

# **THE GOVERNANCE OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE IN OUTDOOR CULTURAL OBJECTS IN QUEENSLAND**

**By**

**Dr. Lisanne Gibson**

**2004**

**Author Contact Details:**

ARC Postdoctoral Fellow

The Australian Centre

University of Melbourne

137 Barry Street

Carlton VIC 3053

Australia

Tel: +61 3 8344 3849

Fax: +61 3 9347 7731

Email: [arts-austcentre@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:arts-austcentre@unimelb.edu.au)

**CONTENTS:**

	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Section One:</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
	1.1 Report Context	
	1.2 Definition of Outdoor Cultural Objects	
	1.3 Aims of Report	
	1.4 Methodology	
<b>Section Two:</b>	<b>Criteria of Heritage Significance, Objects and Places</b>	<b>10</b>
	2.1 Aesthetic Significance	
	2.2 Historic Significance	
	2.3 Social Significance	
	2.4 The Category of Place	
	2.5 Modernist Public Art and the Problem of Place	
	2.6 Public Art, Cultural Heritage and Whole of Government	
<b>Section Three:</b>	<b>Outdoor Cultural Objects and Public Art: Queensland Local Governments Survey, 2001</b>	<b>18</b>
	3.1 Public Art Activity	
	3.2 Funding of Public Art Programs	
	3.3 Aims of Public Art Programs	
	3.4 Commissioning of Public Art	
	3.5 Public Consultation and Public Art	
	3.6 Temporary Public Art	
	3.7 Length of Installation	
	3.8 Conservation of Public Art	
	3.9 Deaccessioning of Public Art	
	3.10 Evaluation of Public Art Activities and Programs	
	3.11 Professional Development	
	3.12 Influence of Public Art Programs	
	3.13 Documentation of Public Art and Outdoor Cultural Objects	
	3.14 Outdoor Cultural Objects	
	3.15 Funding of Cultural Heritage Programs	
	3.16 Aims of Cultural Heritage Programs	
	3.17 Expertise in the Management of Cultural Heritage	
	3.18 Public Consultation and Cultural Heritage	
	3.19 Postwar Outdoor Cultural Heritage	
	3.20 Links between Public Art and Cultural Heritage Programs and Policies	

<b>Section Four:</b>	<b>Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in Queensland Local Government Heritage Surveys, Maps and Policies</b>	<b>29</b>
	4.1 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in Local Government Heritage Surveys	
	4.1.1 Objects on Asset Management Registers and not on Heritage Survey/Registers	
	4.1.2 Heritage surveys recently completed but objects not yet incorporated into planning schemes	
	4.1.3 On a Heritage Register within the City/ Shire Plan	
	4.1.4 Known outdoor cultural objects not included on planning schemes	
	4.1.5 Heritage surveys not completed	
	4.2 Policy on Public Art and Outdoor Cultural Objects	
	4.2.1 Policy in place	
	4.2.2 Policy does not yet exist but the need is recognised	
<b>Section Five:</b>	<b>Outdoor Cultural Objects and Heritage in Australia</b>	<b>34</b>
	5.1 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in America and England	
	5.2 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in Australia	
	5.3 Outdoor Cultural Objects on the Register of the National Estate	
	5.4 Outdoor Cultural Objects on State Government Heritage Registers	
	5.5 Outdoor Cultural Objects: Activities of The National Trust of Australia	
	5.6 Sculpture, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material	
<b>Bibliography:</b>		<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix One:</b>	<b>Public Art and Heritage Project Publication Outcomes listed in DEST Categories</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix Two:</b>	<b>‘A Protocol between Art Queensland and Local Government in Relation to Arts and Cultural Development’</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix Three:</b>	<b>Questionnaire—Outdoor Cultural Objects and Public Art: Queensland Local Government Survey, 2001</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix Four:</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage Branch Local Government Survey, 2002: Results of Q.1.—Local Governments who have undertaken Heritage Surveys</b>	<b>57</b>

<b>Appendix Five:</b>	<b>Table of Objects Discussed in <i>Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape</i></b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix Six:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Queensland Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Appendix Seven:</b>	<b>Australian State Government Heritage Legislation</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Appendix Eight:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Register of the National Estate</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Appendix Nine:</b>	<b>Australian Capital Territory Heritage Objects Act 1991</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Appendix Ten:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Australian Capital Territory Heritage Places Register</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Appendix Eleven:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Victorian Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>Appendix Twelve:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the New South Wales Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Appendix Thirteen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Northern Territory Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>Appendix Fourteen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the South Australian Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>Appendix Fifteen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Tasmanian Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>203</b>
<b>Appendix Sixteen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the West Australian Government Heritage Register</b>	<b>212</b>
<b>Appendix Seventeen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Register of the Victorian Branch of the National Trust of Australia</b>	<b>219</b>
<b>Appendix Eighteen:</b>	<b>List of outdoor cultural objects on the Register of the West Australian branch of the National Trust of Australia</b>	<b>224</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OUTDOOR cultural objects are a crucial part of our cultural landscapes due to their use in the construction and representation of our cultural, social and political identities. It follows that the commissioning and protection of outdoor cultural objects are matters of some importance given their cultural, social and political significance.

- This report concludes that the criteria set out in section 23 of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* for assessing the significance of “places” is appropriate for assessing the significance of outdoor cultural objects. However, five crucial factors impact on the adequate protection of outdoor cultural objects in Queensland:
  - i. the definition of cultural heritage significance as residing in ‘place’ exclusively, rather than ‘place’ and ‘object’, in the Queensland Government’s heritage policy and legislation militates against the assessment of heritage significance in outdoor cultural objects independent of their context. An object of heritage significance in a place which does not have heritage significance thus has no legislative protection.
  - ii. The predominant perception of cultural heritage significance excludes many objects when their heritage significance is of a more social rather than aesthetic character or from a historical trajectory which has not yet been recognised as a significant part of the State’s history.
  - iii. the limited uptake of cultural heritage mapping by Queensland’s Local Governments means that much of the State’s cultural heritage which has local significance rather than State significance is poorly documented and inadequately protected, this is especially so for outdoor cultural objects.
  - iv. Procedures for record keeping and the ongoing conservation of outdoor cultural objects are poor or often non-existent. This presents significant problems for the consideration of heritage significance in outdoor cultural objects due especially to difficulties establishing an objects’ provenance.
  - v. Queensland Government’s cultural heritage mapping guidelines for local government define significance exclusively in terms of “place” rather than “object” and “place”.
- The Queensland Government is not developing policy guidelines or advocating a greater awareness of outdoor cultural objects and their possible heritage significance to either the general public or local government.
- Queensland is the only state or territory government in Australia that does not provide for the management of “objects” with cultural heritage significance regardless of “place”.
- The Queensland Heritage Register has one of the most limited representations of outdoor cultural objects on any government heritage register.
- Very few local or state governments have developed strategic policy connections between the commissioning of outdoor cultural objects (often administered by government departments responsible for cultural development) and the protection of outdoor cultural objects (often administered by parts of government responsible for the management of the environment and planning).
- There is no national scheme to document, catalogue or raise awareness of Australian outdoor cultural objects and their possible heritage value in spite of the burgeoning of “public art” and growing number of outdoor cultural objects in our cultural landscapes over the past 20 years.
- Local government representatives and heritage practitioners interviewed for this project expressed great interest in seeing the final report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. That the Queensland Government develops a whole of government strategy to facilitate closer working relationships between cultural development, cultural protection and cultural management parts of government at all levels. This should be achieved by:

- 1.1 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and Arts Queensland;
- 1.2 the development and implementation of guidelines to enable cross-referencing between public art registers, asset registers and heritage registers;
- 1.3 education of the community to build recognition and appreciation of the heritage significance of outdoor cultural objects (especially the heritage significance of objects installed or created after World War II);
- 1.4 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and the Department of Local Government and Planning to assist local governments meet the recommendations of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* through the development of cultural heritage surveys;
- 1.5 the development of partnerships between relevant government departments and the Local Government Association of Queensland to help local government manage, identify and protect outdoor cultural objects; and,
- 1.6 the reproduction and distribution of this report by the Public Art Agency and/or the Cultural Heritage Branch to Queensland heritage agencies and local governments

(See discussion in Sections Two, Three and Four).

2. The Cultural Heritage Branch to recommend that the Queensland Government consider an amendment to the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* to permit the individual listing of outdoor cultural “objects” or “items”. This would bring the Act into line with current heritage practice and heritage instruments in the other states (see discussion in Sections Two and Five).

3. The Queensland Government to develop policy recommendations and strategies for the heritage management of outdoor cultural objects where objects are of heritage significance but cannot be kept in their original places. This would bring Queensland Government heritage policy into line with The Burra Charter (see discussion in Section Two).

4. The Queensland Government to develop strategic partnership arrangements to encourage more effective management of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland. (Arts Queensland has developed a number of effective strategies and partnerships to promote cultural development in rural and regional Queensland which could be adopted and developed for cultural heritage management). Queensland Government to investigate whether the following could be used as models for the governance of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland:

- i. “A protocol between Arts Queensland and Local Government in Relation to Arts and Cultural Development”—an agreement between the Local Government Association of Queensland and Arts Queensland (see Appendix Two);
- ii. Regional Art Development Fund; and,
- iii. the Museum Development Officer Network (currently under review).

(See discussion in Sections Three and Four).

6. The Queensland Government to develop a whole of Queensland government policy for considering proposals to establish monuments and memorials. This policy should be based on established significance classification procedures such as the Integrated Cultural Opportunities Assessment tool developed by the Public Art Agency and the Criteria of Cultural Heritage Significance specified in section 23 of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (see discussion in Section Two).

7. The Public Art Agency to work with Arts Queensland and the Local Government Association of Queensland to develop guidelines to help local government manage and commission outdoor cultural objects, these guidelines to be made available in an easily usable form. (See for example the “Public Art Resource Kit” CD-rom published by the Local Government and Shires Associations of New South Wales 2003. Also see discussion in Section Three).

8. The Queensland Government to advocate the establishment of a national scheme to document and catalogue outdoor cultural objects (see discussion in Section Five).

## SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Report Context

- The “Public Art and Heritage: History, Practice, Policy” project began early in 2001. It was funded by the Australian Research Council’s Strategic Partnerships with Industry, Research and Training Program (SPIRT) and the Public Art Agency with the Cultural Heritage Branch of the Queensland Government providing cash and in-kind support.
- The project was conducted from the Australian Key Centre for Culture and Media Policy at Griffith University, Queensland, from January 2001 until July 2002 and from the Australian Centre at the University of Melbourne from July 2002 until December 2003.
- Completed at the end of December 2003, it produced the following outcomes:
  - a full-colour text co-authored with Joanna Besley titled *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape* published by the University of Queensland Press in 2004; and,
  - a major report written specifically for the Queensland Government on “developing criteria for establishing the heritage significance of public art” and the governance of outdoor cultural objects. (This document)
  - a number of articles on the project in journals of international standing and presentations at fora in Australia and overseas (see Appendix One).
- Dr. Lisanne Gibson was the project’s Chief Investigator, assisted by staff of the Public Art Agency and Cultural Heritage Branch. Joanna Besley was a research assistant for much of the project and provided substantial assistance and input. Tracey Avery was a research assistant in the final stages of the project and also provided essential assistance.

