

people place heritage

CONTEXT

in collaboration with



HERITAGE MATTERS PTY LTD

A NATIONAL REVIEW OF INVENTORIES OF HISTORIC GARDENS, TREES & LANDSCAPES

6 July 2012

Prepared for
The Australian Garden History Society
National Management Committee



Cover image: Badger's Wood, Bickleigh Vale Road, Mooroolbark, Victoria

A cottage designed by Edna Walling within the designed cultural landscape, Bickleigh Vale.
Source HV HERMES Database.

© Context Pty Ltd 2012

Project Team:

Annabel Neylon, Context Pty Ltd

Dr Timothy Hubbard, Heritage Matters Pty Ltd

Report Register

This report register documents the development and issue of the report entitled *A National Review of Inventories of Historic Gardens, Trees and Landscapes* undertaken by Context Pty Ltd in accordance with our internal quality management system.

Project No.	Issue No.	Notes/description	Issue Date	Issued to
1564	1	Final (edited 23 June 2012)	15 June 2012	AGHS National Management Committee
1564	2	Final report	6 July 2012	AGHS National Management Committee

Context Pty Ltd

22 Merri Street, Brunswick 3056

Phone 03 9380 6933

Facsimile 03 9380 4066

Email context@contextpl.com.au

Web www.contextpl.com.au

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
ACRONYMS	VI
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS	1
Specific Findings	1
General Findings	1
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	2
General Recommendations	2
Priorities for further work	2
DATABASES	4
Inventory of relevant lists/sources	5
INTRODUCTION	6
Purpose	6
Background	6
Scope	7
Limitations to the report	7
Approach and methodology	8
EXISTING INVENTORIES	10
NATIONAL LISTINGS	11
Overview	11
Australian Heritage Database	11
Australian Heritage Places Inventory	14
Non-statutory national lists	15
Usefulness of Existing National Lists	20
STATE AND TERRITORY LISTINGS	22
Queensland	22
Victoria	24
Australian Capital Territory	30
New South Wales	33
South Australia	38
Tasmania	42
Western Australia	48
APPENDIX A: THE BRIEF	51
APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS	54
APPENDIX C: THEMES	56
APPENDIX D: GARDEN TYPES	58

APPENDIX E: GARDEN STYLES	60
APPENDIX F: HERITAGE CRITERIA	62
APPENDIX G: HERITAGE THRESHOLDS	63
APPENDIX H: USEFULNESS OF MOST RELEVANT LISTS	65
APPENDIX I: STATE MATRIX	66
ENDNOTES	71

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines the results of an investigation to determine what state and federal based resources exist which could be used to create a national inventory of significant gardens, trees and landscapes. In addition, it outlines the capabilities and limitations of the most relevant lists and sources. Finally, it provides recommendations regarding the feasibility of the Australian Garden History Society (AGHS) developing its own centralized database of historic gardens, trees and landscapes.

The report was commissioned by the National Management Committee of the AGHS in December 2011. It was prepared by Context Pty Ltd in association with Heritage Matters Pty Ltd.

The main finding of this report is that the most relevant information, both for quality and quantity, is held in the state and territory based databases and in the federal government databases. These overlap to some extent and they tend to include information from all the other lists and sources. Secondly, the best theoretical work, which includes some listings, is that done in 1996 and 1997 leading to the Burnley Report, *A Theoretical Framework for the Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1998)

The overarching recommendation of this report is that, prior to making any commitment to a centralized database of historic gardens, trees and landscapes, the AGHS needs to define clearly the purpose of such a tool. The purpose of the list should drive its structure, format, content and accessibility. In addition, determining thresholds and criteria for which cultural landscapes should be included will be essential to ensure that the list does not become unwieldy or a 'toothless tiger'.

Other recommendations guiding the relevance and usefulness of various statutory and non statutory lists and sources are included within this report. A summation of the priorities for further work is also included.

The report was prepared by Dr. Timothy Hubbard (of Heritage Matters Pty Ltd) and Annabel Neylon (of Context Pty. Ltd.) Timothy Hubbard is a retired heritage architect and planner. He was the project manager, was the main interviewer, undertook research and analysis, was joint text author and compiled the report. Annabel Neylon is a horticulturalist, planner and senior heritage consultant. She undertook research and analysis, was joint text author and reviewed the report as it progressed. Both consultants are long standing members of the Australian Garden History Society.

ACRONYMS

ACNT	Australian Council of National Trusts
ACTD	Australian Capital Territory Database
ADMS	Art Deco and Modernism Society
AGHS	Australian Garden History Society
AHC	Australian Heritage Council (formerly Commission)
AHD	Australian Heritage Database, maintained by the Dept of Environment, Sustainability, Water, Population and Communities, contains information about more than 20,000 natural, historic and Indigenous places listed under Commonwealth Heritage Registers and Lists
AHPI	Australian Heritage Places Inventory, maintained by DESWP, contains summary information about places listed in State, Territory and Commonwealth Heritage Registers and Lists
DERM	the former Department of Environment and Resource Management, Queensland whose responsibilities divided between four departments after 30 March 2012
DSEWPC	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Community
GPS	Global Positioning System, used in many municipal databases to locate places and hold information about them
HERMES	Heritage Management System, the HCV/HV database
HCV	Heritage Council of Victoria
HERCON	Criteria for the assessment of heritage significance now almost standard nationally
HHT	Historic Houses Trust of NSW
HV	Heritage Victoria, part of the Department of Planning and Community Development
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites, Australia ICOMOS being the national chapter
IFLA ISC	joint International Federation of Landscape Architects — International Scientific [or Specialist] Committee on Cultural Landscapes
LHPD	Local Heritage Places Database, precursor to HERMES
NGO	Non-Government Organisation, such as the state based National Trusts and the AGHS
NMC	National Management Committee of the Australian Garden History Society
NLA	National Library of Australia, which manages the Trove on-line search engine
NTA	National Trust of Australia as state-based organisations: such NTA(NSW), NTA(Vic), NTA(Tas), etc.
OGA	Open Gardens Australia, formerly the Australian Open Gardens Scheme
RNE	Register of the National Estate (or sometimes the National Estate Register)
SLV	State Library of Victoria

SQL

Structured Query Language, a special-purpose programming language designed for managing data in relational database management systems

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines the key findings and recommendations of the report. It responds to the two key questions posed by the brief:

- a) Could existing statutory and non-statutory lists across the states and territories of Australia be used by the AGHS to draw up its own adequate lists of significant gardens, trees and landscapes; and
- b) What further work needs to be done to ensure that any proposed list is adequate for AGHS purposes?

Specific Findings

The report finds that existing statutory and non-statutory lists across the states and territories of Australia could be used by AGHS as the basis of an adequate list of significant places. There is, in fact, a very large amount of diverse information available.

However, the report also finds that there are various limitations and constraints, which are discussed further in the various state and territory sections. A table is set out in Appendix * which shows the overall usefulness of each list.

In regard to the further work which must be done to ensure that the list is adequate for AGHS purposes, this report returns to the key issue. The AGHS must determine exactly what the purpose of the list is. Generally speaking the key steps forward would be to:

- a) Collate the various statutory and non statutory lists into a single list which can be easily sorted by broad fields such as State, Locality, Address, Type, Style, etc.
- b) Determine in more detail what the weaknesses are in the information, which will require significant analysis of the data. If the quantity of the information is great, it is clear that the quality varies greatly. It is expected that gaps will include geographic areas, rigour of assessment, types, and dates (e.g. newer gardens may be missing). The AGHS needs to undertake this preliminary work to determine what it has already. Only then can an appropriate focus for further work be decided.

There are two models which could be followed for undertaking further work. The first model uses professional consultants and is likely to produce a higher quality and quantity of material, in a shorter timeframe. It would follow the process undertaken in various state and local governments where a 'heritage gap study' is undertaken in a locality or for a typology, or on a thematic basis. The disadvantage is the cost of undertaking such work — ensuring the brief adequately describes and addresses the background, context, purpose and required outputs.

The second model is similar to the approach currently used by the National Trust of Australia (NTA) which relies on volunteer research, assessment and administration. The advantages include low costs and passionate participation, albeit at a different level from the professional consultant. Disadvantages include the difficulties in providing constructive feedback, the time taken to produce work, and the consistency of assessment if numerous individuals undertake the work. There is also a potential perception that the public and professionals within the field would attach less weight to such work.

General Findings

- Existing listings are quite disparate as to age, scope, quality and quantity of information, sophistication of process, etc
- Best existing electronic database appears to be HERMES, owned and managed by Heritage Victoria
- HERMES is available for use under licence with substantial benefits for using it

-
- There are other databases owned and managed by other state and municipal governments
 - Nationally, there is an increasing combination by municipalities of databases and GPS/cadastral information, a facility not available through HERMES
 - Beyond existing database listings, there is a very large amount of information about significant gardens, trees and cultural landscapes
 - There is almost complete uniformity for heritage themes, criteria and thresholds across Australia under the HERCON system
 - There is good but not perfect or universal agreement as to types of gardens and there is some agreement as to styles.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

General Recommendations

It is recommended that the Australian Garden History Society (AGHS) should:

- Decide if a new database should be established, as is recommended
- Decide if the new database is state-based or, as is recommended, nation-wide
- Determine a clear statement of purpose for any proposed database or other compilation of sources
Commence a compilation of places from statutory and non statutory lists across the nation. The compiled data should be held in a simple [temporary] shell database with a limited number of fields
Update the AGHS website immediately with links to the key existing statutory and non statutory databases and lists in each state which already hold and manage information on historic gardens and landscapes
Consider further the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and limitations of an independent AGHS run master list database

Priorities for further work

When adopting this report's recommendations, the following priorities are suggested:

Immediate

- Collate a master list of all historic gardens, landscapes, trees included in statutory and non statutory lists of primary relevance across the nation (as shown in Appendix H)
- Determine a clear Statement of Purpose for the creation of this database
- Develop a simple 'shell' database probably using Microsoft Access software which will act as a repository for the master list until more detail has been established about the requirement and purpose of the AGHS National Database.

Short term

- Analyse the master list to determine strengths and weaknesses, particularly 'gap' analysis
- Seek contributions from members who are able to provide additional information in terms of nominations of new places, information on existing places etc.
- Determine an approach for undertaking the various 'gaps' studies – either consultant based or volunteer based (depending on available funds and membership interest)

Medium term

- Prepare a strategic directions paper as to what the priorities for new work to fill the gaps are
- Put links to the initial database online, and publicise it, asking for comment and feedback from AGHS membership and other relevant professional bodies
- Undertake a feasibility study as to the most appropriate type of database to use. The database should contain places across Australia, but have the capacity to sort by state, locality, type etc. A simple database to hold information is all that is required initially
- Engage personnel or volunteers to populate the database with the basic information, including attachments of existing documentation about the place (which may be heritage study citations, book extracts, photographs etc.)
- Develop more complex field requirements, thresholds and themes which can be applied to places, and further develop the database
- Develop a plan to ensure adequate funding will exist to continue the program of gap studies (likely to continue for 10 or more years)
- Review and refine the database Statement of Purpose – is it achieving what it set out to? How could it better meet the current needs of the AGHS?

Long Term

- Commence a program of testing places against thresholds to determine significance
- Continue gap studies, including the identification of other gaps which may emerge
- Develop and refine the sophistication and purpose of the database to meet its purpose which may change over time.

DATABASES

There is no existing nation-wide database on which the AGHS could piggy-back. The Australian Heritage Database (AHD) and the Australian Heritage Places Inventory (AHPI) are not available for what is essentially a private purpose. Choosing to piggy-back on the databases in each state and territory is likely to consolidate and compound the existing differences across Australia. The AGHS can, however, learn much from the work done by others. It can create a simple but expandable database based on the best system, perhaps the HERMES database maintained by Heritage Victoria. Alternatively, a cadastral database as used by many municipalities may be adopted. It can still populate the new database on a state-by-state basis. The database can include special features accommodating regional differences. It can include information about places lost through demolition, subdivision, natural attrition and neglect. More work needs to be done on standardizing typologies, styles, terms, criteria and thresholds but these are already generally agreed. A database can have different levels of access including online public access through the AGHS website. It can be made available by links to compatible websites, such as the various National Trusts, Open Gardens Australia, state heritage authorities and the excellent Trove website managed by the Australian National Library.

Any new database should:

- Decide if setting up a new SQL database (probably based on HERMES) is feasible, especially financially, as is recommended
- Decide if using HERMES under licence is the best way to go, whether for separate state-based databases or a national database
- Decide if unsuccessful statutory nominations should be included in the database, as is recommended
- Decide if 'lost' places should be included in the database, as is recommended
- Decide if one state should be a pilot, possibly Queensland, whether for separate state-based databases or a national database
- Clarify any differences over themes, criteria and thresholds
- Clarify any differences over typology, styles, etc
- Consider whether to include Indigenous issues: gardens, trees and landscapes.

Any new database should:

- include significant gardens, trees and broader landscapes as 'places' according to the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter
- include unsuccessful statutory nominations
- include 'lost' places which were significant to consolidate a centralized record and for comparative purposes
- avoid multiple entries for single places
- establish thresholds for inclusion
- have fields which follow standard and best practice, probably the HERCON model

-
- have typologies, styles, names of designers, gardeners, etc. finally decided through a series of AGHS workshops or seminars
 - be populated state-by-state
 - start with one state serving as a pilot, possibly Queensland.

Inventory of relevant lists/sources

The most relevant existing lists are:

- Australian Heritage Database
- Victorian State Heritage Database – HERMES
(now also used by NTA(Vic) and soon by ACNT)
- National Trust of Australia (Vic) Significant Tree Register
- NSW State Heritage Database
- City of Sydney Significant Tree Register
- WA State Heritage Database
- SA State Heritage Database
- Tas State Heritage Database (but not yet fully operational)
- Australian Capital Territory Database
- AGHS work (especially ‘Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia’ report)

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This report was prepared for the National Management Committee (NMC) of the Australian Garden History Society (AGHS). The four tasks required of the Consultants were to:

- Make an inventory of all relevant lists of heritage places
- Examine each list and determine their characteristics
- Provide advice on the overall usefulness of each list for AGHS purposes
- Provide advice about priorities and what is required to produce lists adequate for AGHS purposes

The report seeks to provide a comprehensive inventory of the relevant statutory and non-statutory lists and sources which include historic gardens and landscapes across Australia, with a view to creating a centralised database, a master list owned and held by AGHS. It also seeks to determine what further work is required to achieve the creation of such a database.

Generally, this builds on the work of the pilot project in Queensland completed in December 2010 by Catherine Brouwer in association with Nissen Associates, titled 'AGHS Inventory of Historic Gardens – Queensland'. The findings of the Brouwer report are discussed in the main body of the report. A copy of the brief is included at Appendix A.

Background

The Australian Garden History Society was founded in 1980. Since at least 1983 it has wanted to establish and develop a list of significant historic gardens. Concerned about the gradual loss of Australia's historic gardens and the need to conserve existing historic gardens, the advantages then of having a national list of significant historic gardens were because:

- It is concrete evidence of the quantity and quality of historic gardens in Australia;
- it provides a basis upon which submissions for financial assistance (grants and tax and rate relief) can be made, i.e. if a garden is on the list it can be eligible for assistance or relief;
- the preparation of a list indicates to various authorities that there is a body of people in Australia interested in this problem
- it provides a comprehensive comparative analysis between places on a national and state level

The difficulties of preparing an authoritative list were clear and included: the scale of the task; the criteria for listing; who would do the work; how the task could be broken down and/or delegated; how a national list could be compiled from state-based work; provision for updating; and the formalities of endorsement. In 1983 about 145 historic gardens were identified in a preliminary 'super-list'.

In the intervening thirty years much has happened. The theory and practice of heritage identification, protection, management and interpretation has been codified in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. There has been a steady increase in the awareness of historic gardens and significant trees. The new concept of cultural landscapes has emerged, including the notion of gardens as designed landscapes. Many individuals have done and continue to do sound work in the field. None should be singled out because it has been largely a joint effort but key people are mentioned throughout the report for their contributions.

All Australian states and territories and the federal government now maintain statutory lists of heritage places. Much more information is held about historic gardens and cultural landscapes, largely as a result of the research which underlies the statutory listing processes of the state,

territory and federal governments. Research capabilities have increased, especially with the advent of new online search tools, such as the Australian National Library's 'Trove' search engine. Certain individual researchers have built up a body of work which provides authoritative information to substantiate listing places at all levels of significance. Parallel to this gathering of information, there has been a revolution in the management of information in computer databases. This revolution not only allows the reliable collection, updating, cross referencing and analysis of the information but also allows quick and easy access via the internet for all people, subject to security, from the most rigorous researcher through to the general public.

Perhaps the most substantial and important work to be done in this field was the report edited by Richard Aitken, Jan Schapper, Juliet Ramsay and Michael Looker titled *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1997) produced in three volumes for the Australian Heritage Commission (now Council) at Burnley College, the University of Melbourne¹ (All the authors and consultants are members of the AGHS.). It advanced earlier work and incorporated reports on each of the six states and two internal territories of Australia. The discussion of definitions, types and styles contained in the Burnley report was particularly useful. The chronologies and bibliographies contained in the state and territory sections of that document were also very useful.

Another important (earlier) work used in the production of this report is the 'Preliminary Nominations for inclusion on the List of Significant Gardens', an internal report prepared by Peter Watts for the Executive Committee of the AGHS in 1986. In 2007 Juliet Ramsay prepared an 'Inventory of Heritage Gardens and Parklands, Australia' for the ICOMOS-IFLA International Scientific Committee for Cultural Landscapes.² More recently the AGHS commissioned a pilot project, titled 'AGHS Inventory of Historic Gardens – Queensland' from Catherine Brouwer and Judith Nissen, also members of the AGHS. They searched for and made an inventory of relevant lists of heritage places in Queensland which might include significant historic gardens. They examined each list and advised on the overall usefulness of each list, the gaps or shortcomings to be overcome for a comprehensive state list and what criteria and thresholds should be used. The Brouwer report was submitted in December 2010. It forms the basis for this national survey which follows a similar brief.

Scope

The scope and definitions of terms in this review were clearly set out in the brief (Appendix A). It was to include lists of significant historic gardens, significant trees, historic landscapes, and historic landscapes as settings to significant buildings. The term 'garden' was to include public parks and gardens (including cemeteries and railway stations), private gardens of all sizes and locations, as well as avenues and arboreta. Landscapes, or more precisely cultural landscapes, were to include those designed and created intentionally by man, organically evolved landscapes and associative landscapes.

The review covers nation-wide inventories and those in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory. Queensland is included in the discussion of the situation across Australia by using the Brouwer report.

Limitations to the report

The limited timeframe and budget for the review and analysis has meant that the inventory of all lists and sources may not be complete. It was not possible to investigate exhaustively local heritage studies and their implementation as heritage schedules in planning schemes, for example, as potential lists. It is expected that new sources will come to light. The brief placed several limitations on the research, namely that it was to be a desktop survey, with no fieldwork involved, and that the scope of the study was to exclude the Queensland, the Northern Territory and the external territories of Australia.

The review does not include any references to Indigenous gardens, trees or landscapes. While this field is of great cultural significance, it is not a focus for the AGHS. For the most part, it is dealt with under separate legislation from the state heritage and planning acts which identify, protect and manage places of post-contact cultural significance. Furthermore, there are sensitivities concerning Indigenous places which ought to be respected.

In addition, this report is not intended as a feasibility study of one or other types of database which could be used by the AGHS. Discussion regarding thresholds, criteria for inclusion, themes, fields and other technicalities are commented on generally, but definitive recommendations of this detail are beyond the scope of this report.

The report makes no comment on the issue of copyright which may be important in the cutting and pasting of information from existing lists. Including information about the origin of information is critical for practical as well as legal reasons.

Approach and methodology

Assessment and documentation

The principal task for the consultants was to “make an inventory of all the relevant lists of heritage places which include significant gardens, trees and landscapes”. So, the consultants went in search of lists. Many of the obvious sources are well known and it was relatively easy to check if one sort of list in a state existed in another. It was also clear that one list built on another. Two major steps seemed sensible. One step was to sort existing lists into statutory and non-statutory divisions, i.e. lists created by jurisdictions for the identification and management of places, and lists created by people and organisations for their own reasons. The AGHS falls into the latter as do all of the many heritage professionals interested in the field. The other step was to sort the lists according to their scope, i.e. whether they had a national outlook or whether they were state and territory based. This group was further sub-divided into local sources, usually by municipality. The consultants also searched for lists which were indirect and not included in existing research but which are still useful as secondary if not primary sources.

