

MOVING BUILDINGS

A study of issues surrounding moving buildings of heritage value for use in outdoor museums in Queensland

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This study

Context

Specifics of moving heritage buildings to a heritage museum

Legislative framework

Policy framework

Cultural significance

Management issues

Recommendations

1.2 Community attitudes towards moving historic buildings

1.3 Policy implications

2. CONTEXT

2.1 Historical perspective on moving buildings in Queensland

The types of buildings and structures that were and are moved.

2.2 Specifics of moving heritage buildings to a heritage museum

Why move buildings?

Background to outdoor museums internationally and in Australia

Queensland museum complexes containing relocated historic buildings:

2.3 Legislative framework

Australian Heritage Commission Act

Queensland Heritage Act

Local government controls

2.4 Policy framework

Financial constraints

Government Strategic Asset Management - asset disposal process

National Trust policies

Australia ICOMOS –Burra Charter

Aesthetic value

Historic value

Scientific value

Social value

Burra Charter implications

3. RETAINING CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Effect of removal and relocation on heritage values of buildings

3.2 Relocating objects from historic sites

3.3 Retaining existing significance

3.4 Retaining aesthetic value

[3.5 Retaining historic value](#)
[3.6 Retaining scientific value](#)
[3.7 Retaining social value](#)

[4. MANAGEMENT ISSUES](#)

[4.1 Methods used to try and retain context](#)

[Recording the place:](#)

[Moving:](#)

[Landscape considerations:](#)

[Moving contents:](#)

[4.2 Problems associated with managing moved buildings](#)

[4.3 Adaptive re-use of moved buildings](#)

[4.4 Sustainability](#)

[4.5 Interpreting moved buildings](#)

[4.6 Conclusions](#)

[5. RECOMMENDATIONS](#)

[5.1 Deciding to move a building.](#)

[5.2 Managing a building that has already been moved.](#)

[5.3 Implications for funding.](#)

[5.4 Policy requirements](#)

[6. BIBLIOGRAPHY](#)

[APPENDICES](#)

[7.1 Queensland Case Studies](#)

[Bellevue](#)

[Caboolture Historical Village](#)

[Capella Pioneer Village](#)

[Earlystreet Historical Village](#)

[Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Woolshed Museum & Park](#)

[Rockhampton Heritage Village](#)

[Townsville Heritage Village](#)

[Carpenter's Estimates of Building Repair Costs.](#)

[REVISED BURRA CHARTER](#)

[The Burra Charter \(November 1999\)](#)

[Preamble](#)

[Who is the Charter for?](#)

[Using the Charter](#)

[What places does the Charter apply to?](#)

[Why conserve?](#)



Caboolture Historical Village

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the role of Jinx Miles of the National Trust who saw the need for the study, organised the funding application and supervised the study including establishing a reference group. This included Denise Neville of Mirani who represented Museums Australia Queensland and wrote an article in *Museum News* (November 1999) canvassing comments from historical villages; Greg Connolly and Natalie Cook from Arts Queensland; John Hoystead from Environmental Protection Agency and Niall Mackin of Public Works.

Judy Rechner prepared the detailed Appendix 7.1.

In addition, Les Gleadhill of Caboolture and the Caboolture Historical Village management committee provided details of building condition and history.

Issues raised by the consultant were discussed enthusiastically at a workshop of people attending the Museums Australia (Qld) State Conference at Fairymead

House in Bundaberg on 19 March 2000. Experiences, suggestions and ideas were freely shared and some of these have been incorporated into this paper and its recommendations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Following on from the recommendations in *Hidden Heritage: A Development Plan for Museums in Queensland*, Arts Queensland gave a grant at the end of 1998 to the National Trust to investigate the issues surrounding moving buildings for use in outdoor museums in Queensland and to recommend policies suitable for adoption by heritage organisations, museums and managers of heritage buildings.

1.1 This study

This study investigates the consequences of moving buildings for use in outdoor museums in Queensland and identifies management problems associated with moved buildings. It recommends policies for adoption by heritage organisations and by groups who already manage moved buildings. It provides information for those who may donate a building for removal or acquire one.

It is intended that the policies in the document will be submitted to the Australian Council of National Trusts for consideration in a national policy. The project includes discussions with heritage organisations, like the Cultural Heritage branch of the Environment Protection Agency, museum groups and with government departments who make buildings available for removal, like the Department of Transport.

The National Trust wants to produce the policy because, in spite of continued resistance by heritage organisations, people still move buildings for use as museums and visitors still enjoy sites that contain moved buildings. The Trust does not support moving buildings, yet it manages buildings that have been moved. Popular arguments range from 'a building loses its significance when it loses its context' to 'moving buildings is a historic Queensland activity and should continue'. Often people subscribe to one philosophy or the other without a real understanding of the consequences.

The study addresses the following:

Context

- Historical perspective on moving buildings
- The types of buildings and structures that are moved.

Specifics of moving heritage buildings to a heritage museum

- Why buildings are moved.
- Background to outdoors museums internationally and in Australia
- Queensland examples of museum complexes containing relocated buildings

Legislative framework

- Australian Heritage Commission
- Queensland Heritage Act
- Local government

Policy framework

- Government Strategic Asset management –asset disposal process
- National Trust policies
- Australia ICOMOS –Burra Charter

Cultural significance

- Heritage values of buildings and how these may be affected by moving buildings
- Aesthetic
- Historic
- Scientific
- Social

Management issues

- Methods used to try and retain context –recording, moving landscape features, orientation, moving contents, use.
- Problems associated with managing moved buildings –using and maintaining the buildings on their new site. Sustainability.
- Interpreting moved buildings.
- Options for historical villages.

Recommendations

- Deciding to move a building.
- Managing a building that has already been moved.
- Implications for funding.

1.2 Community attitudes towards moving historic buildings

Individuals often prefer to renovate, restore and refurbish old houses into their homes as part of a trend to connect with the more gracious elements of past living- to secure “a slice of history to grace their acreage block”.... “people hankering for homes with historic charm.” These people often lavish much time and money on their restorations. A major article in *Brisbane’s Courier Mail* (2 June 1999) discussed how relocating old houses is once again a popular option –it may not be cheaper or quicker than building a new house but it holds great appeal largely due to high quality materials and workmanship.

However, the major pitfall is the hidden costs associated with relocation and the initial relocation estimate of \$30,000 can end up costing more than \$100,000.

Community groups band together to 'save' historic buildings from demolition and in the process they 'corral' them into new locations such as recreated villages. For some of these groups the aim is to preserve the history of their locality and they do not want buildings from outside the district –this is the case with Pine Rivers Shire and their North Country Park (*Northern Times*, 12 March 1998).

But does a museum of buildings really conserve local history?

Is the building still retaining its cultural significance and heritage values on its new site or does it have new values?

Has it lost its landscape context and setting?

Does it alter the significance of the environment into which it has been moved?

Is its new use historically appropriate?

Is there enough money for restoration and maintenance?

1.3 Policy implications

Answering these questions has policy implications for the use of public funds. Are we really saving historic buildings by moving them into museum settings?

This report discusses these questions.

DAVID LANE
AUCTIONEERS & VALUERS
under instructions from the owners of "Early Street Historical Village"

**HISTORICAL HOMES
FOR REMOVAL
- FOR SALE BY AUCTION -**
9.00 am Thursday 25th June 1998
ON SITE at Early Street Historical Village
75 McIlwraith Avenue Norman Park

A Colour Brochure is available from the auctioneers on request.
Offers prior to Auction will be considered.
Inspection is by appointment only.
For further information, contact David Nucifora.

29-35 Charlton St,
East Brisbane
Ph: (07) 3391 8277
Fax: (07) 3391 8577

DAVID LANE FOR SPECIAL AUCTION SERVICE

Terms for all Auctions: Cash or bank cheque

2. CONTEXT

2.1 Historical perspective on moving buildings in Queensland

Historically, buildings were moved because it was cheaper to do this rather than build a new structure at the desired site and a completed building was available elsewhere and able to be relocated. The population moved and the administration did not have a budget for new structures yet unused buildings were available elsewhere in the district/region. Contrary to popular belief this practice is not peculiar to Queensland. In the nineteenth century public buildings and private houses were moved from goldfield to goldfield all over Australia. It was generally the case with timber structures of simple design. Many illustrated histories show bullock teams moving buildings from one site to another.

As Peter Bell has shown in his study of North Queensland houses, the origins of their features can be traced to other parts of Australia but the frequent combination and repetition of features gave rise to an unmistakably local style:

...The typical North Queensland house is seldom much to look at, even when the architect has evidently done his best. At their worst they are square wooden boxes on long legs (quoted in Bell, 1987:18).

The distinctive characteristics of Queensland that assist in explaining its regional patterns relate to remoteness from early European settlement in the continent, tropical climate with fungal decay and wind damage, relatively late in Australian settlement history, rapid settlement occupation so that one-sixth of the continent was opened up for lease holding between 1860 and 1864 and an economy dominated by mining whose settlements raised costs in an already inflated economy and gave mining towns an ephemeral character before their inevitable decline and, in some cases, removal.

Because of this remoteness, living in Queensland was expensive; it was also hot, and it was settled by people who did not expect to remain long. Therefore buildings were of simple styles, usually of symmetrical form, built of timber with iron roofs with subdued fret sawn timber or sheet metal embellishment, stud framed, highly industrialized and often pre-fabricated in construction, elevated above ground on timber stumps. These characteristics also explain their ease of relocation.

The oldest known prefabricated building standing in North Queensland is the Cardwell telegraph office erected by a Brisbane contractor in 1870. By the 1880s each major port had one or more sawmills and served as the centre for prefabrication of houses in its hinterland, such as Rooney Brothers in Townsville. However, their timber supplies were not always local and imports from Maryborough, Tasmania, New Zealand and even California were sold at competitive prices. In the early twentieth century there was increased competition from Brisbane based firms, especially James Campbell and Sons and Brown and Broad, and they dominated the domestic building industry by the 1920s so that regional diversity in Queensland house styles virtually disappeared with the First World War (Bell, 1987:20-1).

The use of milled timber and the simple construction of the Queensland house enabled additions and alterations to be made easily. It also meant that if a household had to relocate or a better allotment had been purchased, the building could move too.

Moving houses has been a feature of Queensland life since the first convict settlement at Redcliffe. Its prefabricated huts were dismantled and moved up the river to Brisbane when the garrison was relocated in 1825. Later, the use of stumps in construction enabled a house to be adapted to different topography and old stumps could be recut to the new height or new ones obtained. Some houses had adventurous moves – the Crouch family opened a kiosk and holiday resort at Bishop Island at the mouth of the Brisbane River prior to World War 1 and took their house with them from McConnel Street, Bulimba on a barge; when the resort closed in the 1930s the house sailed back in the same way (Gregory, 1994:8)

Often buildings were moved in the past as part of an event or a pattern of history which may be significant in itself, such as to escape repeated flooding or because of the decline of mining in a district. There is also the tradition of recycling buildings from place to place especially in remote areas where transport of building materials from the place of production is expensive. This was especially the case in the nineteenth century, while in the twentieth century complete settlements were designed for use during the life of the adjacent mine then planned for dismantling and relocation – Mary Kathleen and Greenvale are examples. These moves are accepted as part of our settlement history.

The types of buildings and structures that were and are moved.

Traditionally timber structures were the main ones moved, although brick/masonry buildings have also been moved especially if the building was regarded as having important historical values, such as Mort's bond store on Sydney Harbour.

There are many examples of government /public buildings being moved: post offices, railway station buildings, goods sheds, court houses, schools, as well as private residences. Churches were also moved: for example, St Thomas Catholic Church in Boonah was moved in 1889 from the site now occupied by the Australian Hotel to its current site in Church Street (SAHANZ, 1974). The Emu Park Museum building was a court house then police station at Mount Chalmers before being relocated to Emu Park in 1986.

Clermont is an interesting example of a town being moved to escape repeated flooding.

Mellum Creek township developed around cross roads from Gympie and Blackall Ranges but with the arrival of the railway line in 1890, the town redeveloped around Landsborough station and many buildings were moved, notably the two storey Mellum Club Hotel.

2.2 Specifics of moving heritage buildings to a heritage museum

Why move buildings?

In an historical context buildings were moved for utilitarian reasons:

because the population had moved,

because the building was surplus to government's specific needs in that place,

because it was cheaper to move a structure already built than start from scratch at the new place.

Over the last few decades buildings have been moved –to save them or to collect them as part of the setting for a museum/historical village.

Government departments/ instrumentalities also made buildings available as community public relations exercises.

