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Paradise Lost? Profiling the heritage of the apple industry in the Garden of Eden (Tasmania) and some lessons for managing rural cultural heritage

Introduction

Tasmania has been a major commercial producer of apples since the mid-1800s, and for most of this period the greatest producer of apples of any of the Australian states. To most Australians born before about 1960, Tasmania and apples are synonymous: it is the Apple Isle. To quote two Edwardian tourists to Tasmania: 'The Garden of Eden must have been something like the Southern Tasmanian fruit area - without the snake, of course. The best way to regain this paradise is - ask at the Tourist Bureau' (Hogan & Gye, c.1913). And Australians have come to Tasmania for decades to enjoy this paradise of apple blossom - a rural Arcadia.

Paradise Lost? The large-scale Tasmanian apple industry, which had its commercial beginnings in about 1840, began to seriously decline in the post World War II period; this culminated in the early 1970s, when large areas of apple orchard were 'grubbed out'. Although apple orcharding in Tasmania today continues as a viable industry, it is on a much-reduced scale, and Tasmania is no longer the same 'paradise' it was.

This paper is derived from a study of the history and heritage of the Tasmanian apple industry carried out by the authors for the Queen Victoria Museum & Art Gallery in Launceston during 1996-1997, and reported in The History and Heritage of the Tasmanian Apple Industry - A Profile (McConnell & Servant 1998). The project was funded by the National Estate Grants Program. The idea of carrying out this study was developed in the early 1990s by the Queen Victoria Museum & Art Gallery in association with the Tasmanian Apple & Pear Growers Association.

Our intent in this paper is to illustrate some of the issues of identification and management of rural cultural heritage, in particular horticultural based heritage, which with its living elements has its own particular management issues. We believe that the findings from the Tasmanian apple industry heritage study will closely parallel the apple industry heritage situation in other parts of Australia, and that the findings are relevant to many other aspects of rural cultural heritage and its management.

Although the paper focuses on issues relating to the identification of the heritage, it provides an overview of the history of the industry for context, and concludes by outlining what is seen, based on the project, as the challenges that the apple industry heritage presents for orchardists, heritage managers and the community generally. Hopefully this will usefully feed into current discourse about the needs and priorities for rural heritage management, in particular for the heritage of the more intensive land use rural industries.
Historical background

The Tasmanian apple industry history can be viewed as a number of stages:

- from planting the first apple tree to semi-commercial orcharding (1788–1840/60)
- transition to commercialisation (1840/60–1900)
- steady growth of the industry (1900–1940)
- the post-war period and the impact of technical improvements (1940–1960)

Although these stages reflect the Tasmania-wide development of the industry, there were regional differences.

Semi-commercial orcharding occurred mainly on the east coast and on the outskirts of Hobart and Launceston, and mainly comprised the sale of surplus fruit from kitchen gardens and estate farm orchards. Circa 1840 the first commercial orchards were planted in the Huon and soon after in the Tamar, but it was some years before these were producing commercially. As the potential of the industry was recognised, and with the high demand for produce on the mainland Australian goldfields, increasing areas of apple orchard were planted in the Huon, in the Tamar, in the Derwent, and by the 1880s on the Tasman Peninsula and Bruny Island and in pockets of inland areas such as the Midlands and the Mersey Valley, and around Scottsdale and Lilydale in the north-east (see Figure 1). Parallels can be made with the wine industry in Tasmania today.
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Tasmania, showing the main historical apple orcharding districts.

(Source: Queen Victoria Museum & Art Gallery)
an illustration of the growth of orchards, in the Huon there were nine orchards in 1865, 192 in 1874, 207 in 1882, and 552 in 1893.

From the late 1800s through to World War II, the industry continued to expand, with increased plantings in all the main apple growing districts. The peak of orchard establishment was in the 1910s with most orchards being small orchards of around 3-15 acres that would support and could be managed by a single family. The peak in planted areas was in 1922 when 26,700 acres were under apple orchard. At this time, a number of 'orchard estates' sprang up with entrepreneurs buying-up large acreages and subdividing them into smaller orchards that were offered for sale. These entrepreneurs sought buyers from India and the United Kingdom, and in many cases managed the orchards for these buyers, often absentee owners. However, the industry did suffer setbacks through this period – the widespread occurrence of codlin moth in the late 1800s requiring state legislation for its control, and the over-abundance of orchards creating an excess supply of apples in the 1920s. Because of the large existing acreages of orchard, the poor quality of the land, a succession of poor seasons, and the use of outdated techniques, the post World War I soldier settlement orchards did not succeed in most cases.

