the 1840s and were gradually improved to include the functions of cleaning and winnowing grain.

The stripper dispensed with the process of reaping by cutting only the ears of the wheat – that is the parts containing the grain and capturing them inside the machine. Strippers were widely used from the 1860s, particularly in South Australia where the Australian version was invented (Wheelhouse 1973, pp. 50-73).

The next step was obvious – combining all the operations in one machine, the Combine Harvester. Successful harvesters were developed in the USA from the 1860s, but alternative designs were being worked on in Australia from the 1880s.

The Sunshine Stripper Harvester is famous for combining the functions of a stripper and winnower in one machine. In one operation it could gather and thresh the ripe heads, separate the grain from the chaff and deliver the grain for bagging. The Sunshine Stripper Harvester, the design of H.V. McKay, was developed in 1884 and went into production from 1888 (Simpson & Simpson 1988, pp. 62-63; Wheelhouse 1973, pp. 86-95). The harvesters shown in Figure 2 are Sunshine Harvesters.

The chief source of power to pull the ploughs and the harvesting machinery was the Australian draught horse which was bred to undertake the heavy work of pulling the machinery. However, after the First World War the rise of tractors resulted in the decline of the breed.

The development of mechanisation and the invention that went with it resulted in a market for machinery that was substantially satisfied by the development of small scale to large scale implement manufacturers (see Figure 5).

Perhaps atypical, but notable, was the development of the Sunshine Harvester Works. Having established an agricultural implement works in Ballarat in Victoria to manufacture his combine harvester, H.V. McKay moved his factory and many of his employees to Braybrook Junction in 1906, where he had earlier (1904) purchased the Braybrook Implement Works. He named the new enterprise the Sunshine Harvester Works after his Sunshine Harvester, which was one of his major products. The factory became the largest in the Southern Hemisphere, and in its early stages McKay successfully increased the concentration and efficiency of the workers. Between 1907 and 1910-11, McKay’s workforce expanded from just over 400 to around 1,500 (Fahey & Lack 2001).
Transport and grain handling

The third element is the introduction of transport for bulk loads of wheat. In NSW this was part of a deliberate policy of the NSW Government in opening up new districts for closer settlement by building “pioneer” railway lines which provided cheap transport for produce to markets. The construction of the railways was an incentive for settlers taking up conditional purchase and in the Central district allowed settlers growing wheat greater access to markets.

Initially, storage and handling of wheat relied on the humble wheat sack – there were millions of them. They were used to transport the wheat to rail stations and sidings and stacked waiting for trains. This exposed the wheat to damage from mice, weevils, climatic conditions and leakage. This was a problem if the grain was stored long term and was notable during the First World War where the wheat crop was left awaiting shipping to become available.

Bulk handling of grain was used in Canada and the United States, and in NSW several reports on these systems were made in the period immediately before the First World War. NSW announced in early 1914 that they would implement a bulk handling system, but parliamentary intrigue and the onset of the First World War stalled implementation (Pollard 2012a). However, events of the war resulted in the Commonwealth providing funding to establish a bulk handling system.

The Commonwealth and State had formed the Australian wheat pool in 1915, to purchase all wheat at a fixed price from farmers and the Wheat Board sold the wheat overseas and organised shipping (Tsokhas 1992, p. 4). But as Tsokhas discusses, both the lack of shipping and the lack of a ready market resulted in wheat having to be stored while the

Figure 5  Massey-Fergusson Combine Harvesters unloading into an International Truck for ongoing transport off the farm to the grain silos. (Source: State Library of Victoria).
Commonwealth negotiated the purchase of the crop with the United Kingdom. Therefore, losses due to poor storage were Commonwealth losses and in 1916 the Commonwealth began funding the construction of grain silos through grants to the states. The Commonwealth’s involvement in grain storage was thus an extension of Commonwealth involvement in other aspects of the wheat industry such as the Wheat Board (whose finances it guaranteed) and the formation of the Commonwealth Shipping Line (Tsokhas 1992).

Thus, bagged wheat began to be phased out (which took a long time – until 1952) in NSW in favour of a bulk handling system which meant wheat grain was no longer required to be bagged before transport and storage. The first country silos (71) and the Glebe Island Grain Terminal were authorised in 1917 and came into operation from 1918 and was mostly operational during the 1920-21 season (Pollard 2012a and 2012b). The extent of the network is shown in Figure 6.

The bulk handling system worked as follows: The farmer delivered wheat to the grain silo and received a Government receipt (or wheat warrants) to the effect that a certain quantity of wheat of a specified grade (wheat was graded for type and quality and sold to purchasers who required wheat of a specific type) had been received at the silo, with a guarantee that a similar quantity of wheat of the same grade will be delivered on surrender of receipt and payment of storage charges incurred. The warrant was a negotiable security, transferable by endorsement, and the farmer could obtain an advance upon it from financial institutions if he did not wish to accept the current price, preferring to hold his grain in view of a rise in the market. On the other hand, he could sell and transfer his warrant outright to a miller or

Figure 6 Distribution of railway lines and grain silos in NSW. (Image: the author).
co-operative pool, and the wheat would then be delivered to the buyer's order on payment of the storage charges.

Under this system, the Government was not involved in any way in the buying or selling of the wheat, but only in safely storing and handling it, while the farmer retained the freedom to sell wheat and was provided with storage of absolute safety until that time.\(^5\)

The key functional elements of the NSW silo system were the silos or grain elevators; without them a bulk haulage system was impossible (for the different types of silos see Ryan 1990a and 1990b). Other aspects such as bulk handling from the farm and efficient hopper type railway wagons were only progressively introduced. The silos ranged in size from the 800 tonne (30,000 bushels) silos to the largest terminal – the Glebe Island Grain

\(^5\) See the 1925 report of The Board of Inquiry into the system of handling wheat in bulk in New South Wales.
Terminal, which had a capacity of 2,800,000 tonnes (10,500,000 bushels) at its maximum extent. The full network can be seen in Figure 6.

The silo site was not just the imposing concrete silos, but importantly the weighbridge, the access way into the silo site, offices and open frame sheds for bagged wheat. Later, bunkers were also common (see Figure 7, above, for a typical railway station with wheat handling facilities). During the harvest season there would have been a long line of farm trucks waiting to unload and this made the yard a place for farmers to interact and socialise. The silos themselves were placed out of towns apparently because of the fear of silos exploding or possibly because land was cheaper to acquire.

There is still much to be learned about these landscapes, in particular how wheat farming was organised and how farms were laid out. Clearly there was a social aspect with possible co-operative or family networks to assist in farming. There is also a need to consider the rhythm of farming – the seasonal round of planning, rains, harvesting and how that adapted to cyclical patterns of drought and flood. All of which needs to be considered in the contexts of change over time.

The Industrial Landscape of Wheat

There is clearly a cultural landscape that has been created by the development of the wheat industry. This is primarily an industrial landscape shaped by wheat farming on a scale that is industrial (as demonstrated by the scale of the industry), the technological development of the industry and the organisation of land and capital to maximise production (see Stuart 2012).

The landscape is mostly located in the areas mapped as South-Western Slopes and Brigalow Belt South bioregions (Sahukar et al. 2003). Within these areas there is a diversity of landforms and soils that suggest that more precise analysis of wheat farming at a local level would help understand the relationship between the industry and the landscape. Generally, the landscape is which the farms are located is one of low-lying rolling hills and plains with medium sized farms. Silos, standing tall are visible across the plains marking the railway lines which took the wheat to ports and small towns near them.

Patterns and landscape characteristics (see Stuart 1997) at a farm level needs further work to understand although as there has been more interest in grain silos (mostly from those seeking to model them) the characteristics and patterning associated with grain silos is well known.

In summary, the industrial scale and nature of these developments and changes in land, technology, bulk handling and genetics all combined to transform the NSW wheat industry from one that barely met local demand into a powerful export industry. This is a significant part of the history of NSW and of Australia.

Heritage Conservation

To conclude this paper, a brief discussion about how the events, places and artefacts are recognised in heritage listings seems appropriate given the importance of the wheat industry in NSW and in Australia’s history.
A general analysis of heritage listings has been undertaken in ArcGIS by running an intersection with the locations of the grain silos and the heritage curtilages supplied by the NSW Department of Planning (downloaded 2019). The intersection had a buffer of 100m to allow for the vagaries of mapping. The results are discussed below.  

Searching this data demonstrates all manner of problems such as not being able to discover at what date the heritage curtilages have been compiled (the metadata being singularly unhelpful). In addition, the terminology used is inconsistent, making data searches difficult.

**State Heritage Items**

No silos are specifically listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR) although a grain storage shed and wheat related items appear to be within the curtilage of the SHR listing for Rock Station and Yard. This seems to be an accident of drafting as the shed is not mentioned in the listing document.

It should be noted that the SHR listings for Finley Railway Station and the Rock Station and Yard exclude the grain silos – whether this is by accident or design is not clear.

**Section 170 Heritage Conservation Register**

State Government agencies are required to compile a Heritage and Conservation Register under Section 170 of the NSW Heritage Act 1977. Unfortunately, the GrainCorp which seems to own or control most of the silos moved from being State owned to privately owned and have never prepared a Section 170 register.

Sydney Ports listed the Glebe Island Grain Terminal on their Section 170 Register after they had demolished all the significant fabric of the Glebe Island Grain Terminal several years earlier and it is not clear what status this listing currently has.

**Local Heritage Items**

The intersection produced 17 local heritage listings of wheat-related items, all grain silos. The listings focus on silos and no attempt has been made to include bulkheads or depots. The focus on the silo structures often ignores that they were part of a larger place that included weighbridges, offices, grain sheds and bunkers (for example those shown in Figure 7).

It is noted that in some cases, for example at Manilla, the curtilage of heritage item I229, Manilla Railway Station, seems to deliberately avoid both the 1934 silo and the 1959 bunker. This may be because railway owned items were being listed and the silos were owned by a different entity.

The listing of 17 items out of a total of 490 grain silos and the lack of listing of other items is indicative of a lack of systematic recording of wheat related items.

**Movable Heritage**

At Ariah Park (RU Wagon) and Binnaway (S truck) there are railway wagons “preserved” outside grain silos. These are not listed, and it is not clear how well preserved they are.

There are also numerous agricultural implements and machinery in local and national museum collections.

---

6 An attempt was made to plot the 17 listed sites onto a general map of the wheat areas of NSW, but it was not possible to produce a meaningful map.
Wheat landscapes

It is possible within existing heritage legislation in NSW to list a landscape, but so far no attempt has been made to list a landscape because of its significance to the wheat industry. Partly this is because of a lack of a systematic approach to the wheat industry and its landscapes and also because Councils and communities would see the management of a landscape listing over agricultural land to be nearly impossible. This is a view which would be shared by many in the heritage community as well.

It might be useful for a non-statutory listing to be prepared of a typical wheat landscape in order for issues such as curtilage and management to be discussed in a non-binding context before attempting a statutory listing of a landscape. In practical terms such landscape listings would require more detail on how a wheat farm worked either through documentary research or through oral history.

What is apparent in the context of heritage conservation is that the identification and listing of key sites, items and landscapes relating to the NSW wheat industry has not been undertaken on a systematic basis, leading to a poor representation of items relating to the wheat industry on the SHR and in local government heritage listings.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to discuss the wheat landscapes of NSW as industrial landscapes and to argue that identifying the industrial nature of the landscape helps understand why the wheat farming landscapes of NSW are of heritage significance. The history of the wheat industry shows that its expansion from the 1880s was a result of a series of key changes in land holding, genetics, farming technology and transport. These changes transformed an industry that was barely supplying the demands of the city population for wheat into a major export industry, one that characterised Australia and led to William Farrer and his wheat being placed on the $2 note (along with John Macarthur and a sheep on the reverse side).

The images of harvesters moving across a verdant field or the tall shafts of the concrete silos are more than an isolated field or place, they are part of an overall industrial economic process – that of the wheat industry, and as important to Australia as the lead-zinc mines of Broken Hill; and should be equally commemorated.
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Registers of Transience: heritage and urban change

This paper describes the context and formative influences of neighbouring communities near the inscribed heritage site within the urban landscape of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The site is on the World Heritage List as Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea. This paper analyses the indirect pressures on historic urban centres that arise from neighbouring urban developments and the visual, environmental and cultural impacts of informal low-income communities. This paper questions the everyday dynamics between heritage sites and neighbouring communities, including their positive influences on the local economy and society.

The dynamics faced by those communities extend beyond physical pressures of population growth and uncontrolled development on the outskirts of heritage centres, where neighbouring communities are vital to the integrity of urban heritage sites. Heritage conservation must accept modernising forces, where transformation is valued not only for the maintenance of local values, but also for the identity of a community. Therefore, the importance of historical and cultural accumulation of values to heritage and its surrounds requires the reinterpretation and revision of heritage legislation and policies to include change.

Case study area

Rio de Janeiro is a former Portuguese colonial port located on the coast of Brazil. It was once the capital of Brazil, is a large and densely populated city and one of the wealthier cities in the country. Rio de Janeiro City Centre and the South Zone have the largest number of heritage properties original to colonial and imperial times in the City. ‘Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea’ was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2012 acknowledging the ‘exceptional urban setting encompassing the key natural elements that have shaped and inspired the development of the city’ (World Heritage Centre 2015). The inscribed property did not include the informal communities within the heritage listed boundaries. However, these communities in Rio have developed since the 1900s and today, all districts in Rio de Janeiro would have at least one of these communities in their boundaries. Rio de Janeiro is recognised on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape. The site includes the Botanical Gardens, established in 1808; colonial buildings; the Sugar Loaf and cable car established in the early 1900s; Christ the Redeemer Statue, erected between 1922 and 1931; the modernist Flamengo Park designed in the 1960s; and other parks and landscapes. The urban landscape has been ‘shaped by significant
Historical events, influenced by a diversity of cultures, is perceived to be of great beauty, and is celebrated in the arts, through painting and poetry in particular’ (World Heritage Centre 2015). However, the inscription does not include contemporary culture and community.

Urban change: Informal communities in Rio de Janeiro

In Brazil, informal development of low-income communities often envelops and penetrates heritage centres. The city centre of Rio de Janeiro possesses outstanding colonial architecture surrounded by rapidly developing low-income informal communities. Informal communities directly affect livelihoods and wellbeing and transform the shape of a city in ways that may threaten the heritage they surround. However, their activities also enliven and maintain the existing culture, presenting an alternative approach to the interpretation of place and local tradition preservation.

Rio de Janeiro city has the largest number of nationally listed heritage buildings in Brazil (IPHAN 2015), most of which are located in the city centre with others spread across surrounding neighbourhoods. Heritage areas are clustered within the busy daily life of Brazil’s second-biggest city, alongside modern high-rises and intensive car and foot traffic. These buildings are survivors in a complex reality, where heritage and environmental bodies struggle to protect the cultural fabric, green areas and forests; where government is ineffective and does not provide housing, policies or funds to avert the chaos of poorly planned urban development. Caught between, the urban poor take advantage of the absence of government planning to construct almost anywhere.

According to the 2010 national census (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística 2010), six percent of Brazil’s total population lives in so-called ‘subnormal agglomerations’, defined as low-income settlements of at least 51 residential units on public or private vacant land. According to Lara (2013, p. 554) these subnormal agglomerations ‘have a wide range of qualities and vulnerabilities’ that will be discussed in this paper. These settlements are colloquially known as favelas, however, the Brazilian government coined ‘subnormal agglomeration’ in 1980 to avoid the pejorative favela (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística 2010).

Many favelas have ‘very different degrees of access to water and electricity but are generally very low on sewage connections’ (Lara 2013, p. 554). There are stark differences between the services provided by the City Council to these low-income communities and those provided to up-market or heritage areas, which are sometimes in the same neighbourhood, as seen in Rio de Janeiro City centre and South Zone (Galdu 2011).

Rio’s first informal low-income community emerged in the late nineteenth century when displaced soldiers returned from the War of Canudos in Bahia, a state in northeast Brazil. While waiting for their government wages, the veterans occupied Providência Hill in Rio’s city centre, which they renamed ‘Favella Hill’ in reference to the favela, a skin-irritating tree native to Bahia. They considered themselves to be as irritable to the government as the native trees (Mattos 2007). The word favela is now associated with poverty, segregation, violence and drugs, but also signifies a place of solidarity and sociability (Valladares 2008), charity and community among disadvantaged Brazilians. After its establishment, Favela Hill became home to many former African slaves as well as immigrants from Europe and the poorer, rural areas of Brazil (Mattos 2007). At that time, residents lived in timber shacks
without public infrastructure. Other *favelas* grew around Rio’s city centre and by the beginning of the twentieth century, three major settlements existed: Providência (Favella) Hill, Santo Antonio Hill and Misericordia, close to Castelo Hill.