When buildings are moved now the new use is generally not compatible with the cultural significance of the building, especially when the building which is regarded as historic is used for a new use such as an interpretative display (of its history) or as a museum piece. Many groups collect buildings as sets in which to display their collections. The heritage values of the building are not of major concern in their planning.

The attitude towards relocation is a major problem as groups and sponsors believe they are undertaking conservation action and saving the building, but in reality they are destroying the historical, aesthetic and scientific significance and turning the evidence into something new – and giving it a social significance.

Background to outdoor museums internationally and in Australia

The outdoor museum movement started in Sweden at the turn of the century where vernacular buildings illustrating a disappearing rural folklife were moved to the nation's capital city, Stockholm, and re-erected in a park setting. This was followed in the USA by the creation of outdoor villages in the 1930s such as Greenfield Village, Dearborn, Michigan, where Henry Ford intent on saving old time Americana moved buildings associated with Americans he admired –those of Thomas Edison, Orville and Wilbur Wright, Stephen Foster and eventually his own birth place! Other outdoor museums followed such as the Farmer's Museum at Cooperstown, New York, Old Sturbridge Village, Massachusetts and John D Rockefeller, Jr's Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia.

They all aimed at preserving examples of buildings and lifestyles from previous eras in American history and, with their costumed attendants, presented 'living history'. However such places were intertwined with the development of tourism due to increasing leisure time and visitors wanted entertainment as well as an understanding of the challenges their predecessors had to face and overcome in the path of progress. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 stimulated nation-wide surveys and Americans realised that there were many buildings and sites worthy of preservation, either in historic districts or as part of historical exhibits. A greater variety of structures including vernacular architecture, historic districts, places associated with ethnic and racially diverse groups, and places related to the industrial development came to prominence (Maas, 1976:38-42). Associated with this was the realisation that only a small representative proportion should be retained as house museums. Other sites should be adapted with new uses in old buildings -uses that may radically change the nature but not the external appearance of these structures. Hence places like Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco were redeveloped so that a multi-level complex of shops, restaurants and theatres occupy nineteenth century factories previously manufacturing chocolate, spices, coffee and woolen goods (Costonis, 1976:77). Individual buildings like redundant railroad stations became antique shops, offices or restaurants aimed at preserving a business district's

historic and architectural integrity while maintaining its economic viability (Hosmer, 1976: 91). Urban renewal based around reusing redundant industrial and commercial buildings became a major trend rather than demolition or relocation of these structures.

In Australia outdoor folk museums burst onto the scene in the 1960s along with hundreds of small museums founded as a result of the quickening interest in local history. It was primarily a grass roots movement and one of the most unexpected and vigorous cultural movements in Australia in this century. Victoria had over 20 outdoor folk museums at one stage all vying for government assistance so that a State Development Committee was established in 1977 to report on their problems. Four of the most popular folk museums in Australia in 1975 were large open-air museums which "set out to re-create segments of Australia's past" (Piggott, 1975:25). Three –Swan Hill, Ballarat's Sovereign Hill and the Lachlan Vintage Village at Forbes –were initiated and strongly supported by local inland communities, while the fourth – Old Sydney Town, near Gosford –was an imaginative business venture.

The Piggott committee was concerned about the authenticity of buildings and furnishings as well as the documentation of objects in these museums and recommended government support only if they "conform in essence to the authenticity expected of museums" (Piggott, 1975:27). The committee further recommended that:

- Any federal grants or loans to local or living history museums be given only on condition that qualified historians, archaeologists, curators and other specialists be engaged as advisers.
- Museums which are primarily fun parlours be forced to justify themselves by the standards of the entertainment industry. If they do not entertain enough people to earn the revenue to pay their expenses, they should be allowed to die. Any further government support to this kind of museum be made only after careful assessment of their prospects of becoming self-supporting, and of their authenticity as history displays (Piggott, 1975:28)

Much had been written about the presentation of historic sites and relics in Australia and its generally poor quality, Disneyland approach. Vociferous critics of Disneyland argued that the fun and fantasy were highlighted at the expense of accurate research and authentic reproduction. But by the holding of the first conference to discuss preparation of the first Victoria Heritage Plan in September 1981, the situation had evolved as follows:

The rapid eruption of inauthentic, poor quality open-air folk museums or historical parks for unsuspecting, uneducated tourists seems to have subsided and, although their Darwinian struggle for survival has resulted in the loss of much historical evidence by the rapid relocation of uncatalogued artefacts, retrospective research and more honest presentation should ensure a proper concern for the collections already assembledRecreations, such as Sovereign Hill, can only be a tourist attraction based around an historical theme. This in turn has highlighted

the case for preserving relics and buildings in situ and leaving ruins as reminders of the sense of isolation and European failure to impose its impact on this New World landscape of ours (Lennon, 1981:20).

While little or no federal conservation funds were allocated for such outdoor folk museums, they continued to proliferate largely in response to local community pressure, especially in Queensland. By 1993 there were 234 museums and house museums and 24 outdoor folk museums in Queensland (Lennon, 1995:11) but a glance at the following 36 entries in the 1991 *Directory of Queensland Museums* shows that many museums have historic buildings moved onto their sites.

Queensland museum complexes containing relocated historic buildings:

Atherton Post Office

Beenleigh –“a collection of the district’s oldest buildings”

Bellevue homestead

Biloela –Greycliffe Homestead (slab building c.1870s) moved in 1979

Boonah –Templin Historical Village (at least 6 historic buildings relocated there)

Broweena –Woocoo Historical Museum (at least 6 historic buildings relocated there)

Bundaberg –Hinkler House Memorial Museum – relocated from Southampton, UK, in 1983

Byfield –Raspberry Creek Homestead moved to town in 1987

Caboolture Historical Village – over 60 historic buildings

Caboonbah

Calliope –Port Curtis Historical Village – 9 and “more buildings are being added”

Chinchilla Historical Museum– industrial buildings including saw mill

Cloncurry and Mary Kathleen Memorial Park –historic buildings from the abandoned mining town in a park setting

Carbethon Folk Museum and Pioneer Village, Crows Nest –at least 4 buildings including milking shed

Gas stripping tower, South Brisbane

Gatton Historical Museum –at least 6 historic buildings

Gayndah Historical Museum –reconstructed Bon Bon homestead located beside the original 1864 cottage forming the museum in 1974

Gympie Historical Society Gold Mining Museum –covers 10 ha with relocated buildings not related to gold theme

Harrisville Historical Museum –cottage plus relocated One Teacher School

Hervey Bay Pioneer Village and Museum

Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Museum –many historic buildings moved into this “museum of rural life”

Kenilworth Folk Museum – three buildings

Kilkivan Folk Museum – slab shed

Kingaroy –Kumbia Historical Museum –school, moved to site

Kurwongbah –North Pine Country Village – many relocated local historic buildings

Laidley Historical Museum – at least 10 relocated historic buildings

Miles and District Historical Village –collection of nineteenth century buildings

Mount Perry and District Historical Museum –slab hut and dairy moved in to Old Shire Office

Munduberra and District Historical Museum –two historic buildings

Pittsworth and District Historical Museum – complex of at least four historic buildings

Rockhampton Historical Village – relocated historic buildings

Springsure Historical Museum –two slab buildings and “largest windmill in Queensland”

Stanthorpe and District Historical Museum –complex around old Shire Chambers 1914

Tara and District Museum –slab hut moved in

Taroom and District Historical Museum – 1893 church plus six other historic buildings

Texas Historical Society Museum – six historical buildings

Torbanlea Mining and Pioneer Museum –at least three historic buildings

Townsville –Castling Street Heritage Centre –three relocated North Queensland historic houses

Winton- Qantilda Museum –several relocated historic buildings

Wolston –store moved there.

2.3 Legislative framework

Australian Heritage Commission Act

The Commission established under this Act has a statutory obligation to identify the National Estate which is those components of Australia's natural and cultural heritage that have aesthetic, historic, scientific or social significance or other special value for future generations, as well as for the present community, and to enter these places into a Register of the National Estate. The Commonwealth government agencies have an obligation to take into account the effect of their actions on the National Estate. The Act places obligations on Commonwealth ministers not to undertake any action that may adversely affect a place on the Register of the National Estate, unless there is no feasible or prudent alternative, and that action be taken to minimise this effect where it is unavoidable.

In the *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975* "place" includes:

- a site, area, or region;
- a building or other structure (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure); and
- a group of buildings or other structures (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures);

and, in relation to the conservation or improvement of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of the place.

For the purposes of the Act, a place that is a component of the natural or cultural environment of Australia is to be taken to be a place included in the national estate if it has significance or other special value for future generations as well as for the present community because of any of the following:

- (a) its importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history
- (b) its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history

- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history
- (d) its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of:
 - (i) a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
 - (ii) a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments
- (e) its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group
- (f) its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period
- (g) its strong or special associations with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- (h) its special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history.

Buildings (defined as places) that are entered on the Register of the National Estate would be expected to remain in situ in accordance with the requirement not "to adversely affect a place." The Commission routinely provide section 30 advice on grants given for heritage projects and conservation works and will not agree to relocation of registered buildings.

Queensland Heritage Act

The *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* includes buildings in a much wider definition of place as a:

...defined or readily identifiable area of land (which may be comprised in separate titles and in different ownership), and includes a building and such of its immediate surrounds as may be required for its conservation: a natural feature of historical significance and such of its immediate surrounds as may be required for its conservation;

There are no specific clauses in the heritage legislation prohibiting moving a listed building although, as shown in the following section, relocation is covered by the definition of development and is therefore subject to permit considerations.

Museums are subject to legislation which protects Queensland's cultural heritage, particularly the *Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland)* and *Queensland Estate Act 1987* and the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*. Section 27 (I) of the former Act stipulates the requirement to obtain a permit to study any aspect of the Queensland Estate which is defined as "evidence of man's occupation of the areas comprising Queensland at any time that is at least 30 years in the past". The Act's provisions regarding

the ownership of the Queensland Estate can also apply to community museum activities, although it has not been used for these purposes.

The *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* applies particularly to places entered in the Queensland Heritage Register, especially with respect to the Act's definition of a building as a:

building or structure, or part of a building or structure, together with associated furniture, fittings and other objects that may contribute to its cultural heritage significance.

This provision relates particularly to collections in house museums which are listed in the Queensland Heritage Register. Sections 34 and 35 apply to development which is also defined in the Act and includes relocation. Development is defined in the *Queensland Heritage Act* as

subdivision, change of use, demolition, erection, construction or relocation of buildings, work that substantially alters the appearance of a building, renovation, alteration or addition to a building, and excavation, disturbance or change to landscape and natural features of land that substantially alters the appearance of a place.

Both community museums and house museums have conservation needs. The Burra Charter, reflected in the provisions of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* includes maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation in its definition of conservation. Renovation and restoration can, therefore, be appropriate forms of conservation. These remarks apply to places entered in the Queensland Heritage Register, but could be extended to buildings and places listed in Local Council heritage inventories and some which are not so far included in any inventory.

Renovation and restoration are defined as development in the *Queensland Heritage Act*. The Act requires that proposals for development be approved by the Queensland Heritage Council. This requirement is necessary to ensure that the heritage values of the place are protected; most town planning provisions for the management of cultural heritage places in local inventories have similar development controls.

Museum administrators who decide to embark on a conservation or renovation program of a place entered in the Queensland Heritage Register must apply for approval under Sections 34 and 35 of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*. Provided that the work will not substantially reduce the cultural heritage significance of the place, approval is granted. About 95% of development applications are approved without amendment.

Local government controls

The requirement to observe statutory or town planning development controls is a much less inhibiting factor in museum development. Owners of all listed places in Queensland are entitled to expert conservation

advice free of charge from the Cultural Heritage Branch, Environment Protection Authority. Owners are encouraged to discuss development proposals before formal planning commences. In areas outside Brisbane, Cultural Heritage Regional Program Managers are available for consultation. In Ipswich, Warwick, Toowoomba, Charters Towers and Maryborough, the Department and the City Councils fund heritage conservation advisers to assist owners of heritage places. This scheme is likely to be extended to other places during the next few years.

Some museums are located in historic buildings which form part of an historic precinct giving character and identity to a town. This is the case at Tambo in the Central West and Port Douglas on the Far North Queensland coast. The building and its surrounds should be protected by the provisions of the town plan.