The more detailed tasks required by the brief were to test the lists for the period over which they were compiled and used, their criteria and thresholds, whether they were still active, the amount and authority of their information, and the format of their information. Accessibility was checked and tested, usually by doing keyword searches. This allowed for some assessment on the usefulness of the existing lists. The testing was both quantitative and qualitative. The more interesting tests are mentioned in the text. The report’s findings lead to recommendations about establishing a master list best suited to the purposes of the AGHS and how and when that might be achieved.

The Brouwer Report was read thoroughly. The research was then conducted in stages. The national section was the first to be researched, for obvious reasons. It was followed by Victoria, the state which the consultants knew most about and which appears to be the most advanced. Then followed the ACT, Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia. New South Wales was left until last to ‘bookend’ the research as the other well advanced state. A matrix of existing lists complements the main text and appendices amplify it. Finally, a process of cross-checking standardized the report.

Towards the end of the review the project was discussed at an Australia ICOMOS workshop on cultural landscapes and routes held in Canberra in late April 2012. Several senior members of the AGHS were present. The discussion, rather like a peer review, confirmed the methodology, issues and preliminary findings. New leads were suggested which have been followed.

Sources and Acknowledgements

A very wide range of sources and research techniques has been used. Full endnotes have been provided, rather than producing yet another bibliography. Many of the more difficult to find sources have been loaned by colleagues. We would like to thank, for example: Dr Juliet Ramsay whose work was seminal and is continuing; Dr Jan Schapper for the loan of her copy of *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1998); John Hawker for the loan of his copy of the 'Victorian Garden Inventory' 1988; and Stuart Read for loaning several books from his collection. The consultants have drawn heavily on their own professional libraries for both published and unpublished sources.

Many people have supported our work through telephone interviews and follow-up emails. All of the state authorities have helped. We would particularly like to highlight the support from Martin Jones with advice on the HERMES database established by the Heritage Council of Victoria and maintained by Heritage Victoria. He is aware of the situation in other states as well as Victoria. National Trust staff members have helped and we would like to highlight the support of Christopher Wain in Canberra, Paul Roser in Melbourne, Glenn Mitchell in Adelaide, and Mara Barnes in Sydney. Anne Claoue-Long provided advice on the ACT. Other AGHS members have been helpful, such as Prof. Jane Lennon, Dr Sandy Blair, Dr Kirsty Altenburg and Christine Johnson, by sharing the wisdom of many years in the heritage industry.

Finally we would like to thank the Steering Committee, chaired by Mr John Taylor for their patience and direction.

EXISTING INVENTORIES

This survey has identified a very wide range of existing inventories, both public (statutory) and private (non-statutory). The former are maintained generally as digital databases by state and territory planning authorities and by the federal government. They may include a range of places of varying significance. Local governments also record places on 'heritage lists' or schedules to the heritage overlays in planning schemes, some with the advantage of GPS/cadastral tracking by location. They vary as to the format, fields of information held, accessibility and convenience. They also vary as to the quality of the information, i.e. age, source, analysis and reliability. There is some general uniformity in the criteria and thresholds used for assessment, the structure or 'architecture' of the systems, the basic information collected and the use of simple and advance searches. The statutory databases have strictly controlled levels of access, ranging from full access for senior officers of the responsible authority, access limited to 'partners' who input information, i.e. municipalities, heritage consultants and NGOs like the National Trust, through to limited but still useful access by the general public in most states. Detailed comments on the usefulness of the inventories, nation-wide and state by state, are given at the end of each major section.

There is an admirable aim to amalgamate all of the statutory databases eventually. This has already happened to some extent through the Australian Heritage Places Inventory (AHPI). Some effort has been made to adopt the same software, to unify the structure of the systems, and to standardize terms, names, criteria and thresholds. Technically, full amalgamation is said to be relatively easy. Politically, it is much more difficult. Amalgamation is likely to be several technological generations away, meaning 10 to 15 years at least. The only existing nation-wide inventory which is broad-based and accessible online through the Australian Heritage Database (AHD) is the National Estate Register (NER). However, the NER has been frozen and suffers from its age, its sometimes very limited information, and its inability to be modified or corrected let alone to be added to. Using the Australian Heritage Database is not a likely option for the AGHS.

Private or non-statutory inventories are much more diverse. They can be relatively sophisticated online databases such as those maintained by some state National Trusts, or electronic or hardcopy lists held by private or incorporated groups or organisations. Usually they are the results of research work by heritage consultants, some of whom hold the information as in-house databases but more of whom hold their information in hardcopy. This information can be accessed through the statutory system while a particular study is underway or once it has been submitted and accepted. The direct input of research and analysis by external professionals into statutory databases is relatively recent. It will continue to grow. However, the vast majority of past information is still held in other forms. Certain states have made commendable efforts to digitize early heritage studies but these hold relatively little information on historic gardens, trees and cultural landscapes. The time and cost of digitizing privately held information seems prohibitive.

Finally, there is a very wide range of what might be described as incidental inventories, sources such as reports, municipal registers, books, catalogs, journal articles and theses. The AGHS and its members have made a considerable contribution to this information. These could be used as checklists and clues or leads for further research. However they tend not to be written in an appropriate format for direct transfer to a database, almost all are state or more regionally based and the quality of the information ranges from excellent to doubtful.

The following sections include detailed assessments of all relevant lists, arranged first as national lists and then by state, including the ACT. The Brouwer report is included under Queensland, although the body of work it prepared forms a separate report.

NATIONAL LISTINGS

Overview

Australia is a federation of states and territories each with its own jurisdiction. The federal government has specific powers under the Constitution which include much to do with the identification and protection of heritage places. Those powers are limited, however, when it comes to their management, to places which are owned by the federal government and its agencies. The states are deeply involved in the identification, protection and management of heritage places. The states are further divided into municipalities under state law.

Theoretically these jurisdictions don't overlap but there is a rich cross pollination of ideas, systems and information especially at a professional and personal level. There is cooperation and coordination. Unfortunately legislation is not uniform in its ideology, content or sophistication. There is also disparity due to remarkable differences in climate, geology, and physiography and because of different cultural influences, not least historical developments. Different places are at different stages of development and, within any place, different groups have reached different stages of development.

The AGHS reflects this broader structure and that interconnection across borders and, sometimes, great distances. If a national concern for significant gardens, trees and cultural landscapes emerged first from the south-eastern corner of the continent, that doesn't mean there is nothing of value elsewhere. Indeed the things which are most different, the exotic, can be the most intriguing and interesting.

There are two very useful nation-wide listings, both maintained by the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Community (DSEWPC). The first, the Australian Heritage Database contains information about natural, historic and Indigenous places which are identified and protected under Federal Government legislation. This is a statutory 'super' list with limited but still useful access to the public. The second, the Australian Heritage Places Inventory contains information about places listed in state, territory and federal heritage registers and lists. This multi-jurisdictional statutory list has public access and although only summary information, is still useful.

Australian Heritage Database

The Commonwealth Government maintains five lists or inventories of heritage places four of which have continuing statutory status. The lists are:

- Register of the National Estate (now a non-statutory archive)
- World Heritage List
- National Heritage List
- Commonwealth Heritage List
- List of Overseas Places of Historic significance to Australia

All places on the five national lists are included in the Australian Heritage Database (AHD), a 'super' list. It can be searched online by the public at the DSEWPC website at <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl>. This nation-wide database therefore includes places of all levels of significance. It contains information about more than 20,000 natural, historic and Indigenous places in Australia, its states, its internal and external territories and a limited number of places which are overseas. Importantly, it also contains places under consideration, or that may have been considered for, any one of these lists.

While there are some minor differences in the wording of the statutory criteria used by each jurisdiction, the Commonwealth, states and territories have, for the most part, endorsed the standard HERCON criteria. These criteria were adopted at the 1998 Conference on Heritage

(HERCON). Almost all jurisdictions have agreed to move towards their adoption, the exception being Tasmania which is likely to follow. The model criteria for identifying heritage places take into account aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or other special values to all generations. They are:

Criterion A

Importance to the course, or pattern, of our cultural or natural history.

Criterion B

Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history.

Criterion C

Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of our cultural or natural history.

Criterion D

Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments.

Criterion E

Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.

Criterion F

Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.

Criterion G

Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions.

Criterion H

Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history.

The Australian Heritage Database is searchable online by the public at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl>. The simplest search is by name and location with the opportunity to limit the search by state and territory and by using the 'overseas' option in a drop down menu. Advanced search options allow for searching by using all or one of the five national lists, by using an individual ID number, by using the name of a municipality, and by using a keyword. The keyword search can include or exclude the history, description and statement of significance.

Using the word 'garden' in the name field, there were 544 hits or approximately 2.72% of all entries. Using the word 'landscape' in the name field, there were 76 hits or approximately 0.38% of all entries. In the advanced search facility, using the keyword 'garden' in all fields, there were 1980 hits or approximately 9.90% of all entries. In the advanced search facility, using the keyword 'landscape' in all fields, there were 1876 hits or approximately 9.38% of all entries. 'Cultural landscape' produced 168 hits or 0.84%. 'Historic garden' produced just 9 hits. The AHD database must be seen as one of the most useful existing national lists.

Register of the National Estate

The preparation of a national, i.e. Australia-wide list of places of cultural significance began in the mid-1970s with the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) and the Register of the National Estate (RNE). It included both cultural and natural places and both Aboriginal and

European history. Put at its simplest, the RNE was a list of ‘the places we should keep’.³ The information collected on each place, its assessment against criteria and thresholds and a formal statement of significance were very limited at first. Listing was deliberately inclusive and recognised the fundamental and, indeed, noble principle that the significance of a place was for all: that a place of local significance mattered to the nation and that a place of national significance mattered to the individual.

Additions to the RNE, for the most part, depended on identification undertaken by the states and territories through thematic and local heritage studies which until 2001 were subsidized by funding through the National Estate Grants Program. The quality of listings gradually improved with the increasing sophistication of those studies and continued to be undertaken until when entries to the RNE closed with the 2006 amendment of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. In February 2012 the RNE became a non-statutory archive of information ‘about more than 13,000 places throughout Australia’. The archived information is publicly available online through the Australian Heritage Database at <http://www.heritage.gov.au/ahpi/index.html>. There is relatively little information about historic gardens and cultural landscapes contained in RNE listings.

The *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* led to the creation of two new national heritage lists in 2003: the National Heritage Register and the Commonwealth Heritage Register.

National Heritage Register

The National Heritage List includes places of outstanding heritage value to the nation. The list presently contains some 115 entries across all states and internal and external territories including Antarctica. Places of natural, cultural and Indigenous significance are included, some places being significant in two if not three ways. Places can be added as part of an annual thematic study or by individual nomination. The National Heritage Register is publicly accessible through the Australian Heritage Database on the DSEWPC website at <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl>. Additions to the NHL are slow and difficult but the quality of the listings is excellent.

Historic gardens and designed landscapes are recognized by the NHR, such as the Adelaide Parklands and Street Layout which includes “includes 900 hectares in total and is defined by the 1837 layout of streets including parks in the city centre and significant areas such as Victoria Square, Hindmarsh Square, the Botanic Gardens, Palmer Gardens and Brougham Gardens in North Adelaide”. The serial convict site listing includes Brickendon Estate and Woolmers Estate, Longford, Tasmania. The former listing states “The Georgian house in its garden setting, farm buildings, hedges, and land use patterns all provide a rare source of information about the living and working conditions of settlers and the convicts assigned to rural estates from the 1820s to the end of transportation to Tasmania in 1853”. The latter listing states “Over time as the estate increased in prosperity, Woolmers became one of the finest colonial estates in Tasmania with grand houses, formal gardens and separate cottages for gardeners and coachmen. The buildings in their landscape setting provide an insight into the evolution of the estate as a large pastoral property over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries.” Nonetheless, the number of places on the NHR which include historic gardens and designed landscapes is very small.

Commonwealth Heritage List

The Commonwealth Heritage List includes heritage places owned or controlled by the Commonwealth and its agencies. It includes “places connected to defence, communications, customs and other government activities that also reflect Australia’s development as a nation”. The list presently contains some 380 entries across all states and internal and external territories including Antarctica. The distribution across the nation, however, is not necessarily representative of the Commonwealth Government’s interests. About 30% (120 places) are in NSW, 20% (81 places) are in the ACT, 10% (41 places) are in Victoria, 7.5% (28 places) are

in Queensland, 5.3% (20 places) are in Western Australia; 4.7% (18 places) are in Tasmania, and only 2.4% (10 places) are in South Australia.

Of the 382 total entries in the Commonwealth Heritage List, many include significant historic gardens and cultural landscapes. Indeed, some of the listings are nationally significant such as: the official residences in Canberra, Yarralumla and The Lodge; Duntroon House and Garden; Old Parliament House and Gardens; the Parliament House Vista; the High Court, National Gallery and National Library beside Lake Burley Griffin; and the Australian National Botanic Gardens (part). Similarly, the official residences in Sydney, Admiralty House and Kirribilli House have gardens and are set within the magnificent cultural landscape of inner Sydney Harbour. By chance, the Commonwealth owns other places with gardens in other states and territories, such as Fortuna at Bendigo in Victoria and the Burnett House, at Myilly Point in Darwin. Almost by definition, lighthouses owned by the Commonwealth stand in remarkable landscapes with their construction representing a strong cultural imposition into the landscape.

World Heritage List

There is a small number of places of cultural or mixed (rather than just natural) significance in Australia inscribed in the World Heritage List. All of the existing fifteen places on the World Heritage List were included in the National Heritage List on 21 May 2007 and others more recently inscribed, such as the serial listing of eleven convict sites have also been added. They are all included in the Australian Heritage Database. The World Heritage criteria are periodically revised and the criteria against which a property was listed in the past may not necessarily be identical with the current criteria.

The most important examples of historic gardens and cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List in Australia (excluding external territories) are probably:

- Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens
- Australian Convict Sites (at least the following 7 of 11)
 - Brickendon & Woolmers Estates, Longford Tasmania
 - Old Government House and the Government Domain, Parramatta, NSW
 - Port Arthur Historic Site, Tasman Peninsula, Tasmania
 - Coal Mines Historic Site, Tasman Peninsula, Tasmania
 - Cascades Female Factory, Hobart, Tasmania
 - Cockatoo Island, Sydney, NSW
 - Darlington Probation Station, Maria Island, Tasmania

Australian Heritage Places Inventory

The Australian Heritage Places Inventory (AHPI), a cooperative project between various governments, is a compilation of federal, state and territory heritage lists. The exact number of place in the database is not known but must be in the tens of thousands. The information is drawn from:

- ACT Heritage Register
- Commonwealth Heritage Register
- National Heritage Register
- NSW Heritage Register
- Northern Territory Heritage Register
- Overseas Places of Heritage Significance List

-
- Queensland Heritage Register
 - Register of the National Estate
 - South Australian Local Heritage Register
 - South Australian State Heritage Register
 - Tasmanian State Heritage Register
 - Victorian State Heritage Register
 - Western Australian State Heritage Register
 - World Heritage List

It should be noted that relatively few places of local significance are included. Most places of local significance are drawn from the RNE and South Australian data which is limited and provided with some cautions. The information in the AHPI is updated regularly and is a good way to obtain information on all places on the ADH, NHR, NRE, state heritage registers, etc. It is located at <http://www.heritage.gov.au/ahpi/index.html>.

The searchable information, although only a summary, includes place name and ID number, location and situation, a statement of significance and a description and the source of the information. If the keyword 'garden' is used in the place name field, searching all sources, there are 530 hits; 'landscape' gets just 26 hits and using 'tree' creates the usual problem of including 'street' in the number of hits. Using the plural, 'trees' there are 123 hits. When the same keywords are used for testing the statements of significance there are 1339 for 'garden', 1614 for 'landscape' and 670 for 'trees'. When the same keywords are used for testing the descriptions of places there are 2096 for 'garden', 1048 for 'landscape' and 1875 for 'trees'.

Once a place has been identified, a brief text entry is provided and a link to the originating source which can provide, sometimes, much more information. The AHPI database must be seen as one of the most useful existing national lists.

Non-statutory national lists

Non-statutory nation-wide and intrastate inventories of historic gardens and cultural landscapes are diverse. All could be used as sources of information on places. The following and the references quoted in the state sections are offered as indications for further research and certainly not as an exhaustive list. The most useful might include:

- Australian Garden History Society
- National Trust of Australia
- Open Gardens Australia
- Art Deco and Modernism Society
- *Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1997)
- Individual researchers, reports, theses, manuscripts, etc.
- Information included in published books

Australian Garden History Society

The AGHS has collected information on individual gardens and landscapes over many years and in many ways. In 1983 its Executive Committee asked Peter Watts to prepare a policy for the listing of significant historic gardens. He prepared a report in 1984. In 1986 it compiled an inventory of 153 places titled 'Preliminary Nominations for Inclusion on the List of Significant Historic Gardens'.⁴ The list was a "super-list", i.e. it only included gardens where

there was no doubt that they were important and did not include any where there was any doubt as to the quality of information. Interestingly, nominators were told to ‘eliminate any notions of beauty, attractiveness, good taste, etc. from your assessment [because] most historic gardens will have these qualities, but they are generally by products of historical significance’.⁵ Most of the information is brief but it is in a format which lends itself to entry in a heritage database and was collected by reliable nominators. The distribution by states and territories was:

Table 1: AGHS Nominations for Inclusion on the List of Significant Historic Gardens, 1986

State or Territory	Places	State or Territory	Places
Australian Capital Territory	3	South Australia	6
New South Wales	25	Tasmania	7
Northern Territory	0	Victoria	83
Queensland	0	Western Australia	10

National Trust of Australia

The National Trust movement in Australia dates mostly from the mid-1950s and is partly modeled on the National Trust in the UK and partly on the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the USA. There are substantial differences with both models, however. For the most part, the state-based National Trusts in Australia are community-based, non-government organisation, not-for-profit private companies. They have different degrees of acknowledgement in state-based heritage legislation. The important work of each in the listing of significant gardens, trees and landscapes is discussed in detail in the appropriate state section.

All the states and territory Trusts come under the Australian Council of National Trusts (ACNT). Based in Canberra, it is a coordinating body and a lobby group but does not list places.

The National Trusts across Australia own and manage at least 300 heritage places, many with significant gardens and trees situated in cultural landscapes. This list could be one useful starting point for preparing an AGHS database.

Open Gardens Australia

Open Gardens Australia (OGA) began in Victoria in 1987 as Victoria's Open Garden Scheme expanding nationally over two decades, with the final territory being added in 2000 when it became Australia's Open Garden Scheme. In 2011 the not-for-profit organisation was renamed Open Gardens Australia. Its website states “Open Gardens Australia has about 10,000 gardens on its books, with new gardens being discovered all the time. Each season we open around 600 private gardens to the public.” Information about the gardens is held centrally but is not in a format which would immediately lend itself to entry into a heritage database. The first guide, compiled by John Patrick, *Gardens of Victoria*, included potted histories, descriptions and lists of important plants as well as excellent sketch plans and some colour photographs.⁶ It also contained information about location, access, facilities, opening times, etc. and type, soil, orientation and maintenance. The guide named the owners, which is not done now for privacy reasons.

The principal purposes of the OGA are to make open private gardens and to organise garden-themed events for public enjoyment around the country. It could be an important partner of the AGHS because of its nation-wide outlook, its excellent reputation, its broad public appeal and because it shares many parallel values and interests.

The lists published by the OGA and its predecessors are not considered to be of particular usefulness for the purposes of inclusion on an AGHS master list. This is partly due to the lack

of focus on 'historic' or 'significant' gardens. Rather the focus is on aesthetics and designers. They could be used as a secondary source.

Art Deco and Modernism Society

One of the aims of the Art Deco and Modernism Society (ADMS) is to preserve and celebrate aspects of the Art Deco era such as architecture and landscaping. The ADMS holds information on many places and people associated with the Art Deco style and the Moderne movement. (Art Deco has been proposed as a gardening style.) But this is not the main focus of the organisation. So, although the ADMS is likely to be supportive of establishing a database of historic gardens and cultural landscapes, it is not likely to be a useful source of information relating to historic gardens (of the period) at this stage.