Outside the *favelas*, the urban poor lived in collective houses or tenements, often unsanitary colonial-era buildings that housed hundreds of people (Mattos 2013; Vaz 1986) with common facilities and few, if any, windows. Following a global trend, the City Council decided to enforce so-called sanitary measures (Mattos 2103) by evicting inhabitants and demolishing those colonial buildings. Displaced inhabitants used materials from demolished buildings to erect structures at Favela Hill. This and the other three communities soon became associated with violence, but were constantly overlooked by the law (Mattos 2007).

Following many unsuccessful attempts to remove *favelas*, Brazil’s military dictatorship between 1962 and 1978 enabled Rio’s administration to formalise a plan to eliminate them. Between 1962 and 1974, 80 *favelas* were destroyed and more than 130,000 people evicted (Mattos 2007) and relocated to new public housing complexes on the edges of the city (Frisch 2012). However, the *favelas* grew in number and density in the city centre and other parts of Rio despite the plan, largely because the new public housing units could not accommodate all those in need. Moreover, not all *favela* inhabitants wanted to leave. Their houses were close to their work places and social connections. Residents responded to the oppressive relocation policies by forming communities and associations that reinforced their political and social organisation and enriched their sense of identity. The government initially cooperated with these associations, seeking to control them (Correia 2006). However, the cooperation was politically motivated: *favelas* were so ingrained in Rio that the government was under pressure by the public to be socially accountable.
During the 1970s and 1980s, Rio experienced a period of uncertainty regarding urban policies, which led to major growth in the *favelas* and the deterioration of urban spaces (Brandão 2006). The government’s urban policies were so ambitious that constructions were often left unfinished, frequently due to inadequate planning. Hence, uncontrolled development of *favelas* in some areas began to threaten a number of the city’s important cultural sites, leading heritage community groups to demand the preservation of some areas, especially within the city centre. Brandão (2006, p. 45) observes that ‘until that time, traditional planning in Rio had very often neglected built and natural environments.’ Moreover, increasing drug trafficking and violence in the *favelas* during the 1980s caused the broader population to fear the *favelas* and their surrounding areas. For the first time, heritage groups had the support of civil society in their push for the government to act towards preserving historical precincts from new *favelas*.

In 1988, three years after democracy was re-established in Brazil, the new Brazilian Constitution included an entire chapter on urban policies (Senado Federal 1988). These policies sought to establish the most appropriate methods for the regulation of the *favelas* and management of the urbanisation process, seeking a socially responsible outcome. *Favelas* began to be identified as low-income communities in need of government assistance rather than places harbouring violent outlaws. As an example of this new approach, squatters were granted ownership of an occupied property after five years of residency. The policies removed all indications of illegal property, banned all eviction programs and made municipalities responsible for transforming the *favelas* into livable neighbourhoods and integrating them into the rest of the city. The new democratic government, seeking socially responsible outcomes, led the changes.

However, in the 1990s, Rio experienced unprecedented levels of urban violence and illegal use of public urban spaces (Brandão 2006), which expanded to occupy empty green areas such as hills and national parks. The total freedom from zoning regulations and construction codes, allied with the failure of the government agencies to protect informal urban growth or provide enough housing for those in need, allowed the *favelas* to expand. Despite almost a century of urban interventions led by municipal and federal governments, non-profit organisations and local communities, Rio’s informal settlements continued to grow. Consequently, in 1992 the municipality of Rio developed a Strategic Plan (Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro 2009) that identified *Area de Proteção do Ambiente Cultural* (APACs), or areas of special cultural interest or built heritage in an urban context, which required conservation. The APACs were comprised of heritage precincts threatened by the growth of informal communities and over-development within their buffer zones. A number of Rio’s municipal buildings and areas were listed as heritage, at local and national levels, including areas of the city centre and Providência Hill.

In 1994, following the adoption of a Strategic Plan, the municipality initiated the Favela-Bairro (Favela-Neighbourhood) program to urbanise its ‘subnormal agglomerations’. The program aimed to respect the inhabitants’ investment, to increase access and services and to treat those settlements as ‘real’ neighbourhoods (Soares Gonçalves 2006). It attempted to integrate the *favelas* into the existing urban fabric, primarily by naming streets and numbering houses, to beautify the city through urban design and make it more attractive for both tourism and investment (Rio & Siembieda 2009). The program is recognised as ‘an excellent example of social and environmental sustainability and benefited more than 500 000 people in 143 favelas throughout Rio de Janeiro’ (Rio & Siembieda 2009, p. 46). However, the *favelas* did not receive the same level of infrastructure and services afforded
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and small alleyways contributes to the aesthetic value and local ambience. Businesses such as family restaurants and beverage shops are common along the larger passages. The entire community shares its public open spaces; children wander around and neighbours engage with each other. This community lifestyle has generated several cultural expressions, or intangible heritage, that even the wider population recognises, including food, linguistic conventions and music, reflecting the importance of those social values and cultural expressions for local identity.

To most favelados, the requisition and building of a home in such circumstances is acceptable. These homes are typically brick and mortar and are built according to a family’s needs. In the early twentieth century, shacks were built to protect inhabitants from the weather, but favela homes now have a more permanent character. However, it is common to leave the outside facade unfinished and an upper level concrete slab ready for the addition of a second storey to save costs as the family grows. Larger communities also have bank branches, mobile phone stores, dry cleaning services, restaurants, bars and a wide variety of commercial facilities on their main streets. These communities provide homes, services and some degree of infrastructure, even without State support. But the State cannot regulate or tax the majority of the favelas, some communities still have high levels of violence and drug trafficking, and their environmentally destructive nature and lack of construction safety awareness make favelas undesirable neighbours. In Rio’s case, the city’s historic fabric extends over most of its urban environment, and urban growth is rapid and unregulated, so it is common for a heritage-listed building or cultural precinct to neighbour or even be located within a favela. The longevity of these heritage and cultural clusters in such transient environments indicates their value to the favela community.

In Rio, there is a unique sense of belonging embodied in the collective memories of its people and its cultural system of symbols that represent the community and the environment, including the favelas. This sense of belonging has resulted in considerable care for the city’s cultural environment, which is recognised in Rio’s World Heritage listing description (World Heritage Centre 2015). The Urban Samba is an example of this care and samba lyrics often include the symbolic value of Rio’s natural environment and the daily life in the favelas.

Carnival is the biggest festival in Rio. The composition of the themes and songs, and design and development of the costumes, parade cars, and much more, happens in the favelas. The four-day parade of favela samba groups, or Samba Schools as it is called locally, provides significant income for the favelados as well as profit and tourism for the municipality. Smaller Carnival Samba Schools are also held in many places around Rio, gathering people from all cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds and reinforcing local identity and intangible values. This vital contribution of the favelas to the culture of Rio reinforces UNESCO’s recognition that ‘the dramatic landscape of Rio de Janeiro has provided inspiration for many forms of art, literature, poetry, and music’ (World Heritage Centre 2015, p. 211). However, the listing has failed to recognise the contributions of Rio’s favelas to this aesthetic heritage (World Heritage Centre 2015).

**Urban dynamic of low-income communities in Rio de Janeiro**

The dynamism of those communities engaged with established heritage centres is important for rethinking heritage. Population growth, development, and rapid cultural change demand that heritage be reconceptualised. There are several ways to conceptualise culture and
cherish past and present values, and the heritage landscape can be the stage for a sustainable and inclusive development. Impoverished areas are often altered by the inhabitants to meet their current needs while preserving what they feel deserves protection at that moment, despite the ambiguity regarding what should be preserved for future generations.

How, then, did the heritage listings of both cities neglect to mention the favelas or low income neighbouring communities? Moreover, how does urban growth influence how change and heritage are understood? In order to secure it, the concept of heritage needs to be rethought considering the terms in which memory and identity are usually held, to allow for a more nuanced definition more open to recognising low-income communities as the embodiment of a culture worthy of preservation.

The challenge of preserving a heritage site’s sense of place extends beyond physical pressures of population growth and uncontrolled building. Each site’s stakeholders are responsible for preserving the site while creating and maintaining a local identity. Because of the combination of cultures, ideas and various vested interests that contribute to each site’s distinctive identity, World Heritage status requires sites to have ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ (OUV). Criterion (vi) specifies that world heritage sites with OUV are ‘directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance’ (UNESCO 2017, p. 26). The diverse identities that have built, used and occupied these sites over the years are responsible, to varying degrees, for the formation of a historic urban environment. Every aspect of that environment is essential to understanding and, ultimately, preserving a given site.

Rio’s local perspectives also present a dynamic that can manipulate and possibly skew understanding of what is valuable and perhaps worthy of preservation. To the majority of Rio’s inhabitants, the favelas are a ‘parallel power’ or a ‘city within the city’ and are still associated with drug lords and violence. Accordingly, the favelados are often perceived as dangerous, pitiful people on the edges of society who are complicit with or beneficiaries of the drug lords; they and their culture are therefore often marginalised (Brum 2003, p. 12). Perlman (2010, p. 15), however, affirms that favelados are not marginal to society, but tightly integrated with it – giving a lot and receiving very little in return. It is the locals who create clear boundaries, and the growth of gated communities, gated buildings and security equipment in each home only intensifies the discourse of fear and violence (Low 2001, p. 45).

According to Tung (2001, p. 16), it is common for people to destroy their own city, either by demolition, war, faith or continuous environmental misuse, but urban renewal has been one of the most destructive forces of this century, as Rio has demonstrated. For some, the occupation of the slopes by crowded informal settlements harms the landscape, wastes valuable land and devalues the neighbouring properties. As persisting organisms in this urban chaos, the favelas can positively contribute to the city’s image, as every neighbourhood in Rio has at least one ‘subnormal agglomeration’ within it, but in Rio, favelas on deforested hills create areas of instability on the slopes, subject to landslide especially after the summer heavy rains, and the risk is often compounded by the accumulation of rubbish (Magalhaes 2010, p.14). The hills are composed of a thin layer of soil overlaying granite. When heavy summer rains fall on the city, this thin layer of soil, formerly protected by forest but now supporting only unstable housing constructions, becomes wet and heavy and slides downhill, sweeping away everything in its path and
taking people’s lives. Such landslides cause enormous distress not only to the communities involved, but also to official bodies. Furthermore, poor urban infrastructure maintenance, irregular land use, silting rivers, blocking street drainage passages with accumulation of rubbish and other misuses of the land make residents even more vulnerable to chaos following climate events such as storms, floods and landslides. Urban floods and landslides are the most common natural threats in Rio (Fernandes et al. 2004; Fernandes, Lagüëns & Netto 1999; Smyth & Royle 2000), directly damaging built heritage and cultural artefacts by increasing levels of humidity and stressing historical structures with debris and water infiltration. They also affect intangible heritage by resulting in the cancellation of festivities, performances and the production of arts and crafts (Rio de Janeiro G1, 2011).

Development also has a visual impact on the heritage core of Rio and can sometimes be detrimental, as taller buildings are constructed adjacent to and sometimes overlooking significant heritage structures. The forms of new constructions can mimic original buildings, but higher densities threaten integrity and authenticity, and population increase can cause additional problems across a region. New constructions may pollute rivers, diminish open green spaces in cities and overpower understaffed city councils with demands for additional services. As a consequence, it may be subject to ineffective supervision and control, constructed without restrictions, proper building approvals or plans. When left unmanaged, the cumulative effects of such growth are often irreversible.

Figure 2 Heritage sites such as Outeiro da Gloria (Gloria Hill) church are embedded in favelas. (Photo: the author, 2012).

A number of iconic buildings and sites date back to when Rio was the capital of the Portuguese Empire (1808–1821) and even further back to earlier periods. These buildings are material icons of historical, social, symbolic and aesthetic value that, more often than not, communities and experts have carefully preserved. In some areas of Rio, however, the favelas are easily seen in the background of the city skyline. Gloria Church, dating from
1739, is located at the top of Gloria Hill and was used by the Portugese Royal Family for religious celebrations. It is now a well-known landmark listed specifically within the UNESCO site boundary, but two favelas – Vila Santo Amaro and Tavares Bastos - are growing explosively within the church’s sightlines. Heritage privileged sightlines perhaps require a nuanced interpretation of values and therefore legislation, to handle the seemingly unavoidable consequence of favelas and their transient character in one's sights.

Favelas increasingly dominate the Rio landscape and the tangible and intangible effects of these communities on the city heritage are evident, including its formation, maintenance and adaptation. However, UNESCO’s Inscribed Property Map for Rio (World Heritage Centre 2015), which clearly identifies the nominated site limits and buffer zones, does not mention the favelas or provide a single picture or map of these communities. Government departments responsible for heritage management fail to acknowledge their existence (IPHAN 2015). Brum (2003) argues that heritage may not take priority over the wellbeing of those who dwell near it, but there must be a way of balancing needs. After all, in Gloria Hill, presented below, and many other cases in Rio de Janeiro, they are part of the heritage vista and streetscape.

As previously mentioned, more than 14 per cent of Rio’s metropolitan population lives in favelas. These settlements are associated with a number of intangible cultural manifestations, including Urban Samba parades, Funk, Carnival, Jongo, Capoeira, and others that inform Rio’s unique lifestyle, which UNESCO has clearly identified as cultural expressions. IPHAN (2007) described these manifestations as ‘not simply musical genres, but forms of expression, modes of socialization and community belonging benchmarks’. These and other cultural expressions that were listed as intangible heritage in 2007, have their roots in Rio’s favelas.

With the success of the UPP program in Rio, favelas are attracting considerable attention. They are also increasingly becoming safer places to visit. Rio’s favelas now have local museums, art galleries and tours that showcase the communities’ culture. Communities in the privileged areas of Rio are also being transformed into trendy places to live and attracting international tourism. However, as these areas are subject to rapid urbanisation, gentrification also raises the spectre of different, but equally important, threats to the ongoing vitality of favela culture (Vasconcelos et al. 2013). Those communities were neglected because from inception, they have been illegal.

In Rio, culturally valuable architectural heritage has been retained largely because of effective legislation that penalised demolition of heritage building with high taxes. Consequently, a high number of architectural structures are preserved within the city, but in a developing country’s list of priorities, conservation issues are often linked to economics and so it is difficult to allocate scarce public resources to preserving historic monuments.

Conclusion

The dynamics of change between old and new in urban heritage is inherent to heritage as a register of transience. The contributions made by informal communities in Rio de Janeiro to urban heritage should be considered bearers of cultural heritage values, some because of an outstanding contribution to the local identity and a considerable aesthetical contribution, and others because of their longevity and resilience. As Tung (2001, p. 388) concludes, ‘the conservation of historic cities entails two primary acts of social invention: the initial
creation of beautiful old cityscapes and, later, the decision to preserve those environments as parts of the expanding contemporary metropolis.’ Consequently, reconceiving heritage as a register of transience requires innovative management approaches that support both tangible and intangible community values.
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Parramatta: Managing rapid growth in an urban cultural landscape
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Introduction

Parramatta is the centre of the land of the Burramattagal people, whose name for the place continues in use. It was the location of the second European settlement in Australia and the first to be planned as a town. Today, its CBD encompasses multiple overlapping layers of Aboriginal and colonial heritage which, together, form an unusual and diverse urban cultural landscape. The scheduled individual items and conservation areas in Parramatta are, in fact, a network of historic urban set outs, buildings and places that form the basis of the city. Here, the natural and cultural history can be read in the layout of streets and siting of buildings, in ways that are not always possible in modern, developed cities.

Now, Parramatta is to be transformed into the central city of Sydney as per the Greater Sydney Commission’s Central West District Plan, and the challenge of managing enormous change in a diverse cultural landscape is one that Parramatta simply must reckon with. A study of Parramatta CBD’s heritage interface areas was commissioned by Parramatta City Council and, based on this study, recommendations were made as to how Parramatta’s cultural landscape values could, somehow, be maintained. These recommendations needed to be both city-wide and fine-grained in order to manage the intangible, natural, and cultural values of the landscape.

This paper explores the process and results of that study, demonstrating the importance of cultural landscape values to conservation management in a fast-changing urban environment and detailing a field-tested methodology for the management of a diverse, urban, cultural landscape.

The situation

On 11 April 2016, Parramatta City Council adopted a planning proposal to provide for an expanded and more intense commercial core to facilitate the role of Parramatta as a Greater Sydney Central city, supported by a higher density of mixed uses. It is envisaged that the planning proposal will provide a capacity for an additional 48,475 jobs and 19,362 dwellings in the CBD.

