INTRODUCTION

Garden buildings and hard landscape elements are visually exciting components of any historic garden. They stimulate exploration of the garden, offer a variety of physical responses and expand the range of plants able to be cultivated. They also have a rich and varied history.

This paper briefly examines that history and introduces the great variety of buildings, structures and materials found in domestic Australian gardens. Nomenclature of this diverse array is also clarified in order to eliminate confusion between Australian buildings and their English and European prototypes.

There is an urgent need to maintain and conserve this vital component of our garden heritage and the paper concludes with comments on conservation issues, where possible drawing on local examples. This should provide an understanding of typical problems and demonstrate principles encountered when dealing with the built component of historic gardens.

For the purposes of analysis I have divided garden building and hard landscape elements into three main groupings.

1. Horticultural buildings.
2. Pleasure buildings.
3. Hard landscape elements.

This categorisation excludes service buildings and more utilitarian structures. The boundaries of each group are also imprecise. For instance a conservatory, essentially a building to house plants, is also associated with pleasurable human recreation, even a simple garden trellis may serve as a utilitarian dividing wall. It may have a precise horticultural function to support for an espaliered fruit tree, or it may be an aesthetically pleasing visual backdrop.

HORTICULTURAL BUILDINGS

In any consideration of horticultural buildings it is vital to understand the nature of different environmental situations and the corresponding constructional techniques which differentiate between the different categories of buildings. This also helps with nomenclature, so that differences are recognised between buildings in cool climates (like England, Europe and southern sections of Australia) and warm temperate or sub-tropical regions (like most of Australia, parts of India and other former colonial outposts). A fernery in London, for instance, is a glazed and heated structure whereas in Melbourne it is essentially a slatted timber building to provide shade.

A theme which often connected different horticultural buildings was the owner's desire for recreational pleasure as well as pure botanical ecstasy. Shade houses and glass houses often incorporated simulated plant habitats, which varied in sophistication depending on the enthusiasm and wealth of the owner. Replicated landscapes as diverse as tropical ponds and rugged fern gullies proliferated across the suburbs, as owners sought to recapture an experience (albeit in miniature) of the natural landscape.

Unglazed buildings

Writing on 15 November 1827 'A Mcl' (correspondent for Loudon's Gardener's Magazine) noted 'we can grow all the European and tropical fruits here, without the aid of walls of glass.' (1) Thus one of the earliest lessons learnt by gardeners in New South Wales following European settlement was communicated to an English society thirsting for exotic 'New Holland' plants.

Rustic pits

The requirement for shade rather than glazed warmth was exemplified by the earliest shade houses which were little more than earthen pits, constructed for the mere survival of plants. Two
early examples at the Melbourne Botanic Gardens (1850-51) were:
formed with tea tree, two hundred feet in length and four feet wide ... [and] very advantageous for shading young and tender plants from the sun during the summer months, and for gradually inuring those which have been raised in the hot-house, to the open air, previous to planting them out in borders. (2)

Bush houses

A E Cole writing as 'Bouquet' in Half-hours in the Bush-house recalled the period, prior to the era of sophisticated lathed shade houses, when a 'little crib of wire-netting and ti-tree branches was the only Australian equivalent for the European greenhouse.' (3) From this the bush house developed, using branches of trees or brush over a timber frame. This type of building was described in the 1870s as a 'useful and thoroughly Australian structure.' (4)

Lathed shade houses

Apart from brush, bamboo (presumably split) was used by South Australian nurseryman Edwin Smith in the late 1860s (Figure 1). 'If [bamboo] is not readily available split pailing [sic] will answer, placed sufficiently close together to break the direct rays of the sun without more than partially excluding the light' wrote fellow nurseryman Henry Sewell in 1875. (5) Orientation and spacing of lathes was the subject of much local discussion. The optimum orientation was east-west so that the sun would create a constantly moving shadow, rather than north-south, which meant some areas would be in shade and others in constant exposure to the sun (Figure 2).

By the 1870s, shade houses were a popular feature in local gardens. Considerable sophistication had also been demonstrated; some larger examples having curved surfaces, elaborate elevations and ground surfaces mimicking the conditions of natural fern gullies. Whilst shade was the main design criterion, the recreational potential of these buildings was also high. This was especially true of the massive shade houses at botanic gardens in Geelong, Ballarat and other places. (6)

Calico houses

'Calico houses' were also used locally in the 19th Century for shade. Thomas Evans of Adelaide contributed an article about 'A Cheap Plant House' to the Garden and the Field in 1876. He cited the need for light and air, and for exclusion of dust and rain. Dismissing 'the much lauded bamboo- houses' as misunderstood and comparatively useless, he proposed a cheaper substitute - the calico house.