### 1.2 Definition of Outdoor Cultural Objects

- “Outdoor cultural objects”, as defined by this report, are those intended to have a representative, memorial or symbolic function outdoors or in a public place. This was taken to include sculptural art in public places, monuments, memorials, mosaics, murals, tympana, building badges (with a sculptural element), outdoor advertising objects (such as the Big Pineapple), sundials, fountains, and stained glass windows.
- Public places were defined as spaces easily accessible to the general public; including foyers of buildings.
- It should be noted that the objects included are often the responsibility of different parts of government – the commissioning of public art or public sculpture usually comes under the umbrella of government departments responsible for cultural development. The management of already existing outdoor cultural objects (including public art) which are deemed to have heritage significance often is the responsibility of government bodies charged with the management of the environment except, for example, where public art is housed in a museum. This report considers outdoor cultural objects as defined no matter which part of government is responsible for them.
- For the purposes of this report outdoor cultural objects do not include objects on church grounds or in cemeteries as the policy contexts of these are quite specific.

### 1.3 Aims of Report

This research reports on:

- the selective governmental and societal understanding of cultural heritage significance in outdoor cultural objects and the reasons this understanding needs to be broadened;
- criteria of cultural heritage significance and outdoor cultural objects; and,
- current Queensland Government and local government policy mechanisms used to establish cultural heritage significance in relation to outdoor cultural objects.

## 1.4 Methodology

### Interviews:

- Interviews and meetings around Australia and in the United Kingdom with academics; heritage and public art professionals; heritage, public art and related administrators in government departments and non-government organisations (NGOs); and urban and cultural planners.

### Literature and Policy:

- Australian local government associations, state and federal government heritage and public art policy, programs, reports and other publications; Australian local government associations and state planning policy and related publications; publications on supranational heritage instruments and discussions, e.g. UNESCO and ICOMOS; policy, reports and publications from government and NGO heritage and public art programs particularly from the UK, and some from the USA
- Academic publications relating to public art, art, heritage, urban and cultural planning
- Close analysis of Australian state government heritage legislation, policies and registers (see Section Five)
- Close analysis of a selection of Queensland local government heritage surveys and policies (see Section Four)
- Analysis of a selection of Victorian and New South Wales local government heritage surveys and policies (see Section Five)

### Surveys:

- Postal and telephone survey of all Queensland local government associations, including Indigenous land councils: total 160
- Postal and telephone survey of regional galleries and museums: total 375
- Initial survey and telephone work took place in late 2001
- See Section Three for survey report
- Further telephone surveying of local government personnel responsible for heritage took place in late 2003 and is reported in Section Four



## SECTION TWO: CRITERIA OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE, OBJECTS AND PLACES

### 2.1 Aesthetic Significance

Traditionally the consideration of outdoor cultural objects, including public art, has valorised particular modes for understanding the significance of objects. In relation to public art, for instance, art and architectural theories have judged the aesthetic or design qualities of an object to be the aspect of most importance. However, the basis on which judgments about the quality of aesthetic form might be made is the subject of much debate; over the last fifty years sociological studies have shown us that taste itself is formed by a person's specific cultural, social and historical context.<sup>1</sup> In other words, there is no such thing as 'pure' taste, and therefore no such a thing as 'pure' quality.<sup>2</sup> The implications of these findings are significant in that they demonstrate that 'taste' is tied to cultural, social and political factors. Many outdoor cultural objects do not fit into the canons of traditional art or architectural history where these are based on an objects' aesthetic quality. Does this mean that these objects are of little or no value or significance?

The Australian Heritage Commission's Aesthetic Value Workshop *More Than Meets The Eye: Identifying and Assessing Aesthetic Value* (1994) was primarily about assessing aesthetic value in cultural landscapes but its findings also shed light on criteria used to measure the aesthetic significance of outdoor cultural objects. This workshop resoundingly endorsed the view that assessment of aesthetic significance must be pluralist. In particular the workshop recommended "the need to elicit information from the community in such a way as to ensure that the widest possible connotations of 'aesthetic' are understood and appreciated".<sup>3</sup> In summary, the working group's definition of aesthetic value was "the response... to visual or non-visual elements and can embrace emotional response, sense of place, sound, smell, and any other factors having a strong impact on human thoughts, feelings and attitudes".<sup>4</sup>

### 2.2 Historic Significance

A second criterion for designating an object's significance is based on its historical importance. The concept of history defined in the singular has also been problematised. The notion that history is not a single story but consists of "histories" or "layers" of history is now familiar. This reinterpretation of the construction of history has been motivated in particular by the recognition that historical events are experienced differently by different groups of people and mean different things to different people. That is, the retelling of a historical event is an act of "making" history rather than merely recognising history. As historian David Lowenthal has argued, "to be a living force the past must ever be remade ... the true steward adds his own stamp to those of his predecessors".<sup>5</sup> Lowenthal emphasises the constructed and ever-changing nature of what is considered to have historical and therefore, heritage, significance. He warns that the process of designating significance must be developmental rather than static if heritage policies and practice are to be democratic. The evaluation of significance is not a simple matter of recognition but an active designation which has cultural, political and social effects.

So who decides which outdoor cultural objects are significant and which less so and how do they decide? Government and heritage practitioners use the concept of "cultural heritage significance" to recognise objects and places as significant and to provide legislative protection for them through heritage acts and registers, administered in Queensland by the State Government and local governments. Like other heritage acts in Australia, the *Queensland Heritage Act* (1992) is based on The Burra Charter which defines cultural heritage for the Australian International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The charter defines cultural heritage significance as

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bourdieu, Pierre 1994, *A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, London; and, Bennett, Tony, Emmison, Michael and Frow, John 1999, *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures*, Cambridge University Press, Australia. See more specifically Kindler, A.M., Pariser, D.A., van den Burg, A., Liu, Wan Chen and Dias, Belidson, 2002, 'Aesthetic Modernism, The First Among Equals? A Look at aesthetic value systems in cross-cultural, age and visuals arts educated and non-visual arts educated judging cohorts', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8, 2, 135-152.

<sup>2</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre. 1994, *A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, London

<sup>3</sup> Ramsay, J. and Paraskevopoulos 1994, *More Than Meets the Eye: Identifying and Assessing Aesthetic Value*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra, 79.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 81.

<sup>5</sup> Lowenthal, David 1998, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge University Press, London, 171.

“aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations”.<sup>6</sup> The *Queensland Heritage Act* establishes the following specific criteria for the assessment of cultural heritage significance:

- a. the place is important in demonstrating the evolution or pattern of Queensland’s history;
- b. the place demonstrates rare, uncommon, or endangered aspects of Queensland’s cultural heritage;
- c. the place has potential to yield information that will contribute to the understanding of Queensland’s history;
- d. the place is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of places;
- e. the place is important because of its aesthetic significance;
- f. the place is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative achievement at a particular period;
- g. the place has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural, or spiritual reasons
- h. the place has a special association with the life or work of a particular person, group or organisation of importance in Queensland’s history.<sup>7</sup>

Currently, most outdoor cultural objects on the *Queensland Heritage Register* are war memorials, traditional statuary, architectural friezes and fountains (see Appendix Six for a list of outdoor cultural objects on the register). In part, this reflects an interpretation of Australian history which sees our participation in wars and particularly WWI and WWII, as key moments in the formation of Australian national identity. The few other outdoor cultural objects on the register are valued for other historical reasons or for their aesthetic merit. The diversity of Queensland’s outdoor cultural objects is poorly represented. As Section Five shows, Queensland has the least diverse listing of outdoor cultural objects of any state, partly due to the Act’s definition of significance as residing in “places” rather than or in addition to “objects”, a definition which has great implications for the heritage management of outdoor cultural objects and which I discuss further below. In addition, the diversity of Queensland’s outdoor cultural objects on the heritage register is poorly represented because most places on the register are nominated by members of the public and there is a chronic lack of information about and awareness of outdoor cultural objects and especially their provenance.

## 2.3 Social Significance

The concept of “social significance” has gained ground as a category of value in the past 10 years, enabling objects and places to be recognised when their significance is not primarily aesthetic or historical. The increasing emphasis on this category is partly due to criticism that heritage assessment practice has been too narrow, failing to reflect the breadth and depth of history, culture and society.<sup>8</sup> The concept of social value sees objects and places as coming from communities rather than professionals. In a report on social value commissioned by the Australian Heritage Commission, Chris Johnston defines places with social value as those which can:

- provide a spiritual connection or traditional connection between past and present;
- tie the past and the present;
- help to give a disempowered group back its history;
- provide an essential reference point in a community’s identity;
- loom large in the daily comings and goings of life;
- provide an essential community function that develops into an attachment; [and,]
- shape some aspect of community behaviour or attitudes.<sup>9</sup>

This definition has since been broadened to include collections and objects rather than only “places”.<sup>10</sup> While protecting such things by retaining them in their original context is the preferred method of protection, this is not

<sup>6</sup> Australia ICOMOS 1999, *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Australia ICOMOS, Victoria.

<sup>7</sup> State Government of Queensland, 1992, *Queensland Heritage Act, 1992*, (Reprinted as in force on 19 July 2000), State Government of Queensland, Brisbane, 16-17.

<sup>8</sup> Johnston, Chris 1994, *What is Social Value?*, AGPS, Canberra, 4.

<sup>9</sup> Johnston, Chris 1994, ‘Social Values- Overview and Issues’, in *People’s Places: Identifying and Assessing Social Value for Communities*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra, 5.

<sup>10</sup> Winkworth, Kylie 1998, *Review of existing criteria for assessing significance relevant to moveable heritage collections and objects*, Department of Communications and the Arts, Canberra.

always possible. Heritage protection mechanisms need to be flexible enough to protect these outdoor cultural objects even where their contexts are destroyed or compromised. Due to the primacy of “place” in Queensland’s heritage legislation, many outdoor cultural objects of heritage significance are not protected through this legislation. Where the significance of such objects is deemed to be of local rather than state value, the criteria of social value is of particular importance. However, actual legal protection in these contexts is problematic primarily due to the inflexibility of legislative and bureaucratic mechanisms.

Professor of Architecture Kim Dovey has commented:

“Educating communities to research and defend their places of value is easier to justify than the determination that such places are to be protected by law against development. Such an approach avoids some of the dilemmas ... in that it does not measure, define, judge or paralyse places of social value. Rather it empowers and enables people to define themselves and places as part of the general development of democratic social life.”<sup>11</sup>

However, often the “provenance” or the history and social significance of an object has been lost or forgotten, a problem exacerbated when the object is perceived to be outside established heritage frameworks. As Dovey argues, it is only through actively raising awareness and providing access to information that our communities can truly participate in the process of identifying those aspects of their cultural heritage that are aesthetically, historically or socially significant. Very little information is available in Queensland about the identification and management of outdoor cultural objects and nowhere is this more apparent than in the heritage mapping policies and surveys of Queensland’s local governments. This will be discussed in detail in Sections Three and Four.