By the 1910s the need for specialised infrastructure for the industry was apparent and in the 1910s–1920s there were huge improvements made in this area, including the development of apple and pear growers associations and co-operatives (agricultural suppliers, packing sheds and cool stores), nurseries, specialised cool storage on land and at sea for the fresh fruit market, the large scale development of apple processing factories (for cider, dried apples, apple juice, pulp and jam making) and the development of specialised transport facilities such as jetties, railway lines, and the two major dedicated export ports of Beauty Point and Port Huon. Associated service industries, such as apple-case making, fertiliser production and equipment design and supply, also developed strongly at this time in response to the burgeoning apple industry.

World War II saw the beginnings of major changes to the industry. Initially there was a decline in apple production with the loss of labour to the war, which in many cases led to the abandonment of orchards that were not able to be maintained over the war years, although a number of orchards received labour assistance through the use of Prisoners of War (mainly Italians), and the Women's Land Army. The viability of many orchards was also compromised by the market fluctuations of this period. Then, from the 1950s, with the economic and technological changes that followed from the war, the industry in Tasmania faced enormous readjustments. Numbers of orchards, used to ongoing change in the industry, managed to meet the changed technological requirements, but the industry failed to meet the economic challenges.

As a consequence, from the 1950s through to the 1970s many orchards were lost, with the main period of orchard loss being the 1970s. Due to the seriousness of the situation, the government subsided orchardists under the Trek...
Pull Scheme (1972) to ‘grub out’ their orchards to reduce the scale of the industry. This cleared orchard-land has been used mainly for cattle grazing, although new horticultural industries are also springing up on former orchards, in particular vineyards, and on the Tasman Peninsula a successful poultry industry has been developed by former orchardists. The orchards that have survived were mainly the larger orchards. But to survive they have had to change - some diversifying, for example, into vegetable cool storage in the Mersey area, and others by taking on a broader industry role. This latter change has occurred mainly in the Huon where the industry is still most visible today. The larger orchards have enlarged their cool storage and fruit handling facilities and act as regional cool storage and packing facilities for the smaller orchards, and in many cases act as the fruit exporter, a function that was performed by specialist companies for much of the 1900s.

Historical themes, derived from the history of the industry and seen as central to an understanding of the industry, are the horticultural practices in the orchards; apple packing and storage with its critical developments in packing and cold storage to ensure successful overseas sales; apple transport in an environment that was initially heavily dependent on water transport including for overseas export; the ways in which apples were used, in particular the processing into jams, pulp, dried apples and cider; and employment within the industry which was varied, using men, women and children, and both seasonal itinerants and local workers. These themes have been used to identify, classify and assess the industry heritage.

Identification – processes

The following looks at two main aspects of identifying the cultural heritage that were undertaken by the project, but which are obviously important in any assessment of cultural heritage, and possibly more so in rural heritage, which is arguably relatively understudied in Australia.

Developing a research design

Looking for apple industry heritage in Tasmania is not difficult - there is a lot of it! Moreover it is spread around the state. Although it can be defined geographically as having occurred in twelve former orcharding districts (Figure 1), some of these districts were large and, as indicated above, contained hundreds of orchards. There was an additional difficulty in that there were no prior studies that we could use as a basis: when it started, this was the first statewide thematic rural-heritage study to be carried out in Tasmania.

Given this, as well as the time constraints of the project, with the project the funding allowing only for an approximately two-person / twelve-week project, it clearly wasn’t going to be possible to identify and document all the apple industry heritage in the state, as well as research the history of the industry in the available timeframe. The options, given the nature of the industry in
Tasmania appeared to be:

- to study one district in detail – but which one as the historical information indicated that all districts were different and therefore likely to contain different ‘assemblages’ of industry heritage;
- to document the icons – but this would give little real information about the heritage and reinforce what was already known, without testing the appropriateness of the known icons;
- to pick representative types of sites and document these – but how to choose these in a meaningful way with no prior contextual or heritage information?