Parramatta has been a place of designated meanings from its start. It was the second town to be established on the continent and the first to be fully planned. The town of Parramatta in the earliest days of European invasion and convict settlement became a seat of government, the landing place for transported convicts, and the centre of administration through the colonial period to 1840. The town that grew on that plan in the mid-19th century was fully developed in all its civic institutions. Its boundaries have been cultural rather than geographical ones. That it retains so much of its early heritage is evidenced in the abundant statutory listings of many heritage items at local, state, national and world heritage levels.
The city commissioned Hector Abrahams Architects to do a study of the heritage impact of the planning proposal. The study coincided not only with the planning vision, but the submission of dozens of planning proposals for skyscrapers on individual sites. The sites of protected items of environmental heritage were assessed decades earlier and were not in contention. The issue was the impact of the development on those items and the city as a whole. Attempts to lower the scale of new development around blocks of conservation areas had not been successful. Could a different way be found to protect the heritage as a whole?

**Approach**

Our approach was based on recognising Parramatta as an urban cultural landscape. In my assessment, the town consisted of more than its assembly of protected houses protected in a statutory planning scheme. It was demonstrable that it was planned on certain principles and important historic events, which remain not just relevant, but essential to its form, character and perceived values. Historic form is not a residual factor in the city, rather it is the indicator of the cultural landscape of the city.

**Methodology**

Following an examination of existing historical and significance analyses of the CBD, field work took us to every block of every street on foot. We visited all the parts of the CBD adjacent to where the existing planning instruments had ascribed special heritage status. The areas were examined at a micro level, comprising a description of form and landscape and photographs at each street intersection. Then a reference study of the CBD of Sydney was undertaken to locate examples of the different relationships that arise between high rise and historic spaces and buildings. This CBD is particularly relevant, as it sits in the same state planning network, and is developed by the same development industry. To gauge current developer approaches, the City of Parramatta were able to supply examples of future development.

---

proposed high rises for the city which, at the time, were being received at a rate of one per week.

Our study focussed on identifying planning and urban principles. Some were found latent in the original grid concept, and others came from the precedent study, and others from understanding the place itself as developed historically. In short, a cultural landscape perspective.

History

The proposition that it was a historically important cultural landscape was demonstrated through a sequence of historic plans describing the theme of the city in each period, presented over the current cadastral plan. This is one:

![Figure 2](image-url) 1814 plan of Township of Parramatta by Governor Macquarie. (Source: State Library of NSW).

It is now some twenty years after its foundation, and the town grid has been extended both north and south of the river. The above plan shows a town as developed at the junction of three main roads which connect to the two main centres of the colony, Sydney and the Hawkesbury. Captions on the plan point out the roads and destinations. The earlier organising axis from the George Street Wharf to Government House has been downgraded, in fact the street has been made narrower. This coincides with the second vision of the colony as a mixed society for convicts, emancipated convicts and increasingly free settlers, a vision framed under the policies of Governor Lachlan Macquarie. As a result, convicts are
at this time not roaming free, but are kept in barracks, and government institutions in the town are to have compound walls.

All the streets shown in the plan remain today along with the public and private demarcations, paths and river crossings, names, and key spatial relationships such as the alignment of George Street to Government House and the public square in front of the government-sponsored St John’s Parramatta Church.

Figure 3  St John’s Anglican Cathedral is the oldest Church of England parish in the country established in c.1802, the building commenced in (1802) sitting today on its original allotment of land. Its twin towers were added by Lachlan and Elizabeth Macquarie as an ornament to the town and references the foundational Saxon Christian church at Reculver, Kent. At the top left is seen the town hall which is sited on the early market square and between the two is the site of official Aboriginal gatherings. (Source: Parramatta Heritage Centre, LSP0381).

Strategies for managing impact

I present below some of the key strategies we suggested for ameliorating impact.

Impact to be assessed everywhere

First was a consideration of the scale of the impact which could be immediate, in the street, or more remote on the grid. The principle is that in an urban cultural landscape, heritage impact forms part of the assessment of any development, no matter where is it located in the town.
Figure 4  Illustration showing the relevance of impact at different levels in Parramatta. (Source: Hector Abrahams Architects).

Setting and space

The principal was that all development should contribute a positive setting for statutory heritage items. At a minimum, the space behind any item should be sufficient for a tree, remembering that most items were houses, which had gardens.
Rhythm of the street and subdivision pattern
The principal was that no matter what the size of the building, even a skyscraper, the rhythm of the street and the early subdivision pattern must be articulated.

Mode of address
The principle is that no matter what size of building, it must submit to the traditional mode of address to a street in an urban grid.
Overshading
Since the planning proposal anticipates tall tower structures, a potential impact lies outside the CBD through long shadows falling on important places. In particular Elizabeth Farm and Experiment Farm Cottage could be impacted.

Figure 8  Experiment Farm Cottage. (Source: Hector Abrahams Architects).

Figure 9  Possible impact of overshadowing on Elizabeth Farm. (Source: Google Earth image overlaid by diagrams by Hector Abrahams Architects).
Conclusion

Rapid, some would say rabid, urban growth indeed is transforming Australian cities, and the former heritage focus on setting apart historic precincts is no longer sufficient to realise environments that have cultural acceptance.

To avoid generic urbanism, the conservation of urban heritage must be incorporated into general planning controls.

This study adopted a cultural landscape perspective in the belief that the perceived experience of the city, even a CBD full of towers as envisaged, remains a cultural landscape experience.

![Figure 10 Current model of future Parramatta current as at November 2018. (Source: Hector Abrahams Architects).](image)

The symposium, *Cultural Landscape Diversity & the Implications for Management*, heard papers on the subject of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendations adopted by UNESCO’s General Conference in 2011. This study fits almost entirely within the HUL framework of identified pressures and opportunities to integrate urban heritage. The notable feature in the case of Parramatta, which perhaps locates it at an extremity of application, is the application of those principles for the conservation of urban landscape, as I would name it, in a city which has no historic district, but which is historic none the less. Although many might regard the heritage of Parramatta as residual, the perspective here has been the opposite.

It is noted that this study has none of the breadth anticipated by the HUL principles where, for instance, communities are consulted about the future form of the city.

The Council of the City of Parramatta endorsed the recommendations of our proposal at their meeting on 10 July 2018. Since then the proposal has been reviewed in the New South Wales planning system.
Extreme Challenges Facing the Conservation of the Lake Burley Griffin and the Lakeshore Landscape — a Community Parkland Space
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Abstract

In the 21st Century, community parkland landscapes have become vulnerable to exploitation by political financial interest groups. The associated values that are under threat are – environmental qualities, views and vistas, significant landscape experiences, community health and recreation resources, and particularly, intergenerational equity.

Using Lake Burley Griffin as a case study, this presentation explores how 21st Century land economics and developer driven strategies have over-ridden and unravelled expert urban planning and design while also ignoring well-supported heritage values. The paper commences with the story of Lake Burley Griffin and its lakeshore landscape and covers a summary of the lake's planning and development processes and the community advocacy undertaken, including its disheartening outcomes. It explores the promulgation of false spin and ignored community concerns for a government program that promotes development at the expense of the ethos of heritage.

The paper touches upon some suggestions as to how community members and the wider heritage discipline could counteract these powerful and damaging forces to strengthen and influence cultural capital in order to protect community parkland spaces.

Introduction

Australia has much to thank its forebears of colonial administration for, for their provision of a generous supply of green space that initially was manifest as domains, botanic gardens, commons and government farms (Freestone 2010, p. 241). Those green areas have evolved and expanded as community parks and recreation and natural areas, evident in city centres, urban fringes, riverine areas, and on hilltops and along foreshores. Canberra, initially planned in the closing era of the picturesque landscape movement and largely established in the mid 20th Century with modernist ideals, was bestowed with a great swathe of open space and a central lake as a core.

In February 2015, a group of friends met for a picnic at Weston Park, on the edge of Lake Burley Griffin, Canberra. All were concerned about recent damaging impacts on the parklands of Lake Burley Griffin that were instigated by Canberra's Kingston Foreshore Development process that had removed a neighbourhood rowing club and a commercial boat maintenance complex from the foreshore area enabling the sale of those sites. Both the boat club and the maintenance complex were subsequently relocated into community lakeside parklands.
The friends consolidated into an advocacy group – Lake Burley Griffin Guardians (the Guardians) and soon discovered that those original issues were the tip of the iceberg of what was being considered for the lake system of Lake Burley Griffin and its lakeshore landscape. Planning had been set in train to ensure that a process of city densification extending over a strategic lakeside parkland and some of the lake-bed in the West Basin could continue. The heritage values of Lake Burley Griffin, the community and the environmental benefits of the lakeshore landscape were ignored.

Lake Burley Griffin with its lakeshore landscape, although a recognised national icon, has only some segments listed for heritage protection. On the National Heritage List is the High Court National Gallery Precinct. On the Commonwealth Heritage List are the Parliament House Vista (encompassing parklands and gardens on the north and south side of the Central Basin), Yarralumla and Surrounds, the Carillon and the Sculpture Gardens of the National Gallery of Australia. On the ACT Heritage List are Jerrabomberra Wetlands and Weston Park, and there are numerous additional place nominations to heritage lists (refer GML 2009, pp. 2-3). Despite various studies and nominations there is no all encompassing heritage listing, conservation or management plan for Lake Burley Griffin's waters and its lakeshore landscape, a designed cultural landscape, as an integrated lake landscape system.

As with all cultural landscapes, understanding the natural environment component of Lake Burley Griffin's landscape system is fundamental to its conservation and management. The Lake is part of the Murray Darling Basin system comprising an impoundment of the Molonglo River with a catchment of approximately 185 km² that extends to the source of the Queanbeyan and Molonglo Rivers and includes Sullivans, Woolshed and Jerrabomberra Creeks. With inflow from the Molonglo River and other contributing streamlines, including urban runoff, virtually ceasing in drier times, the Lake’s waters are retained for lengthy durations and it subsequently requires a major flood for a significant flushing out of accumulated pollutants and contaminants. The Lake was first filled in 1964 and is comparatively young, with natural systems evolving, but yet to mature. Full maturity may be some time in the future (D. Mackenzie, email 3 June 2019).

Acton Park covers most of the West Basin lake landscape and is described as follows:

Acton Park consists of 10.4 hectares along the foreshore of Lake Burley Griffin's West Basin. It is a peaceful beautiful lakeside park with a historic grove of she-oak trees that were planted in 1927. (ACT Government, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate website).

As well as being a strategic component of the award winning Lake Burley Griffin system, the history of West Basin demonstrates how the planning showcase of 20th Century Canberra was flipped over in the 21st Century allowing land economics to prevail to the neglect of iconic heritage.

The Lake Burley Griffin planning story

The incorporation of ornamental waters was a prerequisite for Australia's national capital and a substantial lake system was to be the central feature of the National Capital plan designed by Walter Burley Griffin and Marion Mahony Griffin, and of the subsequent Griffin plans of 1913 (National Capital Authority 2004, p. 45) and 1918 (refer Figure 1). But it was the Menzies Government's National Capital Development Commission (NCDC) (refer Figure 2), undertaking intensive technical research from the 1950s to 1963 as well as a
strong consideration of practical requirements, that made the lake system plan work. The Commission conserved the Griffins’ three-basin composition, but softened the hard edges so that East and West Basins had a naturalistic edging more in line with natural contours of the landscape. The landscape style is discussed by Dianne Firth in her thesis, *Behind the Landscape of Lake Burley Griffin* (2000, p. 6) noting how the picturesque aspirations of the 19th Century met the international modernism ideals of the 20th Century. This is reflected in the landscape style of the lake, which can be loosely described as 'modern picturesque'.

Figure 1  Canberra Plan of City and Environs by W.B. Griffin 1918 from *The Griffin Legacy* report. (Source: National Capital Authority 2004).

Figure 2  Master Plan of Lake Burley Griffin prepared by the National Capital Development Commission 1963. (Source: National Capital Development Commission, map G8984 C3G45, 1964, National Library of Australia).
The lake structure as constructed in 1964 avoided the use of the Griffins’ causeways delineated in the 1911, 1913 and 1918 plans that helped to make the East and West Basins circular, although the 1918 plan (refer Figure 1) demonstrated that the West Basin causeway could not be constructed in a circular form, most likely due to the course of the Molonglo River. Research by the NCDC, leading to the 1964 plan, included a scale model of the lake to test variable water flows and their impacts (Baker 2013, p. 132). The lake was sculpted into formal and informal areas and expanded in parts to create rowing and sailing courses and beaches for recreation. Ken Taylor in *Canberra City in the Landscape* (2007, p. 135) notes that hydraulic considerations were critical design decisions determining the shore alignment and that edge treatments also considered ecological issues, potential wave magnitude, turbidity, sedimentation and erosion.

In 1957 a plan of the lake, prepared by the English planner William Holford, had deleted East and West Lakes on either side of the East and West Basins as they were deemed impractical, reduced East Basin by 50% and had the impoundment wall located off Acton Peninsula (Reid 2002, p. 240). In the early 1960s West Lake and East Basin were returned to approximately their former size to provide suitable waters for recreation (Baker 2013, p. 131). To minimise turbulent water flow, the NCDC established a more natural and less erodible shoreline with several islands to channel water flow (refer Figure 2). The lake infrastructure works included two gracefully curved concrete bridges and a dam wall each of which were outstanding engineering designs of their time. The ends of the southern banks of Central Basin foreshore were bevelled to allow the bridges to meet the lakeshore at right angles and for the lake to be streamlined and hydraulically efficient (Baker 2013, p. 131).

![Figure 3](image-url) The completed and filled West Basin from the air above ANU in 1964, taken by Richard Clough. (Source: National Library of Australia, BibID: 2253890).
West Basin was developed as a horseshoe shape in the 1960s, utilising the natural form of Acton Peninsula as a partial boundary rather than a projection into the basin as proposed in all the Griffin plans. Being protected from the forces of water flow present in other parts of the Lake, West Basin's northern area was constructed with a long extent of beach (shown as a white foreshore line in Figure 3) to provide for public recreation.

Walter Burley Griffin, a landscape architect and architect, had used formal and informal plantings in his American work. He expressed an appreciation of Australia's natural vegetation and, with Marion Mahony Griffin, compiled a list of native plants and their landscaping values (Clough and Gray 1964, p. 3). In his *The Federal Capital: Report Explanatory of the Preliminary General Plan*, (Griffin 1913, p. 7) noted 'the forest reserves of Black Mountain as incidentally perpetuating there the only remnant of primeval luxuriance in the city site'.

Before the lake was constructed, apart from the natural vegetation, plantings and clearing for pasture from the settlement era existed. During the Griffins’ time the lake landscape had begun to incorporate areas of Australian naturalness extending from Black Mountain and from Stirling Ridge to the West Lake shores. Landmark plantings of intense evergreen and formality were established with cypresses on the hill at the western end and a redwood plantation at the eastern end of the lake providing strong green vista terminal features. A continental arboretum, proposed by Griffin, is shown on his 1918 plan (Reid 2002, p. 146) to extend around West Lake and to the nearby hills beyond. During the lake's construction era from 1957-1963 some 40.5 ha of landscape planting was established around the Lake with planted character areas that used existing native trees and groupings of willows and poplars as formal and informal landscape areas. A total planting of 55,000 trees was accomplished (Clough and Gray 1964).

The Lake landscaping works of the 1960s retained much of the exotic tree planting from earlier years blended with native plantings, and followed an overarching principle – to retain the character of the natural landscape with the grey brown colour of the natural landscape to predominate, but with light fresh green around the lake margins; with autumn colours to be fully exploited in character areas of the Lake; and the Central Axis and Kings and Commonwealth Avenues to be formally planted (Clough and Gray 1964, p. 3-4).

The completed lake and landscape was a masterwork of design and engineering that successfully kept the spirit of the Griffins’ plan while achieving a functional and modern attractive expression. The works received the Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture Award of Landscape Excellence in 1986 and the Award of Excellence from Engineering Australia in 2001 (Australian Institute of Landscape Architects and Australian Engineering Legacy websites). National Engineering Landmarks that form part of the Lake Burley Griffin landscape include Scrivener Dam, the Commonwealth Avenue and Kings Avenue Bridges, the altered shoreline and Aspen Island (Australian Engineering Legacy website).