## 2.4 The Category of Place

As Kylie Winkworth noted in the watershed report *Review of Existing Criteria for Assessing Significance Relevant to Moveable Heritage Collections and Objects*, “while criteria for assessing the significance of heritage places are well developed internationally and have been in use for a number of years, criteria for the assessment of significance of moveable heritage are generally poorly defined throughout the world”.<sup>12</sup> The category of “moveable” cultural heritage applies more obviously to some forms of outdoor cultural object than others: free-standing sculpture or monuments, for example, could be understood as easier to move than murals or mosaics. Nevertheless, “items” from “historical monuments”, “original artistic assemblages and montages in any material; works of statutory arts and sculpture in any material; [and] works of applied art in such materials as glass, ceramics, metal, wood, etc” are all listed on the *UNESCO Recommendation for the Protection of Moveable Cultural Property 1978*.<sup>13</sup> Winkworth concludes her report by recommending that The Burra Charter’s central management tool – the statement of significance based on aesthetic, historical, scientific and/or social criteria – is “very suited to adaptation for moveable cultural heritage practice”.<sup>14</sup> Apart from murals and wall paintings applied directly to solid walls, most integrated public art could potentially be moved. In one sense, listing these items separately does not limit future development and could be seen as a soft option which does not value the retention of the work in its original location. However, individual objects may hold higher symbolic meaning within a community than the building to which they are attached. This is particularly valid with respect to signs and their recognition as a brand reproduced in advertising and on the manufactured products themselves. The Pelaco logo on shirts, for example, has been known and recognised nationally, not just in Victoria where the shirts were made and where the Pelaco sign is listed on the Victorian Government Register (see Section Five for further discussion).

As noted above, the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (like most state government heritage acts) is based on The Burra Charter which is founded on the care of heritage “places”. According to the precepts of the Revised Burra Charter, “cultural significance is embodied in the *place* itself, its *fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings,*

<sup>11</sup> Dovey, Kim 1994, ‘On Registering Place Experience’ in *People’s Places: Identifying and Assessing Social Value for Communities*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra, 33.

<sup>12</sup> Winkworth, Kylie 1998, *Review of existing criteria for assessing significance relevant to moveable heritage collections and objects*, Department of Communications and the Arts, Canberra, 3.

<sup>13</sup> UNESCO 1978, *UNESCO Recommendation for the protection of Moveable Cultural Property 1978*, <http://www.unesco.org/general/fre/legal/cltheritage/moveable78.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Winkworth, Kylie 1998, *Review of existing criteria for assessing significance relevant to moveable heritage collections and objects*, Department of Communications and the Arts, Canberra, 49. The recommendations of this report were subsequently adapted and published as Heritage Collections Council 2001, *Significance: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Cultural Heritage Objects and Collections*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

records, *related places* and *related object*".<sup>15</sup> In addition, "contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the *cultural significance* of a *place* should be retained at that place". However, the Charter also makes clear that removal of objects is unacceptable *unless* it is "the sole means of ensuring their security and *preservation*".<sup>16</sup> This is not to say that the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* or the *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management* developed to encourage local governments to undertake heritage mapping and management under the Queensland Government's *Planning Act 1997*<sup>17</sup> do not mention objects at all. On the contrary, like The Burra Charter, the Act defines "cultural heritage significance" as relating to "a place or object",<sup>18</sup> but, as the criteria for listing locates significance in the place only, an object can only be protected as part of a place. Thus, the Queensland legislation does not provide for the situation where removal of an object from a place is the only option for its preservation, as allowed for in The Burra Charter.

The Queensland Government does not have legislation, policy protection or advice covering the management of cultural objects. In addition, the Government, through the Cultural Heritage Branch, frames its heritage recommendations and advice only in terms of significance in relation to place (see, for instance, *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management*). This has had a substantial effect on the kinds of heritage surveys undertaken around the State. As you will see in Sections Three and Four, these also are constructed exclusively in terms of heritage significance emanating only from place.

In many circumstances it may be preferable that outdoor cultural objects remain in their place, but as this often is not possible, it is essential that the Queensland Government develop policy recommendations on moveable cultural heritage, not least because it is the generally recognised view that removal is preferable to demolition (see below for further examples of where this is an issue). Such a change would also bring the Queensland Government into line with other Australian states and the Australian Capital Territory which has had a Heritage Objects Register for some time. New South Wales heritage assessment criteria includes the word "item" to encompass both place and moveable heritage objects with the same criteria applied to each. The Northern Territory's *Heritage Conservation Act 1991* also covers both places and objects. In late 2003 Victoria began developing separate moveable cultural heritage criteria and legislation, although its heritage legislation already related to both place and objects (see 5.4 for further discussion on this and the development of the new legislation. See Appendix Seven for a list of Australian state government heritage Acts and Section five for a discussion on the listing of outdoor cultural objects in other Australian states).

## **Recommendation Two:**

**The Cultural Heritage Branch to recommend that the Queensland Government consider an amendment to the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* to permit the individual listing of outdoor cultural "objects" or "items". This would bring the Act into line with current heritage practice and heritage instruments in other states**

## **2.5 Modernist Public Art and the Problem of Place**

The use of art to adorn Queensland's commercial buildings has a long history – from the late 19th century to modern times. Brisbane has a rich collection artworks that reflect the city's development boom in the 1960s and 1970s. However, despite their richness, these older public art pieces are poorly protected by our heritage management policies. The problem is not specific to Brisbane. Much of the corporate public art developed from the 1950s to the 1970s worldwide is in the form of building badges and sculptural reliefs which decorate the outside of buildings, rather than free-standing sculpture.

---

<sup>15</sup> Australia ICOMOS 1999, *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Australia ICOMOS, Victoria, 2.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>17</sup> Cultural Heritage Branch 2001, *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management*, Environmental Protection Agency, State Government of Queensland, Brisbane and State Government of Queensland 1997, *Integrated Planning Act 1997*, State Government of Queensland, Brisbane.

<sup>18</sup> State Government of Queensland, 1992, *Queensland Heritage Act, 1992*, (Reprinted as in force on 19 July 2000), State Government of Queensland, Brisbane, 12.

While, as noted, contemporary heritage debates are increasingly about ways to protect cultural heritage *objects* rather than only cultural heritage *places*, Queensland's heritage legislation is still designed to protect "places" and therefore can only protect heritage significance where that significance is located in the building (or site) itself. This becomes a problem if the building is deemed not to be of significance but the public art work on it is significant.

Many of Brisbane's heritage-significant outdoor cultural objects have been lost due to unfettered development. President of the Society of Sculptors Queensland, Catharina Hampson, has regretted "the fact that much public sculpture was lost as Brisbane redeveloped. In particular, important architectural modeling by L.J. Harvey and J.L. Watts is no more".<sup>19</sup> Another more recent example of a lost outdoor cultural object of heritage significance is the case of the Tom Bass wall-mounted sculpture developed to adorn and represent Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Limited (MMI) on 344-354 Queen Street, then MMI's Queensland headquarters. Tom Bass is one of Australia's most well-known sculptors: named a Member of the Order of Australia in 1989 for his services to sculpture. There are examples of his sculpture on buildings throughout Australia and overseas and examples of his work in the collection of the National Gallery of Australia as well as many of the state art collections. He has entrance sculptures on the Treasury Building in Canberra (1966-7), the Australian National Library in Canberra (1966-8) and a free-standing sculpture at the entrance to the Australian Chancery Building in Washington DC, USA (1968-9).<sup>20</sup> The bronze relief installed in 1966 was above the front entrance of the MMI building. It consisted of three sections representing the Ark of Knowledge in the left-hand panel, the winged Sun of Truth and Enlightenment in the middle panel, and a branch of the Tree of Wisdom in the right-hand panel.

Despite the significance of Bass's work, its conservation or relocation was not considered before the building was refurbished in 1996. Inquiries with the architects and builders who undertook that work have failed to establish what happened to the sculpture. It seems to have disappeared without trace.

Another excellent example of Queensland's 1970s public sculpture has been lost just along Queen Street at the ANZ Bank Centre on the corner of Creek and Queen Streets. In 1999 a case was brought before the Queensland Heritage Council to consider the heritage significance of the building. One of central platforms of the case for the heritage significance of the building lay in the existence of a ceramic mural which covered the walls of the lift lobby and occupied two panels on the Creek Street elevation of the building. On the basis of expert testimony, the Heritage Register Advisory Committee recommended to the Heritage Council that the building was of heritage significance and should be placed on the *Queensland Heritage Register*.<sup>21</sup> The mural, by Pavel Forman, thus would have been retained in any refurbishment of the building's foyer. In the event the Heritage Council went against the recommendation of its expert committee and did not list the building on the State Register.<sup>22</sup> The mural was jack hammered away within hours of the Heritage Council's decision.

Forman designed and fabricated the mural for the opening of the building in 1973.<sup>23</sup> It was then the largest hand-made ceramic relief sculpture in Australia, comprising 10,000 tiles in tones of brown and gold and covering 170 square metres. It took more than six months to make. The mural depicted aspects of banking symbolism such as keyboards, fingernails, calculators and computer components. Heritage experts rated it as one of the largest ceramic murals in Australia and significant for its level of technical and creative achievement and unrivalled scale.<sup>24</sup>

Kathleen and Leonard Shillam are amongst Queensland's most significant public artists. Apart from Leonard Shillam's relief on the side of the old State Library Building none of the Shillams' public artworks are protected by being listed on the *Queensland Heritage Register*. Two of his most significant pieces were commissioned by banks and located on Brisbane buildings. "The Banker", a 15-metre high aluminum mural signifying the role of banking in supporting industry<sup>25</sup>, was installed on the Post Office Square façade of the Westpac Bank at 260 Queen Street in 1970. On the same wall inside the building there is a smaller Shillam sculpture signifying the city and communications. On the basis of "The Banker", Bligh and Partners, architects for the Commonwealth Savings Bank building on the corner of Albert and Adelaide streets, commissioned Shillam to develop another mural

<sup>19</sup> Society of Sculptors Queensland 1988, *Brisbane Sculpture Guide*, Society of Sculptors Queensland, Brisbane, foreword.

<sup>20</sup> Scarlett, K. 1980, *Australian Sculptors*, Thomas Nelson Australia Pty. Ltd., Melbourne, 47.

<sup>21</sup> Heritage Register Advisory Committee, *Minutes of Meeting No. 51*, Thursday 2 December 1999.

<sup>22</sup> Heritage Council, *Minutes of Meeting No. 105*, Friday 17 December 1999.

<sup>23</sup> Pavel and Paul Forman are brothers of Milos Forman who won an Oscar as Best Director for the film *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*.

<sup>24</sup> Cultural Heritage Branch, *Report to Heritage Register Advisory Committee*, 4 November and 2 December 1999.

<sup>25</sup> Raymond, M. ed. 1995, *Leonard and Kathleen Shillam: A Tribute*, Queensland Art Gallery, Brisbane.

sculpture for the wall facing King George Square.<sup>26</sup> He installed “Banking” on the Adelaide Street façade of the new building in 1970. The copper sheet and tubing sculpture signified banking procedures, the rods and bars denoting the partition between the teller and the customer and the coins and notes denoting money.<sup>27</sup> This piece was demolished in 1992.