To build the calico house all that is required is a substantial framework of quartering, with palings up to the level of the first shelf from the ground; the roof may be made in sashes, as with the glass, and provided with a blind on rollers for very hot sunny days ... To make the houses waterproof ... take a pound of sugar or lead and a pound of alum; dissolve in a large tin with 2 or 3 buckets of water, well soak the calico and hang it out to dry ... (7)
Glazed structures

In 1901 English horticulturalist and author B C Ravenscroft summarised the two main objectives of growing plants under glass:

1. To enable more or less tender exotic subjects to be cultivated in our [i.e. English] comparatively cold and always changeable climate.
2. To 'force' various fruits, flowers and vegetables into abnormally early bloom, etc. and thus induce them to afford their produce more or less in advance of their natural seasons. (B)

Loudon observed in 1834 that 'the climate of Australia includes all the desirable climates of the world, from that of Van Diemen's Land, which resembles the climate of the south of England, to that of Sydney, which admits the culture of tropical fruits in the open air.' (9) Thus glazed structures were generally necessary in the cooler climate of Van Diemen's Land. Even Sydney had its occasional cool spells, causing Loudon to notice pineapples, sugar cane, bread fruit and bananas growing in its botanic gardens 'protected during six weeks or two months by a covering of glass, but without internal flues [i.e. heating].' (10) Glass house was a generic term for all glazed structures while hot house encompassed glazed and heated buildings. Their prototype was the orangery; 'the green-house of the last century' according to Loudon, writing in 1834. (11)

Wardian cases

Wardian cases were the first containers in which plants were transported to and from Australia. They were small glazed enclosures, the base containing earth for plants, and the edges tightly sealed. Designed by N Ward of London, these cases created a micro-climate under the glass with constant moisture level owing to transpiration of the plants and subsequent condensation. M'Intosh cites plants left in Wardian cases for 'upwards of 12 months ... with one supply of water' (Figure 3). (12)

Glazed frames and pits

Forcing frames or pits were used for growing vegetables as well as for protecting tender potted plants. These generally consisted of a glazed sash which rested at an angle on low brick walls. In the case of pits for potted plants, some form of flued heating was often introduced. As with non-glazed structures, small portable devices such as hand glasses and bells were utilised. Today an inverted glass jar on a propagated cutting commonly serves the same function.

Green houses

The green house was an all purpose glazed structure of a type commonly found in Australia (Figure 4). It usually incorporated solid walls around the base with glazed sashes on the walls and a glazed roof. Timber stages ran along the walls and often down the centre if room was available. Heating was a necessity in England and Europe, although as seen earlier, this feature was often only necessary in cooler parts of Australia or for the production of particular horticultural species (like orchids). M'Intosh contrasted the green house with the conservatory and noted the former was generally smaller and 'without architectural pretensions.' (13)

Brick smoke flues were an early form of heating for horticultural buildings. Later developments included metal pipes for conducting heated air or steam, although by the 1830s heating with hot water pipes was generally accepted as the most satisfactory method.

Fruit houses
The vineyard was a specialised form of greenhouse. Here the vines grew in the ground, rather than pots, although details of glazing and heating (if any) were similar to greenhouses. Peach houses also followed this form, with standard trees being grown in prepared earth, rather than tubs.

Close houses

Throughout most of Australia, where merely protection and not artificial heating was required, the concept of a 'close house' was developed. Sir Frederick Sargood's massive shade house at Rippon Lea (erected c.1874, rebuilt c.1884) incorporated a close house at the southern end from its first stage. This was a timber structure, only partially glazed on the roof with no side walls, a sunken path and timber stages for plants. Such a structure was often incorporated with a more open shade house, allowing cultivation of a wider range of plants than on a single environment. (14)

Conservatories

'The erection of conservatories may be considered the highest grade of horticultural architecture; in them elegance of design must be blended with cultural utility - architecture becomes the associate of horticulture.' (15) Thus architectural pretension formed an important component of conservatory design. Writers in the 19th Century stressed the importance of 'taste' in the design of conservatories and often called for architectural style to be similar to the main mansion or residence to which they were attached. Glazed roofs and walls were a necessity, as was heating in cooler climates. Plants were grown in prepared soil and the interior generally opened off one or more rooms of the principal residence. The leisure aspect was often heightened by birds in free flight as an exotic complement to the plants, reinforcing the collector mentality of many 19th Century gardeners. Local examples of conservatories include the structure opening off the drawing room at Rippon Lea (c.1897) and the elongated span-roof conservatory of Mona Vale in Tasmania.
Aquariums