Some museums have specific problems with leasing or obtaining buildings from government agencies. For example, *Caboonbah Homestead* in the Brisbane Valley was resumed by the Water Board and under the *Government Instrumentalities Act*, the Board is not subject to any controls on the land and the 1890 historic building which was Henry Plantagenet Somerset's house. Queensland Rail with its assets rationalisation program, is causing problems for museums who want to acquire railway land and buildings (stations, goods sheds, turntables and station masters' residences), especially where the museum already controls or occupies part of the site as at Gin Gin and Lappa Junction. Again it took three years for Emu Park Museum to get a railway carriage relocated next to their existing building so they could use it to interpret railway holiday excursions to the seaside from their collections.

2.4 Policy framework

Museums occupying listed buildings reflect the diversity of premises used to house museums. This diversity is an indication that use as a general community museum or as a house museum is often regarded as a suitable adaptation of a heritage place when owners cannot devise a more appropriate use. The likelihood of obtaining development approvals, however, should not obscure the difficulties raised by the inappropriate use of some older buildings as museums. This is compounded when collections do not relate to either the building or the local area. The situation of a house museum containing objects which are not evidence of the lives of any of the occupants is similar.

Some historic buildings are museums by virtue of their architectural and historical values; for example Old Government House, Brisbane, in the grounds of the Queensland University of Technology at Garden's Point, was the official residence of the Governors of Queensland from 1862 to 1910 and is now being restored by the National Trust as a house museum - they call the process "A Museum in preparation".

Financial constraints

Finance is a problem, even though some museums are subsidised by Local Councils, and occasionally received grant funding under the now defunct National Estate Grants Program (which operated from 1975 until 1998) or the Queensland Heritage Grants Program or benefit from special government programs such as the previous Commonwealth Government's One Nation program which assisted the Blackall Woolscour. Currently the plethora of funding programs available as part of the Centenary of Federation will assist many museums.

The issue of finance is usually the factor which most restricts building conservation projects.

It is always recommended that owners of listed places invest in the preparation of a conservation plan. The conservation plan identifies particular points of significance, areas of special sensitivity and aspects requiring urgent attention and establishes policies for the conservation of heritage values, as well as explaining the cultural heritage significance of the place in the context of its history, design and development. This enables a program of conservation and renovation work to be planned according to the owner's resources and priorities. It is particularly recommended that Local Councils who own listed buildings used as museum premises fund the preparation of conservation plans for these places. The award winning, recycled building housing the Toowoomba Regional Art Gallery went through this process. Heritage buildings included in the Queensland Heritage Trails Network projects will have to be covered by conservation plans as a first step in the museum/heritage centre development process.

Provision of capital is usually the major drawback to developing a new building to store/exhibit museum collections and so old and/or historic buildings form or are moved into form the nucleus of the museum. In contrast, the Bicentennial provided funding for the construction of new, purpose-designed buildings such as the Stockman's Hall of Fame at Longreach, John Flynn Place at Cloncurry, the Australian Sugar Museum at Mourilyan, Shire of Mirani Museum and Shire of Miriam Vale Museum at Agnes Waters.

Government Strategic Asset Management - asset disposal process

The State government has a disposal strategy that is outlined in the provisions of its Strategic Assets Manual. Assets exist only to support service delivery, otherwise they are deemed surplus to requirements and available for sale or other disposal.

Some departments regard disposal as a community benefit. Queensland Rail for example, "endeavours to assist councils and community groups to acquire buildings of local interest when they are surplus to operational requirements" (Minister for Transport, 25 October, 1999). The donation is expedient and often supported by local authorities but this can create problems later on because the building/structure loses its significance

when it is removed from its operational context. This issue is discussed in further detail in the case studies.

National Trust policies

In accordance with the principles of the Burra Charter, the National Trust has now adopted a position of not supporting relocation of historic buildings except in exceptional cases.

Australia ICOMOS –Burra Charter

The Australian committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) having regard to international charters for conservation and restoration developed its own charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance in Australia – this was adopted at a meeting in Burra Burra, South Australia in 1979, hence the Burra Charter.

The Charter contains definitions and sets down conservation principles and processes to be followed in managing conservation works to places of significance. For 20 years this charter has been the guide for heritage conservation practice in Australia.

Cultural significance is the term used in the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places (the Burra Charter) and the *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975* to refer to qualities and attributes possessed by places that have aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations. In the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* cultural heritage significance is defined more broadly to include “aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social or of technological significance to the present generation or past or future generations.” These cultural heritage values may be seen in a place’s physical features, but can also be associated with intangible qualities such as people’s associations with or feelings for a place. Indigenous places may have other layers of significance as well as those mentioned here; these meanings are defined by the indigenous communities themselves.

Cultural significance is a concept which helps in estimating the value of places. The places that are likely to be of significance are those which help an understanding of the past or enrich the present, and which will be of value to future generations. Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations (Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places– the Burra Charter, Article 1.2).

Criteria for assessing the cultural significance of a place are listed in heritage legislation. Those relevant to Australia’s cultural history, including indigenous history, are listed in the *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975*. (See section 2.3 of this report). Almost identical criteria apply to Queensland in section 23(1) of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*. The criteria address the values of cultural significance and the meanings of these values are described as follows:

Aesthetic value

This comes from people experiencing the environment and includes all aspects of sensory perception, visual and non-visual, and 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; emotional response and any other factors having a strong impact on human feelings and attitudes. The Queensland Act narrows the definition of aesthetic significance of a place or object to "its visual merit or interest."

Historic value

A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase, period 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 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, such as with massacre sites or explorers' landing sites.

Scientific value

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon 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 about environmental, cultural, technological and historical processes.

Social value

This embraces the qualities for which a place has become the focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a group. It is a special meaning important to a community's identity, perhaps through their use of the place or association with it. Places which are associated with events that have had a great impact on a community often have high social value.

Indigenous values are embodied in the cultural, spiritual, religious, social or other importance a place may have for indigenous communities. Significance must be determined through consultation with the relevant indigenous community.

Burra Charter implications

The revision of sections of the Burra Charter has broadened the understanding of what is cultural significance by recognising that significance may lie in more than just the fabric of the place. Thus 'significance is embodied in the place itself, its setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects' (Australia ICOMOS,

September 1999). "Use" means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur there. "Compatible use" means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no or minimal impact on cultural significance, or changes that are substantially reversible.

As well as use, associations and meanings are further defined as part of the new revisions: "Associations" means the special connections that exist between people and a place, including social or spiritual value and associations connected to people's cultural rights and responsibilities for the place. "Meanings" means what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses for people, including intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories.

Article 9 of the Burra Charter stated that:

A building or work should remain in its historical location. The moving of all or part of a building or work is unacceptable unless this is the sole means of ensuring its survival.

The revised Burra Charter splits Article 9 into two new articles to more fully deal with relocation of culturally significant structures:

Article 9.1 Location

The physical location of a *place* is part of its *cultural significance*. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival, or unless Article 9.2 applies.

Article 9.2 Movable structures

Some buildings, works or other components of *places* were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have strong links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.

If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate *use*. Such an action should not be to the detriment of any *place* of cultural *significance*.

3. RETAINING CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Effect of removal and relocation on heritage values of buildings

Are we really saving the building by moving it to a new setting especially an historical village/museum? Is it an example of adults 'playing historic cubby houses'? Or is it 'collecting' buildings to put up as stage sets on which to display the groups' collections? Many persons, when asked, say

"I remember..." but when pressed for detail they cannot describe for example the interior or relationships of objects or people using them.

Cultural significance often stems from the relationship of a place with its surroundings. This relationship can demonstrate important aspects of its history and this evidence is lost if the relationship is broken. An extreme example would be the proposed relocation to mainland Australia of Mawson's Huts from Commonwealth Bay in Antarctica where they demonstrate an heroic period of exploration and living in harsh surroundings whilst awaiting rescue.

Buildings which are moved may also lose fragile jointing materials, such as nails, mortar and plaster as well as accumulated layers of applied decoration and the patina of age and wear and tear.

Claiming that removal is the only means of ensuring survival can be used as an easy way out of finding an acceptable solution. Structures that are seen as robust and portable are especially vulnerable to this claim. By clearly expressing the cultural significance it can be shown that removal is not an acceptable conservation policy for retaining that significance. For example, relocating Mawson's Huts would do irretrievable harm to their historical, symbolic and scientific value. Culturally significant structures that can be moved without damage to their significance are extremely rare.

Some times the sole means of ensuring survival does involve relocating significant buildings or structures. Bellevue Homestead is a case in point. It was originally the centre of a major pastoral holding in the upper Brisbane valley and was one of many hundreds of properties to be inundated by the construction of the Wivenhoe Dam in the late 1970s. The National Trust acquired the complex of homestead buildings and relocated them to higher ground. On their new site, the buildings have lost their former relationship with the river and the river flats –attributes that can never be reinstated. But the significance of the buildings as examples of a range of rare early building methods has survived. So has much of the evidence of the taste, aspirations and way of life of their former owners (Marquis-Kyle and Walker, 1992:44).

Structures or objects vulnerable to decay or vandalism are often moved with the loss of significance –especially if they are forgotten in their new place of 'temporary' storage! Headstones from pioneer graves where the inscriptions are fading are one category. Mining machinery on abandoned fields is another.

Some structures were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of previous moves, for example, prefabricated houses and mine shaft poppet-heads. Provided that such a structure does not have a strong association with its present site, its removal may be considered. If any structure is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate setting and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be detrimental to any place of cultural significance.

Dr Miles Lewis has documented the sad case of Police Magistrate William Lonsdale's cottage: it stood on the corner of Spring and Flinders Streets, Melbourne from 1842 until 1891, when it was sold and relocated to Carrum as a seaside cottage. The National Trust 'rediscovered' it in 1959 and set about moving it back to Melbourne, but en route a portion fell off the back of the low loader and had to be replaced when the building was in temporary storage awaiting a new site. As one was not forthcoming, the cottage was dismantled in 1962 and put in storage at "Como" and covered with corrugated iron. Unfortunately over the next decade bits of the cottage components were used for other repairs and even for Moomba floats. In 1973 an attempt was made to assess what authentic material remained and the pitiful remains were placed in commercial storage. There was continual pressure within the Trust to re-erect the building, which in effect would have been a mock up of the original form. That only a minority of the original fabric remained had not convinced those arguing for a recreation of the building, but rather the lack of accurate information on the exact form of the missing material halted the project (Lewis, 1987:23-5).

3.2 Relocating objects from historic sites

Collections within buildings are particularly at risk when the owner disposes of the house for relocation. Collections are often sold off then or dispersed without any thought as to their significance in relation to the history of the building and its use. Outbuildings and garden structures as well as fencing and ephemeral fixtures such as signboards are also at risk without proper recording and assessment of their significance. Yet it is often the combination of place and its collections in context which give greater significance. Greenmount Homestead at Pioneer valley near Mackay is a good example where the descendants of the original land owner bequeathed the homestead, all its contents, business and family papers, plus a life tenancy for the domestic servant. This rich layered evidence provides the basis for a spectacular interpretation of one family's impact on the pioneering life of the valley.

Mining equipment and vernacular structures such as slab huts are prone to vandalism or theft on remote sites. Many collections of steam engines, stamper batteries and other equipment have been moved off site into new locations, such as in Georgetown next to the former assay office, and promoted as pioneer parks. However, out of their original setting and functional context they lose their significance and visitors need assistance to decipher the history of these objects and their former function in their original location. In addition, the remote site has had its significance lessened by removing prime evidence of its functions and operations and the new location is confusing by the introduction of historically irrelevant evidence. This relocation of mining equipment is a major problem as groups and sponsors believe they are undertaking conservation action, but in reality they are destroying the historical and scientific significance and turning the evidence into something new – a social significance. This is also highlighted by the case of the railway steam locomotive which no longer runs on rails but is relocated into a park where it assumes new functions as a monument, public art sculpture or play equipment.

3.3 Retaining existing significance

Case studies (see those in Appendix 7.1) show how the saved historic building bears no relationship to its previous use, setting or location –but “it has been saved ” according to those passionately behind its rescue and relocation.

For example, the Atherton Post Office building was sold and had to be moved from its site; a generous local person donated land on the outskirts of town for the Historical Society to use in relocating the historic building which was developed as a small museum and tourist information centre, but it was re-erected inappropriately on land that was part of the original Chinatown –a significant feature of Chinatowns was their separation from the main European settlement which makes the recent intrusion of a European building particularly unfortunate. It is now realised that the new site had greater cultural significance as a historical archaeological place rather than regarding it as an empty or spare block of land. The siting and new use of the former post office bore no resemblance to its former cultural significance as a place of communication other than that it acquired new functions of tourist information that have communications value.