### **Recommendation Three:**

**The Queensland Government to develop policy recommendations and strategies for the heritage management of outdoor cultural objects where objects are of heritage significance but cannot be kept in their original places. This would bring Queensland Government heritage policy into line with The Burra Charter**

### **2.6 Public Art, Cultural Heritage and Whole of Government**

There is a remarkable lack of nexus between parts of government responsible for commissioning and developing outdoor cultural objects and parts of government responsible for their protection and conservation. This lack of communication is apparent at all levels of government. As Sections Three and Four demonstrate, strategic policy on cultural development and cultural protection and management in relation to outdoor cultural objects is almost non-existent at local government level. Those responsible for heritage consistently responded that outdoor objects, other than monuments or memorials, were “not heritage” and therefore not their responsibility. In addition, at Queensland Government level it was discovered that applications made to the Queensland Government for the commissioning of monuments and/or memorials were falling into a policy vacuum. Such applications ultimately become the responsibility of the Department of Public Works and Natural Resources who had never considered that such applications might usefully utilise either a criteria for significance extrapolated from the *Queensland Heritage Act 1991* or the Public Art Agency’s ‘Integrated Cultural Opportunities Assessment’ recommended procedure for assessing a proposals merits. In the absence of this the ‘Queensland Framework for Considering Proposals to Establish Memorials and Monuments of Significance’ was developed by a Working Group made up of representatives from Premier and Cabinet and the departments of Public Works and natural resources and was chaired by Protocol Queensland. This document defines a memorial/monument of significance as reflecting one or more of the following:

- the proposal has been forwarded from a high-ranking official such as a head of government, ambassador, honorary consul to Australia;
- the proposal is on behalf of a nation, organisation or group that has made an important and historically significant contribution to Australia, for example during a time of war, or
- the premier of Queensland or director-general, Department of Public Works, has clearly indicated support for the project.<sup>28</sup>

At the very least this criteria is not likely to produce a publicly accountable process for the development of a monument or memorial. The Department of Public Works is aware the policy framework needs to be reviewed but as yet this has not been established. No local government in Queensland has developed a policy for dealing with proposals for the development of new monuments/ memorials.

### **Recommendation One:**

**The Queensland Government develop a whole of government strategy to facilitate closer working relationships between cultural development, cultural protection and cultural management parts of government at all levels. This should be achieved by:**

<sup>26</sup> Hartnett, D. 1996, *Forms Entwined: The life story of sculptors Leonard and Kathleen Shillam*, Pangeza Studio, Brisbane, 121-22.

<sup>27</sup> McKay, J. 1988, *Brisbane Sculpture Guide*, Society of Sculptors Queensland, Brisbane, 3.

<sup>28</sup> Protocol Queensland, 2003 ‘Queensland Framework for Considering Proposals to Establish Memorials and Monuments of Significance’, unpublished document.

- 1.1 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and Arts Queensland;**
- 1.2 the development and implementation of guidelines to enable cross-referencing between public art registers, asset registers and heritage registers;**
- 1.3 education of the community to build recognition and appreciation of the heritage significance of outdoor cultural objects (especially the heritage significance of objects installed or created after World War II);**
- 1.4 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and the Department of Local Government and Planning to help local governments meet the recommendations of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* through the development of cultural heritage surveys;**
- 1.5 the development of partnerships between relevant government departments and the Local Government Association of Queensland to help local government manage, identify and protect outdoor cultural objects;**
- 1.6 the reproduction and distribution of this report by the Public Art Agency and/or the Cultural Heritage Branch to Queensland heritage agencies and local governments**

#### **Recommendation Six:**

**The Queensland Government to develop a whole of Queensland government policy for considering proposals to establish monuments and memorials. This policy should be based on established significance classification procedures such as the Integrated Cultural Opportunities Assessment tool developed by the Public Art Agency and the Criteria of Cultural Heritage Significance specified in section 23 of the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992***

## SECTION THREE: OUTDOOR CULTURAL OBJECTS AND PUBLIC ART: QUEENSLAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY, 2001

### Background:

In early September 2001, a fax-back questionnaire (Appendix Three) was sent to all local councils (apart from Brisbane, Logan, Ipswich and Gold Coast) across Queensland, including Indigenous councils, and also to regional galleries and museums, institutionally-based museums and community-based organisations such as local historical societies, arts organisations, galleries and museums.

The initial response to this mailing was as follows:

Recipient	Number sent	Number received	Response Rate
Local councils	128	8	6%
Indigenous councils	32	0	0%
Galleries/museums	375	34	9%

The second stage of the consultation process involved following-up the mail-out via telephone contact with local councils and where possible, conducting the questionnaire over the phone. This resulted in 85 completed surveys, representing a response rate of 66%. Several Indigenous councils were contacted but given that only two surveys were completed, this information has been integrated with data from other councils.

The response to the second stage telephone interviews was as follows:

Recipient	Interview conducted	Total Response Rate
Local councils	83	
Indigenous councils	2	
<b>Total</b>	85	66%

### Questionnaire Results:

The results have been collated into two categories that mirror the original questionnaire, one dealing with public art policies and practices, the other with cultural heritage policies and practices. In some councils, particularly larger councils, different officers dealt with the two areas. Both officers were contacted where possible. However, it was much more common for councils to employ an arts or cultural officer than it was for them to employ a cultural heritage officer and this consequently is reflected in the response rate to the different sections of the questionnaire. Only 75 councils responded to the initial question relating to the management of cultural heritage and even lower numbers responded to other questions in this section in any detail. This represents an overall response rate of 59%. Data from the detailed questions relating to public art has been drawn from the sample of those who indicated that they do undertake public art activity. The percentages below reflect the response rate.

#### 3.1 Public Art Activity

- 56 or 66% of local councils in Queensland undertake public art activities.
- 29 or 34% of local councils in Queensland do not undertake public art activities.

#### Discussion:

- There was considerable uncertainty among respondents about what exactly was meant by public art. Phone contact was therefore essential for gaining accurate information: a number of organisations which initially responded "no" in fact were undertaking public art activities that were relevant to this project.
- A number of organisations which had not undertaken public art activities indicated they were planning to do so.

#### 3.2 Funding of Public Art Programs



The study showed many approaches were being used to fund public art activities. In many cases, a single council would use several approaches. Hence, responses are expressed in percentage terms.

- Direct budget allocation: 43%
- Regional Arts Development Fund (RADF): 22%
- Art Built-in: 4%
- Heritage Trails: 1%
- Other State Government: 9%
- Gaming Fund: 1%
- Centenary of Federation: 4%
- Private benefactor: 4%
- Donations: 3%
- Country Women's Association: 2%
- Developer contribution: 2%
- Percent for art: 1%
- Work for Dole: 1%
- Australia Council: 1%
- CDEP: 1%
- Other Federal Government: 1%

### 3.3 Aims of Public Art Programs

#### Discussion:

A range of aims were reported for public art programs, falling into the following broad areas:

- providing opportunities for local residents to participate in a broad range of arts activities, develop skills and increase confidence;
- provide professional and artistic opportunities for local artists;
- town beautification, townscape/urban design projects, urban regeneration;
- invite greater use of public space, create ownership;
- deter vandalism, enhance public safety, CPTED—"Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design";
- civic pride;
- to provide artworks which stimulate the community;
- celebrate the character of the community, sense of place, natural environment, local history and cultural heritage, local industry or agriculture;
- attract tourism, economic development;
- create icons, enhance image;
- encourage artists to pursue artistic excellence and innovation;
- co-ordination and communication between local groups; and,
- acknowledgment of local Indigenous culture.

### 3.4 Commissioning of Public Art

Again, there was a diversity of approaches used in commissioning public art and councils often used different approaches for different projects.

- Direct invitation: 35.5%
- Tender process/expressions of interest: 24.5%
- Community initiated/RADF: 14%
- Mix/dependent on project: 5.5%
- Community arts/volunteers: 5.5%
- Competition: 4%
- Exchange project: 3%
- Artist's lists or directories, such as Queensland Artworkers Alliance: 3%
- Donations: 3%
- Art Built-in: 1%
- Purchased from Returned and Services League of Australia: 1%

**Discussion:**

- Many councils emphasised they preferred to use local artists as this fostered local involvement in the arts and provided opportunities for local artists. In some cases, respondents explained that local artists themselves usually initiated projects and sought support from the council, rather than the other way around. Commissioning processes are often dependent on scale and available funding, many respondents indicating that direct invitation is the most appropriate method for small-scale projects. This seemed to reflect a preference among a number of respondents for more informal processes.
- RADF is qualified as “community initiated” because respondents indicated that if a project was initiated by the community, the council used RADF funds which it then matched with a direct budget allocation.
- Most tender/expression of interest processes were decided by a committee, usually with some community representation.
- The category “community arts” is used to refer to a model of projects whereby a local group or organisation (most commonly a school), initiates a project which may or may not involve an artist. Whenever this model of project was raised, it usually was the only form of public art activity in the shire or town.
- In one case, a council commissioned a mural from a local sign writer who was doing some work on a hall the council was renovating – “just got him to slap something up”

**3.5 Public Consultation and Public Art**

- 35 (64%) of councils conduct public consultation as part of the commissioning process for public art.
- 20 - 36% do not conduct public consultation.

An assessment committee with community members (in many cases, the existing RADF committee) was the most common form of consultation. Thirty-one percent of those who conduct consultation reported that this was the method they used.

**Discussion:**

- Direct participation by members of the community in the project was mentioned frequently as a form of public consultation;
- newsletters (articles in existing newsletters such as school or council newsletters,) or articles in local papers;
- public meetings;
- expert advisory committee;
- informal consultation—if town is small, it “happens naturally”;
- consultation during design process, once artist is commissioned;
- consultation may occur in a broad way prior to the project. In some cases, the public art project is an outcome of the consultation. This usually takes place within a planning paradigm such as local area planning, town plan review or urban design consultation or cultural planning paradigm as part of drafting cultural policy or as an activity of a permanent arts advisory panel or the like;
- consultation approach may vary depending on the scale and nature of the project;
- community group will do its own consultation around a project; and,
- in one example, the opposite of consultation, artists lobbied a council for involvement in a project.

**3.6 Temporary Public Art**

Only 18% of respondents had undertaken temporary public art

**Discussion:**

- None of the respondents indicated that they had a permanent program for temporary public art: all examples were one-off events.
- Examples of temporary public art events:  
Townsville City Council: Strand Ephemera 10-day sculpture exhibition  
Noosa Regional Gallery: Floating Land Program  
Mackay City Council: Temporary sculpture at recycling tip, using found objects
- Other works in this category:  
Performance events: one-day, site specific  
Banners

### 3.7 Length of Installation

- 10+ years: 35%
- 50+ years: 19.5%
- 100+ years: 7%
- Have not considered this issue: 28%
- Still working on policy: 3.5%
- Case-by-case according to contract: 7%

#### Discussion:

- This clearly was an issue that many of the respondents had not considered. In many cases, it was obvious that the response was simply that particular officer's opinion about how long a piece should "last" and did not reflect any written policy or formal expectation.
- Vandalism was raised as an important issue in respect to the length of installation. For example, the arts officer at Aurukun indicated that this was a primary issue—"it is a violent community and things don't last".
- Climate also was raised as a problem by a number of respondents, particularly those in remote areas, indicating that the harshness of the weather militated against longevity.

### 3.8 Conservation of Public Art

Only 23% of respondents had processes for seeking conservation advice during the commissioning process (or at any other stage of the process). The remainder did not have processes for seeking conservation advice or had not even considered the issue.