No single type of approach was considered appropriate, and the project research design ultimately combined a range of approaches:

- An attempt to cover the whole of the state, because this was the first study of its kind for the state, using a district-based approach as a framework to identify regional differences.
- Limiting the apple industry heritage we were considering to the ‘industry’ (i.e. the commercial enterprise), although we did consider some of the very early home and farm orchards that had a minor commercial role and which are considered to be the forerunners of the commercial orchards in Tasmania.
- To construct individual district profiles which was achieved by:
  - broad level historical research;
  - oral interview of one knowledgeable person per district associated with the orcharding industry for historical, especially social history information, and to map former orchards together with owner/establishment information, and advice as to what heritage items (particularly those of social significance) occurred in the district;
  - one to two days field reconnaissance which entailed driving around a district mapping, listing and photographing heritage items noted.
- Profiling the heritage by site-type by recording in detail some 30 sites that were considered on the basis of the district reviews and other consultation (with historians, heritage managers, orchardists, and the industry association) to be representative of the main types.
- Documentation of the results through:
  - an inventory of all industry-related places (these may no longer have physical evidence) identified by the project from historical information, interviews, and field reconnaissance;
  - detailed site records for places for which there was more than inventory level information (e.g. a site history and/or information of the existing fabric and condition);
  - a report summarising the results of the project, including methods, contextual information, significance assessment of known sites and recommendations for management and listing.

It was impossible to keep the work within the twelve-week framework. The 24 person-week project turned into something more like a 60 person-week project.
The main reasons for this were:

- there was just so much information (which once collected entails a professional responsibility to document at some level);
- the orchardists and other industry people approached were so helpful that we felt obliged to repay this by providing more comprehensive district reviews than initially envisaged;
- as is often the case, the more one knows, the more the complexity of what is being studied becomes apparent, and it is difficult to resist the desire to try and document and analyse the complex reality.

So what are the lessons to be learned from just getting started in identifying rural cultural heritage?

- There is often an enormous amount of heritage of a range of types that cannot initially be identified and documented thoroughly, and which consequently requires a means of providing overview information or ‘profiling’, as well as the development of mechanisms to continue to develop that information.
- A range of techniques is required to provide the type of information needed for management. Important sources are historical information for context and site information, field-based documentation, and oral sources particularly industry-related sources – to provide detailed local knowledge that is not documented, in particular site information and a social history.
- Having obtained information from people, there is an obligation to do something meaningful and useful with the information.
- Such studies, even overview studies, require a certain level of resource commitment (which is beyond the economic scope of the industries themselves in many cases).

Providing a context

It is clearly important in carrying out an analysis of heritage for management-related reasons to be able to assess the results and the heritage in context. The project, therefore, included a serious attempt to determine what other related studies or management had been carried out previously.

The project found very little evidence of existing heritage studies that could be used for comparative purposes, although we were forced to find new and innovative ways of getting information. Ways in which the project attempted to obtain contextual information included:

- searching the normal bibliographic sources, including journals, reports, lists;
- asking individuals with knowledge of the industry or rural heritage;
- advertising the project and our need for information with HRURAL (an
international rural history internet list), and in newsletters of relevant organisations, for example Australia ICOMOS and ASHA;

• searches of relevant lists and registers (e.g. Register of the National Estate, Tasmanian lists) in Australia;

• contacting all the state historical heritage management agencies in Australia to establish what work had been undertaken in the states;

• writing to all state-based industry associations with a questionnaire that we asked them to send to all their members, asking if they were aware of any historical or heritage studies of the industry.

From this research we determined that

• previous research in this area has been mainly historical research rather than place-based studies;

• very few apple industry related sites are on state registers;

• it is difficult to identify what is an apple industry-related site as the themes used for registration generally do not allow apple industry sites to be picked up in searches;

• registers included sites that had associations with the apple industry, but these were not documented – generally because rural sites are rarely researched in any detail before listing and the apple industry association and other associations are therefore unknown, and because rural sites appear mostly to be listed for select fabric-based values rather than historical associations;

• at the time of the project there had been no previous thematic heritage studies of the apple or other fruit industries in Australia, other than a study of the soft fruit industry in Victoria by Jan Penney (1995), and by the time the project finished a study of the history and heritage of the Tasmanian hops industry (Evans 1994, Davies 1997) had been completed;

• there have been only a small number of place-based studies of apple industry associated places in Australia that acknowledge the orcharding history and significance of the place. These are the Strathdon Orchard (Nunawading, Victoria) study (Gilfedder & Associates 1992); the Baileys Orchard Complex (Glenrock State Reserve, NSW) study (Ashley 1991, Le Maistre 1991); and the conservation planning for Woolmers Estate (Tasmania) (Lucas, Stapleton & Partners Pty Ltd 1996) which although not primarily an orchard, had an orchard and a strong association with the apple industry.