Jondaryan Woolshed has lost its context and historical setting because too many unrelated historic buildings have been collected and moved on to the site without the benefit of a master plan to illustrate the functional relationship of the original woolshed building to its pastoral setting.

Some public buildings have been moved several times in response to population shifts and then returned to their original sites; the Port Douglas and Ravenswood Court Houses are examples. How much original fabric was lost might not be an indicator here of success, but rather the return to its original site and restitution of the relationship with the street and its town function might be better indicators of success in conserving cultural significance.

The railway line at Tiaro was behind the main street and when the line closed, the railway station building was relocated into the town on the main road to serve as a bus stop and visitor information centre. A similar function of receiving/despaching passengers and providing information is continued.

The former hospital at Cooktown was relocated to a site where it did not fit so the two wings were taken off and repositioned by joining together behind the main front hall. It would have been one of the few examples of a nineteenth century pavilion style hospital remaining. The group who purchased the building (Jehovah’s Witnesses) cannot afford to keep going and it is up for sale –putting it back on its original site (still vacant) and using it for staff accommodation is an option.

3.4 Retaining aesthetic value

Given that aesthetic value relates to the landscape setting, orientation of the building, its form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with the place and its use, and the emotional response to these attributes, it is very difficult to retain this value in relocating a building.

The National Trust tried with the relocation of *Bellevue* at Coominya. The Trust looked for another site nearby –land with an historical association, convenient and logistically practical. The new site was a corner of the original property allowing the building to have the same orientation and view. But the original site was on alluvial land and all similar sites were also to be inundated. The new site had very different soil conditions and a different micro climate and although the garden layout was able to be reproduced, the same foliage growth was not. The previous character and aesthetic value arising from that was not able to be retained or recreated (Walker, 1991:16).

Conversely, retention of the surrounding verandahs and screening lattices has enabled the light effects to be replicated; the layout, and space around the house and outbuildings has been attractively recreated. The patination of interiors has been retained especially in the kitchen.

Buildings moved into an historical village setting often are not relocated in the exact position they would have been in the previous historical street setting. Some of the buildings relocated to the Caboolture Historical Village were originally located in King Street but in their new setting they do not have the same arrangement along the street. Others have been elevated to different levels after their relocation so that they do not sit plumb in the landscape –the Sandgate Drill Hall on its 88 new concrete stumps in a Chermside park or the grand Fairymead House at Bundaberg gardens are good examples of this.

There are many example of relocated buildings being repainted in different colours that bear no resemblance to the original –or worse still, oiled timbers that have now been painted, both destroying the original finish and now introducing a recurring maintenance cost. Fascias, decorative friezes, finials are often lost or damaged in the move and not replaced or are replaced with other pieces in a dissimilar pattern.

3.5 Retaining historic value

A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase, period 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 intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. Moving a building will alter this significance because the evidence will not remain *in situ*.

Lack of proper recording prior to the move leads to faked up results –“it would have looked like this because....” But did it? Bert Hinkler’s house in

Bundaberg had a verandah added to suit the local climatic conditions as the original English building components were drying and cracking in the harsher conditions.

A recent case is the relocation of the Sandgate Drill Hall (despite being listed on the Queensland Heritage register). This building was significant because it demonstrated the Armed Forces involvement with the community from the evolution of the volunteer militia in Queensland from the 1911 Defence Forces Act to the present day. The functional timber building was located in the civic precinct next to the grand Post Office and near the railway station for ease of access. This association with the site was an important element in its history of drill training. It was also a building built in response to new arrangements for national defence following Federation, and ironically its move has been funded by monies to celebrate the centenary of Federation. It has now been moved to Seventh Brigade Park at Chermside to house the 9th Battalions War Memorial Museum Collection. It is now a stranded building in a park bearing no relationship to the civic precinct in which it was located to provide drill training for the male population. There is an armed forces link but it does not relate to the history and function of this building.



Sandgate Drill Hall looking towards the Post Office complex and railway station -far red roof. (September, 1999)



Sandgate Drill Hall



Sandgate Drill Hall moved to its new site -note elevation and replacement concrete stumps (February 2000)



Sandgate Drill Hall and another moved building on site in 7th Brigade Park, Chermside

There are many similar examples where a building with a redundant function becomes a new museum building and loses its historical value: the following examples are from Caboolture Historical Village - a real estate agent's office became a barber's shop in the museum, a surveyor's cottage became a CWA cottage, a church hall becomes an exhibition space for gems, bottles etc.

3.6 Retaining scientific value

As the scientific or research value of a place depends upon the importance of the data involved: on its rarity, quality or representativeness, one could argue that such value may best be conserved by moving the rare building or structure with these values. However, the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information about environmental, cultural, technological and historical processes could well be lost in the move. Industrial processing works are a good example -located close to either the transshipment point or the resources used in the processing such as water supply, ore supplies etc.

The Skansen folk village in Stockholm contained vernacular buildings specifically moved with contents, and people to interpret disappearing customs and dialects, as part of a movement to retain cultural and scientific values.

3.7 Retaining social value

This embraces the qualities for which a place has become the focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a group. It is a special meaning important to a community's identity, perhaps through their use of the place or association with it. Places which are associated

with events that have had a great impact on a community often have high social value. Hence public buildings such as shire chambers, halls, churches, railway stations and post offices often exhibit this value. When a community lobbies to save the historic building it is often this social value of memory and meaning that is being expressed rather than the historic value.

On its new site in an outdoor museum the redundant Shire Chambers acquires a social value –it is of benefit primarily to those who ‘collected it’ for its new use as a museum artefact in their collection. Its historic value ceased when it lost its operating context.

Conversely, some buildings such as churches, like St Laurence’s Church of England at Caboolture, retain their social value for the group who promote the continuing use of the church for weddings and special commemorations.

4. MANAGEMENT ISSUES

4.1 Methods used to try and retain context

Although Articles 9 and 10 of the Burra Charter state that removal of a building and its contents of cultural significance is unacceptable, except where removal is the sole means of ensuring its survival, the practice of moving historically significant buildings is widespread and the building is considered ‘saved’ when it is relocated to an outdoor museum.

If a building must be moved, the Burra Charter again provides guidance through Articles 24 to 32 on conservation practice. Most importantly they highlight the need for professionally prepared studies to understand a place or building before any work is undertaken and that the existing fabric and use should be recorded before any changes are made.

Work should be carried out in a logical order:

1. Assess cultural significance
 2. gather evidence
 3. analyse evidence
 4. decide what is significant
-
1. Develop a conservation policy and works strategy
 2. gather information
 3. decide on conservation policy
 4. decide on conservation works strategy
-
1. Carry out the strategy

Recording the place:

Records made before physical intervention in the place are intended as documentary evidence so that in future other people can use these

records to understand what was done. The term 'professionally prepared' does not refer to any particular profession. It means that skill and experience are required and a wide range of skills may be required depending on the nature of the place/building and the issues to be considered.

The history of the building and its setting should be recorded, then the details of the building components themselves. A photographic survey of the place as it is then is an essential first step to assist with the later re-assembly.

The fabric can be recorded by a written schedule whereby the surface of the rooms of a house are systematically recorded and the date of the fabric is set down. This can also be done for the garden. Archaeological excavation may also be required to secure evidence about the setting and context of the place. The *Illustrated Burra Charter* has some relevant case studies on pp.62-68.

Moving:

In 1979 the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service of the US Department of the Interior published a guide to moving historic buildings as part of its Preservation Handbook series. Its aim was to explain the precautions to take, and to suggest procedures to follow during the moving/relocation process that would cause the least damage to the character and historic fabric of the building (Curtis, 1979:1). The following steps were outlined:

- a moving contractor
- permits/licences
- the best procedure for the move
- Moving intact
- Total disassembly
- Partial disassembly

- the route
- required
 - Historical background and research
 - Field notes and physical investigation
 - Recording the disassembly and the move
 - Restoration notes and maintenance notes
- protection prior to the move
 - Weatherproofing the structure
 - Protection from vandalism
- and preparing the new site
- the structure for the move
 - Moving intact
 - Moving partially or totally disassembled
- Re-assembly
 - Siting
 - Foundation construction

- re-assembly
- Restoration
- Documentation

Landscape considerations:

When choosing a site on which to relocate the building, the important influence of solar orientation (usually north facing) on a building's artistic and aesthetic quality should be respected and replicated.

In siting a single structure, it is also important to consider the adjacent structures and the site characteristics –rather than just plonking it where it will fit easily! Shape, mass and scale are critical; the relocated structure should fit harmoniously into its new setting and not appear awkward or out of place.

Garden elements may also be moved to include in the new setting or replicated- trees and shrubs of a similar size, fencing and pathways. In Queensland, the art of moving mature trees such as figs is well established.

Moving contents:

In assessing the cultural significance of the place the contents will also have been considered. For many public buildings the furnishings, trophies and pictures, signs, honour boards are as much part of the historic fabric as the walls and ceilings. These significant objects should be relocated with the building. Current practice would suggest that a building would only be moved today if it had significant collections as well as historic structural/architectural values.

This is often a contentious point with the new managers –they are interested in presenting an interior with “good taste” and if the original contents displayed quirky objects these are often lost in the move, such as the plastic duck on the cedar sideboard! Interiors demand exacting research prior to the move to replace objects in their correct setting.

Relocating on site/reassembly:

Inevitably in the move, parts of the building fabric or structure will be damaged. Costs of reinstatement will be necessary as will the cost of reassembling the building on its new site.

A carpenter was engaged to examine one important historic building –the former Shire Chambers built in 1883 and relocated to Caboolture Historical Village in the 1980s- and to examine it and estimate the costs involved in re-assembly. The guide book states that the building “is in its original condition except for a new roof and a new floor.” His report is at Appendix 6.2. For replacing damaged items (at current rates pre GST) –he estimated 46.16 hours of work totalling \$834 on a unit basis for the

labour cost of the repairs, materials excluded. Then add in cyclical maintenance, insurance, cleaning etc.

The National Trust in Queensland spent over \$400,00 in 5 grants plus a large donation from the Friends in the reassembly and restoration of Bellevue in the 1970s/80s.

4.2 Problems associated with managing moved buildings

Re-use of heritage places in a manner which will not damage their heritage values is a prominent issue in cultural heritage conservation. In many respects, however, older buildings are not suited to museum functions even when existing space volumes are adequate. The protection of collections requires conditions not often found in older buildings. The provision of air conditioning and other forms of atmospheric control, protection against fire and theft, lighting and regular maintenance are usually expensive.

Appropriate lamps and lighting systems as well as provision of fire escapes are issues which must be addressed in the building relocated to a public museum site.

Design styles and standards are a major issue, both of aesthetics and conservation, and there is no such concept as an appropriate style for Queensland museums although government works departments now subscribe to ecologically sustainable development principles in building design.

The purpose-built mudbrick museum building at Caboolture Historical Village is a good example of contemporary and functionally appropriate design.

Community museums are usually competing against better organised regional galleries for capital development funds for new buildings and hence the "making do" approach which has evolved. This has resulted in an often ill-assorted collection of buildings, the museum of tin sheds and prefabricated steel garages, with none of the Queensland vernacular timber and corrugated iron attributes which grace the structures of modern architects like Russell Hall or Lindsay Clare. The Better Cities Program and Urban Renewal Schemes offered opportunities for landscaping museum buildings, as with the Townsville Maritime Museum, but again, inappropriate design and finishes may compromise site authenticity.

The building, historic or new, should be part of the enhancing experience of visiting a museum. For this reason, moving an historic building from its original site so that it can be given to the local museum is to be discouraged.

4.3 Adaptive re-use of moved buildings

Most buildings have been unoccupied, especially if they are on a redevelopment site or in a remote location, and sometimes vandalised while the decision to move them was made. Significant components of the building will therefore have to be restored or reconstructed once the move has been made.

Most historic buildings moved to a museum site are acquired for the purpose of displaying that building's history and use. So a blacksmith's shop will be re-established as such while a house will be set up again as a domestic residence.

However, there are many cases where a building is moved or part of a building and then re-erected for another use on the museum site. This is the case with the former Atherton Post Office which was re-erected in the unmarked Chinatown and used as a gallery with a small museum display.

4.4 Sustainability

Even if an historic building is moved to a new site and used for museum purposes, there are many issues of maintenance, security, insurance/public liability. Ultimately the museum has to undertake constant maintenance and this can be costly –as is the case with over 50 buildings in the Caboolture Historical Village. Other display techniques instead of an historical building set may have been more appropriate. For example, with the *Midnight Grocer* display in Brennan and Gerraghty's store at Maryborough, a huge blown up photograph situated behind the artefacts provides the context and setting.