#### Discussion

- Examples of procedures for seeking conservation advice or undertaking conservation:  
Mackay City Council: part of council's maintenance schedule, a list of where piece is located and who should do conservation work;  
Maroochy Shire Council: public art is registered in the council's asset management system;  
Caboolture Shire Council: 5% of artwork budget set aside for maintenance; artist must submit a maintenance schedule as part of contract  
Redlands Shire Council: uses Arts Law Centre contract.
- Many commented that this was part of Council's general maintenance, undertaken by general works staff.
- Graffiti was mentioned as an issue—one council had sought specialist advice about its removal and several mentioned using anti-graffiti paint in mural projects.
- A small number of respondents indicated that they would seek the advice of an expert.
- Some respondents mentioned that this issue was part of RADF requirements but were hazy on details.
- Some indicated they would use their regional arts and local government networks to track down information.
- A number expressed anxiety about this issue.
- Aurakun had undertaken research into this area to try to address issues specific to its community.

### 3.9 Deaccessioning of Public Art

Only 14.5% of councils had a program or procedures for deaccessioning public art. Most of the remainder indicated they had not considered this issue.

#### Discussion:

- Examples of deaccessioning procedures:  
Redlands Shire Council: in contract, guidelines about modifying or relocating works, copyright shared between artists and council, artists must be contacted before any changes, modification, relocation etc  
Caloundra City Council: artists have full copyright  
Wondai Shire Council: rotation of artworks in the 'Art Up Poles' project

Caboolture Shire Council: deaccessioning clause in contract, council can remove at any time.

- One respondent had deaccessioning processes prepared in draft form and another reported a contract had been drawn up addressing deaccessioning for a particular artwork.

### 3.10 Evaluation of Public Art Activities and Programs

Only 20% of respondents had processes for evaluating public art activities they had undertaken. Of these, a number indicated that the procedures were informal—“in a small town, everybody knows”.

#### Discussion:

Forms of evaluation:

- feedback book at tourist information office;
- committee involved with commissioning process also reviews the process upon completion;
- sometimes part of overall community consultation;
- formal presentation at council meeting;
- project manager does a review before signing off against the brief—Caboolture Shire Council
- some mentioned that they used an RADF evaluation form.

### 3.11 Professional Development

Just over half (54%) of councils reported they had programs for professional development of artists, project managers, and other professionals involved in public art production and management. Of these, 75% used the RADF program to provide these opportunities.

#### Discussion:

- The RADF program offers opportunities for professional development in the arts in general, not specifically programs for public art production and management. Respondents who designated the RADF as their professional development program had not, therefore, necessarily been involved with any professional development relating to public art. Most respondents explained that RADF funding usually had been used to fund professional development in response to formal applications from artists or artworkers who had found the professional development opportunities themselves. In theory then, the RADF could be used to fund professional development in relation to public art but this has not occurred in most situations.
- Therefore, 14% is a more realistic figure for the number of councils who actually have programs or even *ad hoc* opportunities for professional development of artists, project managers and other professionals involved in the production and management of public art. Council officers had attended workshops conducted by Queensland Artworkers Alliance or the Public Art Agency. Redlands Shire had an informal mentor program for youth artists working with established artists on public art projects.

### 3.12 Influence of Public Art Programs

Responses relating to the extent to which formal public art programs had encouraged public or private developments in the shire/city to incorporate public art have been divided into four categories:

- A great extent: 27.5%
- Positive: 30%
- A small extent: 17.5%
- Not at all: 25%

#### Discussion:

- Many of the respondents found this a difficult question to answer, a great many commenting that it was “too early to tell”. This reflects how the production of public art at local government level remains in its early stages in Queensland.
- A number of respondents reported that public art projects had had a significant influence in building civic pride and raising awareness of town beautification. Jericho Shire, for example, commented that people had begun looking after their gardens more actively!

- A small number of respondents indicated that public art activities had created interest within the council itself and that colleagues from other sections of council were keen to become involved with public art production, for example, in Hervey Bay Shire.
- In Redlands Shire, where the Council has been engaged with public art for at least a decade, new housing estates are incorporating public art and developers are bringing development applications to council that already incorporate public art.
- The Mackay and Region Cultural Industry Organisation, a private sector body, has been established to foster the production of public art and aspects of cultural industries.
- Conversely, Noosa Shire Council discourages permanent public art due to an environmental policy which aims to keep the urban environment as uncluttered and “natural” as possible. It has a minimum number of traffic lights, for example, and commercial signage is strictly controlled.

### 3.13 Documentation of Public Art and Outdoor Cultural Objects

Thirty-four percent of respondents had documented existing public art or cultural heritage in their shire/town.

#### Discussion:

- Only one council, Maroochy Shire Council, has undertaken documentation specifically related to outdoor cultural objects and has begun an audit of all art assets in the shire, including outdoor cultural objects.
- 10 councils (16%) had a local heritage list or register.
- 10 had undertaken a heritage study or thematic historical study of their shire.
- In Mackay, the Council Planning department has done a partial heritage survey and their Heritage Advisory Committee and the local National Trust had recently obtained funds through RADF to publish the mapping of heritage sites in the city.
- In Gladstone, the gallery/museum is responsible for the care and conservation of the city's public art which comprises two objects, one of which is contemporary and one is historic. Whereas, the cemetery and cenotaph memorial are maintained by Parks Department.
- In Aurukun, the Arts Officer explained that they have a different concept of cultural heritage in Indigenous communities. An Indigenous understanding is more related to the natural environment and the idea of 'sacred sites', is more intangible and not something they would want to document.

### 3.14 Outdoor Cultural Objects

Fifty-three percent of Queensland councils have a policy or program to manage outdoor cultural heritage such as sculpture, memorials, monuments, murals, fountains and mosaics.

#### Discussion:

- 67.5% of those who reported that they had a program indicated that this program only related to the *maintenance* of cultural heritage assets and usually part of a general asset management program directed by the council's works or parks and gardens department. Such programs do not operate within a cultural heritage framework.
- 15% of those who reported that they had a program indicated that this had been developed in accordance with the new *Integrated Planning Act 1997*.
- Cultural heritage assets in a number of communities are looked after by community groups and voluntary organisations with the council having an overseeing role. Ilfracombe Council funds a community group to manage cultural heritage assets.
- A small number of respondents reported an *ad hoc* restoration program for local historic places with a community group usually approaching the council to provide funding. Examples: Cleveland lighthouse, Burnett Heads lighthouse and the restoration of war memorials.
- Gladstone Council had funded an instructional video for routine maintenance of the William Ewart Gladstone statue.
- In Laidley, the Council commissioned a consultancy to examine the Pioneer Village in order to guide management of the village. The report includes a Business Plan, Collections Policy and Restoration Policy.

### 3.15 Funding of Cultural Heritage Programs

- Direct budget allocation: 74%
- Seek grants: 12%

- Fundraising: 6%
- Private benefactor: 4%
- Veterans Affairs: 2%
- Work for the Dole: 2%

### 3.16 Aims of Cultural Heritage Programs

#### Discussion:

A range of aims were reported for cultural heritage programs, falling into the following broad areas:

- maintenance of existing cultural heritage assets;
- protection and restoration of existing cultural heritage assets;
- promoting heritage identity of town;
- guiding and controlling new development to fit with existing heritage character;
- town beautification;
- attracting tourism;
- focusing community interest and enthusiasm;
- community education;
- establishing and maintaining cultural heritage precincts or “pioneer villages”
- encouraging public display of historical material.

### 3.17 Expertise in the Management of Cultural Heritage

Cultural heritage is managed by people from a broad knowledge base, falling into the following categories:

- General works department/parks and gardens: 30%
- Council staff (generic, such as community services staff): 17%
- Community members: 15%
- Architects: 8.5%
- Planners: 8.5%
- Specialist heritage advisor: 7%
- Art gallery/museum staff: 5%
- Historians: 5%
- Conservators: 2%
- Urban Design Unit: 2%

#### Discussion:

- Only 78% of respondents answered this question, reflecting a general lack of formal process dealing specifically with cultural heritage issues.
- Many respondents reported that a committee managed cultural heritage, the committees possibly including some of the categories above.
- A small number of respondents reported they would seek expert advice on management issues on an as-needed basis.

### 3.18 Public Consultation and Cultural Heritage

#### Discussion:

- Of the small number of councils who had conducted cultural heritage studies or surveys, 50% included public consultation as a component.
- 10% had a heritage committee with community representation.
- A small number reported that cultural heritage had emerged as an issue during other consultation processes such as during the development of a city plan (Caloundra) and a community needs analysis (Quilpie). Recent consultation in Gladstone led to a cultural heritage study now under way.
- A small number of respondents reported their communities had initiated projects and actively put cultural heritage ideas to their councils.

- Consultation most commonly took the form of public meetings, meetings with local groups such as historical societies and meetings with individual members of the community.

### 3.19 Postwar Outdoor Cultural Heritage

Just over one-third (36%) of respondents reported that their program had provided protection for outdoor cultural heritage installed or constructed since WWII.

#### Discussion:

- If councils are responsible for outdoor cultural heritage in general, then no differentiation has been made between pre or postwar objects.
- Examples of postwar outdoor cultural objects of heritage significance:  
Gladstone: *Vitae-Morte* by Dawne Douglas and Michael Liddle, 1995  
Blackall: Major Mitchell clock 1960s, Labor Federation memorial (pyramid)  
Mt Isa: Hand-beaten copper wall mural in Civic Centre by MIM resident artist Val Pinsker, 1974  
Emerald: Council commissioned stainless steel and concrete fountain 10 years ago  
Peak Downs: In Tieri, a coal-mining company town which will disappear when mining stops, there is a Vietnam Veterans' Memorial constructed by two local veterans. Council has undertaken to protect and preserve the memorial, now on the Queensland Government Heritage Register, after Tieri disappears. It may be re-located to Capella.  
Jericho: The Crystal Trumpeteers, a locally conceived and designed rock and crystal structure depicting the Israelites crossing the desert, was constructed between 10 and 15 years ago.
- Some councils are responsible for WWII cultural heritage. St Christopher's Chapel, a simple multi-denominational building constructed during WWII, is under the care of Livingstone Shire Council.

### 3.20 Links between Public Art and Cultural Heritage Programs and Policies

Twenty-four percent of respondents reported policy/practice connections between the commissioning of public art and the management of outdoor cultural objects which have heritage significance.

#### Discussion:

- The most common form of connection is where both cultural heritage and public art are incorporated into a council's overall arts and cultural policy. Under Townsville's Public Art Policy, for example, the Council's heritage officer would generally advise on the heritage significance of potential sites for public art. Bungil Shire's Arts and Cultural Policy encourages "the collection, documentation and representation of local history through the use of all art forms". Several respondents reported that their cultural policies were still in draft form.
- Laidley Council is planning a public art project with a heritage theme at a local lookout designated as having cultural heritage significance. In Caboolture Shire, themes for public art projects have been drawn from a cultural heritage study of the shire. The Shire is also developing a heritage trail with interpretative signage that may be commissioned as a public art project. A walking trail through Mt Isa includes both commissioned outdoor cultural objects such as murals and already existing cultural objects such as farm machinery.
- Two respondents said there had been tension in their communities between those interested in heritage and those interested in the arts. There appears to be a level of conflict in Charters Towers between those promoting it as a heritage town and artists/youth workers who want to engage with contemporary forms and activities. A recently burnt-out heritage building in the town which initially was going to be restored with a heritage façade now has been designated as a youth arts space.