Aquariums for cultivating aquatic plants, such as the 'Victoria Regina' water lily, were a special form of glazed horticultural building. A large artificial pond raised from ground level by a low wall was covered with a glazed roof and heating provided by means of hot water pipes below water level and under paths. The Victoria Regina house at Adelaide Botanic Gardens is an example of this class of building.

LEISURE AND PLEASURE BUILDINGS

Buildings for leisure and pleasure were the aspiration of every domestic garden owner and their presence added considerable visual contrast and interest to a garden. As with plants, their associations were important; 'Gothick' smoking houses and rustic seats were far more than mere seating. Such buildings and structures evoked poetic, artistic and historical associations often far in excess of their actual architectural merit. Through the structures in his own garden, even the most modest villa gardener could re-live the writings of Pope, Gilpin or Addison, and glimpse the 'Sharawadgi' world of 18th Century Chinese gardens.

Seats

Garden buildings served many functions, seats being the most fundamental. Early seats were often quite plain with any decoration usually incorporated as part of the structure. Timber and wrought or cast iron were common materials of construction, and rustic construction was fashionable at the time of European colonisation of Australia (Figure 5). (Apart from the body-blow dealt to rustic construction by the modern movement (c.1930-50) its popularity has rarely waned). After the turn of the century and even the latter part of the 19th Century, mass-produced rusticity was common - structures could even be purchased from catalogues furnished by manufacturers such as William Cooper of London. This was of course contrary to the original picturesque spirit, but retained the basics for a mass market. The use of cast iron for such structures further reduced any spiritual link with their picturesque prototypes.

Summerhouses

Summerhouses, arbors and temples were popular with gardeners of the Victorian era and often incorporated covered seating. Early Victorian designers, perhaps influenced by garden writers such as Loudon, sought mellow structures, casually picturesque and often quite irregular in shape. The 'arbors of cool recess' formed by Dr. Ross in Tasmania in the 1830s probably exemplified this genre. By contrast, as the 19th Century progressed, books such as Shirley Hibberd's Rustic adornments for homes of taste (1856), Kemp's How to lay out a garden (3rd edition, 1864) and Hughes' Garden architecture and landscape gardening (1866) brought more formality to designs. Rusticity was encouraged, but not at the expense of regular plans, crisp surfaces and even metal components (Figure 6). The cast iron bridges at Rippon Lea and the series of rustic shelters at Mel...
bourne’s Royal Botanic Gardens are examples of this later approach. By Edwardian times and even between the world wars, this more man­nered approach was popular. Few timber structures, especially rustic ones, now survive due to their rapid deterioration.

Some summerhouses had little or no provision for seating and were derived from tent forms. Indeed the work pavilion is derived from the Latin papilio (butterfly) and onis (tent). A particularly rare survivor of this form exists at ‘Waiora’ in the Adelaide Hills. Other buildings beloved of followers of the picturesque were ‘Gothick’ in design using Gothic elements in a picturesque or even naïve manner. The smoking house at Woolmers, Tasmania, follows this tradition.

Arbours

Metal structures have fared slightly better and several intact 19th Century specimens survive. At Brickendon, Tasmania, the iron frame of a summerhouse is now deliberately enveloped in ivy providing an interesting example of a leisure structure where planting was the dominant element and the built structure subservient. Ferdinand von Mueller’s ‘Thuja Bower’ or ‘Frond House’ (c.1864) at the Melbourne Botanic Gardens took this idea to its logical conclusion and dispensed with structure altogether, utilising the tall American conifer, Thuja (Arbor vitae) planted in close rows and clipped to form a living shade house. However, the well known arbours at Melbourne’s Royal Botanic Gardens with their arched metal frames covered by Tecomeria capensis formed a more characteristic design.