A cyclical maintenance plan should be drawn up and funded so that buildings as historical assets are maintained regularly.

Museum security ranges from high cyclone mesh, barbed wire topped fencing (the prison approach), location next door to the police station or a property with a guard dog, to alarms, electronic sensors linked to a security service company, smoke detectors and security service patrols. With unsupervised spaces and objects displayed in a domestic setting, an historic building set is often not good in terms of protecting the collections in comparison with a purpose designed space.

Most museums report theft of small objects on display, mostly household or coins. Yet these displays are part of both the authenticity of the presentation and the attraction to sustain the museum. Vandalism and wrecking of displays is of more concern than loss of objects.

With the advent of computerised collection documentation and management and professional training, museum security takes on an added dimension. Computing equipment can not be housed unsatisfactorily in insecure and unoccupied premises, where temperatures might rise significantly when the building is closed.

Public liability is also an issue and some unsightly concessions have been made to historical authenticity in museum buildings –such as ramps and cages.

The demise of Early Street Historical Village in Norman Park, Brisbane in 1998 was an example of a museum reaching the end of its life in terms of public appreciation. When the valuable land on which it was located was mooted for urban redevelopment, the public response was inadequate to force local or State government authorities to keep the buildings as an historical village and they were auctioned off for further relocation –mostly as private residences on outer suburban acreage. This may well herald the demise of the concept of historical villages as a fashion of the 1970s and not worth maintaining in the new millenium.

Creative solutions may be required to keep such historical villages intact – allocating buildings to the temporarily homeless to use in the nights in return for maintaining them for public inspection during the day; or allocating them to school classes to maintain as part of their curriculum.

4.5 Interpreting moved buildings

If adequate research into the history and use of the building is conducted before the move, then this documentation should be displayed at the new site –either in interpretive panels or in brochures available at the new site. However, it is rare for the original contents and fittings to be relocated with their house and the museum management committee is then forced to refurnish them in appropriate style to display authenticity.

Unfortunately, it is in this area of display and presentation that museums fall down with regard to presenting the cultural significance of the place. Lack of research into the provenance of collections and furnishings means that an atmosphere of 'yesteryear' is created rather than presenting known and documented collections in their context. The documentation would show functions of collections and relationships to users with an educational/informative and enjoyable story/message.

4.6 Conclusions

1. Relocated buildings are more expensive than it initially seemed – hidden costs and life cycle costs not calculated.

For houses –Queenslanders –for residential use, initial relocation estimate of \$30,000 can end up costing more than \$100,000.

For museum houses much work is uncoded and carried out by volunteers using scrounged materials which are not historically accurate to the building under repair following its move. But there are long term costs of maintenance, compliance with government regulations for fire, safety and public access, adaptation for other uses/new displays.

1. There is a significant community museum estate of relocated historical buildings.

There are 41 museums with a total of over 500 moved buildings in them; there are 2 with more than 60 buildings. Management of this estate is an increasing problem for the management committees with increased maintenance costs and an aging volunteer work force.

How many of these buildings are culturally significant?

What is the long term cost of not maintaining these community assets? And how should that cost be measured –in terms of cultural capital, social cost or an economic evaluation?

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Deciding to move a building.

Refer to the Burra Charter as a first principle and follow its processes to identify and assess the significance of the building under consideration; then decide if the building is worth moving as a place of cultural significance requiring conservation.

Will this significance be retained by the move?

How will you demonstrate this to the public?

5.2 Managing a building that has already been moved.

The following are essential management considerations:

5.2.1 Siting –relocating the building to a position which replicates its original site characteristics is essential for public appreciation of the historical setting.

5.2.2 Maintenance – once the building has been reassembled it requires regular house keeping and cyclical maintenance in accordance with a schedule so as to maintain it as an asset.

5.2.3 Interpretation – the research conducted prior to the move should be presented to the visiting public so that they understand the cultural significance of the place.

5.2.4 De-accessioning – buildings should be catalogued as part of the historical society's collection. Over time, if the provenance of the building and its contents is documented, the rarity value of the 'asset' will increase. Otherwise, the origins of the building are lost and like unprovenanced objects it may be best to de-accession the building.

5.3 Implications for funding.

As part of the Integrated Planning Act processes in Queensland, buildings of historical value should be identified in community cultural audits or local government conservation plans. This would flag those buildings possibly needing new uses or at risk of having their significance diminished. In exceptional cases where the building cannot be saved in situ, these buildings may need to be 'collected' in order to conserve their special values.

The following steps must be followed and signed off at each stage:

- Proof of need to relocate
- Conservation plan of the building including detailed structural recording and historical research – archival and oral
- Relocation plan
- Re-assembly plan
- Management arrangements covering use, operations, maintenance, interpretation and public presentation.

5.4 Policy requirements

There needs to be a whole of government approach to the use of historical buildings in publicly funded museums.

Arts Queensland should liaise with the Heritage Council and Cultural Heritage Branch in the Environment Protection Agency regarding the cultural values of the subject building prior to any funding decisions. The Ministry for Transport must also be informed of the policy so that it does not succumb to local pressures to relocate redundant buildings especially railway structures. The managers of the Gaming Fund need to know that they are being asked in some cases to fund relocations that contravene other governmental initiatives to retain cultural significance.

Based on the above study and consultations it is recommended that policies be adopted as follows:

- No new museums will be developed using publicly funded moved buildings.
- Existing museums of moved buildings will be better managed regarding presentation of their significance /provenance.
- Partnerships will be sought to provide a range of heritage advice and conservation management plans where significant buildings are involved and for all relatively intact moved buildings.
- An annual allocation of funds should be quarantined from grants to assist in the maintenance and provenancing of significant already moved buildings.

In summary, this becomes the Not Moving Anymore Historic Buildings Policy with a major component to assist managers of those significant buildings already moved to present the cultural values of the buildings to the public.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Peter Bell, 1987. Timber Houses in the north of Queensland, *Built in Wood Conference papers*, Australia ICOMOS, vol. 1, pp17-22

Caboolture Historical Village, n.d. *History Restored*, Area Histories, volume IX, 52 pp.

John J. Costonis, 1976. Commerce and Preservation: The Uneasy Relationship, *Monumentum*, ICOMOS, vol. 13, pp.71-80

John Obed Curtis, 1979. *Moving Historic Buildings*, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Publication no 9, US Department of Interior, 50pp

Helen Gregory, 1994. Lifestyle, in Rod Fisher and Brian Crozier, editors, *The Queensland House*, Queensland Museum, pp1-12

Charles B Hosmer, 1976. Historic Preservation, Tourism and Leisure, *Monumentum*, ICOMOS, vol. 13, pp.81-92

Jane Lennon, 1981. The role of historical archaeology in the conservation of places of cultural significance in Victoria, *Victoria Heritage Plan Conference Discussion Papers*, Ministry for Conservation, pp. 1-23.

Miles Lewis, 1987. Against the grain –prejudice and ignorance in timber conservation, in *Built in Wood Conference papers*, Australia ICOMOS, vol. 1, pp1-31

John Maas, 1976. Historic Preservation and the National Mythology, *Monumentum*, ICOMOS, vol. 13, pp.35 –44.

P.H. Pigott (chairman) 1975. *Museums in Australia 1975*, report of the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and national Collections including the Report of the Planning Committee on the Gallery of Aboriginal Australia, AGPS, Canberra.

Society of Architectural Historians of Australia and New Zealand (SAHANZ), October 1994, *The busses that ate Boonah*, tour notes.

Lennon, Jane. (1995) *Hidden Heritage: A Development Plan for Museums in Queensland*, Queensland Government, Arts Queensland, Brisbane.

Pearson, M., D. Johnston, J. Lennon, I. McBryde, D. Marshall, D. Nash and B. Wellington, 1998. *Environmental indicators for national state of the environment reporting – Natural and Cultural Heritage, Australia: State of the Environment*, Department of the Environment, Canberra.

Walker, Meredith. 1991. Moving Buildings- An Appropriate Solution? *National Trust Journal*, August issue, p.14-16

Young, Linda.1994. House Museums in Australia, *Public History Review*, vol.3, pp.167-1877.

APPENDICES

7.1 Queensland Case Studies

Moving buildings

Major case studies of:

Bellevue

Caboolture Folk Village

Capella Pioneer Village

Earlystreet

Jondaryan

Rockhampton Village

Townsville Heritage Village

For each museum a summary of the research is required answering the following questions:

- Why was it moved?
- Was their community pressure?
- Was their community or government funding for the move?
- Was a rich or influential person involved?
- Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie ongoing costs once it was a museum?
- Was it moved in its entirety/whole?
- How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?
- Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Bellevue

NTQ file ESK 6

Some background data:

- Co-ordinator General resumed the homestead in 1975 for Wivenhoe Dam.[\[1\]](#)
- Because of local concern over the relocation of Bellevue Homestead when Wivenhoe Dam inundate it, the local community lobbied the Trust to acquire the buildings and relocate them.[\[2\]](#)
- Coominya Branch formed at a Public Meeting on 22 March 1974.[\[3\]](#)

- \$70,000 NEG over two years allocated to relocation, and restoration of Bellevue, which was gifted to the Trust by the State Government. Land purchased at Coominya. [4]
- 1974 Laurie Kerr measured and documented the buildings.
- 1975 Laurie Kerr supervised the first stage of the relocation of Bellevue at Coominya. [5]
- 2 June 1975 several sections were moved to Coominya. [6]
- 1976 NEG of \$5,000 for feasibility study and planning.
- The original Bellevue garden was studied and a history of its evolution written, a committee looked at how this garden could be re-created at Coominya. [7]
- Sep 1977 Coominya Branch anxious to move the remaining buildings, tanks and equipment before area flooded. [8]
- June 1980 relocation of out-buildings such as tank stand, stables and hayloft still not done. [9]
- 1980 National Estate Grant of \$20,000.
- 1980 work by local volunteers on relocated outbuildings, and Trust & Esk Shire working to develop tourism of place. [10]
- NTQ acquired grants for the purchase of the land, relocation and subsequent conservation. [11]



Bellevue Homestead Coominya

image courtesy of [Coominya State School](#) (more images available)

Why was it moved?

The Wivenhoe Dam would have drowned it.

Was their community pressure?

Locals requested help from the Trust to save the complex. Subsequently twenty locals led by Fred Banff formed a local Trust Branch for the specific purpose of saving, relocating and restoring this old homestead. [12]

Was their community or government funding for the move?

A NEG and local fund raising.

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Yes in the sense that the Trust Presidents Hon John Herbert MLA then Stanley Hancock supported the move, while most Trust Councillors of that time were influential types.

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie Ongoing costs once it was a museum?

Yes, from the beginning local Trust members and the Trust Head Office considered the costs of restoration of the buildings and grounds.

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

NO. Began in 1975 with the moving of the main homestead and finished with relocation of outbuildings in September 1980. A 1975 photo shows that the house was moved in sections. Chimneys were dismantled and rebuilt on site.[\[13\]](#)

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

Did not find out the actual cost. The community, that is friends and Coominya Branch members helped with fund raising and with physical work with relocation and preparation of the site.

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

As the building could not be saved from inundation, a site on the former station was chosen, it had some similarities to the original, and everyone worked hard to recreate the new site to be like the original. The garden, aspect, placing of buildings and appearance of the moved homestead were replicated as far as possible.

Caboolture Historical Village

NTQ Caboolture CAB 2/3

Some background data:

- The Village started with the moving of the original Shire Chamber (1883) onto the site in 1977.
- 1979 the Caboolture Shire Council gave 4 ha to the Historical Society.
- Using Bicentennial funding and volunteers the Shire Chambers were 'restored' 1988-90.
- The Village includes moved and replica buildings.
- A former home that became Depress Hospital, then a home again moved to the Village in 1983.[\[14\]](#)
- Replica 100-year old hotel built by Historic Society volunteers opened 3 Sep 1988.[\[15\]](#)
- Morayfield schoolteacher's house and typewriter and memorabilia collection donated in 1988.[\[16\]](#)
- 50 historic buildings looked after by Dad's Army, service groups and Woodford prisoners.[\[17\]](#)



Caboolture Historical Village -showing the Council Chambers, right hand side in both photographs

Why was it moved?

Check, did the Council want a modern complex and the community wanted to save the Shire Chambers built in 1883?

Was their community pressure?

Not known

Was their community or government funding for the move?

Local Council funded?

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Not known

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie ongoing costs once it was a museum?