#### Recommendation One:

**The Queensland Government to develop a whole of government strategy to facilitate closer working relationships between cultural development, cultural protection and cultural management parts of government at all levels. This should be achieved by:**

- 1.1 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and Arts Queensland;**

- 1.2 the development and implementation of guidelines to enable cross referencing between ‘public art’ registers, asset registers and heritage registers;**
- 1.3 education of the community to aid in the recognition and appreciation of heritage significance in outdoor cultural objects (and especially the heritage significance of objects installed or created post-World War Two);**
- 1.4 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and the Department of Local Government and Planning, to assist local governments to meet the recommendations of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* through the development of cultural heritage surveys.**
- 1.5 the development of partnership between relevant government departments and the Local Government Association of Queensland to develop tools to aid local government to practice better management, identification and protection of outdoor cultural objects.**
- 1.6 these objectives will be assisted by the reproduction and distribution of this report (minus Appendices) to Queensland heritage agencies and Local Governments early in 2004. (Most local government representatives and heritage practitioners expressed great interest in seeing the report.)**

#### **Recommendation Four:**

**Queensland Government to develop strategic partnership arrangements to encourage more effective management of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland. (Arts Queensland has developed a number of effective strategies and partnerships to promote cultural development in rural and regional Queensland which could be adopted and developed for cultural heritage management). Queensland Government to investigate whether the following could be used as models for the governance of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland:**

- i. “A Protocol between Arts Queensland and Local Government in Relation to Arts and Cultural Development” – an agreement between the Local Government Association of Queensland and Arts Queensland (see Appendix Two);**
- ii. Regional Art Development Fund; and,**
- iii. the Museum Development Officer Network.**

#### **Recommendation Seven:**

**The Public Art Agency to work with Arts Queensland and the Local Government Association of Queensland to develop guidelines to help local government manage and commission outdoor cultural objects, these guidelines to be made available in an easily usable form. (See for example the “Public Art Resource Kit” CD-rom published by the Local Government and Shires Associations of New South Wales (2003).**



## SECTION FOUR: DOCUMENTATION OF OUTDOOR CULTURAL OBJECTS AND PUBLIC ART IN QUEENSLAND'S LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERITAGE SURVEYS, MAPS AND POLICIES<sup>29</sup>

### Background:

In October 2002 the Cultural Heritage Branch conducted a survey to ascertain which local governments had undertaken heritage surveys in Queensland. This confirmed the findings of a survey by this project in September 2001 that few local governments had undertaken heritage surveys. According to the Cultural Heritage Branch's 2002 study, which had an 88% response rate, 45% of local governments had undertaken historical cultural heritage surveys and only 20% had undertaken Indigenous cultural heritage surveys (see Appendix Four). This was despite the provisions of the Queensland Government's *Integrated Planning Act 1997*,<sup>30</sup> which recommends that local governments undertake heritage and cultural planning and mapping. On the basis of information gathered from the 2001 survey, a selection of cultural heritage surveys were studied to identify the extent to which outdoor cultural objects were included on these heritage surveys.

### Summary:

Of the 19 heritage maps and surveys studied none included a broad range of outdoor cultural objects. Rather, they utilised traditional heritage assessment models and so far as outdoor cultural objects are concerned, most only included war memorials or other traditional memorial forms. Thus, the heritage survey process has not, overall, led to an increase in the identification of significant outdoor cultural objects. The primary reason for this may be that definitions of significant heritage objects are based on place (see discussion in Section Two). Also, the language used when seeking nominations refers to "place" and "feature", not "object". In terms of the protection of cultural objects, those objects owned by councils were not considered at risk from development and often not included on planning schemes.

Two groups, Laidley Shire and the Arts and Cultural Regional Organisation of Councils group (Townsville and neighbouring councils), included in their heritage reports the results of consultation in which their communities had been asked to photograph and/or list their areas' valuable cultural heritage features.<sup>31</sup> Participants listed few outdoor heritage objects, probably because consultants only directed them with such terms as "features", "areas" and "places". The heritage consultant on Laidley's heritage report, for example, stated that to protect "character", "features" had to be identified such as landscapes, streetscapes, precincts, *groupings* [but not single items/objects], open spaces, topography and views that contributed to its character (my emphasis).<sup>32</sup> It is fair to assume that the use of the term "object", in addition to "place", would have produced a different list.

Local governments who are identifying heritage places are following the Queensland Government's *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management* (2001). Following this procedure, a framework of the State's nine historical themes would reveal places which 'define the human experience'.<sup>33</sup> These themes were adapted from the set of national themes, developed by the Australian Heritage Commission.<sup>34</sup> While the guidelines suggest that historians could introduce additional sub-themes to deal with the history of an area, broadly defined outdoor cultural objects do not obviously fit into the themes. Identification of such items may rely on consultants putting forward examples during the community consultation process.

---

<sup>29</sup> Examples are given from those shires which responded to the survey in 2001 and/or sent information in 2003.

<sup>30</sup> State Government of Queensland 1997, *Integrated Planning Act, 1997*, State Government of Queensland, Brisbane.

<sup>31</sup> Laidley Shire Council, *Draft Heritage Study Brief*, 10 July 2000, 104.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>33</sup> Cultural Heritage Branch 2001, *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management*, Section 1.2.2. State Government of Queensland, Brisbane, unpaginated.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

## 4.1 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in Local Government Heritage Surveys

### 4.1.1 Objects on Asset Management Registers and not on Heritage Survey/Registers

#### Tambo Shire:

Outdoor cultural objects will be considered for inclusion in planning scheme.

#### Toowoomba City:

Toowoomba's Parks and Open Space's section maintains a list of outdoor objects ('Memorials-Monuments-Statues and Plaques') and oversees their protection and maintenance. Objects also are listed on the council's Major Maintenance Priority Schedule. Some may be on a heritage register but this information is not included on the council list.

### 4.1.2 Heritage surveys recently completed but objects not yet incorporated into planning schemes

#### Eacham Shire:

Sites/objects identified in the Eacham Shire Historical Heritage Study (2003)<sup>35</sup> were divided into 15 site types and entered onto a database. Of note is the listing of movie projectors from the shire's demolished Liberty Theatre. Though the whereabouts of these objects is uncertain, the authors felt that their inclusion on the database would prompt the public's awareness of 'such items and the potential significance of similar items in the future'.<sup>36</sup> Davidson family graves<sup>37</sup> (site type: Cemetery) are identified by a new marker erected by the Eacham Historical Society. The only other objects identified were a tree (Site Type: Landmark) and Yungaburra's War Memorial flagpole (Site Type: Military). The flagpole, as well as being one of many existing but unlisted war memorials, was "nominated as an important *place* to the community" (my emphasis).<sup>38</sup>

#### Laidley Shire:

The Laidley Shire Cultural Heritage Study 2000 notes two war memorials that are already on the Queensland Government Heritage Register. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency's Research Inventory of Historical Places has noted the Laidley Hall Honour Board.

#### Noosa Shire:

Citations have been mapped and could be applied to a future planning scheme.<sup>39</sup> A register of places with photographs, descriptions and maps is available on the Council website. The Cooroy and Tewantin war memorials are the only objects on the register.

### 4.1.3 On a Heritage Register within the City/Shire Plan

#### Brisbane City Council:

- Objects on the BCC's heritage register are not accessible through an on-line database (although there has been some discussion of this occurring soon). The *Interactive CD Rom of the City Plan 2000* does contain a map base with heritage listings but the user would need to know the address of the object to find it.<sup>40</sup> The BCC's public art collections are the responsibility of its City Assets department. A recent study of the heritage potential of these objects did not identify any suitable for heritage listing by the council – somewhat surprising given the historical, cultural and social significance of many of the objects on this

<sup>35</sup> Gordon Grimwade and Associates 2003, *Eacham Shire Historical Heritage Study*, 1, 38-46.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 39-40.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>39</sup> Noosa Council 2002, *Historical Cultural Heritage of Noosa Shire: Report*, <http://stratplan\psreview\planning\planning\studies\cultural\heritage\historical\report.doc>, date accessed 13 November 2003.

<sup>40</sup> Brisbane City Council 2000, *Interactive CD Rom of the City Plan 2000*, Brisbane City Council, Brisbane. While a more recent version of the City Plan CD Rom exists it is only possible to access this through purchase or viewing it in a Brisbane City Council Library. It was not possible to interlibrary loan the version released in 2000. While the City Plan has changed slightly, the format of the CD, and therefore the accessibility of the Heritage Register, is the same.

register (for instance, the T.J. Byrnes in Centenary Place; the Queen Elizabeth II on George Street; the Mooney Fountain). A revised survey has recently been undertaken of the CBD but results were not available at time of writing. Given how difficult it is to access an actual list of the city's heritage register due to the technology of its presentation and similar difficulties accessing a list of the city's public art register, it is impossible to know which of Brisbane's outdoor objects are on which register. Many of the outdoor objects discussed in *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape* (2004),<sup>41</sup> are in Brisbane (see the list in Appendix Six). The inclusion of outdoor cultural objects on the BCC heritage register appears to have been limited by a number of factors. In addition to about 1500 registered places, a further 1500 await listing. The backlog already includes such objects as memorials from WWI and post-WWII objects and places are under-represented. Two objects listed on the register and of more recent heritage are the Sir William Glasgow memorial of 1966 in Upper Roma Street and a retaining wall at Wynnum Manly with a mural painted in the 1950s. Only in the past three to four years has the Council extended such heritage listings to objects outside the CBD.

### **Caloundra City:**

- This list appears under the council's Cultural Heritage and Character Areas Code and includes a brief description, statement of significance and photograph. The objects listed: Seven trees/groups of trees; two woods; three memorials; two sets of graves (not in a cemetery); and a shipwreck (SS Dickey at Dicky Beach). The latter has been there since it was grounded in 1893 and is cited as "a prominent feature of the Dicky Beach landscape".<sup>42</sup>

### **Charters Towers:**

- Objects already heritage-listed, such as a war memorial centred on a WWII cannon, will appear on a planning scheme currently under review. Some pieces of sculpture such as a statue of a bull are listed as "asset" objects within a park and, as such, have not been officially acknowledged as either cultural heritage or public art.

### **Mackay City:**

- Mackay War Memorial in Alfred Street is the only object on "Valuable Features", the city's list and map of cultural heritage which concentrates on the city centre.

### **Maroochy Shire:**

- A separate Public Art Register (2001) records 33 objects installed since 1997. The Shire intends to undertake a cultural heritage survey and audit monuments and memorials when funds are available. The Blackall Range is the only part of the shire with a detailed heritage record, objects including two monuments, an obelisk and memorial trees.

## **4.1.4 Known outdoor cultural objects not included on planning schemes**

### **Noosa Shire:**

- According to council planners, war memorials such as the Tewantin War Memorial are not included on Noosa's planning scheme because they are on public land and therefore not considered at risk from development.

### **Toowoomba City:**

- Outdoor cultural objects are not mentioned in the local planning scheme as they are council-owned and not considered to be at risk.