Gazebos

The Rouse Hill House summerhouse went further than merely providing covered seating and incorporated a verandah from which to view the garden. Towers were yet another form of garden building from which views were to be obtained. The tower at Rippon Lea, Melbourne, is a rare surviving domestic example. Raised summerhouses or towers attached to buildings were known as belvederes (from the Italian bel, beautiful and vedere, see) and all buildings of prospect were covered by the generic term, gazebo. In addition many garden buildings and especially towers were located on vistas or as picturesque silhouette-
animals also prompted garden owners to erect buildings and cages, often far beyond the requirements of the intended inhabitants.

THE HARD LANDSCAPE

'Hard' landscape elements in a garden include paths, steps, edgings, walls, fences, paths, fountains, statues and other elements which do not fall under the heading of buildings. (17)

Paths

Paths have a pre-eminent part to play for the manner in which they shape a garden, and the viewer's perception. They range from the early squared layout of straight paths at Sydney's first Government House, to curved paths like those at the home of Dr. James Ross, editor of the Hobart Town Courier, who in the early 1830s boasted of 'my arbours of cool recess and serpentine walks, formed out of the natural shrubbery, clothed in perpetual green...' (18).

Surface textures varied according to size of garden, position of path and with the changing architectural products available. Thus a small cottage on Victoria's goldfield may have had a gravel path lined with quartz rocks while an inner suburban terrace house of the same period may have utilised tessellated and encaustic tiles, either locally manufactured or imported.

Steps

Paths often incorporated steps, either as a contrived feature or to suit the topography of the site. They also formed an integral part of terracing, a major design feature of many early gardens. Like paths, materials varied widely from the sophisticated cast iron steps of 'Waiora' in the Adelaide Hills to simple stonework in the gardens designed by Edna Walling in Victoria.

Edging

As steps provided the transition between different levels, so edgings provided a line of demarcation between paths and lawns or beds. The homely example of quartz rocks cited in the section on paths contrasted strongly with the rigid terra-cotta edging tiles beloved of inner suburban gardeners. Bricks on edge, simple timber strips and even beer bottles or whale bones provided variation, depending on means and social status.

Gates and fences

Walls and fences, like paths, were other elements used to define edges and shape perceptions of a garden. In general, the materials were complementary to the residence, and of a suitable scale. (It is this feature which is so often overlooked by enthusiastic garden 'restorers' when designing new fences which ignore and ultimately detract from the overall ensemble, either through overdésign or banality. Hedges formed an important form of enclosure and in Australia many indigenous species were utilised beside more traditional English and European species. Perhaps better than any other fencing material, hedges...
have been able to transcend style and provide a traditional form which is readily adaptable to many contemporary situations or when screening of intrusive elements is required.

Openings in walls and fences provided a focus, and were graced often by embellished gates or entries. Often the same materials used for a fence were repeated (like timber pickets or cast iron palisades) although to accentuate an opening as the point of entry, gates commonly incorporated a more complex design. Lych gates were often incorporated in domestic gardens and reflected this desire for a well defined entrance; a macabre twist from their funereal origins as shelters for coffin bearers.

Other elements

Mention could be made of fountains and other water features, rockeries, statues, plant stands, pots and tubs or other features. Contemporary gardening books and journals are the best source of information on such items, and the reader is referred to works such as Loudon's Encyclopedia of Gardening (numerous editions between 1822 and 1870), Thompson's The Gardener's Assistant (editions between 1859 and 1902) or M'Intosh's Book of the Garden (1853-55). (19)

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

Introduction

In Australia, not only have we inherited a fascinating tradition of garden buildings and hard landscape elements, but we still have many extant examples. Faced with the need to conserve such items, we need to distinguish between the many possible approaches to ensure the survival of the building or elements without jeopardising its significance.

The Australia ICOMOS Guidelines for the Conservation of Plans of Cultural Significance (or the 'Burra Charter') provide professional conservators, architects, historians, archaeologists, administrators and funding bodies with a set of standardised terms and approaches to conservation issues. The charter was introduced in 1981 and has been adopted as a set of guiding principles by most professionals working in the conservation field. While the definition of cultural significance is left vague, if a garden owner, management authority, heritage body (like the National Trust or Australian Heritage Commission) or other interested party considers a building, structure or garden element worthy of retention, then the 'Burra Charter' provides invaluable guidance for its conservation.

Four main issues are addressed - preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation and all quotations of definitions are taken directly from the charter. 'Conservation is the general term for the processes of looking after a place, so as to retain its culturally significant qualities. According to circumstances, it will include preservation or restoration as well as maintenance, and it may include the minimum practical reconstruction or adaptation.'