Not known or thought likely

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

??

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

??

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known or thought likely

Capella Pioneer Village

NTQ Peak Downs PKD 1/6. Neither the Homestead or the Village are listed by the Trust.

Some background data:

- Peak Downs Homestead said to be built by 1869 for George Fairbairn and believed to be first homestead in the area.
- Queensland-British Food Corporation acquired the Homestead and developed the Peak Downs area for growing sorghum and pigs to produce food for post-war Britain (c.1948) failed after 4 years. Area subsequently developed by farmers. [\[18\]](#)
- Peak Downs Homestead suffered various alterations, white ants and neglect during the 1950s-70s. [\[19\]](#)
- Peak Downs Shire Council nominated Peak Downs Homestead (with its 'double' roof) and other places to NTQ Rockhampton Branch in 1978. [\[20\]](#)
- Peak Downs Homestead was moved to Capella Pioneer Village in November 1988.
- Other moved buildings on site include the old Gordon Downs Station Store and Old Nanya Rail Siding.
- Though considered for listing a decision was made not to add it to the Trust register because it had suffered considerable loss of significance by being moved, and subsequent extensive replacement of fabric left little of the original fabric. [\[21\]](#)

Why was it moved?

The Milne family (owners) wanted a new home and the house could either be demolished or removed. Locals (the Village committee) considered it a significant historical station homestead that should be kept for future generations.

Was their community pressure?

Locals, particularly the Village committee members, were very keen to save this homestead.

Was their community or government funding for the move?

The owners sold it to the Capella Pioneer Village for \$7,000. The community helped with fund raising eg the Capella Rodeo Association

gave \$4,000. To assist with fund raising the Capella Pioneer Village Inc gained tax deductions rights from the Australian Tax Office, by being called a 'public museum'.

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Not known

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie ongoing costs once it was a museum?

Certainly not for the 'done up' homestead as its fixing up on site was totally unacceptable on Burra Charter conservation principles.

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

A house remover moved the house minus its second (CGI) roof on a semi-trailer.

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

It cost \$10,000 to move the Homestead into the Village. Village committee members assisted with re-stumping and assisted the house removalist. The local community and a Bicentennial grant funded further 'restoration' work.

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known and doubtful.

Earlstreet Historical Village

NTQ file BNE 1/101

Some background data:

- Stanley Hancock established Earlstreet Historical Village in 1965.[\[22\]](#)
- An 1877 slab hut from a Dayboro property removed to Earlstreet in 1968.
- May 1969 Carmelite nuns moved out of *Auchenflower* and it was to be demolished, Stan Hancock saved the billiard room and ballroom, these were dismantled and trucked to Norman Park, the rest of *Auchenflower* was demolished.[\[23\]](#)
- 1970 Hancock purchased *Stromness* to save it from demolition and it was relocated from Evans Deakin Kangaroo Point property to Earlstreet.
- *Stromness* having been used as an office by Evans Deakin, was converted to a furnished house museum.
- General Store from Rocky Water Holes; *Auchenflower* House, *Stromness*, replica *Auchenflower* coach house.
- Stanley Hancock was President of the Trust 1974-8, a time when the Trust was acquiring properties such as Bellevue. He thought he was assisting with the preservation of Queensland's history.

Why were they moved?

To save from demolition and to help create a commercial tourist venue, a historical village.

Was their community pressure?

Don't think so. Nothing in Trust files and Earlstreet was a business venture.

Was their community or government funding for the move?

Not known but doubtful, as this was a commercial enterprise.

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Mr Stanley Hancock was a wealthy and influential person.

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie ongoing costs once they became a museum?

As a tourist/educational business, it should have been considered by the Hancocks, but as this was the first such historical village enterprise it was a very new concept for Queensland.

Hancock was involved with the Trust and was the President from 1974 to 1978, one would expect that he was aware of good conservation practice and maintenance of historic buildings..

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

Not actually known and only part of *Auchenflower* was moved.

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

Not known

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known or thought likely.

Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Woolshed Museum & Park

NTQ Jondaryan JON 3/2

Some background data:

- Woolshed and about 5 ha of land were a gift by owners due to interest evidenced of locals at the time of the Jondaryan State School centenary in 1972. Intent of the gift was to develop a living museum of pioneer life in the district to demonstrate a former way of life. Planned to include other aspects of early pioneer life.
- Jondaryan Woolshed Preservation Committee set up as an investigative committee in December 1973. A public meeting held 3 March 1974 attracted 117 attendees and 29 apologies from a district of only 500 residents. This well attended meeting supported the initial committees' concepts of restoration and preservation of the Woolshed and unanimously authorized the steering committee to continue and to establish a properly constituted Association. 11 committee members donated \$850 for immediate use in 1974. A sub-committee considering a master plan for a living museum complex that was a replica of early station life. [\[24\]](#)
- The first AGM of the Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Museum and Park Association was held on 30 August 1976. [\[25\]](#)
- The Association has a policy of not purchasing items, rather it relies on donations while entrance fees, membership, donations, fund raising and grants help with the daily running, staff and restoration of structures and artefacts. Volunteers also assist with work on the 'homestead', maintenance and staffing.
- Buildings on site include Bank of NSW moved with Westpac contribution \$10,000 in 1986, grain shed moved with assistance of \$25,000 from Utah.

- By March 1988, the complex had grown to include a Bank of NSW, barn, boundary rider's hut, chook yard, school teachers house and school, stables and sulky shed, blacksmith and a homestead.[\[26\]](#)
- In 1994 Woodleigh Cheese Factory was donated by owners Queensco Unity Dairy Co-op with a fund set up to assist with removal and setting up with extra funding sought from diary industry related organisations and people.[\[27\]](#)
- The Treasurer's report in the minutes of the 1997 AGM include that the Cheese factory had a loss of \$3543.96, but no reason was given. Was it the cost of moving, rebuilding, or what?[\[28\]](#)
- By 1998, the place had grown to include Bongeen railway building, gallows, machinery and tractor sheds.[\[29\]](#)
- The 1998 President's report included the Federal Government's grant for \$2,000,000 to restore the Woolshed and associated infrastructure. He mentions donations of farm machinery, Flagstone Creek Community Hall, items awaiting transport and the Association has a policy of not purchasing items.[\[30\]](#) This AGM report does mention sponsorship and grants as a means of funding, revenue from selling cattle, sheep and horses and members subscriptions to help finance the place, as well as gate takings and other revenue raised by visitors (tea, coffee, dampers, souvenirs, etc). It is run as a business with the directors elected from members and it still has staunch local participation.

Why were they moved?

Various buildings moved in because they had become obsolete and/or risked being demolished, and they considered more buildings added to the pioneer village tourism of the place.

Was their community pressure?

The locals were enthusiastic to keep the Woolshed and establish the complex. Don't know about the other buildings, but would assume the various donating people/organisations/communities wanted their historic buildings preserved somewhere.

Was their community or government funding for the relocations?

Grants to restore the Woolshed yes, but think all the relocated and replica buildings have been funded by the society's activities and funding from original owners and sponsors.

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Not known

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie ongoing costs once it was a museum?

As this is a commercial enterprise, the society should have been aware of the need for maintenance.

Were the various structures moved in their entirety/whole?

Not known. ????

How much did the moves cost? Did the community move it?

There has been financial assistance to move some of the buildings eg the NSW Bank, grain shed and cheese factory.

Were there any arguments against these move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known or thought likely

Rockhampton Heritage Village

Gangalook Museum, The Caves NTQ file LIV 2 and Rockhampton Heritage Village NTQ RTN 1/33

Some background data:

- *Gangalook Hall of clocks and Museum* established in 1970s and donated to Council in 1990.
- The Village derived from the Gangalook Museum near the Caves and included a slab cottage, pit saw, blacksmith shop, vehicles, an old Rockhampton Church and the Hall of Clocks.
- Museum relocated to near the Dreamtime Cultural Centre, Bruce Highway using about 150 work for dole people to assist with the move and re-establishment.
- Move and redevelopment cost \$4,663,600 with Rockhampton City Council putting in about \$1 million and monies from major community fund raising.
- Includes moved in buildings such as the Gracemere Catholic church, Rosewood Homestead and a Lakes Creek Workers Cottage and replicas such as stores and businesses.
- The video submitted for the Herbert Heritage awards not at OGH.

Why was it moved?

To create a tourist site and employment, as well as a place to house obsolete buildings and store equipment.

Was their community pressure?

Why else would a local council get involved??

Was their community or government funding for the move?

Local government funding and Work for the Dole employment

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Not known

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie. Ongoing costs once it was a museum?

Not known, but as it was a local Council project that aimed to assist local unemployment it must be assumed that maintenance was considered.

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

Not known

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

According to local newspapers, it cost \$4,663,600 to move and re-establish and it was a local council initiative. No information on community lobbying, but local councils usually require some local prompting to act and spend such vast amounts.

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known, but as this was a mid1990s move surely there was argument and comment?

Townsville Heritage Village

NTQ file TOWN 1/33

Some background data:

- Townsville Branch planned to create a pioneer village comprising tradition characteristic houses that would be furnished authentically to create a folk museum.
- In early 1977, the Townsville NTQ Branch established its Pioneer Homestead sub-committee with the aim to acquire houses to form a folk museum. This sub-committee included prominent locals and University staff.
- The aim of the Branch's Pioneer Homestead sub-committee was not to preserve buildings necessarily of architectural merit, but typical buildings as examples for future generations.[\[31\]](#)
- The Townsville Tourist Organisation and Tropical Queensland Tourist Association supported the Pioneer Homestead concept.[\[32\]](#)
- Townsville CC approved using of Council land and offered the Trust a 20 year lease similar to that offered to sporting clubs.
- December 1977 the Branch was offered the Carter Street workers' cottage built c.1890.
- April 1978 the Doris Court Mundingburra farm house offered to the Branch if they moved it. It was relocated on 2 May 1978.
- *Currajong* in the grounds of Townsville Sisters of Mercy Mater Hospital was going to be demolished to provide a carpark.
- Townsville National Trust took on the saving of *Currajong* as a project with Trust Council approval.
- The building was moved in July/Aug 1978 to a temporary site, but this did not include the service wing. Finally moved to Castling Street in 1979.
- Trust executive meeting of 30 Jul 1979 agreed to 'adopt the Townsville Pioneer Homestead as a project', and it was resolved that consideration be given to founding the project on educational aims rather than restoration under the strict ICOMOS restoration principles. Also, that the Branch could manage the project subject to control of the Executive Council.[\[33\]](#)
- In Feb 1979 Prof Dalton of JCU assessed the project and recommended it to the Utah Foundation. In 1981, a Utah Foundation grant of \$7,500.00 assisted with restoration of the farm house.
- By 25 Jun 1979, the Townsville Branch had raised about \$33,000 though fundraising activities and grants.[\[34\]](#)
- During 1979 volunteers such as Cleveland Bay Leo Club agreed to assist with landscaping the site, the Hon Architect did architectural drawings for caretaking and public facilities, Peter Bell organised a restoration schedule including tasks for unskilled volunteers and TAFE apprentices (and paid skilled workers). TAFE apprentices constructed staircases.[\[35\]](#) Gov allowed used final year apprentices free of charge![\[36\]](#)
- The village consists of three moved buildings *Currajong* (NTQ TOWN 1/33), the Carter Street miners cottage and a 1920s farmhouse.
- Initially the project was called the Townsville 'Pioneer Homestead' complex and it still includes only one listed building, *Currajong*
- By 1981 the National Trust Centre Townsville had been able to 'engender unprecedented community interest in, and contribution

- to, a Trust project' with the farm house restoration completed, *Currajong* re-roofed and miners cottage transported in.[\[37\]](#)
- Restoration of the three buildings took over 10 years, with the centre formally opened in August 1988.
 - A restoration appeal was launched in Sept 1988
 - To raise funds to repay the \$6000 needed to establish the site and another \$19,000 to assist with developing the site and restoration work[\[38\]](#)
 - Dorothy Gibson-Wilde in her 1991 management plan for *Currajong*, said that the three (3) houses were offered to the Branch free of charge, but the Branch had to re-site them. She also exonerated the Branches establishing of a collection of relocated houses by arguing that there is a long history of moving houses in north particularly the smaller ones, with many moved from Charters Towers and Ravenswood to Townsville!

Why was they moved?

All three houses would have been demolished and were given to the Trust on condition they would relocated them!

Was their community pressure?

The Townsville NTQ Branch involved many significant members of the community, and there was support from James Cook University, local Trust members, Townsville Aldermen and tourist associations for the concept of moving houses to establish a museum complex. It would seem, however, that the only house that had direct community agitation to save it was Currajong.