From the moment the Lake filled it became a recreation feature of the fledgling city, with people enjoying the natural (soft) lake environments as well as the structured (hard) environments. The community and visitors continue to use the Lake and its landscape for water sports, fishing, cycling, walking, national and local events and visit for relaxation and enjoyment of the views and vistas (Pipitone 2009).
From sanguine planning to visionless confusion

'Town' or 'urban planning' became a discipline in the 20th Century and, as noted in the Introduction to *Urban Nation Australia's Planning Heritage* by Robert Freestone (2010), has only been popular since 1910 when it ‘arose to capture goals of efficiency, health and beauty of cities over and above the existing preoccupations of the established built environment professions of architecture, engineering and surveying’. However, the early noble intentions of the profession were overtaken in the years leading into the 21st Century, when urban planning became dominated by economic interests.

Land custodianship by a series of Federal Government Planning Authorities had existed in Canberra for almost 50 years. The most influential authority was the National Capital Development Commission (NCDC) established by the Menzies Government in 1958 to hasten the development of the seat of Canberra as the National Capital at a time of post World War II wealth and rapid population growth. The NCDC was also responsible for the establishment of the framework for the satellite cities of Woden Valley, Belconnen, Tuggeranong and Gungahlin and major national cultural institutions. However, the foremost work of the NCDC was the construction of the central lake system (Lake Burley Griffin and lakeshore landscape) that became part of the National Capital Open Space System (NCOSS). NCOSS provided for an open space system to spread across Canberra's hills, including the Lake Burley Griffin system and the Molonglo River course which separated Canberra's satellite cities. NCOSS was part of the 1984 Metropolitan Plan and a designated area of Canberra (refer Figure 4) due to its national significance and being free of urban development (Fischer 2013, p. viii). Canberra's bush covered hills are a major feature that earns the city the title of 'the bush capital'.

![Figure 4](image-url) The 'Designated Area' of the National Capital (in red), 2019. (Courtesy of the National Capital Authority).
Following the establishment of the ACT Government in 1988, the NCDC was abolished in 1989. The *Australian Capital Territory Planning and Land Management Act* 1988 that divided planning responsibilities between the ACT Government and the Federal Government’s National Capital Planning Authority (that later became the National Capital Authority (NCA)) created a complex and confusing duel planning system with the NCA responsible for the national area, identified as the ‘Designated Area’ under the 1990 *National Capital Plan*, while the Territory Plan was to guide the planning and development of the Territory (Fischer and Weirick 2017, p. 118). Figure 5 illustrates land custodianship surrounding Lake Burley Griffin.

![Figure 5](https://example.com/jpg)

*Figure 5* Shoreline Custodianship of Lake Burley Griffin Shoreline 2019. The area edged in 'red' is land managed by the Commonwealth Government, the area edged in yellow is land managed by the ACT Government, and the area edged in green is the Governor General’s Estate. (Courtesy of the National Capital Authority).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A lake central feature of the prize winning plan for Canberra by Walter Burley Griffin and Marian Mahony Griffin, surrounded by a perimeter of parklands with 2 bridges and 2 causeways over the waters, including an extensive East Lake and West Lake either side of three central basins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Central Basin widened with an island at the Regatta Point location in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>West Basin circular shape changed in the plan (Reid 2002, 240).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>William Holford’s plan transformed the lake to an amorphous shape, deleted East and West Lakes, greatly reduced the lake’s size and the formality of its form, and impounded the lake at Acton Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>NCDC plan for the lake keeping Griffin's basin composition, land and water axes and the perimeter of parklands. The east and west ends of the Central Basin south side were bevelled. Freeways separated the city from the lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>NCDC plan for landscaping of the central basin extending natural vegetation from hills to the centre of the City commenced (Reid 2002 p.272).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lake completed with the lake shoreline mostly following natural contours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>NCDC Master Plan for Lake Burley Griffin. Lake waters reached their final level by 29 April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Inauguration and naming of the lake, Lake Burley Griffin by Prime Minister, the Hon Robert Menzies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>The NCDC received the Australian Institute of Landscape Excellence Award for Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Parklands (AILA 1986; NCDC 1986).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>The NCDC was abolished and National Capital Planning Authority (NCPA) established under the Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988 with responsibility for the capital but not for the rest of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Griffin Legacy report published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Amendments to the National Capital Plan (A.56, 59 60 and 61) provided authority for developments without heritage or social planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The City Plan, prepared by the ACT Government, with strategic planning that includes development of West Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City to the Lake Strategic Urban Design Framework prepared by the Land Development Agency, showing the development planned for West Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Amendment 86 to the National Capital Plan introduced wording to allow urban development in the lake parklands, as well as giving strength to heritage in the Designated Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The establishment of the ACT Government's City Renewal Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Henry Rolland Park opened 23 April. ACT Government referring to this as Stage 1 of the West Basin development and staging map developed <a href="https://www.act.gov.au/cityrenewal/places/west-basin">https://www.act.gov.au/cityrenewal/places/west-basin</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** Timeline of events associated with Lake Burley Griffin.
Adding to the planning confusion, the NCA was also responsible for the lands under ACT custodianship that held recognised national significance and lay within the Designated Area. This included segments of the Lake Burley Griffin lakeshore landscape that had been granted to the ACT Government. The National Capital Plan is a legal instrument developed to guide and direct land management in the Designated Area and up until May 2019 has been subject to 91 amendments.

The early years of self-government coincided with a ‘land economics movement’ and in 2003 a Canberra Central Task Force was established comprised 'of out-of-town political heavies and land development lobbyists who demanded that the ACT derive more revenue from inner city land sales after "up-zoning"' (Jack Kershaw, letter Canberra Times 4/9/17).

The NCA responded to the development pressures with *The Griffin Legacy* report (NCA 2004) richly adorned with painted images. The report covered a history of the Griffins’ Canberra planning, but distorted the planning intention to support market forces and enable development of central Canberra (including West Basin), the area declared in the National Capital Plan as being of 'national significance'.

Some of the troubling directions from *The Griffin Legacy* report were transformed in the series of amendments to the National Capital Plan (Amendments 56, 59 60 and 61) without basic urban strategy studies for heritage, social value and the environment (Weirick 2007; Fischer and Weirick 2013). Some of the amendments were far-reaching. For example, Amendment 61 gave directions for the development of an apartment enclave over West Basin with the infilling of 2.8 ha of the lakebed extending up to 80m from the existing shoreline. The Federal Government's Joint Parliamentary Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories (JSCNCET 2007) recommended disallowance of the amendments, and Senator Bob Brown submitted a disallowance motion in Parliament, but both Labor and Liberal politicians provided strong reasons against the motion (Commonwealth Parliament of Australia 2007). Neither position reflected the heritage values of the Lake, City Hill or the past acclaimed urban planning. Senator Bob Brown's motion urging disallowance was lost.

Amendments 56-61 created a flawed National Capital Plan that gave guidance for markedly increasing the density of the inner city landmark feature of City Hill as well as West Basin with high-rise developments that will block significant vistas across the lake. The iconic Commonwealth Avenue route to Australia's Parliament is to be edged on its western lakeside with privately owned apartment blocks, whereas the original design was for parkland with vistas across lake waters to distant mountain ranges.

These changes are part of a wave of city development that has been transforming the excellence of past planning to a city responding to ad hoc market forces. The transformation is well-described by Karl Fisher and James Weirick (2017, pp. 111-135) who also note the shift from high-level political support for Canberra at the Federal level to persistent disinterest on the part of Federal politicians. The political attitude is coupled with the divesting of public assets and chronic underfunding for the planning and development of the capital and its heritage.

The National Capital Authority planners in their *The Griffin Legacy* report ignored the layered history and the heritage of the outstanding contribution of the Menzies NCDC in executing a feasible, well engineered and designed lake system. *The Griffin Legacy* report
instead became a blueprint for market development. Tony Powell, former Director of the NCDC, noted:

... for 25 years the National Capital Plan protected Acton Park, West Basin, for specific public open space for recreation and tourist activities, a status that was confirmed by it being zoned as part of the National Capital Open Space System that was changed without public consultation by a variation to "residential" with a gridiron street pattern that was not in any Griffin's or NCDC schemes. (Powell 2016).

The spin promulgated by the Governments was that infilling part of West Basin followed the line of a segment of the arc of Griffin’s 1918 plan, as if that claim would make it a desirable proposal. As noted above, the design and engineering for the Lake was well researched by the NCDC and kept the spirit of the Griffins’ three basin composition, but involved many alterations to the original Griffin Lake outline. To promote a small segment of the Griffin West Basin outline to validate lake infill for development is antithetical to the Griffin's plans of 1913 and 1918, as well as the NCDC plan of 1963.

Environmental and climate factors ignored

As Canberra’s lakes and most of its creeks do not flow perennially they are prone to poor oxygenation. A wide diversity of plants on land and in the water promotes wildlife habitat and helps trap the inflow of nutrient-rich minerals, which are the prime cause of eutrophication and blue-green algal blooms that in turn can cause more serious deoxygenating and possible fish kills (D. Mackenzie, email 3 June 2019).

The continuous green space of trees and grasslands of the Lake Burley Griffin lakeside is an integral component of the lake system. The natural lake edges of West Basin that have established native wetland grasses are now currently valuable as habitats for wildlife such as swans, ducks and coots, while platypus and rakali (the water rat) have been seen foraging in West Basin's water.

West Basin's naturalistic lake edge and open grassed areas suitable for recreational play and family picnics are to become hard-edged, life-free concrete boardwalks and building structures that not only block significant vistas, but also promote cold winter shadows. The more obvious issues of climate change are excesses and durations of temperature. Frost, drought, summer heat waves, fire and flood that figure strongly in the lives of Canberra citizens will worsen, particularly as population and city densification increases.

Heritage values and ethical planning ignored

The lake and its landscape is part of a National Heritage List nomination, ‘Canberra the Planned National Capital’, that in 2013 was to be finalised by Minister Greg Hunt. The listing however was thwarted by the ACT Labor-Greens Government that would not agree to the proposed boundary. The Chief Minister, Andrew Barr MLA, in a letter to the Hon. Greg Hunt MP (30 November 2015) regarding the listing proposal, also wrote ‘It is important that any future listing does not impose unnecessary additional regulatory burden or economic uncertainty of any kind’.

The Guardians membership is of predominantly retired individuals with backgrounds in a broad range of disciplines, but who have combined due to their common outrage at the
plans to damage Lake Burly Griffin and its associated lakeshore landscape. The group has a strong association with the Australian Garden History Society and has links to the National Trust of Australia (ACT), the Community Councils for North Canberra and Inner South Canberra and some neighbourhood community groups. The Guardians have attempted to pursue heritage listing, believing that the mechanism would enforce the heritage values to be considered.

Well-researched documentation in the form of heritage nominations and emergency nominations for ‘Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape’ were prepared by the Guardians citing heritage significance at a national level against seven of the eight national heritage criteria (Lake Burley Griffin Guardians 2016). This is comparable to the National Heritage listing of the designed cultural landscapes of ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’; ‘Centennial Park’, Sydney; and Melbourne's ‘Domain Parkland and Memorial Precinct’ (Department of Environment & Energy 2019). In addition, a Commonwealth Heritage List nomination was prepared. Despite this, the nominations for the ‘Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape’ have been ignored by the Federal Government and its Heritage Council. However, the Lake waters and one metre of lakeshore edging is supposed to have blanket protection under Commonwealth Heritage in the Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, but this is a status that is yet to be formally tested.

The ongoing lack of the Federal Government's heritage listing encouraged the Guardians to liaise with Australia ICOMOS (International Council of Monuments and Sites) and the ICOMOS-IFLA (International Federation of Landscape Architects) International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes to prepare a Heritage Alert. This led to a Resolution being passed at the International ICOMOS General Assembly in 2017 (ICOMOS letter, 19th February 2018). Both the Federal and the ACT Governments have acknowledged the ICOMOS letter, but appear to have ignored its strong recommendations that covered the lack of progress on the National Heritage listing, that the infill of the Lake for development be halted, and that an overarching conservation management plan recognising and protecting heritage and environmental values be undertaken.

The Guardians, have also pursued other advocacy angles such as legal compliancy, environmental and social concerns, liaison with politicians, informing the public, flyers, petitions to both Federal and ACT Governments, media letters and media releases, information stands, sausage sizzles, clean-up-the-lake work, banner displays and public meetings. The first public meeting in 2016, that had speakers from the Federal and Territory Governments in attendance, resulted in unanimously agreed resolutions for an entire Lake Burley Griffin heritage listing and a halting of the West Basin development. The second public meeting in October 2018, held jointly with other community groups and University of Canberra's Institute for Governance and Political Analysis, had over 400 people attend and had similar resolution outcomes (Lake Burley Griffin Guardians 2018). The Guardian's petition to the ACT Government had over 700 signatures, yet has also been emphatically ignored by the ACT Government (E. Lee, letter 3 August 2018).

Planning processes undertaken by the ACT's Land Development Agency (LDA) that included excessive payments made to commercial operators in West Basin and which were exposed by the ACT's Auditor General, Maxine Cooper (Lawson 2017) resulted in the removal of the agency and the emergence of the City Renewal Authority. This authority however has continued to implement the warped vision of its predecessor. Journalist Jack
Waterford, who publicised the Auditor General’s revelations, noted that Canberra ‘may have the best-educated and most bourgeois citizens of any city in the world but it has never seemed to have exemplary public administration’ (Waterford 2016). The Guardians have also observed other examples of government-developer cronyism, for example the relaxed rules for developers, with shortcuts in environmental assessments and heritage impact studies such as shown in the flow on from the Griffin Legacy amendments.

West Basin with its Acton Park lakeshore landscape, a critical component of Lake Burley Griffin, is but one of the unfortunate proposals subject to intense development promotion directed by the NCP and promoted by the ACT Government. As noted above, the Griffins’ 1918 plan is being misleadingly used to give credibility to the Land Development Agency’s ‘City to the Lake’ proposal, particularly the infilling of 2.8 ha of the Lake to extend the apartment estate area.

Acton Park has been neglected for many years, with the Government adding additional parking areas on redundant futsal courts while commercial operators such as bike hire and paddle boats, that gave the park some vitality were closed down years before they needed to be, thus making the place appear dull and lacking in vibrancy although it continues to be well used by joggers, swimmers, tourists and cyclists. The neglect appears strategic so as to foster the preparation for a densely populated privately owned estate, the ‘City to the Lake’ proposal.

![Figure 6](image.jpg)

**Figure 6** City to the Lake development proposal at West Basin, 2016. (Image provided to the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians by the Land Development Authority 2016).

The first stage of the ‘City to the Lake’ project, a park beside the northern end of Commonwealth Avenue Bridge, was opened in April 2018 with the City Renewal Authority
using the opportunity to foreshadow the ensuing damaging development stages (Willett 2018, pp. 120-121) and to apply more spin:

Just as with Sydney’s Darling Harbour, Brisbane’s South Bank and Melbourne’s Docklands, a redeveloped West Basin will unite the city centre with its best landscape feature (ACT Government City Renewal Authority 2018).

ACT Planning is clearly trying to gain credibility in their planned appropriation of Acton Park and Lake by equating the peoples’ parkland with post-industrial urban renewal. The West Basin development as a major source of revenue for the ACT Government is being strongly promoted, while the proposed final expensive stage of the project – the lowering of Parkes Way to make the City to the Lake connection, is not mentioned. There are sound reasons and support for public transport infrastructure, but what we are seeing in the ACT is the construction of new urban infrastructure primarily for political/economic purposes rather than meeting a demographic demand.

Canberrans generally delight in their self-sufficient city of wide green open spaces with a magnificent lake and gracious vistas. Lake Burley Griffin and its lakeshore landscape are interconnected with the city, the suburbs and the much wider natural open space areas. In 2016, Canberra citizens voted overwhelmingly to brand their car number plates 'Canberra the Bush Capital' (Canberra Times, 14 March 2017) representing their love for their nature-based city. However, one of Canberra's wealthiest development teams has been reported as believing that the term 'bush capital' is used by people to tone down developers delivering ambitious projects who believe their high-rise developments are 'sophisticated' (Foden 2018).

Conclusion

We are now witnessing the undoing of the special qualities of the national capital created in the 20th Century. The ACT Government, reliant on land sales to augment its revenue, is focusing on the sale of green-field areas, including parklands in the city area. The damaging city development proposals with their roots in the 1990 National Capital Plan show no respect for urban heritage planning, the effects of modern climate change on the fragile lake shore environment, the ensuing heat bank and traffic chaos from excessive development, the social need for intergenerational equity or the recreational needs of rapidly increasing numbers of apartment dwellers.