• documented and accessible fruit industry heritage management examples, other than the place-based studies noted above, appear to be limited to the work of Common Ground in England. Research into English apple orchard preservation has found that England has lost two thirds of its orchards in the last 30 years (and in some areas 90 per cent of the orchards). Common Ground sees this as an ‘alarming rate of loss’ of orchards which ‘is diminishing English culture’. As a consequence they have developed and implemented a program of community-based management focused around community (managed) orchards and a celebration of orcharding and related aspects in the form of an annual Apple Day, as well as marketing items such as postcards, posters and calendars, to raise public consciousness.
While the lack of contextual information for the project made assessment and provision of management recommendations more difficult, it also highlights

• our current lack of knowledge of the rural heritage resource base
• the problems in accessing and analysing the information we already have
• that there is a need to have systems which enable the information base to handle a range of levels of information and be upgraded as new information becomes available
• how far we have to go in developing a range of effective management strategies for rural heritage.

Identification – the results

The following section outlines the nature of the Tasmanian apple industry heritage, based on the project results, and explores the implications for management. First, the nature of the cultural heritage is reviewed in terms of site types, and this is followed by a summary of the abundance of the heritage.

Tasmanian Apple Industry Heritage site types identified

Orchards

In a sense, the apple industry starts at the orchards. The orchards were the most common type of industry-related place, and at the peak of planting there were over 25,000 acres of orchard in Tasmania. Most orchards were about 3 acres to 25 acres in size, but there were also larger orchards. A number of the early
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orchards have survived, many as only a few remnant trees in a paddock. Only two 19th-century, relatively intact orchards (plantings) were identified. These are both 1880s plantings, which retain the original root stock, but have been grafted with different varieties over time. The oldest identified extant commercial orchard planting is the Tuckers Orchard at Scottsdale (Figure 2), which not only has the original plantings fully intact, but also has all the elements from the beginning of the orchard (such as house, packing shed, other outbuildings, fences, windbreaks and well) intact and in reasonable condition. This is a heritage gem. Its high integrity and the rarity of orchards of its period make it of very high level significance. The owners, however, are elderly and can no longer maintain the orchard, which is becoming commercially non-viable due to the age of the trees. The second oldest orchard, Sunnybanks, ceased commercial production in 1996 and the land and orchards have been subdivided. Since recording this orchard, half of the 1880s trees have been removed by new residents who are not interested in maintaining the trees, but who are also unaware of their significance. The next oldest orchard trees identified are 1930s plantings.

There is therefore an urgent need to identify and keep these icons and heritage records. Education and maintenance of integrity and old fabric and old trees are issues in such cases. A particular issue is finding ways of preserving and managing the living elements of special heritage orchards in the long term.

Historic orcharding landscapes

Although we need to initially focus on the individual orchards, these orchards occur in a broader physical and historical context: the cultural landscape. Rural cultural landscapes are now accepted as an important type of cultural heritage.
Figur 4 Oscar Hansen’s Orchard apple packing shed, Tassun Peninsula. (A. McConnell)

(Mitchell & Page 1993). Physically (to some extent because it is an intensive land use) the orchards form distinctive cultural landscapes, termed historic orcharding landscapes by the project. The apple industry project revealed that quality apple industry landscapes in Tasmania are rare. Although the industry has survived in the majority of districts, it has undergone massive changes that have resulted in almost a complete loss of early orchards: to another rural industry, to urban encroachment, or for replanting with new tree stock using new planting and pruning regimes that are very different to those used historically (prior to the c.1970s in this case).

The Castle Forbes Bay Historical Orcharding Landscape in the Huon (Figure 3) is one of six apple industry historical orcharding landscapes identified by the project and is regarded as the best of these, even though it has suffered a loss of around 50 per cent of its actual orchards. This landscape retains an orchard-based layout, most of the residences, packing sheds and other outbuildings, orchards that date from the 1930s, cool stores and an apple-drying factory built in the town centre as well as the town (village) services – the store, church and garage. Access to jetties is preserved, although the jetties no longer exist.

Managing rural cultural landscapes is important from a heritage point of view, but also from the point of view of tourism and a community sense of place and belonging.