Each of these approaches will be defined and discussed using local examples involving garden buildings or hard landscape elements. Finally 're-creating,' a term not included in the 'Burra Charter' will be discussed. This raises the inherent difficulty in dealing with conservation of gardens as opposed to buildings. Buildings, as relatively static objects, can easily be codified, but a garden, essentially composed of living material, is subject to constant change. 'This paper deals only with the built elements of gardens, but the issue of dealing with gardens as an entity is discussed in another paper. Both papers raise the question of the relevance of the 'Burra Charter' to gardens and the need for wider scope, particularly within the concept of 're-creation.'

Preservation

'Preservation means maintaining the fabric [i.e. all the physical material of the place or items] of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.' This category is only rarely encountered in conservation of garden buildings and no striking examples come to mind. The simple act of retaining loose pickets of a fence without substituting any new pickets would fit the definition.

Restoration

'Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state.' It is difficult to recall any restoration work associated with garden
structures. Most so-called restoration actually being 'reconstruction.' The revealing of the original entry drive of Vaucluse House in Sydney by careful excavation comes to mind for in this case the original stone drains and paved surfaces were uncovered and left intact. This exercise especially fulfilled Article 14 of the 'Burra Charter,' which states that restoration 'should reveal new culturally significant material.' Article 15 states that 'restoration may involve the reassembling of displaced components... and the reassembly of a dilapidated garden seat or garden structure would satisfy this approach.

Reconstruction

'Reconstruction means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric [my emphasis]. This is not to be confused with either re-creation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of these guidelines.' This is by far the most common approach to the conservation of garden buildings. Three local examples demonstrate the approach where an existing building has fallen into disrepair, and contrary to 'preservation' (where no additional materials can be used), reconstruction allows the introduction of new materials. Article 19 of the 'Burra Charter' sounds a note of caution limiting the form of new materials to those which can be identified from either physical or documentary evidence.

This is clearly the case in the summerhouse (pre-1888) in the Geelong Botanic Garden. Here the thatched roofing was renewed in the mid-1970s by obtaining new reeds from Lake Connewarre. By rethatching this important structure, not only was the traditional fabric being replicated, but also the spirit of the building as a representative rustic specimen. Article 19 goes on to specify that any reconstruction 'should be identifiable on close examination as being new work.' When the present structure at Geelong is viewed in comparison with early photographs, this requirement is well and truly satisfied.

The second example of reconstruction is the small rotunda at Maldon Cemetery. This late 19th Century building is hexagonal with every second face fenced with lattice panels. Prior to funding from the Maldon Restoration Fund in 1978, the timber was badly damaged by white ant infestation. A skilled carpenter was engaged to carefully dismantle sections of the structure piece by piece, renew damaged timber to match the existing and carefully replace the reconstructed sections. In this way, the need to dismantle the entire structure (with the attendant problems of reassembly) was avoided and the maximum amount of original timber was left in situ. This work cost approximately $6500 in 1978.

The third example of reconstruction involves the massive fernery at Rippon Lea. By early 1984 this structure (c1884) was almost devoid of timber lathes, and tall palm trees were posing a potential physical threat to it in high winds. In this instance, measured drawings of surviving fragments of the lathes revealed the original pattern and a conservation analysis supported the wisdom of relating the structure. Of slightly more questionable wisdom was the decision to drill out every rivet in the structure and replace this original fabric with new high strength bolts. A sample truss may possibly have been left in original condition for interpretative purposes. Also of dubious merit was the decision by the Na-
national Trust to proceed with reconstruction work in the absence of any firm policy. While the conservation analysis retrospectively endorsed the approach to the relathing, the conservation actions at the southern 'close house' are less than fully sanctioned. This is possibly a result of the situation where the entire garden is still managed without a fixed policy, a state of affairs regrettably all too common in most historic gardens. However, in this instance it should not detract from the reconstruction of a structure of national, even world, significance.

With regard to reconstruction, Article 17 also specifies that this is appropriate where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration and when it is necessary for its survival, or where it recovers the cultural significance of the place as a whole. In the case of a large garden, the 'place' could be the entire garden and the 'alteration' could be the demolition of a summerhouse or arbour. In this case it could be argued that reconstruction of such a structure may help 'recover the cultural significance' of the garden, especially if the demolished structure was a major element in the overall design. In this way, two reconstructions of bandstands have been initiated, one at Clifton Hill (1976) and one at Camperdown Botanic Gardens (proposed 1985 but still unexecuted see Figure 9).