West Basin should have had protection under the Designated Area planning provisions of the National Capital Plan and the National Capital Open Space System, but this has not saved the lake or parklands and neither have its heritage values. Lake Burley Griffin is loved by Canberrans and visitors, but development on its shores and appropriation of its waters are calamities. Although urban density may need to increase in Canberra, it should not be at the loss of strategic and valued community parklands which, together with Lake Burley Griffin, forms the designed cultural landscape of national significance.

The Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape example indicates that heritage listings and legislation in Australia do not appear to be effective in combating development proposals that are destructive of significant heritage. Heritage groups now need to form and to do battle on behalf of heritage, but wins for heritage are not guaranteed. Basic principles such as the need for intergenerational equity and the precautionary principle are also being ignored. This low ebb for landscape heritage needs a new approach. Education is perhaps a
seed for change if understanding the value of cultural landscapes could be promoted to school children. The topic could be included into existing programs such as environmental education.

A troubling concern noted by the Guardians is that few Canberrans and perhaps fewer Australians in general realise that the shoreline of Lake Burley Griffin, their capital, is destined for urban development. Such a major reuse of national landscape and lake water, zoned as nationally significant, should have elicited not only broad national, but also broad international condemnation. However, possibly due to the ‘secrecy’ associated with the development rezoning and speed of amendments to the National Capital Plan, few people are aware that it is actually happening.

Walter Burley Griffin is famously quoted from an article in *The New York Times* 2 June 1912 (Griffin D, 2008:21) – ’I have planned a City like no other city in the world’. In 2017, Heather Henderson, daughter of Prime Minister Robert Menzies, expressed the painful feelings of most Canberrans when writing that 'If we keep going, Canberra will end up looking like any other city'. Henderson further noted, 'It is sad, distressing, agonising (no word is too strong) to be a witness to the destruction of Canberra ... Who, in their right mind, could prefer concrete and coffee shops and (greatest horror of all) blocks of flats, to calm beautiful water and trees on the shore and mountains in the distance?’ (Henderson 2017).
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The Cultural Landscape of the Cambria property near Swansea, East Coast, Tasmania *
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Introduction
Since 2014, under a Liberal Government, Tasmania has seen profound planning and heritage changes. These were to be fairer, faster, cheaper and simpler. Proposed was a single state-wide planning scheme, ministerial call-in powers, an expert Planning Reform Taskforce and more.

Cambria was placed on the former Register of the National Estate in 1978. It adjoins the Moulting Lagoon which is a dedicated Ramsar Convention Wetland for migratory birds. Originally coastal woodland with marshy areas, it was used by Aboriginal peoples for thousands of years. Cambria was developed as a colonial estate pastoral/agricultural farm from 1821. Currently the property is 3,185 ha in size with twelve titles, owned by six Chinese companies, one Australian Company (two titles) and two private international owners (one has multiple titles). The property was put up for sale in 2012, but the public were not made aware until late April 2018 when the local Glamorgan Spring Bay Council announced a Specific Area Plan (SAP). If passed this Plan would be the facilitator for all development that could or might follow. The Council voted to pass the SAP. Following this decision the matter was sent to the Tasmanian Planning Commission with the public invited to put in representations, (over 600 received), one being from the Australian President of ICOMOS. By August 2018, Hobart Town Hall saw a packed audience over the Council decision.

Original J.C. Loudon components (drive, orchard (s), garden (s), shrubbery etc.) would need restoration but the proposed change of land use/landscape to a tourist/health facility/town for international visitors would, in my professional view, be a totally unacceptable one.

Cultural landscape: Centrepiece of this paper
The Cambria property near Swansea lies within two cultural landscapes (refer Figure 1). The first is an area enclosed by the ridgeline boundary marked along an outlier of the Eastern Tiers, Moulting Lagoon, Great Oyster Bay and the Freycinet Peninsula. Within this large areal place of ancient, highly diverse, land/water interfaces, much natural landscape is

* Author’s note: This paper is based on a Power Point presentation that was delivered at the Cultural Landscape Symposium held in Hobart, Tasmania on 10 November 2018. This paper builds on that presentation through the addition of significant text and visual materials.

---

1 Re-elected March 2018.
2 A fairer, faster, cheaper, simpler planning system: Tasmanian Liberals.
observable. For more than 40,000 years prior to colonial occupation, the land and waters were used by Aboriginal peoples who either lived by the Moulting Lagoon or else seasonally visited it (Mowling & Dunn 2007, Ryan 1996).

Figure 1  Author’s impression of two cultural landscapes, East Coast of Tasmania: The solid line area is the “naturalness/ancient” landscape; and the Cambia landscape is encompassed by the area within the purple dotted line (the original 1822 grant to George Meredith) and the dotted green lines (that part of Cambria now owned by the overseas consortium). (Basemap taken from Tasmania 1:250,000 topographic series).

As a colonial gentleman's estate landscape (of nearly 200 years), the Cambria property is embedded within its larger areal setting. I argue that the Cambria property demonstrates rare and intact cultural landscape values of national significance. In this paper, I draw on a land use model developed in the United Kingdom (UK), which assesses place and the character of place (Swanwick & Land Use Consultants 2002). I have drawn on this model in my past work (Sheridan 2006a, 2006b, 2008, 2012, 2015; Sheridan & Read 2019).
This paper describes refinements to the process of landscape characterisation that have been developed by the Living Landscapes Project (LLP) within the context of the now widely adopted approach to Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) in England.

The Swanwick & Land Use Consultants (2002) report included a diagram, illustrating the components considered as contributing to landscape. Those four major categories of the 2002 work were Natural, Cultural/Social, Perceptual and Aesthetic. With the 2002 original diagram marginally changed by Di Fazio & Modica (2018)\(^3\), such an holistic approach for Historic Rural Landscapes is welcomed. It helps open the international door to World Rural Landscapes. In this paper I principally focus on the cultural/land use/evolved landscape of the Cambria property, but also include some information on the perceptual and aesthetic components. This can be built upon.

The Natural Landscape

The natural landforms, long evolved river terraces, complex soils, existing natural vegetation, four river systems and large but different water bodies dictated how and what kind of settlement would occur in this place; the large outer boundary framework of hill and

---

\(^{3}\) This paper is widely referenced on the Internet.
higher peak ridgelines defining a very strong boundary line for the culturally defined landscapes. The colonial farming landscape (of which Cambria is a large one) is set within that.

Within the natural elements of the evolved landscape are a multiple, very varied, interconnected set of natural landscape components; this is critically important. It would be difficult to find this form of natural landscape elsewhere in Tasmania. The two entirely different water bodies and their surrounds are extremely important due to their diversity and presentation of physical expression. Then too, intangible weather effects play out across the water surfaces, (e.g. sunrise, sun through cloud effects, colour change effects). Such effects can be linked to the eighteenth and nineteenth century landscape aesthetics of the Sublime, Picturesque and Beautiful.

The Colonial Cultural Landscape

Early locations, then grants: Landscape commences to change

George Meredith arrived in Van Diemen's Land in 1821 with his family, a free emigrant of means.

He came to establish a new life in an ancient land on the other side of the world. The east coast of Tasmania in 1821 had no permanent non-Indigenous settlers and the Van Diemen's Land colony was a penal settlement established for convicts deported from the UK. From original records, it is clear that George thought there was a mutual agreement with the British Government for emigrants such as he; that convict labour would be provided to the agricultural settlers by the local authorities (Melville 1836). In addition, his vision was to advance and improve a "large tract of land", combined with reformation of convict labour in his care; both seen by him as beneficial (Meredith 1833).

As early as 1826, George had acquired 13,000 acres of land either having been granted it, or having been given reserved rights to it. It included the Cambria land (then 2,000 acres), Redbanks land (500 acres for his son, George Meredith Junior), land north of the Wye River which became the Riversdale land. The Belmont land and the additional Moulting Lagoon spit land were obtained shortly thereafter (being the eastern extension of spit lands (2715 acres) and Belmont (1030 acres)).

The details of his careful exploration are found in Meredith’s (1821) diary and in an 1821 letter to his brother overseas (Von Stiglitz 1955). Meredith knew about "prospect" (long view outwards, encompassing both land and sky) and grand appearance views but there were practical considerations such as fresh water, boat and transport access (out of the area), flat land for agriculture, while the Hill (or "location") lands were seen as suitable for sheep. In selecting land it was quickly discovered that George Meredith had claimed the same land as William Talbot, also a free emigrant from the Irish gentry. Given that the survey department in Van Diemen's Land was somewhat in disarray, it fell to Earl Bathurst, UK Colonial Secretary Goulburn and Governor Brisbane (N.S.W.) to intervene across 1822-1823 to sort out the confusion (Government Office Duplicate Despatch files). A duplicate despatch government file of 1826 (Figures 3A & 3B) outlined the exact boundaries of Meredith's land claims.

---

Historical Records of Australia. Series III, Vols. 4 and 5 are useful too. Look under Meredith in Index.
Figure 3 Map showing land grants, which are some of the oldest remaining intact in Tasmania and in the nation. A (left): the map (or despatch) is dated 28 August 1826 and was signed by Dumaresq, then Assistant Surveyor General. B (right): blow up of section of Figure 3A showing the site of the first Belmont house, occupied by the Meredith family from approximately 1827 to 1836. (Source: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage Office, Government Office Duplicate Despatch Files, GO33 1.1).

By c.1830, the Cambria estates consisted of the properties Cambria, Riversdale and Belmont; Kearney’s Bogs, near Lake Leake, and Apsley River Farm near Bicheno, (Trethowan 2016).

These very early grants are, in the main, still recognisable in the 2019 landscape. Historically this is extremely important since these earliest land grant patterns are a-typical of what occurred following the arrival of Lieutenant Governor Arthur (1824) and the subsequent Report of the Land Commissioners in 1826-1828 (McKay 1962). The later period saw more orderly methods in land granting occurred, so the pattern of granting changed markedly from the earliest grants. The Meredith family first lived at Redbanks, but by 1827 had moved to an original house constructed by William Talbot. It was called Belmont and was built of logs and shingles with five rooms, an underground dairy and a store room (Ward, Ferris and Brookes 2017).\(^5\)

\(^5\) This sentence is taken from Trethowan Architecture Interiors Heritage (2017), but is originally from Ward, Ferris and Brooks (2016, pp. 13-15).
1800s Landscape Input

At an earlier time in the UK, John Meredith, (George's father) had, from 1785-1791, leased Castle Bromwich Hall\(^6\) a splendid Jacobean structure currently a Grade I English Heritage listed mansion with "its parks and gardens [that] extended over many acres and were justly famous" (Ellis 1979). The Gardens were "rescued in 1985 by the Castle Bromwich Hall Gardens Trust, are Grade II listed"\(^7\) and can be visited by the public.\(^8\) George therefore at formative ages between around 7-13 years was likely cognisant of the beauty of a very large and complex gentleman's country estate garden, with its differently defined garden spaces. Christian Norberg-Schulz (1975) in his 1970s research into the phenomenology of place offered an important insight into our childhood perceptions of place. He noted:

> that objects of identification are concrete environmental properties and that man's relationship to these is usually developed during childhood ... The child develops perceptual schemata which determine all future experiences. (Norberg-Schulz 1975, p. 21).

As an adult, it was likely that George Meredith knew about the landscape debate that was occurring in the UK. The debate centred on the gentleman's country house, gardens and country estate, with intense interest which occurred for more than a 100 year period. From philosophers and parliamentarians, to landscape designers, clergy, artists, novelists, writers and essayists (such as Jane Austen), poets (including William Wordsworth and John Clare), all contributed and became involved in the debate. Everyone it seemed offered an opinion on beauty, connecting it to the country landscape, what was happening and what ought to happen to it. Gardening and plant acquisition became centre stage in respect of the entire estate. Plants hitherto unforeseen were flooding into Britain from the New World and Far East. Publications such as Curtis' Botanical Magazine, Gardener's Magazine, Gardener's Chronicle and J.C. Loudon's works, sprang into life affording the country gentleman a wealth of information. A suitable selection of tasteful, new, fashionable 'must-have' flowers and trees became available at the large nurseries that emerged as a consequence, (e.g. Loddiges, Veitch, Lee and Kennedy).

The terms ‘The Sublime’, its opposite ‘The Beautiful’, (slightly later the ‘Picturesque’) were debated; while landscapes captured the attention of artists. The Grand Tour(s) for the wealthy gained numerous adherents. The country house, landscape design, plant dissemination, "good taste" were central to the change. A growing class of the wealthy were enabled to build the house and then plan their estate land and gardens to complement the house; both considered equally important. Each component depended on and was interconnected to the other. It may be no accident that William Gilpin too, released his Observations on the River Wye in 1782 and that the Wye River in eastern Tasmania has become the current northern boundary of current Cambria ownership. George Meredith for a time lived in Glamorganshire, Wales. Two of his daughters were born in Llantrisant which is not far distant from the Welsh Wye river landscape. The Cambria property is topographically similar to its counterpart on the other side of the world.

---

\(^6\) http://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000118 Castle Bromwich Hall.
\(^7\) https://www.solihull.gov.uk/Resident/.../castlebromwichhistory
\(^8\) https://www.solihull.gov.uk/Resident/.../castlebromwichhistory; and https://www.solihull.gov.uk/Resident/Libraries/Local-family-history/localhistory/castlebromwichhistory
George Meredith thought of himself as a gentleman. His vision was for a gentleman's garden to complement his imposing house. The gardens, (front, south side at a lower level, rear of the house) were all planted out prior to the house being built (1836). This situation is known through early letters that George and Mary (second wife) wrote to each other, with George often issuing instructions. One of these in 1823 is critically significant:

*You and they must study and plan different ways of laying out the Grounds and embellishing nature by art – each person distinct from another that there may be no borrowing or copying and the respective plans and ideas can be compared afterwards. Not only plans of different houses differently laid out, but walks, shrubberies, fields, & & & and even after these anxious endeavours to make Oyster Bay a place of residence to all our wishes.* (Meredith Family Papers UTAS, 1823, 2: emphasis added).

The Gardens

The walks, shrubbery, live hedges, fields, gardens, the 'usual' and unusual plantings (even a Bower and Arcadia) were progressively laid out across the nineteenth century by George (died 1856) and Mary (died 1842), then their son, John Meredith. This is mentioned in early and later family letters, (Meredith papers, various dates) other family documents (Edwin Meredith, n.d.; Louisa Meredith 1852), by successive newspaper articles (Mercury 1883, 1884) by a great, great granddaughter Josephine (no surname given, Meredith Family papers). By the early 1900s, photography helps validate what was then present. Meanwhile original details are described:

..... it was a common event for my Mother to take me with her for the day, taking our dinner with us, spending the day sowing Flower seeds or planting out bulbs etc. & return home to "Belmont" a mile distant, in the evening in time for tea. Then we would make excursions into the "Bush" with Horse and cart and spade, to such places as I indicated as having seen pretty shrubs, while out kangarooing having with us a man to drive the horse and carry the plants to the cart. Many of the plants so obtained were an ornament and memorial of my dear Mother's love of the beautiful when I finally left home at 25 years of age. [Meredith Edwin, n.d., p. 6]

And by 1884,

*The grounds in front are laid out handsomely as a shrubbery and landscape garden of which Mr Meredith is very proud for they are of his own creating. With the exception of a few trees of the pine variety which were grown from nursery saplings, all have been raised from seeds. There are planes, Insignis, Lambertiana, Cunninghamii, Douglasii etc., araucarias, four kinds of pittosporum [sic], Moreton Bay figs, Chillian pepper tree, loquats, cedars and so forth, all large and healthy... A circular bed planted with roses, tulips, polyanthi [sic], hyaciantha [sic], Daphne etc. is in front of the deep verandah, all except the roses in Bloom.* (Mercury, 11 Oct 1884, p. 4).

The trees in 2019 include, *Pinus insignis* (now *Pinus radiata*, then a favoured 'new' introduced tree), *Cunninghamii, Araucaria cunninghamii* (Hoop pine), *Douglasii, Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas or Oregon fir). Two other araucarias are the *Araucacaria heterophylla* (Norfolk Island pine) and *Araucaria bidwillii* (Bunya Bunya pine). Two pittosporums remain at the property, *Pittosporum undulatum* and *Pittosporum eugenioides*
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(Lemonwood, New Zealand). The Chillian pepper tree is a *Schinus molle* (native to Peruvian Andes). The cedars are *Cedrus atlantica* from the Atlas Mountains in Morocco, and only introduced into England "about 1845" (Dallimore and Jackson. 1931). Some trees have obviously been lost; the macrocarpa, two pittosporums, the Moreton Bay figs, and loquats. Other trees have been planted with include the Norfolk Island hibiscus.