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia

A major body of research work was produced with the assistance of funds made available by the Commonwealth of Australia under the 1994-1995 National Estate Grants Program administered by the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC). The report, *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1997) was published by Burnley College, The University of Melbourne, in 1998 called in this report 'The Burnley Report' for short. As the Preface to the 'National Overview Report' states, 'A lack of heritage recognition for designed landscapes was identified by Juliet Ramsay's 1991 report *Parks, Gardens and Special Trees: A classification and assessment method for the Register of the National Estate*.' One of its five aims was to assist in the compilation of a database of information related to the project which could act as a catalyst for future researchers. The work of the individual state and territory authors is excellent. As well as the thought provoking theoretical discussions about natural and cultural influences, the practical discussions about types and styles as well as themes and thresholds is invaluable. These discussions are not yet concluded. The various bibliographies are very useful, especially those prepared by Richard Aitkin and David Jones. Most importantly for this report, each state and territory includes a list of designed landscapes. These are covered in the appropriate sections following.

Individual researchers, reports, theses, manuscripts, etc.

There are many researchers who hold much information privately, both in an individual and in a corporate framework. Some have a long experience and deep understanding of a state or territory. Each tends to have specific interests, limiting themselves to a specific geographical or climatic location, to particular designers, gardeners, plantsmen, and plantswomen, to certain plant species, to botanical art, to botanical literature, etc.

Because only a limited few have a nation-wide interest this source is likely to be more bountiful at a state and territory level, as seen in the Burnley report with its various consultants. Almost all would understand very well the standard process for heritage identification, protection and management as outlined in the Burra Charter, including the issues of types, styles, criteria and thresholds. One of the most important national lists was drawn up by Juliet Ramsay for the ICOMOS-IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes. It is limited, however, to those gardens which were included in statutory lists in 2007. 'The inventory is not a comprehensive list of all of Australia's listed heritage or potential heritage gardens but it covers examples of gardens from different eras, those with different functions and styles and those from different regions.'⁷ It has a total of just 192 entries. Ramsay notes in her IFLA report 'For example, there are 166 botanical gardens in Australia while only 23 are entered in heritage lists and many of those not in the lists are fine gardens of outstanding garden design merit'.

Table 2 'Inventory of Heritage Gardens and Parklands, Australia' for the ICOMOS-IFLA International Scientific Committee for Cultural Landscapes', 2007, Ramsay (1991)

	ACT	NSW	NT	QLD	SA	TAS	VIC	WA	Total
Govt Domains & Official Residence Gardens	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Public Parks, urban reserves and park lands	3	9	0	3	0	2	9	3	29
Botanic Gardens (State)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Botanic Gardens (Regional)	1	0	1	4	2	1	10	0	19
Urban Designed Landscapes & Garden Suburbs	10	7	0	1	2	1	4	0	25
Memorial & Commemorative Landscapes	0	3	1	1	2	0	3	2	12
Institutional Gardens	5	4	0	2	0	1	4	1	17
Zoological Gardens	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
Residential Gardens	2	16	0	7	7	10	13	2	57
Industrial Gardens	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	3	9
Total	24	45	5	22	16	17	49	14	192

As a source, this is particularly useful for in-depth information, however the applicability and ease of transfer of this material in terms of time expenditure for result is limited. Unless the AGHS has a volunteer, or group of volunteers who are prepared to read through this material and extract the information for insertion into a database, it should be considered a secondary priority for inclusion in the master list database.

Information included in books

There is a broad range of topics, themes, designers, styles and types of garden and landscape presented in books published in Australia. Some are more relevant and appropriate, systematic or more eclectic than others. For the most part, these are treated in the state and territory sections below. However, a few deserve noting here for their national or intrastate coverage and strong potential to provide lists of significant places.

In 1976 Howard Tanner and Jane Begg wrote *The Great Gardens of Australia* which included a useful overview covering the history and typology of gardens in Australia and thirty-three examples representing all periods and states but mostly focused on Victoria and New South Wales.⁸ It includes authoritative text on the history of each place, some descriptions of plantings and structures, photographs, and a sketch of the garden from an oblique aerial perspective. *Australia the Beautiful, Great Gardens*, edited by Michael McCarthy and first published in 1983 is a similar full colour anthology of several types of gardens arranged according to climate zone.⁹

Edna Walling, as well as being one of Australia's most important garden designers, wrote several books herself. Others have collected and edited her prolific writings. Peter Watts wrote about her gardens in 1981.¹⁰ Trisha Dixon and Jennie Churchill have written about her work in great detail in *Gardens in Time, in the footsteps of Edna Walling* and in *The Vision of Edna Walling: garden plans 1920-1951*.¹¹ The latter lists more than fifty of her designs, with her watercolour plans for them, and includes garden descriptions, design principles and an overview of her effectively national career.

The exhibition catalogue *Converting the Wilderness: the Art of Gardening in Colonial Australia* (1979-1980) lists a number of gardens, not all of which survive.¹² The illustrations, in a range of media, are now very familiar. There is also good basic information about the artists, photographers and cartographers which could be supplemented by further research. The information in the catalogue must be considered highly reliable, if perhaps now dated because of further research. Another, more incidental source would be *An Australian Gardener's Anthology*, which includes mention of specific gardens and is of some value for its illustrations and literary references.¹³

The water-colourist, William Tibbits painted many house and some hotel portraits and a few views in Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales. They are an excellent source for a range of garden types. The State Library of Victoria and the Historic House Trust NSW mounted two exhibitions of many of Tibbits' works, *Picturesque Victoria through the eyes of William Tibbits*, Melbourne 1983 and *Portraits in the Landscape*, Sydney 1984 and published catalogs.¹⁴ There are over fifty examples of Tibbits' work. Subsequent research has clarified the names of some of the unidentified places and more works have come to light, including their publication in the AGHS journal. Another national travelling exhibition, *Town and Country: Portraits of Colonial Homes and Gardens* mounted by the Bendigo Art Gallery in 2005 showed works by a range of artists in different media.¹⁵ Many other artists painted houses with their gardens: Conrad Martens in NSW (and Queensland?);¹⁶ Eugene von Guérard, Nicholas Chevalier and Thomas Clarke, in Victoria.¹⁷

There are other books with a nation-wide scope. Ken Inglis has written a book on war memorials, *Sacred places: war memorials in the Australian landscape* (2008, 3rd ed.). Terence Lane and Jessie Serle in their compendium, *Australians At Home, a documentary history of Australian domestic interiors from 1788 to 1914* (1990) includes historic photographs of gardens and conservatories. And the Australian Heritage Commission's *Australia's Historic, Gardens Parks and Trees*, AHC Bibliography Series No. 4, (1991) has a nation-wide scope.

The most comprehensive national source must be *The Oxford Companion to Australian Gardening* (2002) edited by Richard Aitken and Michael Looker.¹⁸ It could be sifted for the significant gardens it lists, for the work of important designers and gardeners, and for individually significant plantings. There are other useful entries such as those on cultural and designed landscapes, types of gardens, structures, etc. Those providing state and territory overviews include useful checklists of places, people and publications all of which are cross-referenced back to more specific entries.

Other, arguably less academic books could still be useful for providing lists. *Australia's Remarkable Trees* (2009) by Richard Allen and Kimbal Baker includes fifty examples from across the nation: mostly natives and mostly planted but also some ancient remnant trees. Each could be of state significance and many of national significance when tested against standard criteria and thresholds.

While these types of sources are particularly useful for in-depth information and research purposes, the applicability and ease of transfer of this material in terms of time expenditure versus result is limited. Unless the AGHS has a volunteer, or group of volunteers who are prepared to read through this material and extract the information for insertion into a database, it should be considered a lower priority for inclusion in the 'masterlist' database. They are mentioned here to indicate the richness of the resources available.

Information included in periodicals

There have been many national and state-based magazines and journals devoted to gardening.¹⁹ While these may not provide simple lists, they might feature significant gardens from issue to issue, such as *South Australian Homes and Gardens* (1931-53). Periodicals aimed to be popular and consequently commercially successful, such as *Home Gardener* (1917-54) which focused less on high design and more on down-to-earth practicalities. They were not without high production values and authoritative content, such as *The Home* (1920-42).²⁰ Other periodicals like *Australian Home Beautiful* (1925-) and *Australian House and Garden* (1948-) continue the popular and perhaps increasingly vernacular tastes of Australian gardeners and designers. They can be an excellent primary source for individual gardens and designs. The same caveat applies, however, that they are a lower priority than the existing digital resources held on statutory databases.

Online Resources

There has been an explosion of primary and secondary resources available online in recent years. Each state has its own public library with holdings specific to that state and its local areas. The National Library of Australia (NLA) provides a national perspective. References can be searched quite easily using keywords, authors, titles and subject headings, the later being the most systematic. Online catalogues mean that a single search can now lead serendipitously from one entry to another.

Perhaps the most important tool at a national level is Trove, the search engine established by the NLA, which offers 'books, images, historic newspapers, maps, music, archives and more'. Trove will search across many fields, media and catalogues with useful side references and suggestions for further research. However Trove is limited by the original sources which have been digitised. Presently there is an emphasis on newspapers for practical and copyright reasons. The only major magazine to have been digitised so far is the *Australian Women's Weekly*. No gardening, horticulture or landscape periodicals have been digitised. There is a medium to long term opportunity for the AGHS to support the digitisation of the most important gardening texts.

Usefulness of Existing National Lists

Finally, it is clear that there is a great deal of very reliable information collected from at least the mid-1970s with the beginning of the Australian Heritage Commission's most noble concept of our National Estate. It was the beginning of professional, systematic research and

analysis. The leadership of the AHC in association with the NSW, Victorian and Queensland state heritage offices in particular and Australia ICOMOS as the peak professional body has led to a sensible standardisation of the form and content. The fruits are both the present statutory lists, at all levels of government, and the wealth of private, non-statutory research which supports them. Furthermore, there are many lateral or incidental references which, with some imagination, could be called on to provide checklists. The AGHS and the various National Trusts have played an important part in this national success. The usefulness of the existing national lists can be summarised in the following table.

Table 3 The usefulness and priority for inclusion in an AGHS Database of the most relevant existing national listings.

List or Inventory	Usefulness	Priority for inclusion in AGHS master list database
Australian Heritage Database	5	Very High
Australian Heritage Places Inventory	5	Very High
National Estate Register	3	Medium
National Heritage Register	4	High
Commonwealth Heritage List	3	High
World Heritage List	4	High
Australian Garden History Society List	5	Very High
Open Gardens Australia Lists	2	Medium
Art Deco and Modernism Society List	1	Low
Individual researchers reports, theses, manuscripts etc.	2	Medium
Information included in books	1	Low
Information included in Periodicals	1	Low
Other online resources	3	Medium

STATE AND TERRITORY LISTINGS

The brief required that this report investigate Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the ACT. Further work should include examination of the Northern Territory and Norfolk Island to ensure that a truly national representation of landscapes and gardens is achieved.

Queensland

The findings for Queensland are in the Brouwer report (2010), specifically in its Section 3 'Further Analysis of the Lists' with the last two sub-sections included here.

Overview

The Brouwer report followed a similar brief to this review. It investigated existing lists at all levels of government (using a sample of seven municipalities) and other existing non-statutory lists. It analysed the lists for dates of compilation, criteria for selection, accessibility, ease of use, ease of distinguishing gardens, state coverage, and any problems or shortcomings. Advice is given on the overall usefulness of each list. Advice is also given on how gaps and shortcomings could be overcome. Criteria and thresholds are discussed. The results are presented in a tabulated form which allows easy comparison across the fourteen different lists.

Finally, the Brouwer report anticipates this national review with 'Advisory Notes' in Sections 4 and 5 which have been noted. The vast geographical scale of Queensland, the diversity of soils, climates, environments, etc. and the many historical themes are stressed. Perhaps the most important note was Section 5.5, 'A Single List or Several', which suggests that because of the many types of gardens and landscapes and the many regimes they lie within 'a range of lists would be both more informative and practical'. This would allow each state to have one or more lists based on type and region. The authors of this review do not agree.

The principal conclusions of the Brouwer report were:

3.7 Developing a Comprehensive Queensland List

The development of a single list of historically significant gardens in Queensland is possible (but time consuming) using existing resources. Regardless of the thresholds and criteria that may be adopted by the AGHS, the state and national lists provide a firm foundation for an AGHS list. There is the advantage of their comprehensive search facilities to assist the identification of gardens, whether the garden component is the main reason for listing or incidental to the listing of a structure or other place.

The same cannot be said for local authority lists. Sampling has shown that many local authorities hold no lists and those that exist vary widely in depth and breadth of coverage, age of entries, updating process and ease of access. Extrapolating the Queensland results to other states is more problematic. The usability depends upon the features and compilation process of each state list; e.g.

- Does each of the state authorities survey places and collect and document information to the same detail as done (or claimed) by DERM?
- Did all National Trust branches similarly survey homesteads as was done by NTQ? Do all National Trust branches keep a similar database?

If the criteria are set at less than State significance (e.g. "local" significance levels which generally apply to the Council registers), assembling such a list becomes a great deal more difficult, due to the patchy coverage of existing local authority heritage lists. The time and effort which has been put into compiling the existing lists varies widely amongst local authorities, and few appear to have consciously included "gardens" (even in their widest interpretation) in their lists and registers. Numbers of local authorities appear to not hold any such lists.

3.8 Summary Advisory Conclusion

The state and national lists provide a firm foundation for an AGHS list of significant, at least for Queensland, however, the same cannot be said for the local lists. This pilot study sampling has shown that many local authorities hold no lists and those that exist vary widely in depth and breadth of coverage, age of entries, updating process, ease of access, and criteria often are not explicit. Due to the diversity of types of historic gardens, (as per AGHS desired scope), and distinct state characteristics, compilation of a range of lists of significant historic gardens (following further investigative studies) may be the applicable and more useful approach for the AGHS.

Victoria

Overview

Victoria probably has one of the best developed systems in Australia for listing significant gardens, trees and landscapes. The state was one of the first to prepare conservation planning controls for buildings and trees under the *Town and Country Planning Act 1961* and subsequently the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (as amended). These acts protected places of local significance under municipal planning schemes. Victoria was the first state to introduce controls to protect places of state significance, under the *Historic Buildings Preservation Act 1976* and the *Historic Buildings Act 1981* but it was not until the *Heritage Act 1995* that trees and gardens were included specifically in the definition of 'place' and cultural landscapes were included indirectly through the definitions of 'land' and 'works'. The Victorian Heritage Register now lists some 2281 places of state significance. The number of places of local significance across Victoria is now enormous with both individual and group listings under the heritage overlays in planning schemes. However, the vast majority of these would be buildings with relatively few significant gardens, trees and landscapes identified.

The HERMES database managed by Heritage Victoria is one of the most sophisticated and extensive in Australia. It would be very useful in the compilation of an AGHS 'masterlist'.

State lists and sources

The principal list of places of state significance is the Victorian Heritage Register. It commenced with the introduction of the first heritage legislation in 1976 (the first of any in Australia protecting privately owned property) and then totalled some 600 places, largely drawn from the 'A' and 'B' classifications of the National Trust of Australia (Vic). Places are added to the Register very gradually although the process is now much more streamlined. At first the information gathered was limited but the quality now is excellent. There has been some effort to review and upgrade old registrations. The Register now lists several thousand places. Information contained on the Victorian Heritage Register is considered to be very useful, and easily transferable to any new AGHS master list database. Information held on places not accepted for the Register may also be very useful.

Because trees and gardens could not be identified under the first two heritage acts, scant information was gathered officially until 1995 although much corporate knowledge developed, both with the Heritage Victoria staff and with members of the Heritage Council. A Landscape Committee (including representation by the AGHS) was formed in 1999 which has fostered a systematic approach to the identification, protection and management of significant trees, gardens and landscapes. Gardens and trees and even broad cultural landscapes are now regularly included as part of the registration process, such as the listings of St Vincent's Place, South Melbourne, of Bickleigh Vale, Mooroolbark and of Tower Hill State Reserve. Some early registrations have been reviewed and the significance of their trees, gardens and landscapes included retrospectively in their statements of significance, descriptions and histories. There are now about 150 places listed in the 'item group' of 'Parks, Gardens and Trees' and a further 29 listed as 'Cultural Landscapes', representing a wide range of types, which are listed on the Victorian Heritage Register. All of this information about places of state significance has been collated in HERMES, the heritage database managed by Heritage Victoria. It would be a very easy exercise to transfer this information from one electronic database to another, i.e. from HERMES to a new database, whether state-based or national established by the AGHS.

The HERMES Database

Heritage Victoria manages HERMES, also known as the Victorian Heritage Database, which evolved from several earlier versions. It was a Microsoft Access database in its previous forms. It is now a Microsoft SQL Server database but fully compatible with earlier versions. It is the most sophisticated and powerful state government heritage database but not necessarily the most user-friendly. The database is now dominated by information collected through

municipal heritage studies with about 350 studies incorporated, some dating from the mid-1980s. There is no retrospective revision of this information however — what you see is what you get. Because information has been collected from many statutory and non-statutory ‘partners’, there can be multiple entries for a single place.

HERMES is available at three levels: to the public through the Heritage Victoria website at <http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/>; to partners and professionals through a protected internet gateway; and to HV staff who for the most part have full access. The public can use the advanced search facility which allows for: exclusive and inclusive keyword searches; searches by name, location, date and ID number; and searches by types i.e. ‘heritage type’, ‘heritage category’ and ‘Heritage Act category’. The latter can be used to search by HERCON heritage criteria, i.e. the nationally adopted system. It can become quite specific when ‘Parks, Gardens and Trees’ is used as the heritage type which brings up 33 useful subsets for heritage category. ‘Farming and Grazing’ brings up some further subsets, such as homestead complex, horticulture and orchard, although there is a bias towards built forms. This understandable bias towards built forms and architecture permeates the database. ‘Authorised Users’ have access to a more elaborate advanced search facility with more fields and extensive drop down menus. Some authorized users are also allowed to modify entries, such as consultants undertaking a municipal heritage study. These modifications can be tracked in the case of serious error or malicious change, something which has never occurred. If the AGHS were to become a partner then it would have this deeper authorized access including the opportunity to alter its own entries but not those created by others.

Martin Jones, the staff member who manages the Hermes database has been very supportive in the preparation of this report. He has offered to explore the possibility of the AGHS becoming a partner with rights to create its own entries. He has already made some minor modifications to existing fields and drop down menus. The list of architects and designers is easily expanded and the names ‘Bateman’ and ‘Guilfoyle’ were added recently, for example. New sub-themes might be added such as ‘6.9 Making gardens for Victorians’ under ‘6.0 Building towns, cities and the garden state’ to parallel others for buildings and suburbs. It would be more difficult but Martin Jones has also supported the idea of new fields which could benefit entries for significant trees, gardens and landscapes, such as fields for types, designers and styles. All these changes would need to be ratified by the Victorian Heritage Council.

If the word ‘garden’ is used in the name field of Hermes, there are about 1740 hits and about 40,065 hits when used as a single keyword, which covers names, statements of significance, histories and descriptions but with only 3,000 places returned.

The National Trust of Australia (Vic)

The National Trust of Australia (Vic) was founded in 1956 and, since its establishment, has listed more than 9,000 places, approximately 7,000 of which are classified and 2,000 are recorded. It is an independent non-profit organisation, supported by a large membership base. It has no statutory powers.

In its digital database and hard copy files it maintains extensive information on gardens, trees and landscapes, as well as buildings. The National Trust decided to adopt the HERMES database under licence from Heritage Victoria. The earlier Significant Tree Register, now incorporated into the digital database, is a very important source of reliable information about significant trees in Victoria, however it suffers the inconsistency that many non-statutory lists do. Other National Trusts in Australia are close to adopting the HERMES database to host their Significant Tree Registers. The Australian Council of National Trusts has launched an up-to-the-minute mobile phone ‘app’ especially for significant trees.

Limited access to information on the files is available online through a searchable database. The quality of the information is mixed with many places having no information other than the place name, the file number (using the prefix ‘G’ for gardens and ‘T’ for trees), an address (sometimes doubtful), the location and municipality, and the level of significance attributed to the place by the Trust (which may differ from statutory listings). More complete entries also include an image, the statement of significance and cross references to entries of related places.

The database can be searched by name, keyword/s, file number, location, municipality (drop down menu), item group (drop down menu), item category (drop down menu), file type (drop down menu) and level of significance (drop down menu). Importantly and usefully, the item group and item category fields correspond to the HERCON heritage criteria. A maximum of 200 hits is allowed in any search which may be a serious barrier to research.