The question of whether their reconstruction is necessary for the survival of the garden is problematic. It could be argued, however, that unless such dramatic works are executed in neglected public gardens, little interest will be focused on the gardens and the decline in maintenance will recur, which brought about the need for their present reconstruction.

Article 18 specifies that reconstruction is limited to the completion of a depleted entity and should not constitute the majority of the fabric of a place. In the case of the Camperdown and Clifton Hill examples, although reconstruction of the majority of the fabric was undertaken or proposed, the majority of the fabric of the gardens (which form the relevant equivalent of 'place') was not reconstructed.

Adaptation

'Adaptation means modifying a place to suit new functions without destroying its cultural sig-

Figure 9 Reconstruction drawing (1985) of Camperdown Botanic gardens rotunda (erected 1878, demolished c1960)
Recreation

This approach is not covered by the 'Burra Charter,' and indeed the only mention of the term (in Article 1) carries the impression of disdain, even contempt. However, in the case of many gardens, re-creation is a valid and often necessary approach. This is because gardens are so often subject to dramatic changes, particularly as a result of plant growth and natural decay (of plants and structures) with the consequence that little evidence survives to enable accurate reconstruction.

The garden at 101 Rathdowne Street, Carlton, serves as an example of both reconstruction and recreation. The site contained a former Presbyterian manse, designed in the 1860s by fashionable Melbourne architect, Leonard Terry. In this instance the existing garden was of little merit, yet formed the curtilage for a house of great significance.

The plan (as plotted by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in the 1980s) was checked against earlier photographs and this enabled certain elements to be reconstructed. These included the central path, picket fence, clipped hedges and light coloured surface of the side paths. This was the extent of information available and the remainder of the garden was planned as a sympathetic re-creation of a 19th Century garden appropriate to a residence of this size. Physical evidence of paths was sought, but these had been obscured by a previous reorganisation of levels.

Several trees inappropriate to the early design of the garden, including massed plantings of silver birch and claret ash, were removed and replaced by small scale planting typical of the 19th Century. Several mature cordylines were transplanted into the side garden area where they serve to separate this area from the front section as well as to provide 'architectural' character with their strong silhouettes. A buffalo grass lawn was also introduced with new levels requiring considerable site works to achieve the desired effect of a steeply rolled edge.

Several simple garden structures (like a wire arbor by A.R.C.) were also installed, as no evidence was uncovered to justify reproductions of more elaborate earlier structures. Conversely, in historic gardens with intact early structures, the introduction of further copied or replicated examples can detract from the significance of the originals. The over- elaborate replicated structures (especially the ubiquitous cast iron seats, but also 'Lutyens' seats and 'Versailles' tubs) so readily available from the burgeoning number of specialist nurseries and garden shops look faintly absurd in most re-created gardens.

No evidence of original paving materials (apart from the light colour of the side paths) was available for the Rathdowne Street garden, so characteristic 19th Century surfaces were employed - asphalt for the main path and Lilydale toppings (crushed limestone) for the secondary network of paths. Unlike the secondary paths the central path was reconstructed, as shown in the early MMBW plan and this approach was also adopted with the front fence. In this case the original gateposts existed and a clear photograph enabled documentary evidence to supplement the physical remains as well as indicating a hedge with dark leaves planted on the inside of the fence line. Accordingly this was reinstated with green-leaved pittosporum, a common 19th Century hedge species. It is worth noticing that the complexity of the fence matches the grandeur of the house and the wide frontage. The same cannot be said for many picket fences, now so numerous in trendier parts of the inner suburbs, which incorporate 'one with the lot' irrespective of the frontage, period of the house or size of the property.

With the garden past its third spring the effect has certainly justified the original decision to reconstruct and re-create a garden suited to the conservation of the residence.

Perhaps the most important lesson in re-creation is to call upon the faculties of restraint and sensitivity, opting for solutions which are reserved rather than exaggerated or over-ambitious. The Fuchsia House at Hobart Botanic Gardens demonstrates these desired qualities. It achieves its success by a skilled use of traditional materials with a contemporary interpretation of plan form, lathe pattern and constructional techniques. Were the 'Burra Charter' to ever incorporate 're-creation' as a category, this building would surely qualify as an embodiment of the concept.

Note: This paper was presented at the Historic Gardens Conference Rippon Lea Melbourne, on
16 April 1986. Part of it has since been published in the Historic Building Council/Ministry for Planning and Environment’s proceedings of that Conference.
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