The trees illustrated in Figures 5A and 5B (below) are considered to be at least 160 years old. The Bunya Bunya pine may be as old, or older than the tree at Brickendon Estate, now a World Heritage Area property.

The trees in Figures 5A to 5C form an extremely distinct part of the heritage landscape (front garden) of the Cambria property. It is considered that at least some were sourced originally from the then Royal Society's Gardens in Hobart, now the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens. Alternatively they may have been sourced through George Fordyce Story at Kelvedon, a botanist and medical doctor who lived with the Cotton family; Story had been the first Secretary in 1844 to the Royal Society's Gardens and, as well, his family had links with the Backhouse nursery in York, UK.

**Arcadia, the Bower and the lower river terrace**

Reference to the place called Arcadia, was made in a photograph (refer Figure 6C) and as well by John Meredith in his *Farm Journal* entry in July 1899 at a time when the lower terrace was flooded (John Meredith 1899).

Bowers in Tasmanian historical gardens are considered extremely rare. J.C. Loudon (1822) made a comment about them in the *Encyclopaedia of Gardening*. The Cambria bower was mentioned numerous times in early letters of George Meredith (Meredith, G4/1-22 letters).

The bower was referred to by Louisa Meredith in the 1840s:

> ... showering a bowery path and rustic bench in one place were fine tall trees of the beautiful English elder, rich in their noble creamy-white clusters of most fragrant blossoms ... (Meredith 1852, p. 93).

---

9 A copy of Loudon was known to be in Tasmania by 1826.
And by great, great granddaughter Josephine in the early 1900s:

We pass through a hawthorn-encircled arbour that has seen the love-making of each succeeding generation, along a path overhung with sycamores, and climb up a steep bank thick with periwinkle and ivy, to find ourselves once more in the front garden.

(Josephine, no surname given, TAHO, n.d. (probably early 1900s)).

A most interesting very modern interpretation on the meaning of the Bower comes from Judith W. Page and Elise L. Smith. In reviewing Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*, these authors noted that:

... the Narrator imagines both the bedchamber and the bower as a feminine space associated with tranquility and renewal - for Catharine, the place where she is most herself and not some false representation that she reveals to the world. (Page and Smith 2011, p.217).

---

**Figure 5A**  *Araucaria bidwillii* (Bunya Bunya pine). (Photo: the author, 2019).

**Figure 5B** Radiata pines and Atlas cedar. (Photo: the author 2019).

**Figure 5C** The conifer collection at Cambria. The Queensland Hoop pine is on the far left of the image, the Norfolk Island pine behind a chimney of the house while the Bunya pine dominates the front space. (Photo: Stuart Read, 2019).
Figure 6  Arcadia, Cambria. A (top left): steps down to the lower level (photo: the author, 2019). B (bottom left): a part of Arcadia in 2019 (photo: the author, 2019). C (top right): Arcadia, labelled as such (photo - Violet Mace, early 1900s; courtesy: Glamorgan Spring Bay Historical Society). D (bottom right): another area of Arcadia with New Zealand flax (*Phormium tenax*) growing well amongst the many Sycamore trees\textsuperscript{10} (photo: Stuart Read).

Cambria Shrubbery, Live Hedges and Drive

There was a shrubbery at Cambria, with an 1884 newspaper making reference to it. Its location was also shown in the 1888 map plan of the property:

*The grounds in front are laid out handsomely as a shrubbery and landscape garden* ... (Mercury, 11 Oct 1884, p. 4).

The shrubbery was planted out largely using conifers but they are not present in 2019. A line of English oaks and a hedge now separates what was the shrubbery from the homestead paddocks.

\textsuperscript{10} Louisa Meredith (1852) commented upon New Zealand flax growing at Cambria in the 1840s
Live hedges were an integral part of the Cambria landscape to differentiate paddocks, orchards and farm components. Louisa Meredith referred to gorse and hawthorn, as well as the use of post and rail fencing. One employee, Sam, was kept continually trimming hedges.
across months (1858 *Farm Journal*). Live hedges defined the Cambria Drive, which had an unusual pattern. The drive was described in the early 1900s:

*Turning off the stony main road, we drive up a long lane bordered on both sides by high hawthorn hedges, past the solid stone stables and the high stone wall that surrounds the back garden, and then up another hawthorn shaded lane to the white entrance gates. These are overhung by two enormous almond trees that reach across the giant archway.* (Josephine, no surname given, TAHO, n.d. (probably early 1900s)).

Small sections of the high stone wall remain.

And from Mr. Loudon:

*The first view obtained of the house ought to be as favorable as possible and not of any particularly front, but rather an angular view bosomed in trees. The second or if there are two or more the last view on a nearer approach should be distinct and shew the entrance front and porch or portico; the road approaching it at such a distance obliquely as the eye may now readily comprehend the whole and to the greatest advantage.* (Loudon 1822, p. 1174).

Across the nineteenth century it was not until the carriage turned into the walled entrance gates, (now removed) under the conifers, that the front garden and front of house would have been visible. It fitted more or less to Loudon’s opinion that the view of the house had to be kept ‘hidden’ until the last possible moment. Possibly roof and attics were always visible coming up the drive but enclosure had been designed and then was executed from the middle nineteenth century onward.

The pattern of Cambria Lane is unique to the property.

The Land Use of Cambria

**Paddock size, design, patterns**

In teasing out nineteenth century property place history, plans are crucial. Cambria has plans that stretch from the 1826 grant plan (already referred to), survey plans (1840s), and excellent sale plans for 1861, 1871, and 1888. All of these plans are very detailed in presentation. There are Commonwealth Valuation Field Books for 1951 for Belmont and Redcliffe, both properties integrated into the Cambria Estate in the nineteenth century. These too detail farm management and paddock use, costs, property improvements, etc.

By 1861, paddocks were named, (and numbered); for example Number 13, was one of the orchards, Number 5 a garden paddock which had wheat growing in it.

The 1861 plan can be compared with the *Farm Journal* 1858-59 (Meredith family papers. Non State Records TAHO). The 1871 map plan can be compared to the 1869-70 *Field Journal*. This allows both a time based detailed account and a location based account to be compared with each other.

This type of location based, time based unusual match-up is considered invaluable in cultural heritage research.
There was a distinct seasonal rhythm to the farm work but always plenty of it. Farm work was very labour intensive. Snapshots from the Farm Journals provide a daily detail of how a colonial historic, agricultural, pastoral estate was worked, its pattern uncovered, its specificity detailed.

Google Earth in 2019 indicates the very early pattern of paddock design of the Homestead paddocks. This represents over 170 years of paddock pattern design, albeit now with most of the planted live hedge lines removed.

Cambria by the 1850s was a very large colonial farm, and was large scale in production. There appears to have been (from the last half of the nineteenth century) a defined rhythm...
and synergy to the farm work detailed in the Farm Journal snapshots. This included information with regard to:

- Cereal crops (such as wheat, barley, oats, when sowed, when harvested, when threshed, milled and stacked).
- Preparation of the paddocks and orchard, garden (manuring, use of guano, green manure, seaweed from The Sands, etc.).
- Demonstration of a certain type of crop rotation that was practised, to help maintain the fertility of the soil. It meant that peas might follow a cereal crop, that stock might be put on the stubble, (e.g. manuring the ground); thus emphasising that these soils could support continual cropping across time. This description mostly applies to the Homestead paddocks, but other paddocks were brought into use as well at times.
- Crops such as mangles, (Mangel Wurzel) tobacco, were grown and harvested. Other crops such as potatoes and turnips were grown in the early years at Cambria (Meredith Papers). Additional crops included peas, asparagus, and hops.
- Animal patterns and animal numbers on the farm can be detected. The numbers of stock most likely increased across the nineteenth century but decreased by the turn of the twentieth century. By the 1869 journal it would appear that the sheep were dipped at least once a year; an enormous job considering their numbers. Use of tobacco water was a part of this, tobacco a crop often mentioned. There were thousands of sheep of various ages to be treated. Cattle had to be brought down from the Bogs to be branded. Cattle sometimes were placed on the marshy areas of the farm. Pigs were put out to graze on the harvested stubble of a cereal crop.
Figure 9: A page from the 1858-59 Farm Journal, Saturday June 19th. Industrious apple packing occurred before 200 boxes of apples were sent off to Melbourne. The sewing of Cocksfoot grass seed occurred in the 40 acre paddock.

Figure 10: The plan of the orchards, gardens, shrubbery adapted from the 1888 map plan (Plan of Glamorgan 31, 1888, TAHO). The lower garden (north eastern portion known as Arcadia) most likely merged into orchard; obvious in 2019. This lower area has been ravaged by intermittent flooding of the Meredith River. The fourth orchard is not shown on this image; it was adjacent to the Meredith River, closer to its exit into Great Oyster Bay.
A lot of the farm activities were carried out simultaneously. For example this included ploughing of paddocks and sheep management such as dipping, most likely butchering, dressing etc.

Specific management in the orchard and related, such as apple picking, other types of fruit picking, packing, dispatching, give quite precise accounts of how many boxes were dispatched via boats called *The Tommy* and *Twins*. Care and management of the orchards at times took a number of men daily working in various ways to keep the continual flow of tasks completed. In the 1858 journal a 'new' orchard, was being made.

**Figure 11A** Old pear tree. (Photo: the author, 2019).

**Figure 11B** Very old mulberry tree which walks along the ground. (Photo: the author, 2019).

**Figure 11C** Line of walnut trees. (Photo: Stuart Read, 2019).
Cambria was always a mixed farm so there were varied activities across the year, those connected to stock, (sheep, cattle, pigs), cereal crops, root crops, green crops and to orchard produce.

At the same time there was general farm maintenance being undertaken and new structures were being constructed (e.g. barn, green house in the 1858 journal, irrigation by 1884). Potatoes were a specific crop grown at Cambria from earliest times. Like fruit, potatoes were exported to Melbourne. By the late 1850s, their management, (sowing, harvesting, packing, etc.) had almost wholly become the preserve of possible German journeymen with names Keefer, Dilger, Gemmell, Rapp and Wagner (Courier, October 1855). These names live on in 2019 in Swansea. A. Gemmell built the Swansea Anglican Church to a design by notable architect Henry Hunter of Hobart, with John Meredith laying the foundation stone (Whiteley n.d.). Wagner cottages in 2019 are tourist cottages, Rapp Street exists, and John Keefer baked bread for the town and managed the Riversdale mill (Cassidy and Preston 2000).

Cambria Orchards

Cambria orchards may have been the most extensive in mid-nineteenth century Tasmania. Given this, their long history and scale of output, they are seen as having high historical significance. Edwin Meredith (n.d., p. 6) in his Reminiscences wrote:

*The intention of building a new house had evidently been determined upon years before it was commenced for a large piece of ground had been enclosed for an orchard and garden and well stocked with trees* ...

Orchard trees were mentioned in 1823 (‘take care of the fruit trees and lower hedges’) (Meredith 1823 Meredith Family Papers, G4/5). In a further 1823 letter George wrote:

*I have brt down with me almost every kind of fruit Trees from Sydney and almost every kind of flower.* (1823, Meredith Family Papers, G4/6, June).

By 1825, nectarines and apricot trees were mentioned (Meredith George, 1825). As Colleen Morris noted (Morris 2004, p. 6):

*In colonial times, plant exchange was intrinsically related to family and social networks.*
Further research may reveal that in Sydney, George knew or met persons such as John Macarthur and or others.

The orchards at Cambria were extensive. By 1888 there were four, a total of 18 acres in 1871 (The Mercury, July 1871), by 1888, 23¾ acres of orchards and gardens (1888 map plan). Apples, pears, plums, cherries, walnuts, almonds, gooseberries, currant bushes, figs, hazel and filbert bushes, later lemons, oranges, were all mentioned. It would seem that the Cambria rear garden inter-mixed the fruit and nut trees with the flowers, sometimes vegetables, even crops. Certainly the area of land at the rear of the house is consistently marked on map plans as being ‘orchard and garden’ but the practice may have extended to the other lower terrace orchards too.

Apple and mulberry trees were reported at Cambria from very early times (McLeod 2017).

A Change of Fortune

In 1871, the Cambria property was put up for sale. This time (unlike 1841, 1861) parts of the property were sold. The sale plan clearly outlined the various lots while The Mercury newspaper described them in some detail. As well, the 1871 plan overlaid the original grant to George Meredith.

Certain lots are of immediate interest in the 21st century, given the proposed future development for the property.

Lot 1 was the Cambria land. It was then 5040½ acres (2040 ha.) of which 268 acres (108 ha) were seen as cultivated ‘land all laid down in permanent grasses’, 13 paddocks, 18 acres of orchards, plus the extensive sheep runs. Lot 2 was the Belmont Estate, which is important to consider in 2019 because a large slice of its lands are owned now by an overseas consortium. In 1871 it contained 2,611 acres (1057 ha) fronting on to the Wye and Swan Rivers. It too had buildings, improvements while 211 acres (85 ha) were cultivated.

Lot 3 was the Riversdale farm (close connections to Louisa and Charles Meredith, and to Edwin Meredith), and was, by 1871 very strongly integrated within the Cambria Estate. Riversdale had the working flour mill, with wheat sent from Cambria; much sheep work also occurred at times at Riversdale. There was a substantial house, the flour mill, woolsheds, gardens, 1,803 acres in total and 331 acres laid into permanent pastures. Lot 5 (A and B) are very relevant in 2019. Lot 5 was 4,216 acres (1,706 ha.). In the north it fronted to the Wye River and was considered to be first-rate sheep land, then divided into five runs. In 1871, the land coloured blue (refer Figure 12) was either owned by John Meredith, or the estate of George Meredith (The Mercury, July 1871). These were the Hill lands. The bulk of this land is now owned by the consortium.

Despite having lost the Belmont and Riversdale lands, the Cambria property continued in the latter part of the century producing crops, and stock, whilst becoming a leader in East Coast irrigation.

The Mercury wrote in 1884 of the installed Althouse Windmill:

...pumps water onto tanks on the elevated staging, and from there piping conveys to central places, where hose reaches the whole of the garden and orchard in rear of house and in the same manner the flower garden and shrubbery in front are watered. The house is of course supplied and additional to this troughing in the house
paddocks are kept filled with pure sweet water for the stock. (Mercury, 11 Oct 1884, p. 4).

The Althouse Windmill was described in the *Kerang Times and Swan Hill Gazette*, as being the ‘cheapest and the best’ Windmill and that ‘it very soon paid for itself’ (*Kerang Times & Swan Hill Gazette*, 18 Aug 1882, p. 1).

![Figure 12](image-url) The 1871 plan of ‘Cambria and Riversdale Estates, the Property of John Meredith Esq’ by Major L. Hood, Hobart Town Lithographer. (Tasmanian Archives and Heritage Office: NS570-1-1).

**Meanings, Experience and Aesthetics in Landscape**

In the nineteenth century associations, spiritual values, the setting of the principal house, and holistic perceptions for the country estate were well understood and considered extremely important. Mark Girouard concurred that:

*The nineteenth century was "the golden age of the country house" ... Walking around a garden or driving round a park, whether one's own or somebody else's, loomed large in the ample leisure time of people in polite society.* (Girouard 1978, p. 210).

Humphry Repton (1752-1818) was an acknowledged landscape designer of the time.\(^{11}\) He considered a number of requisite principles for the house location. The natural character of the surrounding country had to be considered, the style and character of the house, its aspect and views from the several apartments, the objects of comfort such as a good water supply. Repton outlined 16 principles for laying out the grounds.

\(^{11}\) Wikipedia (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humphry_Repton) describes Repton as 'the last great English landscape designer of the eighteenth century'. The Encyclopedia Britannica (www.britannica.com) notes that he is the 'English landscape designer who became the undisputed successor to Lancelot Brown as improver of grounds to the landed gentry of England'.
It is interesting to consider these in respect of the Cambria property:

"is that which constitutes true beauty"... I. Congruity, II. Utility, III. Order, IV. Symmetry, V. Picturesque Effect, VI. Intricacy. VII. Simplicity. VIII. Variety. IX. Novelty. X. Contrast. XI Continuity. XII. Association. XIII. Grandeur. XIV. Appropriation, XV. Animation. XVI. the Seasons. (Repton, 1806, pp. 81-82).