A search of the database using 'garden' in the place name generates 110 hits. This number includes duplicates and a small number of places with garden in the name or address by coincidence rather than specifically. More interesting is the use of garden as a keyword. From a sample of 200 places, 69% of such a search produced individual trees, 20% residential gardens including homestead, suburban, townhouse, hill station and holiday house gardens. Exactly half of the sample was of state significance, 30% of regional significance, only 8% of local significance and 3% of national significance. The rest were either demolished or removed. There were eight duplications, all but one of which were residential having the houses and gardens listed separately but with cross-references.

Using 'parks, gardens and trees' as an item group and then 'garden residential' produces 11 records. Using 'trees of social, historic or special significance' as an item category, which is one of six devoted to trees, produces 11 records. Totalling all six categories for trees, there are 307 records but this is likely to be an underestimate because the results for the single 'tree' category are likely to be limited to 200. On the other hand, there may be duplications because 'avenue of honour' is treated separately and one of the two records is repeated.

Using 'landscape – cultural' as an item group there are at least 200 records. Using 'cultural feature' and 'historic landscape' as an item category there are 2 records and 5 records, while using 'other- landscapes-cultural' there are at least 200 records. This suggests that some extra categories could be provided. It also confirms that the concept of significant cultural landscapes is not nearly so well developed, even in Victoria, as significant buildings, gardens and trees.

Overall, the database maintained by the National Trust in Victoria would be a very rich source of information and cross reference for a new AGHS database whether its scope was state-based or national. The Trust's successful decision to use the HERMES database under licence must be considered as a potential model for the AGHS to follow.

Local lists and sources

Most of Victoria has now been surveyed by some sort of municipal heritage or conservation study.²¹ These studies identify all types of heritage place, including trees, gardens, landscapes and cultural landscapes. Many earlier studies lacked the expertise to adequately undertake identification and assessment of historic gardens, trees and landscapes, and there is a clear gap in most studies prior to 1998. Usually, most places which are assessed as being of local significance by the study have the Heritage Overlay applied, and are recorded in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01 of the local Planning Scheme. This schedule is very useful for the compilation of the AGHS 'masterlist' in terms of determining basic locality and place information.

Significant Tree Studies or Registers

Numerous municipal significant tree studies have been undertaken since the first Victorian study was undertaken in 1992. *The City of Prahran Significant Tree and Garden Study* (1992), was the first heritage study in Victoria to focus exclusively on trees and gardens.²² Numerous studies focussing on significant trees have since been undertaken across Victoria. Many municipalities have their own significant tree registers, which are easily available through Council. Moyne Shire commissioned the Mortlake Tree Study in 1995.²³ Other heritage studies included some trees and gardens, such as the City of Coburg Heritage and Streetscape Study (1991), the City of Essendon Conservation Study (1985, revised 1997), the City of Hamilton Conservation Study (1991), and the Macedon Ranges Study (1994). Other municipalities which had not previously included trees, gardens and landscapes were reviewed such as the City of Brighton Urban Character and Conservation Study (1986) and the City of

Sandringham Heritage and Conservation Study (1989) when the two municipalities amalgamated as City of Bayside Heritage Review (1991).

The City of Melbourne has an excellent record in the identification and management of the heritage trees in public reserves and roads for which it is responsible. These should be listed by the administration and the lists should be accessible to the AGHS for its purposes. In mid 2012 the City of Melbourne established an 'exceptional' tree register of 178 rare or unusual trees on private land within the municipality. The Register is available online.²⁴ The webpage states "The City of Melbourne's urban forest includes around 20,000 trees in the private realm".

On the other hand, the Melbourne Planning Scheme identifies and protects remarkably few trees and gardens in private ownership. The Heritage Schedule of the Scheme does include a special section for 'Trees and Gardens' but this only totals 11 places, two of which are Aboriginal scarred trees (HO10 and HO11), and Aboriginal burial site (HO14), three exotics (HO512, HO514 and HO 907) with the five places the great public gardens of the City which are under its control. All five gardens are included in the state Heritage Register as well as the Federal Oak in the Parliament House Gardens, one of the three exotics. Outside this list there are four isolated places: the Royal Melbourne Zoological Gardens (HO828), the system Garden at Melbourne University (HO355), the Queen Victoria Gardens, St Kilda Road (HO947) and two Aboriginal scarred trees in Yarra Park (HO194). Checking Column Five in the Schedule which asks the question "Do Tree Controls Apply?", there are no other positive listings. More significant gardens could be included in the Schedule, although not necessarily protected under the Planning Scheme, because the 'Government House Complex', South Yarra is listed but tree controls do not apply.

The same is the case with the Stonnington Planning Scheme, which incorporates the earlier City of Prahran. Its Heritage Schedule identifies just four individual places and two precincts where tree controls apply. Bayside Council has many more places identified of all sorts. The Heritage Schedule has forty-six places listed of all sorts, seventy per cent of which are clustered at the end of the Schedule suggesting that they are listed as a result of the City of Bayside Heritage Review (1991).

Significant tree studies and registers are considered to be a moderately useful source of information for inclusion on the AGHS master list database. There are some issues regarding the application of the word 'significant' which does not always mean cultural heritage significance. For instance, a tree might be included in a municipal significant tree register as significant as an example of remnant indigenous vegetation.

Arboricultural Reports

One other potential source for lists of significant trees may be condition (rather than heritage) reports by municipal authorities. The Glenelg Shire Council, for example, commissioned a report on the Norfolk Island Pines, *Araucaria heterophylla* in the streets of Portland and in the Portland Botanic Gardens in 2005 from Stephen Fitzgerald Arboriculture.²⁵ There are detailed entries on 125 *Araucaria* as well as two reports on a Red Flowering Gum, *Corymbia ficifolia* and a Cork Oak, *Quercus suber* in the Botanic Gardens. Basic information was collected, including a colour photograph for each tree.

Arboricultural reports are of moderate usefulness for the information they can provide for inclusion on the AGHS database. Arborist's reports on significant trees or groups of trees are usually commissioned by Council as the trees are recognised already for their heritage value, and included on another inventory (such as the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay). The amount of time versus benefit is possibly prohibitive, and this source should be considered of secondary priority for inclusion.

Other lists and sources

Historic Gardens of Victoria, a Reconnaissance (1983)

One of the first and best steps towards the identification of significant trees and gardens in Victoria was the publication of Peter Watts' book, *Historic Gardens of Victoria, a Reconnaissance* in 1983.²⁶ More than 200 gardens were identified. The substantial and authoritative information in this book could be directly transferred to a database with most entries including very useful plans and descriptions. Peter Watts has also written about Edna Walling in *Edna Walling and her gardens* in 1981 and republished in 1991.²⁷ This book is a very useful source, and should be used as a primary source of information for the AGHS masterlist.

Victorian Gardens Inventory (1988)

Chris Johnston prepared the 'Victorian Gardens Inventory' in 1988, a project funded by the National Estate Grants Program.²⁸ As well as providing a good list of existing sources and a very workable list of garden types, it lists about 400 gardens, of which one third is 'public' and the two thirds are 'private'. The list is arranged alphabetically by municipality but these are pre council amalgamation in the mid 1990s. Many municipalities have no gardens identified. This list must be seen as the springboard for setting up a digital database for Victoria. There is mention that 'The Inventory has been entered onto the Ministry for Planning and Environment's computer data base to enable easy updating and analysis of the current listings'.²⁹

This inventory is considered to be particularly useful for the AGHS masterlist. It should be considered of high priority.

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia (1997)

The AGHS (Victorian Branch) prepared *Garden history and historic gardens in Victoria, a bibliography of secondary sources* (1990), a project convened by Richard Aitken.³⁰ Subsequently a very full bibliography prepared by Richard Aitken was included as part of the Victorian section of *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1997). Section (c) of the Bibliography is particularly useful for listing journal articles, conservation management plans and some under-graduate and post-graduate research for the most significant gardens in Victoria.

In his Section 3 Aitken discusses a typological approach to identifying designed landscapes and in Section 4 he discusses a stylistic approach. In both he provides examples which could be used as a list of places. Those in Section 3 have been tabulated below.

Table 4 – Summary of examples from Aitken, 'Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Victoria', Section Three: Typological approach to designed landscapes (1997).

	Classified	Worthy of Classification	Worthy of Investigation	Total
Arboreta and Nurseries	2	3	6	11
Botanical Gardens	6	15	2	23
City Mansion Garden	7	5	7	19
Cottage Garden	1	2	6	9
Hill Station & Summer Retreat	12	31	0	43

Homestead Garden	6	27	58	91
Industrial and Commercial Garden	3	18	0	21
Institutional Garden	9	6	16	31
Landscape Estate	4	1	1	6
Memorial Place, Cemetery & Churchyard	7	17	11	35
Public Garden	9	31	65	105
Suburban Villa	7	6	41	54
Terrace Garden	1	1	8	10
Zoological Garden	1	1	1	3
Utilitarian and Acclimatization Garden	1	0	6	7
TOTAL	76	164	228	468

Incidental Lists and Sources

Finally, other sources might act as clues and leads for further research towards building an AGHS masterlist. For example, there are other published sources not included in these bibliographies which could be used to provide lists of potentially significant places. Michael Cannon edited and republished *Victoria's Representative Men at Home*, the collected interviews by the journalist, 'Lauderdale' first published by Melbourne Punch in 1904.³¹ There are forty-nine entries featuring the house and usually the garden of the family interviewed.

Approximately 40% of the houses survive, although many of the surviving gardens have lost their integrity from sub-division and simplification. The book is, nonetheless, invaluable for its photographs of the gardens and conservatories and for its comments on gardening. The book has a parallel in *Our Beautiful Homes, NSW*. Both volumes raise the issue of the identification of lost gardens.

Usefulness of existing lists

The existing Victorian lists should prove to be very useful for the compilation of a new searchable online database, whether state-based or national. The information is longstanding, usually quite complete and almost always authoritative. Victoria is perhaps the best situated of the states for the compilation of a database and may be an alternative to Queensland as the first. Any database should be compatible with the existing statutory HERMES database.

List or Inventory	Usefulness	Priority for inclusion in AGHS Masterlist Database
Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of each Planning Scheme (Cl. 43.01)	4	High
Significant tree studies or registers	3	Medium
Arboricultural reports commissioned by local government	2	Low
The National Trust of Australia (Vic) Registers	4	High
Historic Gardens of Victoria, a reconnaissance (Watts, 1983)	4	High
Victorian Gardens Inventory (Johnston, 1988)	4	High

Garden history and historic gardens secondary sources (Aitken, 1990)	1	Low
Incidental lists and sources	1	Low

Australian Capital Territory

Overview

The Australian Capital Territory and the city of Canberra represent a special situation, as outlined by Dianne Firth in 'A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in the Australian Capital Territory' (1988). They are perhaps more important for their symbolic cultural landscapes—including a vast program of tree-planting—and iconic public places than for the domestic, industrial and commercial gardens found more numerous elsewhere. Nonetheless, the ACT has a heritage dating back to the mid-1850s with some of its most important sites commencing at that time and a very valuable twentieth-century heritage as one of the world's great planned cities. It has been very well researched and analysed by the federal and territory governments.

ACT Heritage, part of the territory government, administers the heritage provisions of the *Heritage Act 2004* in the ACT. It provides administrative and operational support to the Heritage Council, an independent body providing advice on appropriate conservation of cultural, natural and Aboriginal heritage places and objects in the ACT. ACT Heritage and the Heritage Council have adopted the standard HERCON arrangement of themes, criteria and thresholds. The separation between territory and local significance is complicated by the number of places of national significance.

The National Trust of Australia (ACT) and the Australian Council of National Trusts are located in Canberra. Academics at the Australian National University and Canberra University have played a key role in the theoretical and practical understanding of significant gardens, trees and cultural landscapes.

Territory lists and sources

The National Trust of Australia (ACT)

The National Trust of Australia (ACT) was founded in 1977 as a private, non-profit company. It has listed more than 250 places (90% classified and 10% recorded with some not graded) since its establishment. The National Trust no longer classifies heritage sites. The information held on each place varies greatly but much is substantial and most would be authoritative.³² Some early information is a great value. The information follows the standard format, usually including photographs, and is held as hard copy files which are being progressively digitized. These records are available as downloadable PDF files when they exist. The Trust does not have an internal database. Gardens, trees and other plantings are mentioned in some statements of significance, descriptions and lists of 'features intrinsic to the heritage significance of the place'.

ACT Heritage Register

ACT Heritage Committee produced a report 'The ACT heritage study: a strategy for the conservation of places of cultural heritage significance', the third chapter of which discussed Existing registers/records.³³ The first substantial government heritage survey of the ACT was undertaken by the National Capital Development Commission in 1988. This produced a ten volume report with nine of the volumes devoted to specific locations. It is not known how detailed the report's information is on individual gardens, trees and landscapes but it is likely to be authoritative and, presumably, exhaustive for the time.

This ten volume report and the National Trust of Australia (ACT) listings and its Register of Significant Trees would have formed the basis of the ACT Heritage Register. The Register is available online and can only be searched by location.

Other lists and sources

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia (1997)

Dianne Firth lists about 160 places in Appendix 2 of her section of the ACT section of *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1998). She notes that it is not an exhaustive list 'but a collection of good examples known to the author'. A few of the most important entries are duplicated. Government House is listed as a 'National Setting' under Parks and as a 'National Garden' under Gardens. It includes as few as seven domestic gardens with only two, Lanyon Homestead and Duntroon House (also listed as an institutional garden), dating from before 1930. Interestingly, there is only one diplomatic garden listed, at the Embassy of Japan.

Table 5 – Summary of examples from Firth, 'Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in the ACT', (1997).

TYPE	PLACE	EXAMPLES
3.1 Designed Landscape Settings	3.1.1 National Setting	3
	3.1.2 Open Space System	9
	3.1.3 City Setting	3
	3.1.4 Urban Precincts, spaces & Squares	8
	3.1.5 Suburban-Scale Planning, Estates & Special Functions	8
	3.1.6 Freeways, Avenues and Streetscapes	15
	3.1.7 Utilitarian Areas	6
	3.1.8 Viewpoints	4
	3.1.9 Vistas	2
3.2 Parks	3.2.1 National Setting	12
	3.2.2 Nature Parks/National Parks	5
	3.2.3 Urban Parks	5
	3.2.4 Suburban Parks	6
	3.2.5 Parks for Organisations (including Institutions, etc.)	11
	3.2.6 Cemetery/Crematorium Parklands	3
	3.2.7 Utilitarian Parks	6
3.3 Gardens	3.3.1 National Gardens	8
	3.3.2 Diplomatic Gardens	1
	3.3.3 Gardens for Organisations (including Institutions, etc.)	16
	3.3.4 Sculpture/Museum Gardens	5
	3.3.5 Church Gardens	5
	3.3.6 Domestic Gardens	7
3.4 Isolated Elements	3.4.1 National Elements	5
	3.4.2 Local Elements	3
TOTAL		156

Incidental Lists and Sources

The local non-statutory sources for the ACT tend to be the same as the national. Dianne Firth includes a section in her bibliography on 'Canberra General Publications' but there are few titles which might provide lists of gardens, trees and landscapes. There is *A Guide to Arboreta in the Australian Capital Territory* (1984).³⁴ Greg Murphy gave a paper 'Parks and gardens in Canberra' in 1963 to the Canberra and District Historical Society and Firth mentions his later manuscript, 'Thirty years parks and gardens in Canberra, 1921-1951' (1979).³⁵ The Horticultural Society of Canberra has published *The Canberra Gardener* in several editions since 1947. There may be a useful list of places in Ken Taylor's paper 'Cultural pastoral landscapes of significance: perceptions, values and protection' (1984).³⁶ Many titles deal with one garden in particular, from the National Botanic Gardens through to Calthorps' House, a house museum with a traditional pre-World War Two garden in Red Hill.

There may be some worth in researching individual designers. For example, the NLA holds manuscripts from the firm of Malcolm Johnson Moir, architect relating to 'the erection of embassies, private houses, city office blocks such as the M.L.C. building, alterations to offices and banks, government buildings and designs for parks and gardens'.³⁷

The AGHS published *A gardener's city: Canberra's garden heritage* in 2006.³⁸

Usefulness of existing lists

The existing lists should prove to be useful for the compilation of a new searchable online database, whether territory-based or national. The information largely dates from post 1980, is usually very complete and almost always authoritative. The ACT (along with federal government resources) is perhaps the best situated for official research and analysis because of the NCDC of jurisdictions for the compilation of a database. Any database should be compatible with the existing statutory Australian Heritage Database.

New South Wales

Overview

New South Wales is generally comparable with Victoria for the breadth and depth of its identification of significant gardens, trees and landscapes and for the principal of protection for significant places even if some may challenge the State's application of statutory processes. However, there are some important structural differences between the two states. The *National Trust of Australia (NSW) Act 1960* established the Trust as a statutory authority while its Victorian equivalent is a non-profit public company. The former still owns and manages a large number of properties with designed landscapes which are open to the public. The latter is in the process of reviewing its property portfolio. The NSW *Heritage Act 1977* was passed two years after similar legislation in Victoria and, with amendments, it remains the Act while Victoria has had three difference Acts. The NSW Act does not define 'place' in the same sense as the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter although it does follow the Charter's definition of 'conservation'. The NSW Act does not define or mention 'garden' at all. 'Tree' and 'other vegetation' are mentioned in relation to the harm of a place and the management of significant trees and vegetation could fall under the permit process.

The National Trust of Australia (NSW) manages a very large number of places, many of which have significant gardens. It does not have a Significant Tree Register and it does not have a searchable online database. Importantly, NSW also has the Historic Houses Trust of NSW, a statutory body which owns also properties, seven with significant gardens, and undertakes substantial research.

State lists and sources

NSW Heritage Register

The focus for the statutory identification of significant places in NSW is on buildings. *The Heritage Act 1977* identifies both public and private places. There is the usual division of places into state and local significance. Places of state significance are included in the State Heritage Register which was created in 1999. It contains approximately 1,500 places. It is managed by the Heritage Branch (formerly the Heritage Office) of the Office of Heritage and Environment.

Under Section 170 of the *Heritage Act*, government agencies are required to keep a register of heritage items. Twenty-three agencies have submitted their S. 170 registers to the Heritage Council. These are available online through the NSW State Heritage Inventory which is also managed by the NSW Heritage Branch.³⁹

Information about places of state significance is held on the State Heritage Database and is discussed below.

The National Trust of Australia (NSW)

The Australian National Trust movement was formed in Sydney in 1945 and from the beginning has had a strong interest in gardens, trees and cultural landscapes.⁴⁰ The Trust became a statutory body under the *National Trust of Australia (NSW) Act 1960*. In the 1960s the Trust acquired several properties which include designed landscapes: Experiment Farm Cottage (c1835), Harris Park; Ludovic Blackwood Memorial Sanctuary; Everglades House and Gardens (1930s), Leura; Lindesay (1834), Darling Point; Stella James House (1934), Avalon; and Old Government House (from 1799), Parramatta. Further properties with designed landscapes were acquired in the 1970s: Cooma Cottage (c1834), Yass; Norman Lindsay Gallery and some artworks, Springwood; Grossmann House (1871), Maitland; Riversdale (c1840), Goulburn; Harpers Mansion (1834), Berrima; Miss Traill's House and Garden (1834), Bathurst and Woodford Academy (1840s), Woodford. In the 1980s it acquired: Vienna Cottage (1871), Hunters Hill; Saumarez Homestead (1888-1896), Armidale; Dundullimal Homestead (c1842), Dubbo, and Tomago House (1840s), Tomago.

The National Trust of Australia (NSW) does not have an online searchable database nor does it have a Significant Tree Register. It has listed more than 11,000 places since its establishment. The information held on each place, as usual, varies greatly but much is substantial and most would be authoritative. The information follows the standard format, usually including photographs, and is held as hard copy files which are being progressively digitized. Gardens, trees and other plantings are mentioned in some statements of significance, descriptions and lists of 'features intrinsic to the heritage significance of the place'. The information is not yet digitized but it would be available to serious researchers.⁴¹

The Historic Houses Trust of NSW

The Historic Houses Trust of NSW 'was established in 1980 to run Vaucluse House and Elizabeth Bay House and has now grown to manage 14 diverse sites and properties including houses, public buildings, a farm, gardens, parklands, a beach and urban spaces'.⁴² Only seven places in the HHT's property portfolio have gardens, although some of them are significant, even at a national level. More importantly, the HHT undertakes serious research at the highest level into its properties and more generally. Its Caroline Simpson Library & Research Collection is available to the public and catalogues and databases are available online, such as the Colonial Plants database. These are a tremendous asset for researchers in NSW and beyond.