**Common structures - packing sheds & cool stores**

The commonest site types are orchardist’s houses, apple packing-sheds and cool stores. In most apple growing areas (except the Bagdad area), for most of the industry’s history, each orchard had its own residence (and often other houses for workers and huts for pickers) and packing shed. Although orchardists
residences are common, they are typical of urban homes of their period of construction. The packing sheds, however, are distinctive elements of the industry heritage and demonstrate changing design and use of materials over time. Packing sheds also played an important social role, acting as a focus for the community during picking, and in some cases for dances, church services and other community meetings.

Oscar Hansen’s packing shed at Highcroft, on the Tasman Peninsula (Figure 4) is an example of the most representative type of shed: the single roomed, small-medium wooden (usually oiled weatherboard or vertical board) shed purpose built on each orchard in most areas from late last century until the mid-1900s. This shed is typical of the smaller earlier packing sheds on orchards: small, of timber, with sliding doors, a gable ended corrugated iron roof with skylights, and located in the orchard but on the road edge. After World War II, the individual orchard sheds tended to be corrugated iron clad. In some cases on the smaller orchards up until the early–mid 1900s, the sheds were smaller and might be associated with other orchard buildings, for example stables and/or a garage. Some sheds were distinctive, for example a concrete packing shed in dairying country at Lalla, or some of the packing sheds in the Huon, or the Brooks Bay shed (Figure 5) which is built out over the water, reflecting the importance of water transport in the Tasmanian apple industry until after World War II. One of the features of orchards that has a long history is that generally all the packing sheds remain. Rather than knocking down early ones and replacing them, they tended to be used for something else (timber storage, garage, general storage) and a new packing shed built, or added onto until there was a complex of conjoined sheds of various ages and with various functions. Many individual orchards added cool stores, and later controlled atmosphere stores as they
became a commercial necessity. Broun's Orchard in the Mersey district (Figure 6) is a good example of this evolving use and growth of the packing-shed / cool-store complex. It has lost its first packing shed but has retained the second early/mid-1900s shed and continued to add to it. Today it is a multi-age complex of packing shed, cool stores, controlled atmosphere storage, loading bays and crate-storage areas. It is typical of the changes orchards have undergone to remain successful up to the present. These larger orchards, particularly in the Huon, sort, store and export apples for the smaller orchards. There are some fifteen to twenty of these operating in Tasmania today.

While there are many cool store complexes like that on Broun's Orchard, there are individual ones on some larger orchards, and cool stores built at points of export (i.e. the ports) and in urban areas. The cool stores in urban areas were some of the earliest, but there are few extant examples of the earlier cool stores. The Tasmanian Cool Stores in Hobart (Figure 7) is one of these. This was the first dedicated fruit cool-store built in Tasmania, and probably in Australia. It was built in 1912, mainly through the energy of a fascinating orchardist and doctor, Dr Harry Benjafield, and used the latest technology from America (the Madison Cooper cooling system) to experiment with cool storage of apples and pears. It survives with a high level of integrity, housed in two buildings. It is almost completely intact, including the cooling systems, engines, workshop and tools.

Consideration of conserving rare and representative examples of specialised features is important. This is made complex by the fact that many of these features are in private ownership, often now on properties that no longer have orchards and where there is little use for such features.
An industry - an integrated system

As can be seen above, apple industry heritage is not only located in rural areas, but has widespread components. The industry was a system with apples being produced in the country, transported to local towns for transport and often some level of processing, then transported to major ports for export, often in the cities, which also housed the offices and storage facilities of major export companies and major processing factories.

A desirable approach in making decisions about the conservation of rural heritage is to regard the heritage as a system rather than a collection of individual sites, as this adds meaning to the conserved heritage and helps in the identification of the range of types of places associated with industry.

Port Huon in the Huon district (Figure 8) is an example of a transport-related element of the system. It was one of Tasmania's two main ports and the only one that is extant. It was built in the late 1910s for the Port Huon Fruit Growers Association, specifically for the export of apples (and pears). It is a large site with a number of structures: sheds, cool stores, offices, weigh stations and jetties. These are intact but now disused, except for a few light industry purposes.

Can this type of heritage be preserved given the low-level use and the costs of maintaining this type of site? Can we find other uses for it?