Was their community or government funding for the move?

Fundraising by Branch members and grants. Head Office provided \$8,000 towards the estimated cost of \$15,000 to relocated Currajong.

Was a rich or influential person involved?

Pioneer Homestead sub-committee in early 1977 included prominent locals and University staff. Some of the towns 'dignitaries' and James Cook lecturers and a professor were members of the Branch Committee.

Did anyone argue for maintenance costs, ie. ongoing costs once it was a museum?

Prof Dalton in his Utah report, the Trust Architect and local Branch were most aware of the need for funds to fix up and maintain the three buildings. 'Restoration' was aided by

- community members who assisted with skills and time
- the government permitted use of TAFE apprentices for free
- Utah gave \$7,500 towards restoration of the farm house

Was it moved in its entirety/whole?

Currajong was moved without proper recording and in two sections, cut down through the hallway, and it would seem that the kitchen and Kanaka house were not saved. Very little on the other buildings in any of the Trust files.

How much did the move cost? Did the community move it?

The estimate for moving *Currajong* was \$15,000, Head Office provided \$8,000, fundraising helped and so did the *Townsville Daily Bulletin*. The Farmhouse was moved with ten Trust members providing interest-free

loans of \$500 each. The move was estimated to cost \$5,000 and workers/mining cottage estimated to cost \$3,000.

Were there any arguments against its move on in situ conservation significance grounds?

Not known but Prof Dalton and the Branch were keen to save *Currajong*, and the Branch were very enthusiastic about creating a historical village, and the moves did occur in the late 1970s. The 'restoration' appears to be adaptive and not fully in line with the Burra Charter.

Carpenter's Estimates of Building Repair Costs.

7.2 Carpenter's Estimates of Building Repair Costs

The following estimates are based on replacing the damaged item. Time estimates are for competent trades people. Hourly costs are referenced from Q.M.B.A Loaded Hourly Rates, plus an industry allowance for charge out costs. Total hour cost e.g. \$38.00 Per Hour (Pre - G.S.T).

DEFINITIONS

PATCH - e.g. fill, cover over, superficial only.

REPAIR - e.g. strengthen with additional member along side of existing structural members.

REPLACE - e.g. remove existing damaged items and others for access and replace with new to original specifications if / where possible.

Additional to these estimates are the following variables:

- individual material costs for each specific item
- access to the damaged location
- safety conditions of structure
- height of structure e.g. scaffolding
- availability of new / replacement items
- compliance to relevant building codes

NOTE! Provision would also have to be made for the following items:

- Access - Stairs - Ramps
- Drainage - storm water sewerage and ground run off
- Landscaping - trees shrubs - fences - surrounds - topography
- Services - Phone - Gas - Electricity
- Security - monitoring and intruder Systems
- Structural - tie down requirements / building by laws

The following details the Estimate Time in Minutes taken for a particular aspect of work

The Unit is shown as Lm (Lineal metre), M2 (Metre squared) or similar.

The Unit Labour Time in Minutes is the time taken for a particular aspect of work and expressed per unit. e.g.40 minutes to replace each Lineal metre of flooring.

The Cost is based on \$38 per hour charge out rate as detailed above and is costed on the minutes per unit.

Prior to repairs being carried out there would need to be a process of auditing to establish the extent of damage and the necessary repairs.

The estimate below is a guide on a unit basis for the labour cost of repairs. The details for these estimates follow and should be read in conjunction with this guide.

	Estimate Time Minutes	Unit	Unit Labour Minutes	Cost \$
Stumps	180	stump	180	114
Ant Cap	35	ant cap	35	22
Bearers	150	Lm	50	32
Floor Joist	165	Lm	55	35
Flooring	160	Lm	40	25
*Wall Framing Structural	120	stud	120	76
*Wall Sheeting Interior	150	Lm	50	32
*Ceiling Structural	140	Lm	28	18
*Ceiling Lining	180	Lm	45	28
*Roof Members - Pitch	170	rafter	170	108
*Roof Sheeting	520	M2	11	7
*Exterior Cladding	75	Lm	15	10
*Soffit	95	Lm	24	15
Joinery	100	door	100	63
Locks	80	lock	80	51
Trim	85	Lm	21	13
Decoration	95	per post	95	60
*Painting	160	M2	160	101
*Painting	110	Lm	37	24

NOTE! The items marked with the * are possibly subject to additional costs due to height and scaffolding requirements.

Stump (not at edge of building)@ Stump	Minutes
equipment to location	20
support bearer	15
excavate hole	60
remove post	15
install new	20
back fill	30
remove equipment	20
Estimate Time	180

Ant Cap @Ant cap

equipment to location	10
support Bearer	10
slip in cap	5
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	35

Bearer (3m. length not at edge)@Lm. of bearer

equipment to location	15
support joist	30
detach bearer	50
remove bearer	10
cut new bearer	10
install new bearer	10
fix to joists	15
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	150

Floor Joist (3m. Length) @Lm. of joist

equipment to location	15
support flooring	30
cut joist twice	20
remove joist	35
remove flooring nails	15
cut new joist	10
install new joist	10
refix flooring	15
remove equipment	15
Estimate Time	165

Flooring (4m. isolated boards)@Lm. of flooring

equipment to location	10
cut board	10
remove board	15
remove skirting	30
lift boards either side	40
cut new board	5
install new board	10
fix all three boards	10
refix skirting	20
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	160

***Wall Framing Structural (one side of wall sheeting already removed)@Wall Stud (scaffolding?)**

equipment to location	10
cut stud	10
remove stud	35
cut new stud	15
install new stud	10

fix new stud	10
refix sheeting etc.	20
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	120

***Wall Sheeting Interior (3m. isolated boards)**

equipment to location	10
cut board	15
remove board	20
remove Cornice, skirting	20
lift board either side	30
cut new board	5
install new board	15
fix all three boards	10
refix cornice	15
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	150

***Ceiling Joist Structural (5m. length) @ Lm**

equipment to location	20
support ceiling boards	20
cut ceiling joist	15
remove ceiling joist	20
cut new ceiling joist	10
fit new ceiling joist	10
fix new ceiling joist	10
refix boards	15
remove equipment	20
Estimate Time	140

***Ceiling Lining (4m length)**

equipment to location	20
cut board	15
remove board	25
remove cornice	20
lift board each side	30
cut new board	10
install new board	10
fix all three boards	15
refix cornice	15
remove equipment	20
Estimate Time	180

***Roof Members Structural (rafter - subject to pitch) (scaffolding?)**

equipment to location	20
support roof sheeting	20
cut rafter	10
remove the rafter	50
cut rafter	10

install rafter	10
fix rafter	10
fix roof sheeting	20
remove equipment	20
Estimate Time	170

***Roof Sheeting (10 ten sheets up to 6M long totaling 50m2)
(scaffolding ?)**

pre-measure, order and delivery to site.	90
equipment to location	30
remove damaged sheeting	100
lower sheeting to ground	50
refix rafters	30
raise new sheeting to roof	50
fix new sheeting	140
remove equipment	30
Estimate Time	520

***Exterior Cladding (5m. Scaffolding?)**

equipment to location	10
cut board	10
remove board	10
cut new board	5
prepare new board	20
install new board	5
fix board	5
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	75

***Soffit (3 boards X 4m) (scaffolding?)**

equipment to location	10
remove boards	15
cut boards	10
prepare boards	30
install and fix boards	20
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	95

Joinery (door)

equipment to location	10
remove door	10
patch jams etc.	40
fit replacement door	30
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	100

Locks (deep mortice lock)

equipment to location	10
-----------------------	----

remove lock	10
patch	20
install replacement	20
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	70

Trim (4m. length of skirting, cornice etc.)

equipment to site	10
remove items	25
cut new	20
fit and fix	20
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	85

Decoration (capitals, astragals brackets)

equipment to location	10
remove	15
patch	10
cut new pieces	25
prepare new pieces	10
fit and fix	15
remove equipment	10
Estimate Time	95

*Painting (square metre - Scaffolding)

equipment to location	15
removal of old paint	60
patch indifferences	15
prepare surface	15
prime coat	10
undercoat	15
finish coat	15
remove equipment	15
Estimate Time	160

*Painting (3m skirting / cornice) (scaffolding?)

equipment to location	15
removal of old paint	30
patch indifferences	10
prepare surface	10
prime coat	10
undercoat	10
finish coat	10
remove equipment	15
Estimate Time	

REVISED BURRA CHARTER

The Burra Charter (November 1999)

(The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance)

Preamble

Considering the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1964), and the Resolutions of the 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the Burra Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS (the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS) on 19 August 1979 at Burra, South Australia. Revisions were adopted on 23 February 1981, 23 April 1988 and 26 November 1999.

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.

Conservation is an integral part of the management of places of cultural significance and is an ongoing responsibility.

Who is the Charter for?

The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.

Using the Charter

The Charter should be read as a whole. Many articles are interdependent. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections. Headings have been included for ease of reading but do not form part of the Charter.

The Charter is self-contained, but aspects of its use and application are further explained in the following Australia ICOMOS documents:

- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance;
- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy;
- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports;
- Code on the Ethics of Coexistence in Conserving Significant Places.

What places does the Charter apply to?

The Charter can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, indigenous and historic places with cultural values.

The standards of other organisations may also be relevant. These include the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Draft Guidelines for the Protection, Management and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Places.

Why conserve?

Places of cultural significance enrich people's lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences. They are historical records, that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are irreplaceable and precious.

These places of cultural significance must be conserved for present and future generations.

The Burra Charter advocates a cautious approach to change: do as much as necessary to care for the place and to make it useable, but otherwise change it as little as possible so that its cultural significance is retained.

Articles

Explanatory Notes

Article 1. Definitions

For the purposes of this Charter:

1.1 *Place* means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

The concept of place should be broadly interpreted. The elements described in Article 1.1 may include memorials, trees, gardens, parks, places of historical events, urban areas, towns, industrial places, archaeological sites and spiritual and religious places.

1.2 *Cultural significance* means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.

Cultural significance is embodied in the *place* itself, its *fabric*, *setting*, *use*, *associations*, *meanings*, *records*, *related places* and *related objects*.

Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

The term cultural significance is synonymous with heritage significance and cultural heritage value.

Cultural significance may change as a result of the continuing history of the place.

Understanding of cultural significance may change as a result of new information.

1.3 *Fabric* means all the physical material of the *place* including components, fixtures, contents, and objects.

Fabric includes building interiors and sub-surface remains, as well as excavated material.

Fabric may define spaces and these may be important elements of the significance of the place.

1.4 Conservation means all the processes of looking after a *place* so as to retain its *cultural significance*.

1.5 Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the *fabric* and *setting* of a *place*, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves *restoration* or *reconstruction*.

The distinctions referred to, for example in relation to roof gutters, are:

- maintenance — regular inspection and cleaning of gutters;
- repair involving restoration — returning of dislodged gutters;
- repair involving reconstruction — replacing decayed gutters.

1.6 Preservation means maintaining the *fabric* of a *place* in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

It is recognised that all places and their components change over time at varying rates.

1.7 Restoration means returning the existing *fabric* of a *place* to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

1.8 Reconstruction means returning a *place* to a known earlier state and is distinguished from *restoration* by the introduction of new material into the *fabric*.

New material may include recycled material salvaged from other places. This should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

1.9 Adaptation means modifying a *place* to suit the existing *use* or a proposed use.

1.10 Use means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.

1.11 Compatible use means a *use* which respects the *cultural significance* of a *place*. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

1.12 Setting means the area around a *place*, which may include the visual catchment.

1.13 Related place means a *place* that contributes to the *cultural significance* of another place.

1.14 Related object means an object that contributes to the *cultural significance* of a *place* but is not at the place.

1.15 Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a *place*.

Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place.

1.16 Meanings denote what a *place* signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses.

Meanings generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories.

1.17 Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the *cultural significance of a place*.

Interpretation may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric (e.g. maintenance, restoration, reconstruction); the use of and activities at the place; and the use of introduced explanatory material.

Conservation Principles

Article 2. Conservation and management

2.1 *Places of cultural significance* should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of *conservation* is to retain the *cultural significance of a place*.

2.3 *Conservation* is an integral part of good management of *places of cultural significance*.

2.4 *Places of cultural significance* should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

Article 3. Cautious approach

3.1 *Conservation* is based on a respect for the existing *fabric, use, associations and meanings*. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

The traces of additions, alterations and earlier treatments to the fabric of a place are evidence of its history and uses which may be part of its significance. Conservation action should assist and not impede their understanding.