## **4.1.5 Heritage surveys not completed**

### **Sarina Shire:**

- It has taken time to establish a heritage committee. Little progress has been made with lists or policy.

<sup>41</sup> Gibson, L. and Besley, J. 2004, *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape*, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane.

<sup>42</sup> Caloundra City Council, no date, *Caloundra City Plan: Public Display Version*, part 2, 61.

## 4.2 Policy on Public Art and Outdoor Cultural Objects

### 4.2.1 Policy in place

#### Redland Shire:

- The shire's policy on public art, in effect since August 2003, has been linked with the Redlands Planning Scheme. The policy relates to the commissioning of works and states that a "proportion of funds will be set aside for long-term maintenance".<sup>43</sup> The policy is in draft form.

#### Noosa Shire:

- The policy is in draft form and will not be available until 2004.

### 4.2.2 Policy does not yet exist but the need is recognised

#### Caboolture:

- A recently produced Arts Culture Development Planning: Art Collection Policy (April 2003) does not cover outdoor cultural objects but the Shire's Arts and Cultural Planner recognises the need.

#### Maroochy Shire:

- Intends to develop policy as part of a cultural heritage survey when funds become available.

#### Tambo Shire:

- No specific policy as yet.

### Recommendation One:

**The Queensland Government to develop a whole of government strategy to facilitate closer working relationships between cultural development, cultural protection and cultural management parts of government at all levels. This should be achieved by:**

- 1.1 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and Arts Queensland;**
- 1.2 the development and implementation of guidelines to enable cross referencing between 'public art' registers, asset registers and heritage registers;**
- 1.3 education of the community to aid in the recognition and appreciation of heritage significance in outdoor cultural objects (and especially the heritage significance of objects installed or created post-World War Two);**
- 1.4 the development of more strategic relations between the Cultural Heritage Branch and the Department of Local Government and Planning, to assist Local Governments to meet the recommendations of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* through the development of cultural heritage surveys.**
- 1.5 the development of partnership between relevant government departments and the Local Government Association of Queensland to develop tools to aid local government to practice better management, identification and protection of outdoor cultural objects.**
- 1.6 these objectives will be assisted by the reproduction and distribution of this report (minus Appendices) to Queensland heritage agencies and Local**

---

<sup>43</sup> Redland Shire Council, 2003, *Public Art Guidelines*, 9.

**Governments early in 2004. (Most local government representatives and heritage practitioners expressed great interest in seeing the report.)**

**Recommendation Four:**

**The Queensland Government to develop strategic partnership arrangements to facilitate more effective management of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland. Arts Queensland has developed a number of effective strategies and partnerships to facilitate cultural development in rural and regional Queensland which could be adopted and developed for cultural heritage management. Queensland Government to investigate the following for their possible usefulness as models for the governance of cultural heritage in rural and regional Queensland:**

- i. ‘A Protocol between Art Queensland and Local Government in Relation to Arts and Cultural Development’—an agreement between the Local Government Association of Queensland and Arts Queensland (see Appendix Two);**
- ii. Regional Art Development Fund; and,**
- iii. the Museum Development Officer Network (currently under review).**

## SECTION FIVE: OUTDOOR CULTURAL OBJECTS AND HERITAGE IN AUSTRALIA

### 5.1 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in America and England

The National Recording Project in England has catalogued public monuments and sculpture and the National Inventory of War Memorials has catalogued war memorials across the entire country. The National Recording Project defined public sculpture broadly to include commemorative statues, architectural sculpture, columns, obelisks, public drinking fountains “as long as these seem... to possess sculptural or associative interest”. It also included “pieces of modern street furniture or architectural sculpture” and recent public art “where this may be defined as sculptural in character but not all the other objects which are commonly labeled public art such as murals, temporary installations, stained glass, performance art and utilitarian street furniture”.<sup>44</sup>

While cataloguing does not provide these objects with legislative protection this massive project has substantially raised community awareness. Similarly, in America, the Save Outdoor Sculpture Program (SOS), a joint project of Heritage Preservation and the Smithsonian American Art Museum, has been very successful in its advocacy for heightened community awareness and ownership of outdoor cultural objects in public places. Save Outdoor Sculpture “is a private/public initiative to document all monuments and outdoor sculpture in the United States and to help communities and local groups of all ages and interests preserve their sculptural legacy for the next century”.<sup>45</sup>

### 5.2 Documentation of Outdoor Cultural Objects in Australia

The only significant Australian initiative to catalogue outdoor cultural objects has been the appointment of a Queensland Government Public Art Curator responsible for documenting the Queensland Government’s art collection including outdoor cultural objects. Many other state and local governments have collection managers responsible for artworks including outdoor cultural objects owned by government. However, there is no national scheme to document, catalogue or raise awareness of Australian outdoor cultural objects and their possible heritage value. This is despite the burgeoning of public art commissioning over the past two decades.

There has been only limited documentation of Australia’s outdoor cultural objects. The most detailed identification and interpretation of commemorative public statues and objects has concentrated on war memorials<sup>46</sup> and colonial monuments. There is a published catalogue of New South Wales’s monuments and memorials but this contains no discussion<sup>47</sup>. ‘The Unusual Monuments Project’ was an Australian wide survey of monuments and other outdoor cultural objects that represented parts of history or social, cultural or political identities defined as ‘unusual’ or oppositional to dominant forms of national history and identity. Thus, the project set out to catalogue outdoor cultural objects which celebrated labour history, women’s history, social history, Aboriginal history, or were in some other way ‘unusual’. The project resulted in a number of academic articles and the archive for this project is lodged at the National Archives in Canberra.<sup>48</sup>

In writing *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape*, we researched more than 300 outdoor cultural objects in Queensland (although only just over 200 are discussed in the book, see Appendix Five for the table of objects discussed). In common with ‘The Unusual Monuments Project’ we found that certain representations of Queensland and Australian identity were hegemonic in Queensland’s outdoor cultural objects and there were very significant absences. In particular, we found that only four monuments in the entire State signified women and work and that while a number of outdoor cultural objects had been built by Indigenous

<sup>44</sup> Usherwood, P., Beach, J. and Morris, C. 2000, *Public Sculpture of North-East England*, Liverpool University Press, UK, 15.

<sup>45</sup> Save Outdoor Sculpture, *About Save Outdoor Sculpture*,

<http://www.heritagepreservation.org/PROGRAMS/SOS/sosmain.htm>, accessed on 14 November 2003.

<sup>46</sup> See for instance Ken Inglis, 1999, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*, Melbourne University Press, Victoria.

<sup>47</sup> Beryl Henderson, 1988, *Monuments and Memorials*, Macarthur Press, Sydney.

<sup>48</sup> Bulbeck, C. ‘Women of Substance: The Depiction of Women in Australian Monuments’, *Hecate*, 1992, xviii, ii, 24; Bulbeck, C. 1991, ‘The National Register of Unusual Monuments’, *Heritage Australia*, 10, 2; Bulbeck, Chilla. 1990, ‘Building the Nation: Silences and Marginalities concerning the representation of workers in monuments’, *Labour History*, 59; Bulbeck, Chilla 1988, ‘The Stone Laurel: Of Race, Gender and Class in Australian Memorials’, *Occasional Paper No.5*, Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University; Bulbeck, C. 1988, *A National Register of Unusual Monuments*, data sheets, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Australians and represented Indigenous identities, very few of them represented Indigenous conflict with settler society.

### 5.3 Outdoor Cultural Objects on the Register of the National Estate

The Register of the National Estate was searched for outdoor cultural objects using the following search terms:

- Monument
- Mural
- Memorial
- Sculpture
- Fountain
- Window (for stained glass, etc.)
- Public art
- Mosaic
- Sign
- Statue
- Sundial

Following is the summary results of this search. The full list of outdoor cultural objects on the Register is at Appendix Eight. (Please note that the numbers refer to the quantity of each type of object listed).

- Sculpture: 7
- Monument: 71
- Memorial: 329
- Mosaic: 1
- Mural: 5

Of particular note are the Father and Son Sculpture, Canberra and the Ethos Sculpture, Canberra. The Dreamers Gate, a monumental sculpture in New South Wales, is listed on the Register of the National Estate but not the NSW Government Heritage Register. It appears that Leonard's Shillam's Seal Sculpture in Queensland has been taken off the State Register (as it does not come up under any search criteria) but it is on the Register of the National Estate. In contrast the Newspaper House Mural in Victoria is listed on the Register of the National Estate and the State Register (see Appendix Eight for the statements of significance for all of these objects).

### 5.4 Outdoor Cultural Objects on State Government Heritage Registers

The Australian Capital Territory is the only state/territory with specific legislation for the management of heritage objects and an associated heritage register for heritage objects. The *Heritage Objects Act 1991* (last amended 2003) is reproduced at Appendix Nine. In this Act "heritage object" means a natural or manufactured object, including an Aboriginal object, of heritage significance in relation to the ACT, but does not include an object kept by—

- a) an individual—
- i) as a collector of heritage objects; or
  - ii) as a memento; or

- b) a prescribed body' (p.3).

The heritage significance of objects is defined in accordance with The Burra Charter as "archaeological, historic, aesthetic, architectural, scientific, natural or social significance for the present community and for future generations" (p.3), although significance is not deemed to be located in a place but in the object itself. (See Appendix Ten for entries in this register).

A small number of objects integrated with a building structure have been given separate listing status in some states. Such objects have generally been constructed separately by an artist or manufacturer and then fixed to the building so they are not strictly moveable cultural heritage but a fitting or fixture. Nevertheless, the portability of these objects appears to have been taken into account in the listings. For example, the History of Transport Mural (1973-78) on the main concourse at Spencer Street Railway Station in Melbourne was partially dismantled and repositioned in 2000 and has been moved again during redevelopment works. This work was painted on canvas panels and is, therefore, portable (the statement of significance for the piece is at Appendix Eleven).

In the listing of commercial signs in Victoria and New South Wales, the sign and its metal support are listed, but the building is not. In the case of the Pelaco sign in Richmond, Melbourne, two aspects of significance are covered: the role of the Pelaco company in the commercial history of Australia and the landmark quality of the sign to its surroundings (the statement of significance for this piece is at Appendix Nine). In Sydney, Sharpies Golf sign is additionally significant because it was technically innovative in itself, an early animated neon sign (the statement of significance for this piece is at Appendix Twelve).

In 2000 the *Victorian Heritage Strategy* was developed to provide direction for the identification, protection, conservation, management and use of cultural heritage in Victoria. As a result, an advisory committee was established to help the state's Heritage Council protect significant objects and collections. The Heritage Collections Advisory Committee was inaugurated in November 2001, meets every two months and reports directly to the Heritage Council. Its objectives are to:

- Develop a framework for the identification and assessment of significant collections of objects and artefacts in Victoria.
- Investigate and report to the Heritage Council on mechanisms to ensure appropriate and practical protection for significant heritage collections.
- Examine and make recommendations on the management of in situ objects or objects associated with significant places.
- Identify the best means of providing appropriate and practical protection for significant movable objects, public art works and sculptures.

A number of amendments were made to the *Victorian Heritage Act 1995* on 19 May 2004 to enable objects deemed to be of heritage significance to be protected separately (Victorian Consolidated Legislation, [http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol\\_act/ha199586/](http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/ha199586/)).