Another component of the system was the processing factories: for drying, juicing, jam-making, and pulping and canning. The Franklin Evaporators is an apple-drying factory built c.1910 and still operating with the technology it
started with (in spite of complete rebuilding twice due to fires). It is still commercially viable and a major employer of local labour, primarily women. Apples are dried on slatted floors over kiln fires, and is believed to be one of the last factories in the world to use this technology. This is another heritage gem: it is rare and its continued use has resulted in its high integrity and ongoing preservation. This is a rare example of heritage looking after itself - but for how long?

Rural industries need support services. Other components of the system include nurseries, sawmills and case-making factories, fertilisers manufacturers and (more rarely) research and development support. The Grove Research Station is Tasmania’s only site of this type, but is comparatively young. It was established c.1950 to carry out experimental apple-growing research and is a government operation. Today, given government cuts, this is the only apple research station in Australia, similar enterprises in other states having been closed down in the last 20 years. The Grove Research Station also has another important type of industry heritage significance. It houses the largest heritage varietal collection (it has approximately 350 varieties, many of which are local), and is the only large well-established heritage variety collection in Australia. Many varieties were contributed by the other Australian research stations on their closure. The collection includes genetic stock from which not only Australian, but the other main southern hemisphere apple production areas (Argentina and New Zealand) were established, as Tasmanian nurseries supplied much of the original tree stock to these developing orcharding areas in the 1910s–1920s. This is a major pool of genetic material that is important to retain for industry as well as heritage reasons.

Some apple industry heritage is also specially related through associations, and
may form recognisable associational complexes. In such cases the elements may be in one area or be geographically separated. The business empire of Henry Jones IXL is possibly the best example of this in Tasmania. It comprised a range of heritage places around Tasmania, including the well-known industrial complex in the Hobart port area (Figure 9) where apples were stored and jam was made prior to export, the apple storage and processing facility at Beauty Point on the Tamar, and orchards in the Derwent, Huon and on the East Coast. Rostrevor near Triabunna is an example of this, with extremely well preserved apple industry features including a timber drying shed, a packing shed and one of the better preserved early cool stores. In its time (c. 1920) it was the largest apple orchard in the southern hemisphere, and reflects one of the outstanding qualities of Henry Jones approach: the money he put into his developments and their quality. Some apple industry heritage is also related through associations to form sub-systems or associational complexes, which may be geographically widespread – in which case it is important to preserve all the elements that show the operation and inter-relationships of the particular system.

**Intangible heritage and a cultural legacy**

As well as heritage places that have physical evidence of the industry, rural heritage, including apple industry heritage, has other places that are historically important but have no physical evidence. The Early Apple Planting Site at Bruny Island (Figure 10) is an example of such a place. In 1788, Captain Bligh of the Bounty planted three apple seedlings at Adventure Bay, making it the site of the first apple trees planted in Tasmania, and an early Australian apple planting site (the area is also important as Captain Cook’s first landing place in Australia). Although there is no evidence of the early planting event and the
exact location is not known, the place is of significance, including to the local community who have planted three apple trees and erected a sign to commemorate these first apple plantings. Sadly, the community interest has not been maintained and the sign has collapsed and little regular maintenance of the trees occurs. To make a commitment to managing these types of sites, which are about meaning and associations rather than fabric, will require a shift in focus by many heritage managers.

The apple industry has also left a cultural legacy, a result of the importance of the industry and its longevity, and the broader social significance that it attained, and which still survives primarily in Tasmania, but also in Australia more broadly. Again it is about meanings and associations rather than fabric. Its expression is varied, ranging from the practical to the esoteric – apple beauty products (soaps, perfumes), apple recipe books, placemats that use apple-box label designs, creatures made from wizened apples. Telstra advertisements for Tasmania’s new area codes (1997) using lettering made of apple peels. Tasmanian ‘apples’ at the Gay & Lesbian Mardi Gras parade in Sydney in 1997, and more simply the use of apple-related colours to represent things Tasmanian. From a heritage management point of view, this type of heritage provides a basis on which to build not only community participation in rural heritage conservation, but also cultural tourism – a spin off from which may be better preservation of industry heritage places.

Wouldn’t it be wonderful today to still be able to say: ‘The best way to regain
this paradise is – ask at the Tourist Bureau’ (Hogan & Gye, c.1913) as our two Edwardian tourists advocated. But industry, community, heritage managers and government have some work to do before this will be the case, and many challenges need to be met before this aspect of rural heritage, at least, can be conserved and accessible.