3.2 Changes to a *place* should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

Article 4. Knowledge, skills and techniques

4.1 *Conservation* should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the *place*.

4.2 Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the *conservation* of significant *fabric*. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate.

The use of modern materials and techniques must be supported by firm scientific evidence or by a body of experience.

Article 5. Values

5.1 *Conservation* of a *place* should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

Conservation of places with natural significance is explained in the Australian Natural Heritage Charter. This Charter defines natural significance to mean the importance of ecosystems, biological diversity and geodiversity for their existence value, or for present or future generations in terms of their scientific, social, aesthetic and life-support value.

5.2 Relative degrees of *cultural significance* may lead to different *conservation* actions at a place.

A cautious approach is needed, as understanding of cultural significance may change. This article should not be used to justify actions which do not retain cultural significance.

Article 6. Burra Charter Process

6.1 The *cultural significance* of a *place* and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy.

The Burra Charter process, or sequence of investigations, decisions and actions, is illustrated in the accompanying flowchart.

6.2 The policy for managing a *place* must be based on an understanding of its *cultural significance*.

6.3 Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a *place* such as the owner's needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition.

Article 7. Use

7.1 Where the *use* of a *place* is of *cultural significance* it should be retained.

7.2 A *place* should have a *compatible use*.

The policy should identify a use or combination of uses or constraints on uses that retain the cultural significance of the place. New use of a place should involve minimal change, to significant fabric and use; should respect associations and meanings; and where appropriate should provide for continuation of practices which contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

Article 8. Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual *setting* and other relationships that contribute to the *cultural significance* of the *place*. New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Aspects of the visual setting may include use, siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and materials.

Other relationships, such as historical connections, may contribute to interpretation, appreciation, enjoyment or experience of the place.

Article 9. Location

9.1 The physical location of a *place* is part of its *cultural significance*. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

9.2 Some buildings, works or other components of *places* were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have significant links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.

9.3 If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate *use*. Such action should not be to the detriment of any *place of cultural significance*.

Article 10. Contents

Contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the *cultural significance* of a *place* should be retained at that place. Their removal is unacceptable unless it is: the sole means of ensuring their security and *preservation*; on a temporary basis for treatment or exhibition; for cultural reasons; for health and safety; or to protect the place. Such contents, fixtures and objects should be returned where circumstances permit and it is culturally appropriate.

Article 11. Related places and objects

The contribution which *related places* and *related objects* make to the *cultural significance* of the *place* should be retained.

Article 12. Participation

Conservation, interpretation and management of a *place* should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special *associations* and *meanings*, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.

Article 13. Co-existence of cultural values

Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.

For some places, conflicting cultural values may affect policy development and management decisions. In this article, the term cultural values refers to those beliefs which are important to a cultural group, including but not limited to political, religious, spiritual and moral beliefs. This is broader than values associated with cultural significance.

Conservation Processes

Article 14. Conservation processes

Conservation may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a *use*; retention of *associations* and *meanings*; *maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation* and *interpretation*; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these.

There may be circumstances where no action is required to achieve conservation.

Article 15. Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain *cultural significance*, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a *place* should be guided by the *cultural significance* of the place and its appropriate *interpretation*.

When change is being considered, a range of options should be explored to seek the option which minimises the reduction of cultural significance.

15.2 Changes which reduce *cultural significance* should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.

Reversible changes should be considered temporary. Non-reversible change should only be used as a last resort and should not prevent future conservation action.

15.3 Demolition of significant *fabric* of a *place* is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of *conservation*. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

15.4 The contributions of all aspects of *cultural significance* of a *place* should be respected. If a place includes *fabric, uses, associations* or *meanings* of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance.

Article 16. Maintenance

Maintenance is fundamental to *conservation* and should be undertaken where *fabric* is of *cultural significance* and its *maintenance* is necessary to retain that *cultural significance*.

Article 17. Preservation

Preservation is appropriate where the existing *fabric* or its condition constitutes evidence of *cultural significance*, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other *conservation* processes to be carried out.

Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:

- where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it should not be altered;
- where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 26 to 28.

New work (e.g. stabilisation) may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 22.

Article 18. Restoration and reconstruction

Restoration and *reconstruction* should reveal culturally significant aspects of the *place*.

Article 19. Restoration

Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the *fabric*.

Article 20. Reconstruction

20.1 *Reconstruction* is appropriate only where a *place* is incomplete through damage or alteration, and only where there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the *fabric*. In rare cases, reconstruction may also be appropriate as part of a *use* or practice that retains the *cultural significance* of the place.

20.2 *Reconstruction* should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional *interpretation*.

Article 21. Adaptation

21.1 *Adaptation* is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the *cultural significance* of the *place*.

Adaptation may involve the introduction of new services, or a new use, or changes to safeguard the place.

21.2 *Adaptation* should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22. New work

22.1 New work such as additions to the *place* may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the *cultural significance* of the place, or detract from its *interpretation* and appreciation.

New work may be sympathetic if its siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and material are similar to the existing fabric, but imitation should be avoided.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such.

Article 23. Conserving use

Continuing, modifying or reinstating a significant *use* may be appropriate and preferred forms of *conservation*.

These may require changes to significant *fabric* but they should be minimised. In some cases, continuing a significant use or practice may involve substantial new work.

Article 24. Retaining associations and meanings

24.1 Significant *associations* between people and a *place* should be respected, retained and not obscured. Opportunities for the *interpretation*, commemoration and celebration of these associations should be investigated and implemented.

For many places associations will be linked to use.

24.2 Significant *meanings*, including spiritual values, of a *place* should be respected. Opportunities for the continuation or revival of these meanings should be investigated and implemented.

Article 25. Interpretation

The *cultural significance* of many *places* is not readily apparent, and should be explained by *interpretation*. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.

Conservation Practice

Article 26. Applying the Burra Charter process

26.1 Work on a *place* should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines. The results of studies should be up to date, regularly reviewed and revised as necessary.

26.2 Written statements of *cultural significance* and policy for the *place* should be prepared, justified and accompanied by supporting evidence. The statements of significance and policy should be incorporated into a management plan for the place.

Statements of significance and policy should be kept up to date by regular review and revision as necessary. The management plan may deal with other matters related to the management of the place.

26.3 Groups and individuals with *associations* with a *place* as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in understanding the *cultural significance* of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its *conservation* and management.

Article 27. Managing change

27.1 The impact of proposed changes on the *cultural significance* of a *place* should be analysed with reference to the statement of significance and the policy for managing the place. It may be necessary to modify proposed changes following analysis to better retain cultural significance.

27.2 Existing *fabric, use, associations* and *meanings* should be adequately recorded before any changes are made to the *place*.

Article 28. Disturbance of fabric

28.1 Disturbance of significant *fabric* for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a *place* by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the *conservation* of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible.

28.2 Investigation of a *place* which requires disturbance of the *fabric*, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigation should be based on important research questions which have potential to substantially add to knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimises disturbance of significant fabric.

Article 29. Responsibility for decisions

The organisations and individuals responsible for management decisions should be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

Article 30. Direction, supervision and implementation

Competent direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with appropriate knowledge and skills.

Article 31. Documenting evidence and decisions

A log of new evidence and additional decisions should be kept.

Article 32. Records

32.1 The records associated with the *conservation* of a *place* should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

32.2 Records about the history of a *place* should be protected and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

Article 33. Removed fabric

Significant *fabric* which has been removed from a *place* including contents, fixtures and objects, should be catalogued, and protected in accordance with its *cultural significance*.

Where possible and culturally appropriate, removed significant fabric including contents, fixtures and objects, should be kept at the place.

Article 34. Resources

Adequate resources should be provided for *conservation*.

The best conservation often involves the least work and can be inexpensive.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.

[1] Draft Bellevue Homestead Coominya conservation plan, National Trust of Queensland, 21 March 1998, p.5.

[2] Draft Bellevue Homestead Coominya conservation plan, National Trust of Queensland, 21 March 1998, p.5.

[3] Branch report in the *Eleventh annual report*, The National Trust of Queensland, 1973-74.

[4] *Twelfth annual report*, The National Trust of Queensland, 1974-75; A typescript that I have says that the land cost \$28,000 and was funded by a NEG.

[5] Laurie Kerr. Bellevue Homestead: restoration strategy, Dept of Architecture and Industrial Design, School of the Built Environment, QIR.

[6] 'Ladies sub-committee report'. *The National Trust of Queensland Bulletin*, (July 1975), p.5.

[7] Kerr, LJ. Comments on the gardens of Bellevue and proposals for reestablishment of the garden and development of the Coominya site: report to the Coominya and District Branch of the National Trust of Queensland, 1977.

[8] 'Bellevue Homestead'. *The National Trust of Queensland Journal*, (Sep 1977), p. 28.

[9] 'Work in Progress at Trust Properties: Bellevue Homestead, Coominya'. *The National Trust of Queensland Bulletin*, vol.1 no.2, (Jun 1980), p.3.

[10] 'Annual report 1979-80'. *The National Trust of Queensland Bulletin*, vol.1 no.3, (Dec 1980), p.14.

[11] Draft Bellevue Homestead Coominya conservation plan, National Trust of Queensland, 21 March 1998, p.6.

[12] Angela Burger. 'Saving an old homestead'. *Australian Women's Weekly*, (5 Jun 1974), p.10.

[13] Angela Burger. 'Saving an old homestead'.

[14] 'Hospital moved'. *Northside Advertiser*, (19 Aug 1987).

[15] 'Pioneer hotel'. *Near North Coast News*, (17 Aug 1988), p.3.

[16] 'Village to host jugs and bottle'. *Near North Coast news*, (1 Nov 1988).

[17] '50 historic buildings'. *The Sun*, (25 Jan 1990), p.47.

[18] W Ross Johnson. *The call of the land: A history of Queensland to the present day*. Milton, Qld: Jacaranda Press, 1982, p.171.

[19] NTQ red file PKD 1/6

[20] Letter Peak Downs Shire Council to NTQ Rockhampton Branch, NTQ white file Peak Downs Hire - General, PKD 1., 28 Nov 1978.

[21] Letters from NTQ to Capella Pioneer Village Inc, 30 Jun 1989 and 20 Apr 1990.

[22] Eulalia, Queensland Heritage Register file 600269.

[23] Stephen Pitt. 'Preserving a piece of colonial Queensland'. *QIT Communique*, (May 1987), p.7.

[24] The case for the preservation and restoration of the Jondaryan Woolshed, typescript, 1974/5?

[25] Letter from Chairman Grundy of Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Museum and Park Association to fellow residents inviting them to the AGM, dated 20 Aug 1976.

[26] Letter Jondaryan Woolshed Association to NTQ dated 30 Mar 1988 and brochure.

[27] 'Woodleigh Cheese factory'. *The Chronicle*, (7 Dec 1994), p.11.

[28] Minutes of the annual General Meeting of the Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Museum and Park Association in the Woolshed on 25 October 1997, meeting no. 314, p.2.

[29] National Centre for Studies in Travel and Tourism. *Jondaryan Woolshed Association business plan - 1997/98 - 1998/99*, p.22.

[30] The Jondaryan Woolshed Historical Museum & Park Association, *Annual Report 1997/98*, 1998, p.1.

[31] National Trust of Queensland Townsville Branch. *Restoration of historic houses appeal brochure*, Sept 1978.

[32] National Trust of Queensland Townsville Branch. *Restoration of historic houses appeal brochure*, Sept 1978.

[33] Letter from Hon Sec JA Fuller to Prof IN Moles Townsville Branch, re-Pioneer Homestead Project, dated 21 Aug 1979.

[34] Council minutes of 25 Jun 1979, paragraph 7.4.

[35] NTQ Townsville Branch Pioneer Homestead sub-committee 17th report, 5 Jun 1979.

[36] NTQ Townsville Branch Pioneer Homestead sub-committee reports.

[37] 'Annual report, Property Development: The National Trust Centre Townsville'. *The National Trust of Queensland Bulletin*, vol.2 no.3, (Nov 1981), p.10.

[38] National Trust of Queensland Townsville Branch. *Restoration of historic houses appeal brochure*, Sept 1978.

Jane Lennon and Associates - April 2000

[Contents](#)



© 2001 Museums
Australia Queensland.
Site queries:
mail@maq.org.au
Ph: +61 7 3215 0840
Fax: +61 7 3215 0841
Last Modified: *Friday
January 09 2004*

Site hosting by



**Queensland
Government**
Arts Queensland
MAQ is funded by