Most of these qualities can still be demonstrated in the 2019 landscape. Dixon and Hunt (1998) have further elaborated upon Repton’s work. Fascinatingly, in 1865 Robert Kerr wrote on the desirable qualities of house location, which George Meredith some 40 years earlier had executed in the Cambria house setting:

South and West [relate to north and east in southern hemisphere] he will be anxious to see a broad panorama of lower landscape, perhaps a river and the opposite watershed rising up in distant hills. (Kerr 1865, p. 300).

Overseas geographers meanwhile were hard at work a century later (1970s) examining in detail what the meaning and experience of landscape meant. Three are briefly cited, their works still very relevant in 2019.

For example, Christian Norberg-Schulz (1975, 19) noted:

To gain an existential foothold, man has to be able to orientate himself, he has to know where he is. But he also has to identify himself with the environment, that is, he has to know how he is in a certain place.
Jay Appleton (1975, updated 1996) compiled *The Experience of Landscape*. Appleton's research, into art science, the literature, and theoretical approach to landscape aesthetics gave the world the ‘prospect-refuge theory’\(^{12}\). This has been applied successfully elsewhere in Tasmania (Sheridan 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008) with regard to landscape.

A third influential writer was Edward Relph. He noted:

*To be human is to live in a world that is filled with significant places: to be human is to have and to know your place* (Relph 1976, p. 1).

Both Relph and Norberg-Schulz made reference to the philosopher, Martin Heidegger (1889-1976).

The prospect/refuge interpretation is particularly interesting because it can be related historically to the Sublime and the Beautiful. In Tasmania, there were two competing symbolic interpretations of island landscapes in the Beautiful, and the Sublime, with the Picturesque, fitted in between. The untamed Sublime lay beyond, (wildness, wilderness, etc.) ‘out there’ (providing picturesque effect, contrast and grandeur), while the ordered paddocks, hedges, plantings constituted what Robert Browning (1841) poetically described as ‘God's in his Heaven, All's right with the world’\(^{13}\) or the ‘Beautiful perception of the colonial estate’ (i.e., order, symmetry, novelty, appropriation, association, seasonal changes) (Sheridan 2001, 2002, 2004, 2006a, 2006b).

The panoramic view from the top of Brady's Hill extends in all directions over 190 degrees; it is vast and stunning. The cultural landscape can be truly appreciated and viewed.

---

\(^{12}\) Appleton (1996, p. 66) - ‘Where he has an unimpeded opportunity to see, we can call it a prospect. Where he has an opportunity to hide, a refuge’.

\(^{13}\) Robert Browning, 1841 - Pippa's Song (https://englishverse.com/poems/pippas_song).
The homestead nestled amongst the trees. The reason for the smoky images was that in January 2019, Tasmania had huge fires burning across the western part of the state, including in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. (Photo: Stuart Read, 2019).

The Cambria Estate represents a symbolic landscape in many respects. In Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania), prolific and world renowned artist John Glover's landscapes have been interpreted as the Symbolic Landscape of an Eden within an Eden (McPhee 2004). The Tasmanian Edenic or Arcadian landscape theme is one that has travelled across time in published research, accounts, tourist publications, art critiques and is almost always coupled to the beauty of the island. For example, The Times (29 Jun 1835, p. 5 cited in Hansen 2004, p. 94) described VDL landscapes as ‘beautiful and picturesque, magnificent and sublime, ... delightful and noble’.

In Britain, the creation of a Picturesque landscape required:

The capital of a gentleman, the design skills of a Capability Brown, and the trades and labour of whole villages. In Van Diemen’s Land it was already there. In other words, (to use Michael Rosenthal’s formulation) ‘in England Arcadia has to be made; in Australia it is found’. (Hansen 2004).

Conclusion

As of October 2019, there has been no full hearing by the Tasmanian Planning Commission into the Specific Area Plan. Deadline dates were issued for 2019, but consistently these were not met by the proponents. Jurisdictional matters were tested by a hearing on 30 August 2019. The amount of material in the public domain across the period from June 2018-October 2019 amounts to hundreds of pages.
On 22 November 2019 the Tasmanian Planning Commission determined 'on the basis of evidence before it, that the requirements of section 33 (2A) [were] not met'. So 'that it did not have jurisdiction to determine the draft amendment.' The matter may be appealed and taken to the Supreme Court of Tasmania in 2020, but as of January 2020, the fate of Cambria hangs in the balance.

It ought not to be like this; Tasmanian governments have a clear responsibility for what happens to their oldest, and most authentic historic properties. Would Woolmers and Brickendon have become World Heritage Area listed properties if only the house had been considered?

The Meredith archive is an extraordinary one. Such a social history is invaluable to the fabric of modern Tasmania.

The Cambria Estate is a cultural landscape of high integrity, authenticity, heritage significance and contains enormously rare heritage values to the nation. It sits within that wider cultural ancient landscape as outlined previously. Within the Estate, there are micro landscape areas that can still be identified (e.g., gardens, orchards, drive, hedged fields, field pattern designs) and more. Each of these helps determine and adds to, the significance values of the others. The trees in the front garden (and elsewhere) are a legacy of garden planting in the nineteenth century; an unusual collection remains, adding to Australian botanical and garden history. Old orchard trees add too – they contribute to Tasmania's botanical history and may represent very old, interesting species. The mulberry trees may be amongst the oldest in Tasmania. Arcadia, and the accompanying Bower, are places in 2019 that, while wanting restoration, are quiet, peaceful, filtered light areas. One can still imagine (as Josephine wrote) ‘the lovers of the past together’. The setting of the homestead and its surrounds are considered unique in Tasmania. The amazingly stunning views (from Brady's Hill) outwards across the Estate, the ancient landscape it sits within, of diverse water patterns reflecting the sky on any particular day or time, are beautiful and unique in their naturalness of form. There is a vastness evoked in the evolved landscape of sky, water and land.

The bringing of a vision to Tasmania to recreate the English country estate in the most fastidious degree possible can still be realised. As, at the same time the family were managing a business farm and exporting produce, this must be seen as Australian farming and agricultural history. The interconnection and integration of all of the various heritage evolved components to the estate, discussed above, lead to a clear conclusion: Cultural landscape evolution and the stories that sit behind that evolution, matter very much.

This property cannot and must not become a tourist town.
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Abstract

Point Nepean National Park in Victoria is a most unique national park exemplifying an extraordinary diversity of cultural landscapes within its mere 560 hectares. What this diversity means for the identification, categorisation, assessment and management of such a cultural landscape is the subject of this paper. Three areas are considered: first the paper introduces Point Nepean National Park and its natural and cultural heritage; second it reviews and critiques the Point Nepean National Park Master Plan adopted in January 2018; and thirdly it examines the task of implementation now being undertaken by Parks Victoria.

Point Nepean National Park is on the narrowest strip of land on the tip of the Mornington Peninsula between Bass Strait and Port Phillip, one arm of the Heads; a space in between, a liminal landscape of ritual and passage. It is a place of unparalleled natural beauty, where diverse, fragile landscapes co-exist with marine parks; 35,000 years of Indigenous history; two centuries of European settlement; agriculture, defence and quarantine; multiple jurisdictions conflated; a shared contemporary landscape that is at once Country and National Park.

The Taylor Cullity Lethlean-prepared Master Plan for Point Nepean National Park was awarded an AILA Victoria Award of Excellence for Cultural Heritage in the 2018 Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture State chapter awards. The client was Parks Victoria, the collaborators were Tonkin Zulaikha Greer and David Lancashire Design. The Master Plan evaluated the landscape and its heritage to determine the optimum use for the quarantine station and its many heritage buildings.

The task of implementing the master plan is an onerous one with many competing priorities. Contextually, the heritage landscape is changing in a number of important ways. These include the growing instability of nature/culture divides, alongside tangible/intangible oppositions. And a growing demand/expectation on the part of audiences to shared meaning making and involvement. These developments acknowledge that there are other understandings of what heritage is, and how it should be protected and interpreted. These intellectual and practical problems now confront Parks Victoria in implementing the Point Nepean National Park Master Plan, where the heritage process continues to be informed by a richly complex layering across time.

Introduction

Point Nepean National Park in Victoria is a most unique national park exemplifying an extraordinary diversity of cultural landscapes within its mere 560 hectares (refer Figure 1).

What this diversity means for the identification, categorisation, assessment and management of such a cultural landscape is the subject of this paper. Three areas are considered: First the paper introduces Point Nepean National Park and its natural and cultural heritage; second it reviews and critiques the Point Nepean National Park Master Plan...
Point Nepean National Park

Point Nepean National Park is one of the smallest National Parks in Victoria. It is located on the narrowest strip of land on the tip of the Mornington Peninsula between Bass Strait and Port Phillip. It is a place of unparalleled natural beauty, where diverse, fragile landscapes co-exist with marine parks; where 35,000 years of Indigenous history precede two centuries of European settlement, agriculture, defence and quarantine; where multiple jurisdictions are conflated; where a shared contemporary landscape is at once Country and National Park.

Point Nepean National Park is a tiny sliver of land, an isthmus between ocean and bay, one arm of the treacherous Heads, isolated, distant, remote; both refuge and protector; hell-on-earth and place of spiritual renewal; a geological, geographical and marine wonderland; home to remnant moonah woodlands; and habitat to endangered species (refer Figures 1 and 2). It is a sustaining, nourishing place. Here Bunurong/Boon Wurrung, European explorer, pastoralist, colonial/post-colonial, scientific and environmental understandings of place contribute to richly layered meanings. Stories intersect and clash across time. Oral accounts, historical memory and current usage combine to create a particular sense of place here, a genius loci, that is not only locally remarkable, but possibly unique in an Australian context, and potentially of global symbolic significance.
An early Ocean Beach Reserve was established at Sorrento in the nineteenth-century and walking tracks and shelters were built. Cape Schanck Coastal Park was established in 1975. It became Point Nepean National Park in 1988, when part of the historic Point Nepean area, previously closed to the public for more than 100 years, was transferred from the Commonwealth to the State as part of Australia’s bicentennial celebrations. The site’s archaeological, ecological, architectural, historical scientific and social significance were noted. The Park was renamed Mornington Peninsula National Park in 1995. The end of Army occupation at Point Nepean in 1998, saw the future of that site debated across Commonwealth, State and local government jurisdictions, become a political football and even a commercial proposition. The local and Victorian communities, the National Trust of Australia [Victoria] and environmental groups fought, campaigned and lobbied to preserve the site as public land. But an integrated National Park was not achievable. In 2004 the Commonwealth Government established the Point Nepean Community Trust to manage the 90-hectare Quarantine Station precinct on its behalf, before it was transferred in 2009 to the Victorian Government for its incorporation into a National Park.¹

In 2004, the Commonwealth excised 17.5 hectares from Point Nepean to create a separate Shire Park. Ownership of the land was transferred by Deed of Settlement Trust to the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council. The main objective of that trust was to preserve the land for passive recreation and use as a public open space, and to provide a “...shire park with attributes of regional significance in relation to social, environmental, cultural and heritage values which is expected to attract a wide range of different user interests from the

¹ The above Information has been compiled from numerous reports and conservation plans developed and published by Parks Victoria.
public...” (Context 2012, p. 1). The 2004 carving up of the land meant that there could not be an integrated Point Nepean National Park, which brought together the whole site.

The current Point Nepean National Park came into being in 2009, when the Quarantine Station precinct was handed over to Victoria. It has been managed by Parks Victoria under a 2009 Management Plan prepared by Parks Victoria and the Point Nepean Community Trust (Parks Victoria and Point Nepean Community Trust 2009). A 2010 Draft Master Plan prepared for the site (Parks Victoria 2010) was amended in 2013 to reflect updated policies which promoted investment in national parks. The Napthine Liberal Government signed a commercial lease in 2014, to which the community reacted strongly. This lease lapsed in 2015, when planning amendments were not approved by the new Andrews Labor Government. In 2016, the 2010 Master Plan was revisited. A renewal process saw wide consultation with the public and the Indigenous Traditional Owners, the Boon Wurrung and Bunurong. The Bunurong Land Council Aboriginal Corporation was recognised as the Registered Aboriginal Party on 19 July 2017 (Aboriginal Heritage Council 2017), necessitating further changes to the Master Plan. The new master plan, the *Point Nepean National Park Master Plan* (Parks Victoria 2017), was adopted in January 2018.

Parts of Point Nepean are listed on the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR H2030). The Heritage Place, inscribed in 2004, is described as: “Point Nepean Defence and Quarantine Precinct, Point Nepean Road, Portsea, Mornington Peninsula Shire Council”. For the avoidance of doubt, this registration did not apply to the Commonwealth in its capacity as the occupier of the land (VHR datasheet H2030). The section ‘What is significant’ usefully describes the precinct and its history. ‘How is it significant’ states:

> **Point Nepean Defence and Quarantine Precinct is of archaeological, aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific and social significance to the State of Victoria**.

‘Why is it significant’ acknowledges that “Point Nepean Defence and Quarantine Precinct is of outstanding aesthetic significance for its landscape, its open space, some avenues and stands of trees, and its internal and external views. These views include the relationship between bush and sea, between the buildings and their context, the views across the Heads to Queenscliff and the Otways, views back towards Melbourne, to the Bay and from the water to the site, and the 360-degree views from the narrowest portion of land near the tip of the peninsula. (VHR datasheet H2030).

However, due to the initial nomination for its historic values, the focus of the registration is on the Quarantine Station and its buildings, the defence infrastructure, and early European settlement. Still reference is made to it being “of outstanding historical significance for its capacity to demonstrate the historic use of the site over a long period, from the Aboriginal period to the most recent use of the land for recreation. Each phase of use has left evidence in the landscape, in built form, or in archaeological remains” (VHR datasheet H2030). Further it recognises that “The part of Point Nepean which has been a national park since

---

2 Refer to the Nepean Conservation Group, Nepean Historical Society and Nepean Ratepayers Association, 2014 Submission on Quarantine Station Point Nepean National Park.
4 Refer footnote 3.
5 Refer footnote 3.
1988 is of social significance as a tourist attraction in allowing public access to a unique site of natural and historic value within Victoria” (VHR datasheet H2030).

Point Nepean is included on the National Heritage List (NHL) as an historic place, the emphasis coming from the nomination grounded in its historic values. The summary statement of significance begins:

Point Nepean is the site of the oldest, surviving, purpose-built, barracks-style, quarantine accommodation buildings in Australia, as well as fortifications demonstrating the primary importance of coastal defence to the Australian colonies. As an island-nation, quarantine has played an important part in controlling the impact of ship-borne diseases on Australia from the early 1800s. Point Nepean is an historic landscape, which features a range of values relating to both Victorian and national quarantine processes from the 1850s and to the history of coastal defence from the 1870s”. Only under “description” are the natural environment and indigenous occupation acknowledged: “Point Nepean is registered by Aboriginal Affairs Victoria as an Aboriginal historical place with contemporary significance to Aboriginal communities in the area. Local Aboriginal people say that Point Nepean was a place of women’s business, of birthing, collecting food, and of rituals for young men”. (NHL Place datasheet 2/18/021/0015).

Because of the urgency of the nomination, resulting from the politics at the time, it focussed on the historic, and so on the existing heritage listings at State and Federal level, privilege recent cultural heritage over ancient cultural heritage, and natural heritage is effectively sidelined.

The Burra Charter, the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Australia ICOMOS 2013) helps us to make “good decisions about the care of important places”. It states inter alia that “The place itself is important”; that we should “Understand the significance of the place”; and that “Significance should guide decisions”. Over decades, much information has been assembled, many histories, biographies, flora and fauna studies, master plans, and conservation studies have been written. All have been driven by a desire to prove that the parts of the past have a story, a story that can keep them alive, and sustain them and the place they imagine into the future. Since I became entangled in the fight to stop the Federal Government selling off surplus Defence land at Point Nepean in 2002, my understanding of, and vision for, Point Nepean has been far more holistic than these heritage listings state. Indeed, the heritage registers and listings now fall far short of articulating the much broader natural and cultural, tangible and intangible values embedded in, and intrinsic to, this place.

---

7 A limited summary of knowledge up until 2005 is included under ‘History: Indigenous’.
8 Point Nepean was initially on the Register of the National Estate, which was frozen in 2007. The fact sheet, on line at http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/45a69069-bdc1-4cdb-b8e8-2b24dfcecc951/files/national-estate.pdf explains its demise and replacement.
Point Nepean National Park Master Plan 2017

The *Point Nepean National Park Master Plan* (Parks Victoria 2017) prepared by Taylor Cullity Lethlean and others, including Tonkin Zulaikha Greer and David Lancashire Design, for Point Nepean National Park (refer Figure 3) was awarded an Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture Victorian Award of Excellence for Cultural Heritage in the Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture state chapter awards in September 2018.