Local lists and sources

Information about places on the State Heritage Register and of local significance is held in the online State Heritage Database.⁴³ It can be searched using basic fields such as name, location, municipality and statutory listing. More advanced terms included owner, designer, item type (which includes 'landscape'), item group (which includes 'parks, gardens, trees') and both Australian, i.e. HERCON, and NSW historic themes. When the database was searched for 'parks, gardens, trees' as a group there were 1692 hits. These were subdivided into two sections, the first twenty-five were 'Items listed under the NSW Heritage Act' and the second 1144, were items listed under Local Government and State agencies. The items are ordered alphabetically by name and then by address, suburb and municipality, each of which can then be sorted alphabetically. When the database was search for 'landscape' there were 1690 hits, 143 in Section 1 and 1549 in Section 2. Importantly, many types of designed landscapes appeared including public and private gardens, trees, reserves, parks, arboreta, etc. Finally, when the database was searched using 'cultural landscape' in the drop down menu of NSE historic themes, there were 1013 hits subdivided into 217 in Section 1 and 1013 in Section 2. There was great overlapping in the various searches, of course. Using 'garden' in the place name field produced many fewer hits, 12 in Section 1 and 32 in Section 2. This search did not call up the many places with the name 'garden' in the earlier advanced searches. The individual entries for places on the State Register are very fully documented with the seven criteria used for testing state significance downloadable from within the entry as a one-page PDF file. Entries for places of local significance, for the most part based on a heritage study, are usually less detailed and more varied with some fields missing but still informative and presumably accurate.

The City of Sydney has a Significant Tree Register which is available online as a PDF file.⁴⁴ It is divided by area and datasheets can be downloaded on each significant tree. It uses the standard criteria and thresholds, 'The assessment methodology for determining significant trees is based on the criteria developed for the Register of the National Estate [i.e. the AHC HERCON system], in accordance with the Burra Charter.'⁴⁵ Each tree is located, described, recorded, tested against criteria and assessed through a statement of significance. The list is ordered by ownership and then by address. The list has not been quantified for the purpose of this study.

One of the more interesting discoveries for this report was the survey of significant landscapes undertaken by the City of Orange, a rural municipality some three and a half hours drive west of Sydney.⁴⁶ The survey identified fifty-three landscapes of various types, two thirds of which were in central Orange. The brief sought to include 'views, vistas and places'; individual trees

and gardens were not included.⁴⁷ Each place is located, photographed and has a statement of significance. Some places have more information in the statement than others. The landscapes are not identified and protected under the Orange Planning Scheme but the survey is used as a referral document in the planning process and for educational purposes. Six places are identified in the Planning Scheme: a Lone Pine memorial tree; three public parks; and two mansion gardens, one formerly used as a mental asylum.⁴⁸ The survey won an National Trust award in 2007. No similar surveys are known to have been conducted in the same region.

Other lists and sources

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia (1998)

Chris Betteridge, in his section on NSW in *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*, provides a comprehensive bibliography, usefully including undergraduate theses and state government reports.⁴⁹ He also provides examples of places based on the Ramsay categories of types and styles although these cannot be exhaustive lists or lists of just places of state significance. The list of places according to type, which at 258 examples is the longer, is tabulated here.

Table 6 – Summary of examples from Betteridge, ‘Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in NSW’ (1997).

Number	Type of Garden	Sub-Type of Garden	Sub-Total	Total
1	Scientific Gardens	Scientific Gardens	3	7
		Arboreta	1	
		Nurseries	3	
2	Botanical Gardens			7
3	Cottage Garden			4
4	Large Urban Residence (City Mansion) Gardens			13
5	Hill Station & Summer Retreat			6
6	Homestead Garden			15
7	Private Parklands			2
8	Industrial and Commercial Gardens	Caravan Parks	0	8
		Resorts	3	
		Special Function Gardens	3	
		Display Gardens	2	
9	Institutional Gardens	Seminaries, convents, presbyteries, manses	3	23
		Hospitals	16	
		Defence establishments	4	
10	Landscape Estates			3
11	Memorial Place, Cemetery & Churchyard	Memorial Places	2	31
		Cemeteries	26	

		Churchyards	3	
12	Public Parks, Gardens, Domains & Reserves	Public Parks	20	21
		Pleasure Grounds	1	
13	Suburban Villa Gardens			5
14	Terrace Gardens			3
15	Zoological Gardens			3
16	Utilitarian, Acclimatization and Mission Gardens	Utilitarian Gardens	2	4
		Acclimatization Gardens	2	
		Mission Gardens	0	
17	Trees, Avenues, Tree Groups, Boundary Markers, Urban Trees, Plantations & Survey Markers			62
18	Public Squares, Urban Squares and Urban Precincts			2
19	Nature Parks, Nature or Forest Reserves			1
20	Railway Stations, Airports and Industrial Places	Railway Stations	2	
		Airports	1	
		Industrial Places	11	
21	Viewpoints			5
22	Sculpture Gardens			2
23	Reconstructed or Conjectural Gardens			4
24	Archaeological Sites			3
25	Gardens with Associative Values			21
26	Retirement Villages			2
27	Housing Estates			1
	TOTAL			258

James Broadbent, historian, conservationist and author based at the HHT, has written extensively on houses and gardens. His books, *The Australian Colonial House* (1997) and, with Joan Kerr, *Gothick Taste in the Colony of New South Wales* (1980) are essential background reading.⁵⁰ They do not provide lists of significant gardens, trees and landscapes but the former provides a wealth of illustrative material and erudite analysis on the gardens of houses, villas and homesteads in and around Sydney up to 1842.

Several books could provide checklists of places likely to have significant gardens. *Homesteads of Southern New South Wales, 1830-1900* by Maurice Cantlon includes some sixty-five places which have brief histories, descriptions and photographs.⁵¹ *The Homestead, A Riverina Anthology* by Peter Freeman has two parts: the first providing a background to the Riverina, the lifestyle of its homesteads and how they were built; and the second providing histories, descriptions, plans, old and new photographs and other illustrations for thirty places.⁵² The biography of Leslie Wilkinson, architect by David Wilkinson includes a comprehensive list of his buildings, usually with the date (of drawing), client, job, cost and builder as an appendix.⁵³

Usefulness of existing lists

The NSW State Heritage Database appears to be a very useful source for places of state and local significance. The City of Sydney Significant Tree Register is an excellent list which could

transposed immediately into an AGHS database. The National Trust's information, while possibly fulsome and accurate, would be very difficult to transpose. The City of Orange landscape survey, although apparently unique in rural NSW, is a useful list and deserves to be promoted as a model.

South Australia

Overview

It is the role of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources with the South Australian Heritage Council to identify, conserve, protect, promote and provide policy advice on the state heritage places of South Australia. The Heritage Places Act 1993 came into operation on 17 November 2005, replacing the Heritage Act 1993. The Heritage Places Regulations 2005 also came into operation on 17 November 2005, replacing the Heritage Regulations 2005. Local heritage management is provided for in the Development Act 1993, and is a responsibility of local councils. Information about places is held in an electronic database, the South Australian Heritage Register managed by the department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. The usual system of heritage studies leading to heritage listings applies at both state and local levels of significance.

State lists and sources

Information about heritage places has been collected since the passing of the *South Australian Heritage Act 1978* (now repealed) and is held on the electronic database with a wide range in quantity and quality.⁵⁴ There are over 2,215 heritage places of state significance entered in the South Australian Heritage Register. The history of the database and its protocols for data capture are detailed on-line.⁵⁵ The Register includes but is not limited to historical buildings, mine sites and monuments as well as gardens and trees, usually in association with structures. The Register also includes:

- local heritage places designated by a development plan
- local heritage places designated by a development plan
- local heritage zones and policy areas designated by a development plan
- places within the state entered in any register of places of natural or historic significance kept under the law of the Commonwealth (i.e. the Register of the National Estate, the Commonwealth Heritage List, National Heritage List and declared World Heritage Properties)
- state heritage areas.

The Heritage Places Database provides:

- data on state heritage places, local heritage places and contributory items, including mapping capability
- links to Commonwealth websites to give access to South Australian places on the world, national and Commonwealth Heritage Lists
- easy searching for information by suburb, council area, ID numbers and dates of listing (local heritage places and contributory items)
- for export into MS Excel formats or, in the case of Development Plan lists, into MS Word.

The search facility of the database is not friendly towards gardens, trees and landscapes. It is not possible to search by place name or keyword. The type of place seems to be based on the Australian Standard land use classification code in AS2482 rather than the HERCON standard breakdown.⁵⁶ 'Garden' is not included in the drop down menu of place types. Curiously, however, various gardens types are listed as a subset under 'Parks – Recreation – Public Open Space' (2 hits). An individual trees can be found under 'Prominent Lone Tree' (32 hits) but is also included as a part of 'House; gate; fence/wall; prominent individual tree'. There is a field for 'Trees – scattered' (20 hits). Cultural landscapes are limited to 'Cemetery' (125 hits) or 'House; orchard – vineyard – plantation (other than pine) (1 hit).

Using the location fields is also difficult. 'Penola' elicits Yallam Park but only provides basic statutory and land data. There is no history, description or statement of significance. Similar searches for other prominent places produce the same result. Users are advised that 'The features which create the heritage significance of a place should be ascertained from the staff of the Heritage Branch.'⁵⁷ Consequently, without internal access, the publically available database is probably the least friendly of all those presently available.

The National Trust of South Australia

The National Trust of South Australia was established in 1955 under an Act of Parliament but is a not-for-profit private company.⁵⁸ It has over 130 places under its care and control, many with significant gardens and trees, and 30 reserves, two of which are designed cultural landscapes.

The Trust has a Significant Places Register comprising about 450 entries but is not presently processing new nominations. (Information is also held on places that are not classified.) The information held on each place varies greatly but much is substantial and most would be authoritative. The information follows the standard format, usually including photographs, and is held as hard copy files some of which have been digitized. Gardens, trees and other plantings are mentioned in some statements of significance, descriptions and lists of 'features intrinsic to the heritage significance of the place'.

The National Trust has been involved in the conservation of significant trees for many years and in 1983 it established a Register of Significant Trees to help identify and conserve trees of importance to the South Australian community. It was based on the protocols established by the National Trust in Victoria. Over 450 trees have been registered for their rarity or aesthetic, natural, historic or cultural value. (Files are held on a further 150 unsuccessful nominations.) Basic information on a sample of ten trees is available online from the Trust's website.⁵⁹ The Trust still accepts nominations for additions to the Significant Tree Register. It is cooperating with the Australian Council of National Trusts to establish a nation-wide Significant Tree Register.

The digitized information is held on a Microsoft 'Flat File' Excel spreadsheet, partially converted to a Microsoft Access database. It is not yet refined enough for convenient searching. The information is not available to the general public but would be made available to serious researchers. The Trust does maintain a simple online search engine which allows for searching by keyword. Using the keyword 'garden' there are 219 hits with basic information on each place most of which are owned and opened by the Trust. Each hit leads to further information which varies but which may be substantial. Importantly, some of those lead to PDF files drawn from the South Australian Heritage Database. This may be a usual way to circumvent the limitations of using the database online.⁶⁰ Using the keyword 'tree' there are 226 hits with similar results.

Local lists and sources

Heritage studies have been undertaken at a municipal level for about twenty-five years. There are some six to eight thousand places now identified and protected under local planning schemes for their local significance. The standard HERCON framework of themes, criteria and thresholds applies. Heritage studies have not generally included gardens, trees and landscapes because of their emphasis on buildings and structures for planning purposes.⁶¹ Nonetheless, some gardens and trees are included incidentally with the identification of built forms. Many places are identified through earlier National Trust listings, including a Significant Tree Register and consequently reflect the Trust's broader interest. Public access is through the Heritage Places Database. Access to the State Heritage Unit's database would have to be internal but it would be possible to search the database using place names (which might include 'garden', 'reserve', 'park', etc.) and keywords. It has not been possible to quantify this information.

Other lists and sources

Some Historic Gardens of South Australia (1981)

In the late 1970s the National Trust of South Australia received grants from the AHC to develop evaluation criteria, to survey historic gardens, to prepare a list and to make a visual and documentary record of places. The research was completed by Tony Whitehill and Rodney Beames. Historic landscapes, such as orchards and market gardens, were not included nor were trees considered individually. Other omissions are due to owners not wanting their gardens listed, inaccessibility and the loss of smaller, more ephemeral gardens. The results came to be published by the National Trust of South Australia as *Some Historic Gardens of South Australia* (1981).⁶² Just twenty-three places were identified representing the better known, larger gardens, all of which are residential. The entries include a history, a description, brief comments on condition, integrity and maintenance, plant lists, plans, photos and notes on special features.

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia (1998)

David Jones in his thorough and thoughtful section on South Australia in *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* states 'Surprisingly, there is a dearth of period literature on garden, garden design or similar written for SA' and then comments on those which do exist.⁶³ He goes on to discuss 'several very influential periodicals'. None of these primary sources are likely to provide useful lists.

Jones provides an excellent discussion on the status of designed landscape knowledge in South Australia in his section in *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*. Most usefully, he tabulates the quality of designed landscape identification by region and then municipality, nominating each heritage study and rating it.⁶⁴ Jones doesn't provide a single list of examples but several of his tables, based on practitioners, themes (i.e. the City Beautiful), and types could be used as partial lists. He holds serious reservations about the typologies of Ramsay (1991) and Aitken (1995). In Table II.1 in his Appendix II he does provide an inventory of designed landscapes which he cautions is preliminary. 'This is an inventory of designed landscapes in SA that have been identified in the literature and heritage survey review. It is not intended to be a listing of assessed places but rather a list of the potential range of designed landscapes for which more detailed assessment is required.'⁶⁵ The inventory is arranged by location and municipality as in 1996 but 'undergoing amalgamation. The present report has not attempted to convert the comprehensive inventory into types. Each entry includes a chronology (sometimes extensive), any references and the name of any heritage study.

Typological Studies

The wine industry has been a major part of South Australia's heritage and wineries are often associated with extensive cultural landscapes. Some, such as Seppeltsfield (from 1851) and Wynns (from 1890), are possibly of national significance. A series of reports was prepared on 'The Winery Buildings in South Australia, 1836 to 1936' as part of research into the industrial buildings of South Australia.⁶⁶ Just one part of the research, by Katrina McDougall, identified more than forty wineries in the Barossa region. While the focus of the research was on structures, with the potted histories, it provides a good start for a checklist of significant wineries. Similar typological studies may exist in other states.

Heritage of the City of Adelaide (1990)

One book which might be used as a checklist is the *Heritage of the City of Adelaide* (1990).⁶⁷ Its emphasis is on buildings and the nineteenth and early twentieth century. There are useful historic and contemporary photographs of the more residential sections of the city, including many suburban and mansion gardens. There are also entries on important public parks and gardens, including the Botanic and Zoological Gardens. The general index has various lists under 'house' and 'schools' but nothing under 'garden', 'park' or 'tree'. There are also useful entries in the biographical index, such as for ten members of the Bagot family including ten references under Walter Hervey Bagot, architect and gardener. Biographies on John Ednie

Brown, George Strickland Kingston, William Light and Charles Compton Reade as early designers might also act as checklists.

Usefulness of existing lists

The South Australian Heritage Register is not a useful source for existing lists of significant gardens, trees and cultural landscapes. Access to information behind the very limited online face of the database may be accessible through the National Trust of Australia's online search engine but this too is quite limited. The Trust's Significant Tree Register with 450 up-to-date entries should be very useful but it is not available online. The Beames and Whitehill reference, *Some Historic Gardens in South Australia* is authoritative and detailed but has only twenty-three places, all residential and rural. Local heritage studies may be useful based on Jones assessments even though the standard brief does not specifically require the identification of gardens and trees. Perhaps the best list is that by Jones in his Table II.2.

Tasmania

Overview

Tasmania, forced to acknowledge natural conservation in the 1970s, was the last state in Australia to implement cultural conservation legislation, notwithstanding its wealth of heritage places and their parallel tourism value. The *Historic Cultural Heritage Act* was passed in 1995.⁶⁸ The Act adopted, in principle, the conventional separation between places of state and local significance, however, in application, it has not been adequately followed through. The Tasmanian Heritage Register now contains 5,500 places of both state and local significance. The *Historic Cultural Heritage Amendment Bill 2012* attempts to remedy this situation through a new Section 15(1A) which states that the purpose of the Heritage Register is to keep an inventory of places of state significance. This bill also reflects an agreement to standardise heritage criteria in line with the national heritage convention of chairs of state heritage councils and directors of heritage to formally adopt the HERCON criteria.

Gardens are neither defined nor mentioned in the Act. Trees are only mentioned under the definition of ‘works’. Trees are only considered significant where they form part of a cohesive landscape setting or the whole of a place such as a memorial avenue or some other formal/designed group. Trees that are merely fine specimens or attractive examples would not be registered, leaving single tree management (native and introduced) to local councils and recording/promotion of individual trees to community lists (e.g. the National Trust or AGHS; see discussion below). The term ‘landscape’ is used only in respect of formal hard and soft landscaping that makes up, or contributes to, a place and in describing a landscape setting.

State lists and sources

Tasmanian Heritage Register

Places of state significance are identified under the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act* and are listed in the Heritage Register. Gardens are rarely identified in their own right, important examples being: the d'Entrecasteaux 1793 Garden at Catamaran; the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens, Hobart; Ockerby Gardens, Launceston; and the Perry-Ling Gardens, Penguin. There is a conscious approach to avoid the Heritage Register becoming a ‘significant trees register’ of individual plantings. Amongst other things, the draft Bill to amend the present Act proposes that responsibility for the management of places of state significance should devolve to local government.

The Tasmanian Heritage Council has started a state-based heritage database known as the Heritage Management System (HMS) modeled on the Microsoft SQL server based Victorian database Hermes. It is not accessible to the public and will probably not be for many years. Unlike Hermes, it is unlikely to have any non-government access for data entry because of security concerns.

The Tasmanian Heritage Register is available online as a basic list with ID number, place name, address, location, municipality, and THR status (permanent or provisional). The Register is maintained by the Tasmanian Heritage Council under the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995*. The THC administration acknowledges that the Register is a poor repository of information on significant trees, gardens and landscapes. The Registration Manager has stated “Even when these are associated with iconic buildings, they tend to be poorly described, and whilst I don’t have any statistical information, from personal experience I know there is negligible information on these elements captured in the database. The Tasmanian Heritage Register is a poor repository of information on significant trees, gardens and landscapes.”⁶⁹ There is no active program to add data from old studies into the database; old site entries are updated on a one-off, as-needed basis, typically when a major development is imminent. However, entries made after 2007 are reasonably comprehensive.

A search of the online list using the keyword ‘garden’ produces just nineteen entries. A search for ‘tree’ produces none. There must be many more listed places which have significant

gardens and trees. Using the keyword 'reserve' produces several places which could be described as cultural landscapes. Individual place reports are available on request and this may reveal more information.

National Trust of Australia (Tas)

The National Trust of Australia (Tas) was founded in 1960 and, in December 2006 following a period of administration and restructure, a new National Trust Act was proclaimed by the Tasmanian Government. It has classified [??] places since its establishment. It holds files on the places which it has identified but the amount of information is varied and limited.⁷⁰ All places registered by the Trust are now on the state government's Tasmanian Heritage Register. There is no public access to the Trust's Register via the internet other than through the THR as discussed above. The NTA(Tas)'s Register cannot be seen as a particularly useful list. For a long time the NTA(Tas) has maintained a Significant Tree Register. This is also not available online but it has formed the basis for Schedules in planning schemes and would be most useful through this medium.

Local lists and sources

Places of local significance are identified in heritage schedules in planning schemes. These are places of significance within a local municipality, managed by the local government authority through the local planning scheme under the provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act* 1993. The overwhelming focus of municipal planning schemes is on land use, buildings and associated development. Some municipalities have more than one planning scheme. Hobart has three: the large City of Hobart Planning Scheme and the two much smaller Battery Point and Sullivan's Cove Planning Schemes.