An overview of the resource

The inventory, a listing of what there was (that is, all places known to have been associated with the industry regardless of its preservation), indicates that there has been at least 2000 places associated with the apple industry statewide from its inception to c.1970. Almost 1200 are listed in the inventory. Analysis of the inventory by site type (Table 1) indicates that the majority of places inventoried were orchards, but there were also numbers of independent and cooperative packing sheds and cool stores; transport-related places such as jetties, railways and tracks; factories for the processing of apples; a smaller number of offices and warehouses; service industry places such as nurseries; sawmills that produced case timber; fertiliser factories; one research station; a museum and a small number of early planting sites. The orchards were of different types: small to large dedicated orchards, orchards that were part of established farms, and orchards that were developed on 'orchard estates', many of which attracted purchasers from overseas. The processing factories identified produced dried, pulped, canned and juiced apples, or turned them into jam or apple cider.

The sites and features that survive today are a remnant of what there was originally. Table 2 summarises what is left, that is, the present day heritage resource in terms of places or sites. The project identified only 446 industry-related places with extant remains (note – not all extant industry heritage was identified by the project). This is considered to represent less than 20 per cent of all the places that were associated with the industry. Analysis of the heritage by district revealed that, although the type of heritage features are generally similar in each district, there are regional differences that mainly relate to the slightly different periods of establishment and major production, to the geographical location, and to local availability of materials.

Comparison of Tables 1 and 2 gives some idea of the degree of survival of industry places. The survival rate of the different place types appears to be roughly the same, although interestingly the rarer types of places appear to have had a better survival rate, which happily means that we still have examples of these place types. Table 2 also indicates that orchards are the most common place type, and make up about 80 per cent of sites identified.

It is instructive, however, to look at an analysis of the survival of features rather than places. The project listed the main industry-related features at each recorded site, and this information has been summarised in Table 3. Because industry places are generally complex, comprising more than one element or
feature, it is important to review the heritage at the feature level. Table 3 shows that, although orchard sites are the most common site type, remnant orchard plantings of more than a few trees represent only about 14 per cent of the extant industry related features; it is the orchardist residences that are the well-preserved features and contribute to an apparently high 'orchard' survival rate. A comparison of the tables also indicates that industry places that have survived are generally not well preserved, that is, have relatively low integrity. Fortunately a number of key apple industry sites are well preserved and provide good representative place examples for most aspects of the industry. However, movable objects are very rare and only two 'collections' and four early apple graders were identified. Considering that almost each orchard would have had an apple grader, this is a surprising and significant loss of industry specific objects.

It is suggested, therefore, that

- the approach taken by the apple industry heritage project which enables the numbers and types of original industry places with extant features as well as sites gives a more reliable picture of the industry's heritage today;
- that in identifying and analysing rural heritage, the interconnections of the places, the complexity of sites, and the effects of environmental and social factors on the nature of the industry and its places needs to be recognised and accommodated.

The significance of the Apple Industry heritage

Although the significance of the apple industry heritage identified by the project is not discussed in this paper, given its focus on identification, some sense of its value is useful in considering the lessons for identification and conservation of this type of cultural heritage. A large number of places identified in the project were considered to be of cultural significance. Eleven places are considered to be of outstanding heritage value with respect to the apple industry. These have national or international associations, and/or are particularly old, rare and/or have high integrity. Forty-five additional places are considered to have state level significance. Places considered to be significant at this level are the small number of places established and operating in the 19th-century that have extant evidence of this; the small number of well preserved orchards dating to between 1900 and c.1930s that have productive orchards and most of their original features extant; extant evidence of apple processing and dedicated transport facilities, and a small number of sites of special interest or which are a rare type.

Challenges and a way forward for rural cultural heritage management

A systematic identification and analysis of the Tasmanian apple industry give a clear picture of the range of challenges associated with the identification and
conservation of rural cultural heritage. Although some challenges will be particular to types of rural industries that are similar to the apple industry (that is, are small scale, intensive land-use industries with a widespread and complex infrastructure), much of the discussion is considered to be applicable to rural heritage identification and management generally and reflect what is, or should be, best practice.

The challenges recognised are considered to be of two types: identifying the heritage and managing the heritage.

**Challenges for Identification**

- Designing identification processes that will pick up the range of rural heritage (including complexes, within industry types, and heritage meanings and associations) and allowing regional and broader similarities and differences to be identified.
- Developing sources of funding to enable the necessary heritage identification to be carried out (this will probably require a combination of industry and government resourcing – and better heritage outcomes are likely if partnerships are established at this stage).
- Improving data management systems
  - to be able to easily source other relevant studies at the state, national and international level;
  - to ensure the range of identified places are being registered (even though they may have variable levels of data and data accuracy);
  - to enable these to be identified in other studies and assessments by a range of themes that are appropriate to rural cultural heritage.