The *Point Nepean National Park Master Plan* (PNNP Master Plan) evaluated the landscape and its heritage to determine the optimum use for the quarantine station and its many heritage buildings. Taylor Cullity Lethlean state “The Point Nepean National Park master plan aspires to protect the site’s unique qualities, distil its many stories and, ultimately, provide a clear identity and vision for the park. … the document promotes a more complex understanding of the site as a shared cultural landscape, read as both Country and National Park. The master plan translates this reading into design initiatives, interpretation and management”.9 To be clear, as a master plan, it is a non-statutory document that outlines a vision to guide growth, development and protection of a place over a number of years and is intended to set out strategies to manage a place over time.

![Figure 3 Point Nepean National Park](https://example.com/image.png)

*Figure 3*  Point Nepean National Park. (Source: *Point Nepean National Park Master Plan* (Parks Victoria, 2017, p. 12)).

How “Excellence for Cultural Heritage” is understood is not fully clear. The Australian Institute of Landscape Architecture (AILA) jury report stated:

> ... this master plan is a beautiful and sensitive way to build upon and strengthen a sense of community. The landscape architects have shown leadership in collaborating

---

and developing the precinct in conjunction with Aboriginal Traditional Owners and Parks Victoria. The engagement with Traditional Owners and Country clearly supports the shared, co-interpretation of traditional cultural narratives, European settlement and Australian defence force connections with the landscape. Overall the jury felt that the master plan provides a good foundation for the site and displayed leadership qualities that will foresee an excellent directional framework for the investment and the visitor experience within the park. (AILA 2018).

What is clear from the 2017 Taylor Cullity Lethlean led PNNP Master Plan, is that it considers Point Nepean National Park a shared cultural landscape. The adopted site themes – Shared cultural landscape, Peninsula, Country, Coast, The Heads, and Quarantine – are translated into key principles which form the basis of the Master Plan – Revealing stories, Peninsula connections, Caring for Country, Coastal experiences, The Heads and Quarantine. The Master Plan concludes with recommendations for implementation and governance to achieve activation of the Quarantine Station as well as financially sustainable public and private investment within the park. The master plan renewal process validated the information and strategic intent of the 2010 Draft Master Plan (also largely prepared by Taylor Cullity Lethlean) and builds on knowledge gathered during broad public engagement over 2016–2017.

A real challenge for many professionals is that the conventional approach of heritage, grounded in the Burra Charter, focuses on the physical ‘place’ and therefore intangible values may not be given the credit that they deserve. The 2017 PNNP Master Plan is a visionary document in that it attempts to consider Point Nepean National Park holistically. Its key initiatives include – support for Traditional Owners’ connection to country; revealing stories of Point Nepean across the whole site via high-quality interpretation strategies; improving access for all visitors; creating a real welcome; establishing the Quarantine Station as a central visitor arrival and orientation point; enriching and activating the Quarantine Station with compatible uses; creating new tracks; caring for country; developing coastal experiences and immersive Heads experiences; promoting sensitive adaptive re-use of heritage buildings; providing a range of accommodation; and enlivening the site through activities, events and programs.

In January 2018, the Victorian National Parks Association (VNPA), and other environmental groups, welcomed the release of the Andrews Government’s final master plan for Point Nepean National Park on the Mornington Peninsula. “After decades of bickering back and forth between major political parties and state and federal governments, the final master plan for Point Nepean is by and large a very positive document, setting out a clear and largely appropriate vision for the whole of the controversial site” (Hinchliffe 2018; VNPA 2018).

The Andrews Labor Government media release explained that it will employ new staff and introduce new camping areas as part of the final master plan for PNNP. $3.7 million was provided for early initiatives including:

- establishment of the Point Nepean Advisory Group reporting to the Parks Victoria Board,
- a new staff member dedicated to the activation of the project,
- a new camping experience at the Quarantine Station,
- repairs of the Defence Road out to Fort Nepean,
• upgrading the Quarantine Station disinfecting complex and park-wide interpretation and storytelling, and
• improved visitor amenities.¹⁰

How these initiatives and projects were prioritised was not disclosed; nor were any details provided.

On the ground, the 2017 PNNP Master Plan is being implemented through the 2009 Point Nepean National Park Management Plan (Parks Victoria and the Point Nepean Community Trust 2009). How relevant it is in light of the new PNNP Master Plan remains to be determined. Written 10 years earlier in partnership with Parks Victoria and the Point Nepean Community Trust, the understanding of, and approach to Point Nepean must surely be re-considered. Further, while both the 2017 PNNP Master Plan and the 2012 Police Point Shire Park Conservation Management Plan acknowledge how integral Police Point Shire Park and Point Nepean National Park are to each other in terms of place, history, identity and storytelling, it is not clear how these documents speak to each other, nor how the State and local authorities will work together. From a heritage perspective, Point Nepean must be understood as a whole; and that whole is bigger than political circumstances currently allow.

Implementing the Point Nepean National Park Master Plan

The task of implementing the 2017 PNNP Master Plan is an onerous one with many competing priorities. Contextually, the heritage landscape is changing in a number of important ways. These include the growing instability of nature/culture divides alongside tangible/intangible oppositions, and a growing demand/expectation on the part of audiences to shared meaning-making and involvement. These developments acknowledge that there are other understandings of what heritage is, and how it should be protected and interpreted. These intellectual and practical problems confront Parks Victoria in implementing the PNNP Master Plan for Point Nepean National Park.

To date the author has considered “Place-Based Knowledge” as critical to creatively engaging with the Nepean Peninsula and with Point Nepean National Park. What emerges from Place-Based Knowledge is a highly complex picture of interwoven relationships between the natural world and human engagement and understandings.

The proposition, that models for the management of public assets that secure sense of place are lacking, inadequate or poorly understood, developed out of a Place-Based Knowledge project undertaken in the period when the Point Nepean Quarantine Station transferred from Federal to State government ownership in 2009. At the time it presented an opportunity to examine the role sense of place could play in planning the future amenity of the site. The project found that literature on the regulation of public assets, as opposed to that on physical, spiritual, emotional and intellectual engagement with public assets, was much more developed. Both, however, saw the visitor primarily as a consumer or passive subject who represents an impost on the system (de Jong 2015; de Jong 2011; Carter 2008).

Yet place is dynamic, evolving, changing. Place provides people with the opportunity to bond with the natural world. A national park offers deep experiential experiences, and connects place with self and community. Place encourages seeing, hearing, tasting, touching

and smelling the world around us. Thomas Berry’s idea of a re-enchantment with the world captures this well. Acknowledging the many layers of meaning provides challenges and possibilities. A Place-Based Knowledge approach is to reveal rather than impose; to recognise communities as possessors and generators of knowledge; and understand that place is embodied and local. Place-Based Knowledge is communicated through stories and other forms of narrative, providing the opportunity to explore multiple stories and to acknowledge contested spaces, to raise awareness of the significant silences in history, and to avoid privileging one interpretation over another.

Over the past eighteen months, the School of Architecture and Built Environment at Deakin University has restructured its collaborative research groupings to tighten its research focus. It has adopted Integral Design Futures as a framework. Such an approach aims to inform holistic solutions to the complex problems facing future research into the built environment, such as sustainable design, the embrace of smart technologies in construction, advancing society and culture through design, and understanding the health impacts of building and urban design.

The management of Point Nepean National Park is one such complex problem. This paper puts forward the proposition that the ‘Integral Design Futures – revisited’ model (Kocaturk 2018) (refer Figure 4) could be productively used to consider, structure, support and effect the implementation of the PNNP Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved user experience</th>
<th>Improved performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>PRODUCT/PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY/CULTURE</td>
<td>ECONOMY/ECOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policies and Practices</td>
<td>New services and Business Models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Integral Design Futures - revisited. (Source: Kocaturk 2018).

To the left in the above diagram, lie the values of the National Park; to the right lie the aspirations of Government in making the National Park self-sustaining. The left upper and lower quadrants contain the qualitative attributes/methodologies. The right upper and lower quadrants contain quantitative attributes/methodologies. The quadrants should not be read as separated domains, rather they are fluid and three dimensional. We could further overlay the model with a vertical and horizontal axis: ‘community – stakeholders’ situated on the vertical and ‘power – vested in various authorities’ on the horizontal.

To begin, we should name the aims, objectives, qualities, attributes, values in each quadrant, that is consider them from different perspectives. How do you then prioritise these values? How do you ensure that improved user experience, improved performance, new policies and practices, and new services and business models will not compromise the intrinsic values of the National Park? For instance, it could well be that some of the business opportunities could be curtailed by impacts on National Heritage values. How do you holistically embrace the natural and cultural values of Point Nepean National Park and honour the tangible and intangible? How do you identify, articulate and enhance the complex web of relationships and inter-relationships that co-exist at Point Nepean National Park?
Key principles have been articulated in the PNNP Master Plan. Respecting a quadruple bottom line – environmental well-being; social capital; financial accountability; and futurity – will require considered negotiation. Aspirations include – recognising the rich and diverse heritage of this place; using Point Nepean National Park’s heritage to plan for a sustainable future for the region; telling Point Nepean National Parks’s story by interweaving the past, present and future, creatively, imaginatively and truthfully; building strong and inclusive networks and partnerships throughout the region and beyond; resourcing the community and empowering people. Heritage values will be prioritised by the statutory listing process whether we like it or not, but the importance of a holistic approach to place and research of local values is essential and should be adopted in the management of the site.

Connecting to place

Adopting a focus on place compels us to consider the particular qualities within places – where meanings, engagement and a specific landscape are all implicated and enfolded by each other. Within the incessant motion of life in our modern societies, we rush from location to location, rarely getting to know the subtleties of places, their histories, ecologies, economies. The consequence is a loss of a deep experience of attachment to a place that can sustain our sense of a meaningful life. Philosophers implore us to be quiet; to be attentive to the subtle, local elements; and to be attuned to the sense of place. Thus tangible and intangible values should not be seen in opposition to each other, but understood as enhancing each other, adding to the richness of the place. A deeper issue that should be recognised, is that the intangible values are not generally well identified in heritage assessments and that probably the original heritage nominators of Point Nepean did not have the resources or the time to undertake the community liaison to gain those insights.

Place literature draws our attention to the importance of the lived experience of place for individual and collective identity. In October 2018, a family reunion picnic was rescheduled to Jells Park, because it was perceived that there was “nothing to do” for children in Point Nepean National Park. Formalised constructed children’s playgrounds were considered essential to entertain the children, and to allow the adults to sit, eat and watch. Edward Relph notes that in such instances, places are experienced as little more than a background or setting for activities (Relph 1976). Yi-Fu Tuan already in 1977 observed that modern humans rarely establish roots, and then their experience of place is superficial (Tuan 1977). The PNNP Master Plan speaks of “activating” the site, and so the State government has appointed a Business Development and Activation Manager for Point Nepean. There is an underlying assumption here that ‘activities’ must be orchestrated, that stillness, being present, listening, observing, walking, breathing, imagining, and learning from place (refer Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8) are somehow of lesser value.

Yet stories are held in place. Rangers, guides and interpretation must be subtle – people must be invited in and given time to discover place. David Orr (1992, p. 30) argues “... the inhabitant dwells ... in an intimate, organic, and mutually nurturing relationship with a place. Good inhabitation is an art requiring detailed knowledge of a place, the capacity for observation, and a sense of care and rootedness”. People need to be allowed to spend time

---

11 Jells Park in the Dandenong Creek Valley, Wheelers Hill, is a 127 hectare natural oasis in Melbourne’s suburbia set aside for both public leisure and conservation. Parks Victoria is the authority that cares for it. The park attracts over 900,000 visitors a year; it contains nine kilometres of bike paths and a fitness station area, children’s playgrounds, cafes etc.
in place, to re-learn how to enjoy nature, to re-connect with flora, fauna, place. Mutual belonging exists between a place and a people. The process of reinvention and renewal involves the participation of multiple creative communities, rather than an exclusive government driven EOI12 process (2014) or an emphasis on site activation (2017-2018), where a place risks becoming the same as everywhere else. Digital technology and apps cannot replace experience.

Figure 5  Point Nepean National Park – view from Port Philip. (Photo: the author, 2016).

Figure 6  Point Nepean National Park – view over the reefs of Bass Strait. (Photo: the author, 2016).

12 Expression of Interest.
Managing national parks as cultural landscapes

National Parks were originally set aside to protect and conserve flora and fauna habitats, ecologies, biodiversity. Now modern societies are re-confirming that contemplation of nature, or a walk in a park, is favourable to the health and vigour of humans. The Americans, Frederick Law Olmsted, Ralph Waldo Emerson and John Muir, among others, claimed that nature had healing powers for both mind and body. Modern day science provides evidence that that is the case (Williams 2016). Parks Victoria’s slogan “Healthy
Parks, Healthy People” is more relevant than ever, as Melbourne’s population has passed the five million mark and heads to eight million. The Burra Charter states that when caring for significant heritage places, we should ‘Do as much as necessary, as little as possible’ (Australia ICOMOS 2013). Re-narrating place provides opportunities for new understandings and envisioning a new future through informed imagination, stories and insights. Custodianship is a different way of caring for place – it means responsibilities and accountability, belonging not ownership; and acknowledging the invisible webs of relationships. Michael Leunig, Australian cartoonist, poet and cultural commentator, makes the point most eloquently in “the sky is my device” (refer Figure 9, below).

Figure 9  Cartoon: “the sky is my device”. (Image courtesy Michael Leunig).

Natural and cultural heritage places are a key resource of the State of Victoria. Point Nepean National Park (refer Figure 10) is one such key natural and cultural heritage site. It is possible that local ecologies, as well as local communities and their histories can be lost if we do not make a concerted effort to nurture them and nourish them for future generations.

The wise management of Point Nepean National Park is critical to its future longevity. The ‘Integral Design Futures-revisited’ model provides a robust tool to guide the process of discernment, allowing all voices to be heard and considered in the implementation of the PNNP Master Plan going forward. So let us think creatively about the management of Point Nepean National Park, of all our national parks, their use and their interpretation, so that each one of us will always be able to say “I don’t ever have to recharge my device. It recharges me” (Michael Leunig, n.d., “the sky is my device”).
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1:35  Session 3  Chair: Hector Abrahams
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Iain Stuart - Rural and industrial landscapes – the wheat landscape.
Ursula de Jong - Point Nepean National Park – a new master plan and its implementation.
David Kirkland, Dominic Steele, Jakub Czastka & Stephanie Licciardo - Managing the varied and complex values of cultural landscapes - Parramatta Park.

3:00  Afternoon Tea

3:20  Session 4  Chair: Liz Vines
What are the challenges for urban cultural landscapes? Managing values and diversity.
Hector Abrahams - Parramatta: Managing rapid growth in an urban cultural landscape.
Flavia Kiperman - Shared reality of communities neighbouring historic urban centres. The case of Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the mountain and the sea.
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Summing Up – Steve Brown
Closing remarks – Anne McConnell

Close - 4:45
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FIELD EXCURSION PROGRAMME (SUNDAY 11TH NOVEMBER 2018)

ABOUT AUSTRALIA ICOMOS
Australia ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is a non-government, not-for-profit organisation of cultural heritage professionals, which formed as a national committee of ICOMOS in 1976. Australia ICOMOS’ mission is to lead cultural heritage conservation in Australia by raising standards, encouraging debate and generating innovative ideas. Australia ICOMOS has an Australia-wide membership base and encourages heritage professionals and others with an interest in the conservation of cultural heritage to join. More information is available at https://australia.icomos.org/.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES & CULTURAL ROUTES (NSC-CLCR)
The National Scientific Committee (NSC) on Cultural Routes and Cultural Landscapes is a sub-group of Australia ICOMOS. The NSC provides a forum for informed discussion of theory, issues and practice relating to cultural landscapes and cultural routes among Australia ICOMOS members. Its role is to provide a focus for ongoing professional development and enhancing Australian practice in these areas. It also provides a basis for broader and more informed participation by Australian experts and associate members at the international level (ie, through the ICOMOS International Scientific Committees related to cultural landscapes and cultural routes).
1. Outeiro da Gloria (Gloria Hill) church embedded in one of Rio de Janeiro’s *favelas* within the Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes World Heritage Area, Brazil. (Photo: Flavia Kiperman, 2012).


3. The Recherche Bay associative cultural landscape located partly within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, Australia. (Photo: Anne McConnell, 2007).

4. Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape, Canberra, Australia. The HUL approach in Canberra allows for the broad landscape setting quality of this city to be considered in its management. (Photo: Elizabeth Vines, 2018).