There are twenty-nine municipalities in Tasmania. The single largest, measured by population, is Launceston but the conurbation around the City of Hobart also includes all of Brighton Council, the City of Clarence, the City of Glenorchy and parts of the Kingborough Council. The 2006 State of the Environment Report stated that "Currently, 97% of planning schemes contain a heritage section compared to 71% in 1997" as favourable news and that "Eighty percent of planning schemes currently include a heritage list, compared to 71% in 1997".⁷¹ However, gardens, trees and cultural landscapes do not appear to be well represented in heritage schedules in Tasmanian planning schemes. Nor are cultural landscapes and streetscapes well represented, an absence particularly noted by the 2006 Report which recommended legislative amendments to address the issue.

The City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 is the current planning scheme. It includes a Heritage Schedule and a Schedule of Significant Trees. The *Draft City of Hobart Planning Scheme* was released for public discussion in 2009. It has not been adopted and is likely to be superseded.⁷² It contains detailed heritage planning controls, the spirit and structure of which are unlikely to change. They already exist in the recently amended *Battery Point Planning Scheme*.

The Burra Charter is included as the base document for understanding the existing and draft Schemes' heritage planning controls and therefore gardens, trees and cultural landscapes can be included in the Heritage Schedule of the Scheme. Cultural significance "means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations". Place "means a site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views". The objective of S4.5.7 'Development affecting Gardens and Settings of Cultural Significance' is to conserve gardens and settings of cultural significance. The standard HERCON themes, criteria and thresholds seem to apply, at least through the identification of places in various heritage studies. However, the Schedule rarely mentions specific gardens and only occasionally mentions trees and hedges (but see discussion below). Going back to the original heritage studies and their reviews for detailed information is likely to be more useful, probably referring to the 'Significant Gardens Study (New Town and Lenah Valley)' (1999) by Regan Douglas.

In 1997 the *City of Hobart Planning Scheme* 1982 was amended to insert a register of significant trees initially based on the National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) Significant Tree Register. The list presently includes about 100 entries representing 325 trees including two groups both of 45 London Plane trees, *Platanus x hispanica* and two 'hedges'. It includes brief notes for the significance of the tree/s tested against ten criteria. More trees were proposed to be added in 2010 as part of the *Draft City of Hobart Planning Scheme*. A total of 77 nominations were received, with 188 individual trees being nominated. These trees were individually assessed to determine whether they met any of the specified criteria for listing. Ninety of the nominated trees were considered to meet one or more of the assessment criteria, and therefore were considered worthy of inclusion in the Significant Tree Register. The ten criteria (or categories) were sound and comprehensive.

In 1999 the City of Hobart commissioned the *New Town and Lenah Valley Significant Gardens Study* report written by Regan Douglas.⁷³ It recommended that 80 places described as designed landscapes 'within the 7008 postcode' should firstly be included in the Heritage Schedule of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme and subsequently all nominated for inclusion in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The report notes some limitations, importantly that mostly only front gardens had been investigated.

The *Battery Point Planning Scheme* 1979 was amended in 2012 to introduce a Schedule of Significant Trees and supporting controls. The Schedule includes 10 entries protecting 39 trees, including one group of 23 Plane Trees, *Platanus x hispanica* [?] as street trees. It already includes planning controls which are likely to be implemented in the next City of Hobart Planning Scheme.

The *Launceston Planning Scheme* 1996 is the current planning scheme. It includes a Heritage Schedule and, as an addendum to the Heritage Schedule, a Schedule of Significant Trees. The term 'garden' is rarely mentioned in the Heritage Schedule entries. There are 26 entries in the Schedule of Significant Trees which is dated 1995 and drawn directly from the National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) Significant Tree Register. Of these, twenty are 'classified' and six are 'recorded'. The *Draft City of Launceston Planning Scheme* (2011) is similar to that of Hobart.⁷⁴ Other than occasionally in the Schedule, gardens are not mentioned and trees are only mentioned under the definition of 'works' which 'includes any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land including the removal, destruction or lopping of trees and the removal of vegetation or topsoil', which arguably includes gardening, and matters to be considered at Section 37.6(n) 'if any pruning or removal of a tree will adversely affect the importance, character or appearance of the tree and the area'. The original heritage studies are likely to be more useful for lists and detailed information.

Other lists and Sources

Historic Tasmanian Gardens (1987)

Only seven gardens in Tasmania were listed in the AGHS report 'Preliminary Nominations for Inclusion on the List of Significant Gardens' (1986) prepared by Peter Watts. Perhaps the first substantial listing of significant gardens in Tasmania was Dr Phyl Frazer Simons book *Historic Tasmanian Gardens* published in 1987.⁷⁵ The places are arranged by location but indexed by name. Information in the book varies greatly but may include: a potted history, descriptions (including artefacts and furniture), comments on style, sketch plans, elevations and other drawings, and rarely photographs.

Table 7 - Places by location, P. Frazer Simons, Historic Gardens of Tasmania (1987)

Location			Sub-Total
Hobart			59
Bothwell			11
New Norfolk			10
Richmond			8
Brighton & District			8
Port Arthur			1
Huon District			4
Midlands			55
Longford			29
Launceston			11
Devonport & Georgetown			6
Deloraine & Westbury			12
Swansea & East Coast			19
Total			233

Early Buildings of Northern and Southern Tasmania

E. Graeme Robertson wrote two books, both in two volumes, on the historic buildings of Northern and Southern Tasmania.⁷⁶ While they focus on the architecture of places these seminal texts could be used as checklists since many if not most of the places are of state significance. Many of the places are now lost. The black and white photographs taken by E. Graeme Robertson are an excellent record of the places at that time.

A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia (1998)

Francene Gilfedder created a list of designed landscapes as an appendix to the section she contributed to *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1998). This totaled approximately 215 gardens including three groups of trees (but no mature street tree plantings), 170 of which were some form of domestic garden. It is clear that many of the entries under sub-types need to be completed.

Table 8 – Summary of examples, F. Gilfedder, ‘Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Tasmania’ (1997).

NATURAL	TYPE	SUB-TYPE	EXAMPLES
		Mt Wellington & Cataract Gorge	2
CULTURAL	1. Domestic Gardens	Pre 1850	129
		Post 1850	15
		Unknown	24
		Suburban Villa	no entry
		Terrace Garden	no entry
		City Mansion Garden	no entry
		Hill Station & Summer Retreat	no entry
		Homestead Garden	no entry

NATURAL	TYPE	SUB-TYPE	EXAMPLES
	2. Public Parks, Gardens & Designed Landscape	Domains	1
		Botanic Gardens	1
		Government Gardens	10
		Experimental Gardens	5
		Tea Gardens and Leisure Parks	no entry
		Government Purposes	no entry
		Reservoir Gardens	2
		Public Parks & Gardens	2
		National Parks	no entry
		Squares	3
		Recreation Reserves and Sports Grounds	no entry
		Boulevards	1
		Beaches, Foreshore Reserves & Esplanades	2
		Street Trees	"few"
		Zoological Gardens & Wildlife Reserves	no entry
		Industrial Gardens	1
		Nurseries	1
		[Ship] Chandlers	1
		Children's Playgrounds	no entry
		Cemeteries	"separate category"
	3. Institutional Gardens and Designed Landscapes	"Other ??"	1
		Transport	no entry
		Utility Services	1
		Education	1
		Religion	7
		Judicial, Penal	2
		Defence	2
TOTAL			214

Research by AGHS Members

More recently local members of the Australian Gardens History Society, led by Dr Deborah Malor have recently produced a very comprehensive list of about 480 significant gardens.⁷⁷ The spreadsheet includes the earliest source of the listing, e.g. Frazer Simons (1997), The Oxford Companion (2002), the Tasmanian Heritage Register (and other statutory sources), local planning schemes, the AGHS, and a few 'other' sources. This should prove an excellent starting point for creating a database. The spreadsheet is presently organized by location, i.e.

postcode. It might be useful to add a type or category column, using the headings now more or less standard, which would be useful to sort the entries. The members have also developed an excellent Field Survey Kit, a 52 page document which provides the theoretical background and a structure for identifying a wide range of garden types.⁷⁸ The document could easily be adapted for use in other states. The spreadsheet and the kit are some of the best work done recently in Australia. Gwenda Sheridan has also done excellent work on the gardens of the Archer family and especially on William Archer, one of the most important amateur botanists in colonial Australia.

Usefulness of existing lists

The existing lists could prove useful for the compilation of a new searchable online database, whether state-based or national. There is much good research and analysis. The information is relatively recent and not quite complete but it is usually authoritative, especially the recent AGHS work. Tasmania has a rich heritage of significant gardens, trees and cultural landscapes. Any database should be compatible with the existing statutory database which in turn is closely based on the Victorian HERMES database.

Western Australia

Overview

A fact sheet explaining heritage in Western Australia is available online through the state Environmental Defender's Office.⁷⁹ There is the standard separation between places of state and local significance. The Heritage Council of Western Australia compiles and administers the State Register of Heritage Places established under the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990*. The Heritage Council uses the standard HERCON approach and the wording of its legislation follows the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. The State Heritage Office website has a page dedicated to the Burra Charter, stating that it applies to gardens, and a link to the Australia ICOMOS webpage. The register includes buildings, structures, gardens, cemeteries, landscapes, archaeological sites and more. Entry is assessed against the usual criteria: aesthetic, historic, scientific and social values, rarity and representativeness. Under the *Planning & Development Act (2005)* local governments have the power to protect heritage places through their local planning schemes using the same standard approach. This is done by identifying places through heritage studies and requiring approval for any development which affects a place listed within the local planning scheme. Plants, gardens and areas of natural heritage may be protected under the state's heritage laws provided they possess cultural heritage significance. Generally there is a reasonable amount of reliable information in existing lists but this not easily accessible to the general public.

State lists and sources

State Register of Heritage Places

As with other states, the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* is the overarching statutory tool for the protection of significant heritage places. There are over 1,300 entries in the State Register of Heritage Places. These are managed through the Heritage Places Database which also includes heritage places listed on local government heritage inventories, Commonwealth heritage lists and the List of Classified Places managed by the National Trust of Australia (WA), or those included in surveys and studies. The database allows both a simple and an advanced search facility. There is an option to search the whole database or just the State Register of Heritage Places. The simple or 'quick' search is limited to ID number, name, address, municipality and 'search logic' or simple Boolean choice. Limiting the simple search to places of state significance and entering 'garden' in the name field of the simple search produces just nine entries. Extending the search to the whole database produces 103 entries. Using the word 'trees' produces four and 163 entries respectively. (Using the word 'tree' only brings up entries with the word **street** in the name.) The entries for places of state significance then offer further information with detailed statements of significance, descriptions and assessments against HERCON criteria as well as other information available in PDF format.

National Trust of Australia (WA)

The National Trust of Australia (WA) was founded in 1959 by a group of concerned citizens and established under the *National Trust of Australia (WA) Act 1964*. It is primarily a custodian of heritage places and reports directly to the Western Australian Parliament. The Trust's official Information Statement states

The National Trust of Australia (WA) manages an archive of historic data relating to the identification and assessment of heritage places in Western Australia which has been gathered over almost 50 years. These records include correspondence, copies of media clippings, plans, research papers and images (photographs, slides and transparencies). These records can be accessed by requesting an appointment with the Heritage Officer during normal office hours. Copies of these documents are available for a nominal cost (cost recovery). Records relating to the management of National Trust places, research and interpretation, as well as education and learning programs may be accessed in accordance with Administrative Instruction 711 of the Chief Executive Officer.

The Trust holds files on approximately 2000 places which it has classified as having state significance but the amount of information is varied and limited.⁸⁰ The files include information on gardens and trees and on about 250 landscapes but the latter are no longer classified. Information about 1236 of these places is held on the *Traces of the past* CD-ROM which was produced for the Trust in 1996. It can be accessed through an experimental online interface managed by the University of Western Australia.⁸¹ The first searchable report is a list of all properties, ordered by local government authority. Using the keyword 'garden' produces ten hits in the names of places and one hit in the address, actually the Supreme Court Gardens. Selecting any property produces its basic details and some commentary in a new window. The second report retrieves properties according to a predefined list of functions but these are not useful for searching directly for trees and gardens. One function is 'cemeteries' which produces fourteen hits. The last report performs a free-text search on designer, builder, summary and history fields. Using the same keywords only produces a more limited number of hits for garden and the usual problem of **street** for tree. This arrangement for hosting the Trust's files through UWA is under review.

For a long time the NTA(WA) has maintained a Significant Tree Register with 50 entries which is, however, currently dormant.⁸² This is also not available online but it has formed the basis for Schedules in planning schemes and would be most useful through this medium.

The NTA (WA) has been responsible for the production of several very important reports about the heritage of gardens, trees and landscapes in the state. Some are on properties owned by the Trust such as the historic house, Woodbridge at West Midland (1995).⁸³ Others look at larger areas such as the *Guilford Garden Study, 1829-1930s* (1993) for the Trust's Landscape and Conservation Committee.⁸⁴ The most extensive was the *Historic Gardens Study (WA), final Report*, prepared by Duncan and Oline Richards in 1980.⁸⁵ This was followed by their *Gardens and Trees of the Kimberley, Western Australia, a survey of historic places, gardens & trees undertaken for the National Trust of Australia (WA)* in 1983.⁸⁶

Local lists and sources

Like most states, the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* requires a local government to prepare an inventory of buildings within its district, which in its opinion are, or may become, of cultural heritage significance. The inventory must be updated annually, and reviewed every four years. In preparing an inventory, a local government should ensure that they have proper public consultation. A copy of the inventory must be provided to the Heritage Council. There are no legal consequences attached to listing on the local government inventory. Therefore, it has little effect beyond requiring the local government to acknowledge the heritage value of a place. However, a local government inventory may be given legal effect through incorporation into a town planning scheme.

Other lists and sources

Oline and Duncan Richards have published other highly regarded work which would produce lists of significant places. These include a paper titled 'The Avenue in Peace, honour avenues of the Great War in Western Australia, published in the AGHS *Studies in Australian Garden History*, Vol. 1 (2003).⁸⁷ In a similar theme, she also wrote *War Memorials in Western Australia* in 1996 and 'The Empty Tomb, Memorials to World War II in Western Australia' in *On the Homefront* (1996).

A private webpage, <http://www.warmemorials.net/index.html> provides a simple list of many war memorials, including diverse photographs. The webpage mentions that "The State Govt. started to compile [a central registry of war memorials] in April '04".

Usefulness of existing lists

The existing lists should prove to be very useful for the compilation of a new searchable online database, whether state-based or national. The research by Oline and Duncan Richards is

critical. The information is longstanding, usually quite complete and almost always authoritative.

APPENDIX A: THE BRIEF

AUSTRALIAN GARDEN HISTORY SOCIETY INVENTORIES OF HISTORIC GARDENS CONSULTANT'S BRIEF

3 October 2011

Introduction

The Australian Garden History Society (www.gardenhistorysociety.org.au) was formed in 1980 to bring together people interested in the history of gardens and gardening. Its mission is to be the leader in the conservation of significant cultural landscapes and historic gardens through committed, relevant and sustainable action. The Society has around 2 000 members Australia-wide with active branches in all states.

The Society looks at gardens and gardening in their widest form and application, as shown by the range of its research and publications, such as the 2002 *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens* and 2 volumes of *Studies in Australian Garden History*. Gardens include public parks and gardens (including cemeteries and railway stations), private gardens of all sizes and locations, as well as avenues and arboreta.

The Society is active in providing a program of events for its members, publishing the journal "*Australian Garden History*" four times each year, running an annual conference and organising tours of historic gardens. It is also an active advocate for historic gardens and prepares submissions to planning authorities, heritage councils, state and federal government departments and garden owners. It provides funding and practical assistance to owners of significant gardens through working bees, grants and advice.

The Society has recognised that its advocacy work would be assisted by having a list of significant historic gardens for each state and the ACT. But we are aware that there are many existing lists of places of heritage significance, drawn up at different times and for different purposes with different criteria, which include gardens (and in some cases, landscapes). Some heritage listings of buildings include gardens as landscape settings, although often the significance of these gardens, independent of the buildings, has not been assessed.

If the Society knew more about existing heritage lists – their scope, criteria, availability, quality and gaps - it could refer to them to determine the significance of specific gardens or use them to start drawing up its own list. This would be useful for its advocacy, education and research activities.

In 2010 the Society commissioned consultants to examine how well historic gardens are represented on heritage lists in Queensland. Catherine Brouwer Landscape Architects in association with Nissen Associates produced a report which shows that while the Queensland Heritage Register includes some gardens there are gaps, and in general it is oriented to buildings. The report found that representation of gardens on local government lists is poor. A summary of the report is attached.

The Society is aware that the situation in other states may be different from that in Queensland, due to work done by the National Trust and the openness of state registers to listing gardens and landscapes.

Accordingly the Society now wishes to look at the position with respect to the representation of historic gardens on state and local government heritage lists in the other states and the ACT. The question is: how well are historic gardens represented on existing heritage lists, what is the quality of the information and is the information accessible?

While different states will have different approaches, the criteria used in making heritage lists across Australia are sufficiently similar to make it possible to analyse the situation in the states and the ACT and make meaningful comparisons. Other sources of information are *The Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens* and *Inventory of Heritage Gardens and Parklands* prepared by Juliet Ramsay.

The study will give the Society a picture of the situation in respect to the listing of gardens across all its branches and enable it to use a national approach to planning the next phase of the project, allocating priorities and identifying methods which have been successful.

This study is to cover New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory. Queensland should be included in any discussion of the situation across Australia by using the Brouwer report.

The steering committee for this study includes people from each state and the ACT who are prepared to assist the consultant with advice on collecting information.

This is a desk top study.

The Society has not addressed the question of thresholds, that is, the level of heritage significance a garden should have before it would be placed on a Society list. However, for any such list to be of manageable size the threshold should be set fairly high. We are interested in the approach of listing bodies to thresholds.

In this brief the meaning of significance is that given in the Burra Charter. The Society considers that gardens are as much a heritage place as any other type of heritage place and takes the broadest possible view of the definitions of significance in the Burra Charter. Similarly the Society considers gardens can meet each of the commonly used heritage criteria (e.g. historic, associative, aesthetic, social, technical/scientific, representative and uncommon/rare).

Consultant's tasks

1. Make an inventory of all relevant lists of heritage places which include significant historic gardens and landscapes, including as settings to significant buildings. This is to include the Australia-wide lists of the federal government, and, for each of the five states and the ACT, the lists held by state government departments, local government authorities,¹ the National Trust and other bodies with relevant information.
2. Examine each list and determine:
 - The period over which the list was compiled, the process by which it was compiled, the criteria used and whether it continues to be managed, updated and expanded
 - The listing body's approach to setting thresholds for listing
 - How much information is provided for each entry on the list, and the standard of this information

¹ A sampling approach may be used to establish how local governments have handled gardens listing.

-
- How publicly accessible the list is, and how easy it is to search the list and find particular places, including how easy it is to distinguish places with gardens from those with buildings only
 - The coverage of the lists, gaps and other problems and shortcomings (e.g. adequate statements of significance, descriptions, histories, information on modifications and integrity, relevant references).
3. Provide advice on the overall usefulness of each list and whether, for each state and the ACT, the lists could be used by the Society to draw up its own adequate lists of significant historic gardens.
 4. Provide advice about priorities and or methods for the work that is required to produce lists adequate for the Society's purposes.

Procedures

1. Funding available for this consultancy is \$10 000.
2. The output from this consultancy will be a report to the Society.
3. A draft report should be submitted 12 weeks (negotiable) after the consultant is appointed, and a final report 4 weeks after the consultant receives feedback on the draft report from the Society. The draft report should be electronic in word.doc format, and the final should be printed (three hard copies) and on a CD.
4. The Society will pay the consultant \$7 000 on receipt of an agreed-as-satisfactory draft report and the final \$3 000 on receipt of an agreed-as-satisfactory final report.
5. This brief, the consultant's response to the brief and the Society's letter appointing the consultant will constitute the contract under which the work is done and payments will be made.
6. The project will be managed by a steering committee of Society members. John Taylor in Brisbane will be the contact.
7. The consultant is encouraged to meet with John and other steering committee members to clarify the brief before starting work, and to review progress at about the halfway point of the project.
8. Proposals from consultants are invited and should be submitted to John Taylor before 14 October 2011.
9. The criteria to be used to select the consultant are:
 - demonstrated understanding of the brief
 - proposed methodology
 - knowledge of heritage lists
 - knowledge of historic gardens
 - understanding of the Burra Charter, especially in applying its definitions of significance to gardens
10. For further information contact John Taylor on jht@hotkey.net.au or 0408 884 707.

APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS

The brief defines the meaning of 'garden' for the purposes of this report. The word garden is very old, dating from Middle English, i.e. the mediaeval period, with French and other Romance language roots.⁸⁸ It has deep meanings and wide associations. When not used metaphorically as a noun, such as in 'the Garden of Eden', it is usually combined with a descriptive word to specify what type of garden it is, such as herb, flower, kitchen or botanical. It becomes an adjective itself in such terms as garden wall, garden party or garden city. It can also be used as a verb. It is the root of gardener, a person who works in a garden, and gardenesque, a style of gardening which displays the special character of a garden.

Finding a good definition for 'historic garden' presents challenges. According to the Brief, the AGHS looks at gardens and gardening in their widest form and application, as shown by the range of its research and publications, such as the *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens* (2002) and 2 volumes of *Studies in Australian Garden History*. T. R. (Tommy) Garnett provides a philosophical overview of historic gardens in Australia in the former publication.⁸⁹ Gardens include public parks and gardens (including cemeteries and railway stations), private gardens of all sizes and locations, as well as avenues and arboreta.

A much more formal and perhaps too complicated definition was included in the ICOMOS Florence Charter (1992) which states.

Article 1.

"A historic garden is an architectural and horticultural composition of interest to the public from the historical or artistic point of view". As such, it is to be considered as a monument.

Article 2.

"The historic garden is an architectural composition whose constituents are primarily vegetal and therefore living, which means that they are perishable and renewable." Thus its appearance reflects the perpetual balance between the cycle of the seasons, the growth and decay of nature and the desire of the artist and craftsman to keep it permanently unchanged.

Article 3.

As a monument, the historic garden must be preserved in accordance with the spirit of the Venice Charter. However, since it is a living monument, its preservation must be governed by specific rules which are the subject of the Present charter.

Article 4.

The architectural composition of the historic garden includes:

- Its plan and its topography.
- Its vegetation, including its species, proportions, colour schemes, spacing and respective heights.
- Its structural and decorative features.
- Its water, running or still, reflecting the sky.

Article 5.

As the expression of the direct affinity between civilisation and nature, and as a place of enjoyment suited to meditation or repose, the garden thus acquires the cosmic significance of an idealised image of the world, a "paradise" in the etymological sense of the term, and yet a testimony to a culture, a style, an age, and often to the originality of a creative artist.

Article 6.

The term "historic garden" is equally applicable to small gardens and to large parks, whether formal or "landscape".

Article 7.

Whether or not it is associated with a building in which case it is an inseparable complement, the historic garden cannot be isolated from its own particular environment, whether urban or rural, artificial or natural.

Article 8.

A historic site is a specific landscape associated with a memorable act, as, for example, a major historic event; a well-known myth; an epic combat; or the subject of a famous picture.

Article 9.

The preservation of historic gardens depends on their identification and listing. They require several kinds of action, namely maintenance, conservation and restoration. In certain cases, reconstruction may be recommended. The authenticity of a historic garden depends as much on the design and scale of its various parts as on its decorative features and on the choice of plant or inorganic materials adopted for each of its parts.⁹⁰

Dating from after 1600, the word 'landscape' is not so old as 'garden'. It stems from Old Dutch and was a painter's term.⁹¹ It also now has several meanings: a painting of inland scenery; a prospect of inland scenery taken in at a glance; and, more generally, a broader, more natural scene or its representation. Landscape gardening is the art of laying out grounds so as to produce the effect of landscape scenery as is landscape architecture, an American term originally.

Cultural landscapes and designed landscapes have also been formally defined. The World Heritage Convention places 'designed landscapes' as a sub-set of 'cultural landscapes'. It provides the following definition for cultural landscapes in the Convention itself:

47. Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the "combined works of nature and of man" 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.

Generally, gardens and landscapes do not need to be defined for their entry into databases. More important is the recognition that they can be significant and should be identified, managed and interpreted.

For the purposes of this report, we have focused on designed or evolved landscapes, rather than broad acre natural landscapes with specific social or aesthetic values. This also includes planted significant trees, or trees which have a special historical or other cultural heritage value.

APPENDIX C: THEMES

Several states and the ACT have prepared historic themes to assist their statutory process of identification and comparative analysis. From 1993, acknowledging work over the previous twenty-five years, the Australian Heritage Commission prepared nine overarching theme groups and published them in 2001 as the *Australian Historic Themes: a framework for use in heritage assessment and management*.⁹² The themes and subthemes were adopted nationally in 1997 with minor revisions in 1998 and 1999. The final Framework can be applied to places at all levels of significance from local through to national. It deals only with historic values although it recognises that natural, social, scientific and aesthetic values may also reside in a place. One or more of these latter values are very likely to be found in significant historic gardens and cultural landscapes. Possible additional sub-themes are provided to suit local variations. They are intended to be used in databases.

The word 'garden' is used only once in the Framework in Theme 8: Developing Australia's Cultural Life in the Sub-theme 8.1 Organising recreation, 8.1.3 Developing public parks and gardens. However public and private gardens, gardeners and gardening might be recognised indirectly in other sub-themes of Theme 8, such as:

3.8 Moving Goods and People

- 3.8.6 Building and maintaining railways
 - i.e. Railway stations and their gardens
- 3.19 marketing and retailing
 - i.e. Former horticultural nurseries –
- 8.5 Forming associations,
 - i.e. forming horticultural societies and the Australian Garden History Society.
 - 8.5.1 Preserving traditions and group memories
 - 8.5.2 Helping other people
 - 8.5.3 Associating for mutual aid
 - 8.5.4 Pursuing common leisure interests
- 8.12 Living in and around Australian homes
 - i.e. creating gardens, planting trees for special occasions, maintaining an orchard, etc.
- 8.13 Living in cities and suburbs
 - i.e. creating gardens suburbs
- 8.14 Living in the country and rural settlements
 - i.e. creating farm and homestead gardens.
- 8.9 (Federal Oak for instance)
 - Public parks – recreating Australians
 - Botanical gardens

The word 'landscape' is only used once in the Introduction of the Framework in the sentence 'We are the only nation to occupy a whole continent and the diversity of our experience of our **landscapes** can be linked through a thematic framework.' The word is not used in the themes and sub-themes. However cultural landscapes might be recognised indirectly in other sub-themes of Theme 8, such as:

- 8.8 Remembering the fallen
 - i.e. planting avenues of honour,

-
- 8.10 Pursuing excellence in the arts and sciences
i.e. establishing botanical and zoological gardens and arboreta
 - 8.10.4 Designing and building fine buildings
i.e. placing a fine building or buildings within a designed landscape
 - 8.10.5 Advancing knowledge in science and technology
i.e. by establishing botanical and zoological gardens and arboreta.

Cultural landscapes, as institutional complexes or groups of individual places could also be recognised under Theme 8, such as:

- 8.13 Living in cities and suburbs
i.e. creating educational, health, industrial and other campuses or subdivisions which incorporate communal gardens and landscaping
- 8.14 Living in the country and rural settlements
i.e. creating 'hill stations' or valley floors dedicated to fruit and vegetable growing or extensive areas of monocultures, such as vineyards, plantations and orchards.

Cultural landscapes could also be recognised under Theme 1: Tracing the Evolution of the Australian Environment, such as:

- 1.4 Appreciating the natural wonders of Australia
i.e. establishing botanical and zoological gardens and arboreta, or establishing nature reserves and parks.

And under Theme 9: Marking the Phases of Life, such as:

9.7 Dying

- 9.7.1 Dealing with human remains
i.e. creating cemeteries
- 9.7.2 Mourning the dead
i.e. planting avenues of honour
- 9.7.3 Remembering the dead
i.e. planting memorial trees.

These historic themes and sub-themes still stand and, as was intended, have strongly influenced the creation and revision of heritage databases around Australia. Any review of the Australian Historic Themes Framework might include more detailed consideration of historic gardens and cultural landscapes. The themes used in each state and territory are discussed in detail below.

APPENDIX D: GARDEN TYPES

There has been much work done on creating a typology for historic gardens, special trees and cultural landscapes. In 1991 the Australian Heritage Commission published a typology prepared by Juliet Ramsay based on work to date.⁹³ It considered their:

Function, size, spaces, types of plants and hard landscaping features, the building with which the garden may be associated, and the special uses of the garden.⁹⁴

The published typology of twenty-two types was:

Utilitarian, Acclimatisation and Mission Gardens	Trees: Avenues, Tree Groups, Boundary Markers, Urban Trees, Plantations, Symbolic Trees and Survey Markers
Public Squares, Urban Squares and Urban Precincts	Institutional Grounds/Campuses, Civic and Administrative Gardens
Large Urban Residence Gardens	Memorial Places, Cemeteries and Churchyards
Terrace House Gardens	Landscape Estates
Suburban Gardens	Cottage Gardens
Homestead Gardens	Private Parklands
Commercial Gardens	Zoological Gardens
Public Parks, Gardens, Domains and Reserve Areas	Nature Parks and Nature or Forest Reserves/National Parks
Hill Stations	Railway Stations, Airports and industrial Places
Botanic Gardens	Scientific Gardens/Arboreta and Nurseries
Viewpoints	Sculpture Gardens

In 1995 Richard Aitken expanded the typology to fifty-three types.⁹⁵ The Burnley report, in 1998, took this work further by “refining” and “simplifying” it to include the following attributes for assessing gardens:

- Function and/or use
- Ownership
- Association with a particular horticultural or cultural technique
- Overall management regime or technique.

The authors of the Burnley report acknowledged that a particular place may fall into one or more categories or may be so distinctive that it fits into none. The consultants’ reports on individual states and the ACT, starting with Ramsay’s AHC typology, discuss types and that discussion was used to simplify Ramsay’s twenty-two types down to six with certain exclusions. Aitkin’s discussion on types and sub-types and his suggested twelve types and examples is particularly useful and has clearly influenced the final result. Excluding Aboriginal places, natural places and individually significant trees, the six types proposed were (with the number of sub-types offered noted in brackets):

- Symbolic and commemorative designed landscapes (7)
- Institutional, commercial and industrial designed landscapes (20)
- Productive designed landscapes (18)
- Residential and domestic designed landscapes (12 small & 6 large scale)

-
- Botanic gardens and designed landscapes for scientific purposes (8)
 - Public parks, public gardens, urban spaces and city settings (24)

The Burnley report was also influenced by work done by UNESCO and the ICOMOS ISC on Cultural Landscapes. In the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention it states:

10. Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories, namely:
 - (i) The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined **landscape designed and created intentionally by man**. 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.
 - (ii) 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 sub-categories:
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - (iii) The final category is the **associative cultural landscape**. The inscription 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.⁹⁶

While the six major categories proposed in the Burnley report and their more detailed examples of sub-types might be used in a database, the authors of this report can see some potential difficulty. As the Burnley report acknowledges, some places may include several types, such as an orchard which may be commercial or in a homestead setting. Golf courses incorporating residential development straddle two types. Certain types are duplicated, such as botanic gardens and psychiatric hospitals. These difficulties are perhaps more about the quality of data input than the typology itself.

APPENDIX E: GARDEN STYLES

If a typology of types of gardens and landscapes is difficult and still fluid, the creation of a taxonomy or systematic classification of styles is even more of a vexed issue. There are serious difficulties with a division based on historical periods and on designed content. The influence of dominant designers, the rich diversity of regional styles and revivalism must be accommodated somehow. Environmental and ecological factors are clearly important. And the tension between exotic and native plantings must be addressed. Nothing exists for gardens and landscapes like the ‘Style Chart’ or the ‘List of Styles’ for architecture in *Identifying Australian Architecture*.⁹⁷

Styles were discussed in the Burnley report *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (1997) at Section 3.0, with acknowledgement of previous important work, and in the Appendices on the Northern Territory, Victoria, and South Australia.⁹⁸ The discussion by Richard Aitken on styles in Victoria is particularly useful.⁹⁹ While it is clear that there was some disagreement amongst the authors it was agreed “that a basic division into formal and informal styles could be made, with a recognition that some designed landscapes may exhibit a mixture of the two”. The report lists the 17 stylistic categories prepared by Juliet Ramsay and used by the AHC. They are:

Squared Gardens	High Victorian	City Beautiful/Art Deco
Geometric	Boom	Interwar Domestic
Arcadian	Paradise	Leisure
Picturesque	Federation	Bush Gardens
Gardenesque	Edwardian	Mediterranean
	Bungalow	Plantsman’s Gardens

These were subsequently amplified by Aitkin to 31 styles. The Burnley report gives the lists of styles from some of the states and the ACT and then suggests the following distillation:

Formal

- Formal styles (Victoria)
- Geometric/Formal/Architectural and Utilitarian/Squared (Western Australia)
- Formal (Australian Capital Territory)

Informal

- Informal or irregular styles (Victoria)
- Naturalistic/Informal and Plant Collections (Western Australia)
- Naturalistic and Ecological (Australian Capital Territory)

The Burnley report concludes with the comments:

When compared with typologies, stylistic categories appear far more elusive to Quantify, a point made by several of the consultants. Style should be viewed as an overlay on the various type categories to characterise a place. In this way, style could be viewed as another sieve apart from the type classification, and this may be useful when evaluating the heritage value of a place.¹⁰⁰

The agreements and disagreements of the Burnley report were discussed further in the *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens* by Jeannie Sim, one of the consultants for the Northern Territory who contributed to the Burnley report.¹⁰¹ The themes used in each state and territory are discussed in detail below.

Whether the AGHS decides to establish a combined inventory on a single national database or separate lists on one or several databases, it will be necessary to develop an agreed taxonomy with a consistent structure and nomenclature.

APPENDIX F: HERITAGE CRITERIA

It is essential for the Australian Garden History Society to determine and agree on the adoption of a set of Criteria against which to assess each place which is to be placed on any proposed inventory.

If the Australian Garden History Society considers gardens and landscapes can meet one or more of the nationally accepted HERCON criteria then it would seem that these criteria are a natural fit.¹⁰² The HERCON criteria, more or less, are of long standing in heritage identification in Australia, dating from the earliest town planning controls in Victoria and the writing of the Burra Charter in the mid-1970s. The Burra Charter, in Article 1.2 Definitions states that “Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations” and the Guidelines to the Burra Charter state:

2. 2 **Aesthetic value**

Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria may include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with the place and its use.

2. 3 **Historic value**

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society, and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the terms set out in this section. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase or activity. It may also have historic value as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or event survives in situ, or where the settings are substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment.

2. 4 **Scientific value**

The scientific or research value of a place will depend on the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

2. 5 **Social value**

Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group. (Social value was included in the 1999 revision of the Burra Charter.)

It should be noted that ‘associative value’ is incorporated into ‘historical value’. Similarly ‘spiritual value’ is incorporated into ‘social value’. The terms ‘representative’ and ‘uncommon or rare’ are not included in the Burra Charter but can be seen as thresholds as much as values. The economic value of a place should not and cannot be considered in the process of establishing cultural significance.

The criteria used by each state and the ACT are discussed in more detail below.

APPENDIX G: HERITAGE THRESHOLDS

Thresholds are used to test the level of significance of heritage places. In establishing an inventory, it is essential that the Australian Garden History Society determine and incorporate thresholds which each place must meet prior to inclusion on the inventory. The statutory level of significance has implications for the management of the place. Four levels are generally recognised: local, state, national and international or world significance. The levels of significance are always relative and should be assessed by a comparative analysis of the values of a place with its peers, if they exist. It is in this sense that ‘representative’ and ‘uncommon or rare’ can be useful as thresholds rather than values.

Sometimes another level, ‘regional’ is used but, although the concept may be useful, it is problematic because the extent of the region is rarely defined. It usually straddles statutory boundaries, crossing municipal or state borders, for example. The term regional can also be used internationally with Australia falling into the South East Asia, Pacific and even Antarctic regions.

The assessment of relative levels of significance is a matter for objective judgement by professionals and by the community. This assessment is likely to have been made already in the preparation of existing inventories.

The thresholds used by each state and the ACT are discussed in more detail below.

Table 1: Relative Significance and Management Responsibilities, A Guide to Heritage Listing in Australia, (2008).¹⁰³

Level of government	Heritage responsibility	Heritage list	Threshold for listing
Australian / National	World Heritage These places have outstanding universal values above and beyond the values they hold for a particular nation. For example, the Great Barrier Reef.	World Heritage List Places in Australia are nominated by the Australian Government but the list is maintained by the World Heritage Centre of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), based in Paris.	Outstanding universal value
	National Heritage Our most valued natural, Indigenous and historic heritage sites. They reflect the richness of our natural heritage and the story of our development, from our original inhabitants to present day, Australia’s spirit and ingenuity, and our unique, living landscapes. For example, Old Parliament House in Canberra.	National Heritage List	Outstanding heritage value to the nation
	Commonwealth Heritage These are places owned or controlled by the Australian Government. For example, Geraldton Drill Hall Complex, WA.	Commonwealth Heritage List	Significant heritage value

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">State and territory</p>	<p>State and territory heritage</p> <p>These are places of special interest in the broader context of the state or territory. They must have some important significance to the state or territory in its widest sense (rather than just a locally important place). For example, a colonial building.</p>	<p>ACT Heritage Register</p> <p>NSW State Heritage Register</p> <p>NT Heritage Register</p> <p>Queensland Heritage Register</p> <p>SA Heritage Register</p> <p>Tasmanian Heritage Register</p> <p>Victorian Heritage Register</p> <p>WA Register of Heritage Places</p> <p>Some of these lists deal with all types of heritage – natural, Indigenous and historic, and some also deal with heritage objects. Some states and territories also have a separate Indigenous site register.</p>	<p>Importance or significance to the state or territory</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Local government</p>	<p>Local heritage</p> <p>These places are significant in the context of a local area. They contribute to the individuality and streetscape, townscape, landscape or natural character of an area and are matters controlled by local government. They often reflect the socio-economic or natural history of a local area. For example, a church or town hall.</p>	<p>ACT: incorporated in the territory register</p> <p>NSW: NSW State Heritage Inventory/Local Environment Plan</p> <p>Qld: local government heritage register</p> <p>SA: list in Council Development Plan</p> <p>Tas: list in planning scheme heritage schedules</p> <p>Vic: scheduling in Heritage Overlay or other mechanism in local government planning scheme</p> <p>WA: Municipal Inventory.</p>	<p>Importance or significance to the local community</p>

APPENDIX H: USEFULNESS OF MOST RELEVANT LISTS

The following table summarises the scope and usefulness of the most relevant existing lists for inclusion within the AGHS master list database.

List name	Application	Usefulness 1 = limited use 5 = exceptionally useful
Australian Heritage Database	National	5
Australian Heritage Places Inventory	National & State	5
National Heritage Register	National	4
Register of the National Estate	National, State & Local	3
Open Garden Scheme	National	1
Local heritage lists (held by municipalities)	Local	4
State/territory heritage registers on: Queensland State Heritage Database Victorian State Heritage Database (HERMES) Australian Capital Territory Database NSW State Heritage Database SA State Heritage Database Tasmanian State Heritage Database WA State Heritage Database	State	4
<i>Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia</i> report)	National, State & Local	4
AGHS work (various reports)	National, State & Local	3

APPENDIX I: STATE MATRIX

MATRIX OF EXISTING LISTINGS OF SIGNIFICANT GARDENS, TREES AND LANDSCAPES

Note: *Australian Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia* (eds. Richard Aitken, Jan Schapper, Juliet Ramsay and Michael Looker) provides inventories of designed landscapes, arranged under type within each state and highly useful bibliographical material: (ACT, VOL 1, appendix 1)(VIC Vol 1, appendix 2 - includes studies such as Watts 1980 Historic Gardens Study, vols 1 & 2 including inventories)(WA - appendix 3 - not as well represented in terms of actual PLACES but reference material and bibliographical/technical information is useful)

	VIC	NSW	TAS	SA	WA	ACT
Overarching List or Repository	Victorian heritage Database	State Heritage Inventory	none	South Australian Heritage Places Database	Places Database	
	HERMES	internal dbase?	internal database?	internal similar to HERMES?	?	
Web based address?	http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/#	http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_04.cfm		http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/index.cfm?objectID=F2ADC01D-F203-0D46-AD421807BC2E7F91	http://register.heritage.wa.gov.au/	
Government Agency owned/managed heritage places	Yes	Yes	n/a	?	?	
Places on State heritage register?	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	Yes	
Places on Local Statutory lists/register/schedule ?	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	Yes	
Places identified as potentially significant but not assessed or tested as yet?	Yes (yes, only in HERMES)	?	n/a	Yes (provisionally listed)	?	
	Yes					

Local Significance							
		VIC	NSW	TAS	SA	WA	ACT
	Relevant Act	P&E Act 1987	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979	<i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i>	Development Act 1993	Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990	Don't think there is such a thing as locally significant - all appears to be under the ACT Heritage Register?
	Schedule or List Name	Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the local Planning Scheme	Local Environmental Plan (LEP)	Schedule - Heritage Sites (seem to be taken from National Trust and RNE Registers) great variation across municipalities in terms of PS format and heritage schedules	Municipality Based Development Plan	Local Government Inventory (previously referred to as Municipal inventory)	n/a?
		Significant Landscape Overlay					
	Municipality based?	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Yes	district or township based
	Regional significance identified?	No	Yes, recorded in Regional Environmental Plan (REP)	no evidence of regional significance	?	?	none
	Statement of Significance?	Yes - variety of quality, inconsistent methodology	Yes - variety of quality, inconsistent methodology	unable to view online	not able to view on line	not available online	n/a?
	Criteria for Assessment	Heritage Council Criteria for Assessment	NSW Heritage Assessment Criteria	not available on line	places must meet at least one of the criteria in section 23(4) of the Development Act.	Criteria for the Assessment of Local Places and Areas closely follows Burra Charter	n/a?
	Citation available online	Yes	Yes	No	only most basic information through online database	No - only very basic information available through dbase	n/a?
	Linked or included in State Register or List	Yes in VHD	Yes in SHI	No	Yes in SAHPD	Yes in PD	n/a?