**Challenges for management**

There are specific issues for management that differentiate rural heritage from many other types of cultural heritage:

- a heritage that is poorly known;
- a heritage that is not homogeneous, but has strong regional differences resulting from different environments and economic and social histories that have influenced both the nature of the heritage features and their preservation;
- systems that are geographically widespread and include both rural and non-rural areas and a range of site types;
- intensive cultural landscapes;
- heritage that has living elements that require ongoing and relatively intensive ‘curation’;
- a heritage resource that is abundant, yet largely redundant;
- a heritage type that is primarily in private ownership and which is an integral part of the personal history of the private owner, but where the owners generally have extremely limited resources for heritage conservation;
- a heritage that is located in a context that has other major conservation imperatives: for example, soil conservation and weed control – and where
action in relation to these imperatives is using up large amounts of money, and has been designed in isolation from other conservation needs, such as cultural heritage conservation.

Some solutions

The Tasmanian apple industry heritage project (McConnell & Servant 1998) came up with a raft of recommendations that attempt to address the above issues and challenges in the Tasmanian context and specifically relate to apple industry heritage. Some of these however will be more generally applicable to rural heritage, although it needs to be remembered that different places and different types of rural heritage will need different solutions, as for example the pastoral industry (Australia ICOMOS 1995).

The following are seen as keys to achieving successful rural heritage conservation outcomes:

• acknowledging the nature, extent and special characteristics of rural heritage
• developing partnerships between industry, owners, local communities and government
• lobbying government to provide cultural heritage conservation resourcing in line with natural heritage conservation resourcing
• integrating with other conservation strategies such as Landcare
• involving local communities to manage the living elements
• raising the profile of the heritage and a pride in the heritage through commemorative events and strategies
• building on the social and economic values of the heritage by maximising the opportunities for presenting and caring for the heritage through fora such as cultural tourism.
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### TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF THE TASMANIAN APPLE INDUSTRY INVENTORY (all places identified, listed by district and place type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place types</th>
<th>total places</th>
<th>places recorded</th>
<th>early plantings</th>
<th>orchards &amp; orch &amp; other</th>
<th>orch &amp; other</th>
<th>pickers huts</th>
<th>packing sheds</th>
<th>cool stores</th>
<th>factories</th>
<th>warehouse</th>
<th>land transport</th>
<th>jetties</th>
<th>sawmills</th>
<th>nurseries</th>
<th>research farms</th>
<th>museums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9 (2)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialised site types within sites above and not listed separately include: 2 sawmills; 3 probation stations; 2 cider cellars; 1 cider house; 4 cool stores; 1 fertiliser factory; 1 flour mill; 1 museum.

Processing site types include: 13 cider factories; 16 apple evaporating factories; 12 jam factories; 8 general processing works (canning/pulping).

### TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF THE TASMANIAN APPLE INDUSTRY HERITAGE SITE TYPES (all places known to have extant apple industry related features)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>total sites</th>
<th>% of known places</th>
<th>early plantings</th>
<th>orchards &amp; orch &amp; other</th>
<th>orch &amp; other</th>
<th>packing sheds</th>
<th>cool stores</th>
<th>factories</th>
<th>warehouse</th>
<th>land transport</th>
<th>jetties</th>
<th>sawmills</th>
<th>nurseries</th>
<th>research farms</th>
<th>museums</th>
<th>cultural landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
<td>15 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site numbers in brackets indicate that they are part of a large site already counted as the site proper.

### TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF TASMANIAN APPLE INDUSTRY HERITAGE SITE FEATURES

| FEATURE TYPE | early planting | orchard | residence | other residences | pickers hut | packing shed | cool store | ca store | stable shed | other sheds | windbreak | other plants | irrigation | land transport | jetty | sawmill | factory | cider | nursery | varietal | moveable objects |
|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------|------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|---------| buildings & plant | manuf. | collection | objects |              |
| Total        | 2 (2)          | 142(44) | 220       | 55               | 19          | 266          | 70         | 19       | 13(2)       | 82(3)               | 38(27)   | 16       | 3          | 8              | 4     | 9       | 7                   | 2     | 2       | 7                   |