State Significance							
		VIC	NSW	TAS	SA	WA	ACT
	Relevant Act	Heritage Act 1994	NSW Heritage Act 1977	<i>Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995.</i>	Heritage Places Act 1993	Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990	<i>Heritage Act 2004</i>
	Municipality identified	Yes, clearly and sort by available through HERMES	Yes, clearly and sort by available	Yes, list is permanently sorted by municipality		Yes, sort by available in advanced search	No, but 'district' and 'suburb' are available as search criteria
	Criteria Assessed Against?	Heritage Council Criteria for Assessment (HERCON)	State Heritage Register Criteria (identical to HERCON)	Tasmanian Historic Heritage Assessment Criteria - these appear to be similar to the pre 2008 criteria used broadly at State Level.	Criteria set out section 16 of the Heritage Places Act 1993	Criteria for the Assessment of Places of State Significance (closely follows Burra Charter)	Seems to follow the old RNE criteria
	Statement of Significance?	Yes but varies in format, quality etc. Earliest often has no S of S	Yes but varies in format, quality etc. Earliest often has no S of S	none provided on line		Not available on line	search was so difficult to use (only search by street or title information)
	Available online	Yes	Yes	Yes as a list of very limited information only	Yes but only general information	Yes but only general information	?
	Name of List	Victorian Heritage Register	State Heritage Register	Tasmanian Heritage Register	SA Heritage Register	The State Register of Heritage Places	ACT Heritage Register

National Significance							
		VIC	NSW	TAS	SA	WA	ACT
	Relevant Act	EBPC	EPBC	EPBC	EPBC	EPBC	EPBC
	Municipality identified		?				
	Statement of Significance?		?				
	Available online	Yes	?				
	Linked or included in State Register or List	Yes	No				
Community Lists and Registers		National Trust of Victoria (Australia)	Art Deco Society Register (1918-1939)				
			National Trust	National Trust	National Trust	National Trust	National Trust
			Royal Australian Institute of Architects' Register of 20th Century Buildings				
			Geological Society Register				
			Australian Institute of Engineers Australia				
			Professional Historians Association (NSW) Register of Historic Places and Objects				
			Australian Museums on Line	Australian Museums on Line	Australian Museums on Line	Australian Museums on Line	Australian Museums on Line
Additional lists or registers			Conservation and Heritage Registers - Government Agencies S.170 Registers Included on State Heritage Inventory				
		Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)	Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)	Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)	Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)	Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)	Australian Commonwealth Heritage List (owned or leased by the Commonwealth with heritage value)
		Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)	Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)	Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)	Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)	Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)	Aboriginal Sites Register (managed by National Parks and Wildlife)
		Significant Tree Register - maintained by some local governments		City of Hobart Significant Tree Register			
					Significant Tree Legislation		Significant Tree Legislation

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Richard Aitken, Jan Schapper, Juliet Ramsay and Michael Looker, eds, *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*, Burnley College, The University of Melbourne, 1998.
- ² <http://www.icomos.org/landscapes/ISC%20CL%20Aust%20Gdn%20Inventory%201.pdf>
- ³ Australian Heritage Commission, *The Heritage of Australia, the Illustrated Register of the National Estate*, The Macmillan Company of Australia in association with the AHC, South Melbourne, 1981, p. 9.
- ⁴ Watts Report; note: there seems to be a discrepancy between the total of 153 stated by Watts and the tally of the individual nominations of 134.
- ⁵ Letter from project coordinator, Peter Watts instructing nominators, dated 29th January 1985, incorporated into report.
- ⁶ John Patrick, comp., *Gardens of Victoria*, ABC Enterprises, Sydney, 1987.
- ⁷ Juliet Ramsay, 'Inventory of Heritage Gardens and Parklands, Australia' for the ICOMOS-IFLA International Scientific Committee for Cultural Landscapes', 2007.
- ⁸ Tanner, Howard and Jane Begg, *The Great Gardens of Australia*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1976.
- ⁹ Michael Martin McCarthy, special ed., *Australia the Beautiful, Great Gardens*, Ure Smith Press, Willoughby, NSW, 1983 and 1991.
- ¹⁰ Watts, Peter, *The Gardens of Edna Walling*, National Trust of Australia (Victoria), Women's Committee, Melbourne, 1981; republished as *Edna Walling and her gardens*, Florilegium, [Balmain, N.S.W.], 1991.
- ¹¹ Dixon, Trisha and Jennie Churchill, *Gardens in Time, in the footsteps of Edna Walling*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1988; *The Vision of Edna Walling: garden plans 1920-1951*, Blooming's Books, Hawthorn, Vic., 1998.
- ¹² Australian Gallery Directors Council and Howard Tanner, *Converting the Wilderness: the Art of Gardening in Colonial Australia*, exhibition catalogue, Sydney, 1979-1980.
- ¹³ McPhee Gribble Publishers, eds., *An Australian Gardener's Anthology*, McPhee Gribble Publishers, Melbourne, 1982, republished 1989.
- ¹⁴ Christine Downer, *Picturesque Victoria through the eyes of William Tibbits: an exhibition of 19th century architectural and landscape painting*, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, 1983; Shar Jones, *Portraits in the landscape: the house paintings of William Tibbits, 1870-1906*, Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales, Glebe, NSW, 1984; and George Tibbits, *William Tibbits, 1837-1906: cottage, house and garden artist*, Dept. of Architecture and Building, University of Melbourne, Parkville, 1984.
- ¹⁵ Tracy Cooper-Lavery, ed., with essays by Jane Clark and James Broadbent, *Town and Country: Portraits of Colonial Homes and Gardens*, Bendigo Art Gallery, Bendigo, 2005.
- ¹⁶ Clune Galleries, *Conrad Martens, 1801-1878: [exhibition held at] Clune Galleries, Sydney, 19--?*, Clune Galleries, Sydney.
- ¹⁷ Ruth Pullin, *Eugene von Guérard, Nature Revealed*, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, 2012; Simon Gregg, *Nicolas Chevalier, Australian Odyssey*, Gippsland Art Gallery, Sale, 2011.
- ¹⁸ Richard Aitken and Michael Looker, eds., *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens*, Oxford University Press, with the AGHS, Oxford and Melbourne, 2002. The more recently published *Encyclopaedia of Australian Architecture*, edited by Philip Goad and Julie Willis, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 2011 is a useful but limited source of information for places and people.
- ¹⁹ See Helen M. Cohn, 'Garden Magazines', *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardening*, pp. 251-2 for a general discussion and other individual entries.
- ²⁰ For example, an article on "Garden at Eryldene" appears in *The Home*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2 January 1940, Sydney Ure Smith, Sydney, Australia.
- ²¹ A full list of studies is available at: <http://www.dpcd.vic.gov.au/heritage/publications-and-research/councils>.

-
- ²² Timothy Hubbard and Michael Looker, 'Significant Tree and Garden Study', City of Prahran, Timothy Hubbard Pty Ltd, St Kilda, 1992 which was awarded the Royal Australian Planning Institute Award for Planning Excellence.
- ²³ Jill Burness, John Fordham, *Mortlake Tree Study*, Moyne Shire Council, the Authors, West Footscray, Vic., 1995.
- ²⁴ <http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/Sustainability/UrbanForest/Pages/ExceptionalTreeRegister.aspx> (accessed 5 July 2012)
- ²⁵ Copy held by Heritage Matters Pty Ltd, formerly heritage adviser to the Glenelg Shire.
- ²⁶ Watts, Peter, edited by Margaret Barrett, *Historic gardens of Victoria: a reconnaissance from a report of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria)*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1983.
- ²⁷ Watts, Peter, *Edna Walling and her gardens*, [Balmain, N.S.W.]: Florilegium, 1991 (Previous ed. published as: *The gardens of Edna Walling*, Melbourne: National Trust of Australia (Victoria), Women's Committee, 1981).
- ²⁸ Johnston, Christine, 'Victorian Gardens Inventory', Heritage Branch, Ministry for Planning & Environment, Melbourne, 1988.
- ²⁹ Johnston, 'Victorian Gardens Inventory', p. 10.
- ³⁰ Richard Aitken, *Garden history and historic gardens in Victoria, a bibliography of secondary sources*, AGHS (Victorian Branch), Melbourne, 1990.
- ³¹ Cannon, Michael, ed., *Australia's Upper Middle Class in the Edwardian Age*, Vol. 1, *Victoria's Representative Men at Home: Punch's illustrated interviews, by Lauderdale*, Today's Heritage, Melbourne, 198-.
- ³² Personal communication with, Christopher Wain, ED, NTA(ACT), 23 April 2012.
- ³³ ACT Heritage Committee, *The ACT heritage study: a strategy for the conservation of places of cultural heritage significance: working papers*, copy held at NLA.
- ³⁴ Bruce Chapman, *A guide to arboreta in the Australian Capital Territory*, A.C.T. Region, Royal Australian Institute of Parks and Recreation, Canberra, 1984.
- ³⁵ G.P. Murphy, 'Parks and gardens in Canberra: origins and foundation, 1911-1920, a paper given to the Canberra and District Historical Society, 19 Nov 1963, copy held in NLA.
- ³⁶ Ken Taylor, 'Cultural pastoral landscapes of significance: perceptions, values and protection', Australian Institute of Landscape Architects Conference, Canberra, 1984.
- ³⁷
[http://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/1102710?lookfor=\(embassy\)%20AND%20\(garden\)%20AND%20\(canberra\)%20{\(author-cluster:"Moir%20and%20Slater%20\(Firm\)"\)%20AND%20author-cluster:"Moir%20and%20Sutherland%20\(Firm\)"}&offset=1&max=1](http://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/1102710?lookfor=(embassy)%20AND%20(garden)%20AND%20(canberra)%20{(author-cluster:)
- ³⁸ This is a CD ROM; *A gardener's city: Canberra's garden heritage*, produced for The Australian Garden History Society by the Production Hub, Melbourne, 2006.
- ³⁹ http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_04.cfm
- ⁴⁰ <http://www.nationaltrust.com.au/about/history/>
- ⁴¹ Personal communication with Mara Barnes, Conservation Services Co-ordinator, NTA(NSW), 14 May 2012.
- ⁴² <http://www.hht.net.au/about>
- ⁴³ http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_04.cfm
- ⁴⁴
<http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/environment/documents/TreeManagement/SignificantTreeRegister/RSTVolume1ParksandPublicReserves.pdf>
- ⁴⁵ Landarc Pty Ltd, 'Register of Significant Trees', The City of Sydney, adopted 2005.
-

-
- ⁴⁶ The consultants are grateful to Mandy Stroebel for bringing the survey to our attention. It is available online at <http://www.orangesignificantscapes.com.au/>.
- ⁴⁷ Personal communication with Alison Russell, Planning Officer, City of Orange, 6 July 2012.
- ⁴⁸ Personal communication with Rochelle Kent, Planning Officer, City of Orange, 5 July 2012.
- ⁴⁹ Richard Aitken, Jan Schapper, Juliet Ramsay and Michael Looker, eds, *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*, Burnley College, The University of Melbourne, 1998, Vol. Three, Appendix Six.
- ⁵⁰ James Broadbent, *The Australian Colonial House, Architecture and Society in New South Wales 1788-1842*, Hordern House, Sydney in assoc. with the HHT of NSW, 1997; and Joan Kerr and James Broadbent, *Gothick Taste in the Colony of New South Wales*, The David Ell Press, Sydney in association with the Elizabeth Bay House Trust, 1980.
- ⁵¹ Maurice Cantlon, *Homesteads of Southern New South Wales, 1830-1900*, Queensberry Hill Press, Carlton, Vic, 1981.
- ⁵² Peter Freeman, *The Homestead, A Riverina Anthology*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1982.
- ⁵³ David Wilkinson, Leslie Wilkinson, Valadon Publishing, Sydney, 1982.
- ⁵⁴ Personal communication with Jeffrey Sewart, Team Leader Implementation Team, Department of Planning and Local Government, 11 May 2012.
- ⁵⁵ <http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/index.cfm?objectID=F2548538-F203-0D46-A665CD808D301411>.
- ⁵⁶ *Geographic information systems - Geographic data - Interchange of feature-coded digital mapping data*, Standards Australia, 1989.
- ⁵⁷ <http://www.heritage.gov.au/ahpi/sa.html>
- ⁵⁸ Personal communication with Glenn Williams, Natural Heritage Manager, NTA(SA), 14 May 2012.
- ⁵⁹ http://www.nationaltrustsa.org.au/index.php/advocacy/significant_trees/#national_trust.
- ⁶⁰ However, the links did not work on the occasions when the system was tested.
- ⁶¹ Personal communication with Peter Wells, SA State Heritage Unit, 11 May 2012.
- ⁶² Tony Whitehill and Rodney Beames, *Some Historic Gardens of South Australia*, National Trust of South Australia with the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide, 1981 and 1988.
- ⁶³ David Jones in Richard Aitken, et al., *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*, Vol. Two, Appendix Four, p. 27.
- ⁶⁴ David Jones in Richard Aitken, et al., *A Theoretical Framework for Designed Landscapes in Australia*, Vol. Two, Appendix Four, Table 4.2.1, p. 52.
- ⁶⁵ Jones, *Theoretical Framework*, Appendix II, p. 5.
- ⁶⁶ David Saunders, director, *Architectural Papers*, Department of Architecture, University of Adelaide, 1980.
- ⁶⁷ Susan Marsden, Paul Stark and Patricia Sumerling, *Heritage of the City of Adelaide*, Corporation of the City of Adelaide, Adelaide, 1990.
- ⁶⁸ A draft Bill proposing a number of amendments to the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995* is now available for comment, before being referred to State Parliament. Submissions on the draft Bill had to be submitted in writing by Friday 13 April 2012.
- ⁶⁹ Email from David Scott, 23 Jan 2012 in reply to detailed queries.
- ⁷⁰ Personal communication with NTA(Tas), 17 April 2012.
- ⁷¹ <http://soer.justice.tas.gov.au/2003/her/6/issue/105/ataglace.php>, accessed 17 April 2012. See also <http://soer.justice.tas.gov.au/2003/her/6/issue/105/index.php> for further details.
- ⁷² The draft 2009 scheme will be superseded by a new draft planning scheme prepared in accordance with Planning Directive No. 1 - The Planning Scheme Template for Tasmania released by the

Tasmanian Planning Commission in June 2011. The new draft planning scheme will contain State, regional and local provisions and will be made available for public consultation in 2012.

⁷³ Regan Douglas, *New Town and Lenah Valley Significant Gardens Study*, for Hobart City Council, James Douglas & Associates Pty Ltd, City Beach, WA, [1999?].

⁷⁴ The 1996 Planning Scheme is presently in force.

⁷⁵ Symons, Phyl Frazer, *Historic Tasmanian Gardens*, Mulini Press, Canberra, 1987.

⁷⁶ E Graeme Robertson and Edith Craig, *Early Houses of Northern Tasmania, an Historical and Architectural Survey*, Vols. I & II, Georgian House, Melbourne, 1964; and E Graeme Robertson, *Early Buildings of Southern Tasmania*, Vols. I & II, Georgian House, Melbourne, 1970.

⁷⁷ Malor, Deborah, 'Making a list, checking it twice...', *Blue Gum*, AGHS Tasmanian Branch, Newsletter No. 95, Nov. 2005, pp. 1 & 4.

⁷⁸ Many types, such as 'Residential Garden', 'Kitchen/Vegetable Garden', 'Market Garden', and 'Pastoral' are not yet fully developed but this is a minor concern because the basic model is already well developed.

⁷⁹ http://www.edowa.org.au/files/factsheets/bhpl_heritage_protection.pdf.

⁸⁰ Personal communication with Clare Nunan, NTA(WA), 11 May 2012. (clare.nunan@ntwa.com.au)

⁸¹ <http://traces.duit.uwa.edu.au/>

⁸² It expects to reactivate the register as part of the proposed national Register of Significant Trees.

⁸³ John Pidgeon and Oline Richards, *Woodbridge West Midland WA: conservation plan*, National Trust of Australia (WA), Perth, 1995.

⁸⁴ Lorraine Lingard and Kath Napier, *Guilford Garden Study, 1829-1930s*, National Trust of Australia (WA), Landscape and Conservation Committee, West Perth, Heritage Council of Western Australia, 1993.

⁸⁵ Duncan Richards and Oline Richards, *Historic Gardens Study (WA), final Report*, National Trust of Australia (WA), Perth, 1980.

⁸⁶ Duncan Richards and Oline Richards, *Gardens and Trees of the Kimberley, Western Australia, a survey of historic places, gardens & trees undertaken for the National Trust of Australia (WA)*, National Trust of Australia (WA), Perth, 1983.

⁸⁷ Oline Richards, 'The Avenue in Peace, honour avenues of the Great War in Western Australia, in Max Bourke and Colleen Morris, eds., *Studies in Australian Garden History*, Vol. 1, Australian Garden History Society, Melbourne, 2003.

⁸⁸ C. T. Onions, ed., *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 832.

⁸⁹ Richard Aitken and Michael Looker, eds., *Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens*, Oxford University Press, with the AGHS, Oxford and Melbourne, 2002, pp. 242-3.

⁹⁰ *The Florence Charter*, ICOMOS-IFLA International Committee for Historic Gardens, meeting in Florence on 21 May 1981, ratified and published by ICOMOS on 15 December 1982 as an addendum to the Venice Charter.

⁹¹ C. T. Onions, ed., *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 1174.

⁹² Australian Heritage Commission, *Australian Historic Themes: a framework for use in heritage assessment and management*, with Jane Lennon and the Centre for Western Australian History, Canberra 2001.

The document is available online at:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/ahc/publications/commission/books/pubs/australian-historic-themes.pdf>; and

<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/ahc/publications/commission/books/pubs/australian-historic-themes-framework.pdf>

⁹³ Juliet Ramsay, *Parks, Gardens and Special Trees: A Classification and Assessment Method for the Register of the National Estate*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra, 1991.

⁹⁴ Aitken., 1998, p. 18 & 19.

⁹⁵ Richard Aitken, “Brief for the Thematic Framework for the Designed Landscape Study”, unpublished document.

⁹⁶ UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, 2011, p. 88.

⁹⁷ Richard Apperley, et al., eds., *A Pictorial Guide to Identifying Australian Architecture, Styles and Terms from 1788 to the Present*, Angus and Robertson, Melbourne, 1989, p. 20.

⁹⁸ Aitken., 1998, pp. 26ff.

⁹⁹ Aitken, 1998, Appendix Two, pp. 66-84.

¹⁰⁰ Aitken., 1998, p. 33.

¹⁰¹ Richard Aitken and Michael Looker, eds., *The Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens*, published in association with the Australian Garden History Society, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 575-6.

¹⁰² ‘HERCON’ is the name given to the standard National heritage assessment criteria that were recently adopted by each state and territory.

¹⁰³ *A Guide to Heritage Listing in Australia, thresholds for different levels of heritage listing*, Environment Protection and Heritage Council, Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Canberra, 2008.

http://www.ephc.gov.au/sites/default/files/HTG_Brch__Guide_to_Heritage_listing_200901.pdf