In September 2003 the Victorian Government tendered for a consultant to “review existing assessment criteria used by the Heritage Council and Heritage Victoria to ensure that the significance of objects, and the extent to which they are integral to a place of cultural heritage significance, can be assessed at the same time as assessing the significance of a place and where appropriate, develop additional and specific assessment criteria that enable the Heritage Council and Heritage Victoria to assess the significance of heritage objects for potential inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Register”. At the time of the final draft of this report the results of this consultancy were not complete.

The State Government heritage registers were searched for outdoor cultural objects using the search terms listed above and used to search the Register of the National Estate.

Following is the summary of the results of these searches. Lists of outdoor cultural objects in each state government register are in the Appendices. All state government registers include objects defined as monuments, memorials and fountains.

### **Australian Capital Territory**

The Australian Capital Territory has a Register of Heritage Places and a Register of Heritage Objects (see Appendix Ten). The Register of Heritage Places includes many “Precincts” and “Aboriginal Places”, the contents of which are not listed but which may include outdoor cultural objects. This register also includes the Aboriginal Tent Embassy and a number of trees.

#### **Register of Heritage Places:**

- Memorials: 2
- Fountain: 1

#### **Register of Heritage Objects:**

The Register of Heritage Objects contains no outdoor cultural objects which are the focus of this study. This is due to the complex system of land management in the Australian Capital Territory and the Heritage Council prefers to list only objects and places which are on territory land. Most heritage-significant monuments, memorials, public sculpture and so forth in the Australian Capital Territory are listed on the Register of the National Estate.



## **New South Wales**

The New South Wales register includes the neon sign for Sharpies Golf House. Most New South Wales heritage objects are listed on local government registers (Appendix Twelve shows both lists). Of particular interest is the listing of a terrace house and its mural (see Appendix Twelve for the statement of significance).

- Monuments, excluding cemeteries: 3
- Memorials: 3
- Fountains: 2
- Signs: 1

## **Northern Territory**

For the Northern Territory there is no searchable database but there is a heritage list with an index which is available on the State Government's website. [www.nt.gov.au](http://www.nt.gov.au) The list includes places and objects that reflect the territory's unique history, particularly with reference to the challenges of living in remote areas. One object of interest is the Daly Waters Flying Fox, which still operates in times of flood (see Appendix Thirteen).

- Memorials: 2

## **Queensland**

Queensland has the narrowest range of defined objects of all the searchable registers (see Appendix Six).

- Monuments: 7
- Memorials: 62
- Fountains: 2

## **South Australia**

South Australia has a traditional range of objects listed (see Appendix Fourteen).

- Memorials: 60
- Monument: 3
- Fountains: 6
- Statues: 6

## **Tasmania**

Of note are entries for the Keens Curry sign and ABC Mosaic Mural (see Appendix Fifteen for statements of significance).

- Monuments: 2
- Mural/Mosaic: 1
- Memorials: 10
- Fountains: 1
- Signs: 1

## **Victoria**

Victoria has the broadest range of listed categories of outdoor cultural objects (see Appendix Eleven).

- Monument: 2
- Mural: 1
- Memorial: 11
- Fountain: 4
- Mosaic: 1
- Public art: 1
- Sign: 1
- Statue: 1

## **Western Australia**

- Monument: 9
- Sculpture: 1
- Memorial: several hundred
- Fountain: 10
- Mosaic: 1
- Statue: 8
- Sundial: 1

## **5.5 Outdoor Cultural Objects: Activities of The National Trust of Australia**

### **Australian Capital Territory**

- The ACT does list outdoor cultural objects and has a heritage committee and a heritage officer but no special committee dedicated to outdoor cultural objects, although they do propose objects to the ACT government for listing. The ACT and South Australian National Trusts have a yearly “Heritage Icons Project” where the public nominates items which are seen as particularly significant.

### **New South Wales**

- This branch has eight committees but none devoted exclusively to outdoor cultural objects.

### **Northern Territory**

- Trees, memorials, etc. are considered but the territory branch only has one-and-a-half staff, so it does not have separate listing committees. Nominations of items go before the branch’s 12 councillors.

### **Queensland**

- Maintains a heritage register which includes objects. In 2004 Queensland commenced an Icon Project similar to ACT and SA.

### **South Australia**

- Although the South Australian branch of the National Trust does not undertake heritage listing, it does run an annual program to nominate heritage “icons”. Its purpose is to encourage public awareness of and participation in broader definitions of heritage. Recent years have seen the nomination of Grange wine, Humphrey B. Bear and less tangible heritage such as long-standing community events.

### **Tasmania**

- The Trust in Tasmania has two classification committees (north and south). The southern committee leader also is the heritage officer in Hobart. The Trust does not list outdoor cultural objects because the Tasmanian Heritage Council has taken over the heritage identification role for past 5-6 years. Hobart Council has no management policy on listing but engages professional conservators to look after council-owned items.

### **Victoria**

- The most active non-government organisation (NGO) advocate for outdoor cultural objects is the Victorian branch of the National Trust of Australia, which runs a Public Art Committee. To date, this organisation has classified 45 outdoor cultural objects and has a further eight objects on file awaiting further research and approval for classification. This list has a wide range of objects, both free-standing and attached to buildings. They are generally works of fine and decorative art, rather than more everyday works such as commercial signs (see Appendix Seventeen for this list).

### **Western Australia**

- The Trust has classified a number of items around the state and has used the results of its Sculpture, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material survey to inform the listing. One item, the Edith Cowan Memorial, is now on the State Register of Heritage Places (see Appendix Eighteen for this list)

## **5.6 Sculpture, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material**

SMOCM, the Sculpture, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material survey, began identifying outdoor cultural objects across Australia in the 1990s.<sup>49</sup> Due to its primary location in New South Wales and its initiation via funding from the Australian Research Council and backing from the Art Gallery of NSW, relatively thorough surveying was only undertaken in New South Wales. This database is available on the Australian Museums and Galleries On Line (AMOL) website.<sup>50</sup>

SMOCM later joined with Arts Queensland to undertake a pilot project of the South Burnett region. It recommended a strategy for the cataloguing of sculptures, monuments and outdoor cultural material in the State but the strategy was never developed.<sup>51</sup> Nor are results of the pilot survey available as they were never converted into an electronic format and remain in paper form in the SMOCM archives at the Art Gallery of New South Wales.

In a few cases, the results of the SMOCM survey have been considered for inclusion on heritage registers held by NGOs, state and local governments. In Western Australia, two outdoor cultural objects identified in the SMOCM survey have been registered by the West Australian branch of the National Trust. One is on the State Government Heritage Register and the other is being assessed for listing.<sup>52</sup> The West Australian branch of the National Trust also has a public art committee but this has been inactive.

Wollongong City Council in New South Wales has used SMOCM survey forms to organise field surveying and the results are listed on the SMOCM New South Wales database. Some outdoor cultural objects surveyed were already on their heritage list. However, the post-WWII objects identified in the SMOCM process have not yet been transferred to any heritage list, although the council hopes to revisit the list in the future.

The inclusion of SMOCM results on local government heritage registers and planning schemes in New South Wales was found to be rare among those councils who had participated in the initial surveys.<sup>53</sup> A review of the accessibility of the on-line database records showed that items were not catalogued according to local government areas and not easily searched by location. It would not be a simple process for councils to retrieve items relevant to them.

Bathurst, New South Wales, another SMOCM subject, used the survey to develop its outdoor cultural object register. The city's the Public Art Register notably includes items of all ages – war memorials, for example, and more recently installed outdoor cultural objects in Bicentennial Park. This register is included in the *Bathurst Social/Community/Cultural Plan* (2000) is a broadly-based document that outlines the past and present “cultural capital” of the city. One of the benefits of not separating cultural material on the basis of age is likely to be better long-term management: the issues of protection and conservation will apply equally to recent and historic outdoor cultural objects.

---

<sup>49</sup> SMOCM became defunct in 2002, I gave a presentation on my research for this project at its final meeting in Sydney.

<sup>50</sup> See the Open Collections database at [www.amol.org.au](http://www.amol.org.au)

<sup>51</sup> Pinkus, L. 1998, *Developing a Draft Strategic Plan for Sculptures, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material*, Arts Queensland, Brisbane.

<sup>52</sup> Telephone interview with Chair of Public Art Committee of WA National Trust, and previous WA representative for SMOCM, Dr. Robyn Taylor, 14 November 2003.

<sup>53</sup> Thirteen NSW local governments involved in the original SMOCM survey were contacted.

**Recommendation Two:**

**The Cultural Heritage Branch to recommend that the Queensland Government considers an amendment to the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* to permit the individual listing of outdoor cultural ‘objects’ or ‘items’. This will bring the Act in line with current heritage practice and heritage instruments in the other states of Australia.**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Australia ICOMOS 1999, *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Australia ICOMOS, Victoria
- Bennett, Tony, Emmison, Michael and Frow, John 1999, *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures*, Cambridge University Press, Australia
- Bourdieu, P., 1994, *A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, London
- Brisbane City Council 2000, *Interactive CD Rom of the City Plan 2000*, Brisbane City Council, Brisbane
- Bulbeck, C. 'Women of Substance: The Depiction of Women in Australian Monuments', *Hecate*, 1992, xviii, ii
- Bulbeck, C. 1988, 'The Stone Laurel: Of Race, Gender and Class in Australian Memorials', *Occasional Paper No.5, Institute for Cultural Policy Studies*, Griffith University
- Bulbeck, C. 1988, *A National Register of Unusual Monuments*, data sheets, National Library of Australia, Canberra
- Bulbeck, C. 1990, 'Building the Nation: Silences and Marginalities concerning the representation of workers in monuments', *Labour History*, 59
- Bulbeck, C. 1991, 'The National Register of Unusual Monuments', *Heritage Australia*, 10, 2
- Caloundra City Council, no date, *Caloundra City Plan: Public Display Version*, part 2
- Cultural Heritage Branch 2001, *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Management*, Environmental Protection Agency, Queensland Government, Brisbane
- Cultural Heritage Branch, *Report to Heritage Register Advisory Committee*, 4 November and 2 December 1999
- Deutsche, R. 1998, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA
- Dovey, Kim 1994, 'On Registering Place Experience' in *People's Places: Identifying and Assessing Social Value for Communities*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra
- Evans, G. 2001, *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* Routledge, London
- Gablik, Suzi 1991, *The Reenchantment of Art*, Thames and Hudson, New York, NY
- Gibson, L. and Besley, J. 2004 *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape*, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane
- Gordon Grimwade and Associates 2003, *Eacham Shire Historical Heritage Study*, 1
- Government and Shires Associations of New South Wales 2003, 'Public Art Resource Kit', Local Government and Shires Associations of New South Wales
- Hartnett, D. 1996, *Forms Entwined: The life story of sculptors Leonard and Kathleen Shillam*, Pangeza Studio, Brisbane

Heritage Collections Council, 2001, *Significance: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Cultural Heritage Objects and Collections*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra

Heritage Council, *Minutes of Meeting No. 105*, Friday 17 December 1999

Heritage Register Advisory Committee, *Minutes of Meeting No. 51*, Thursday 2 December 1999

Johnston, Chris 1994, 'Social Values – Overview and Issues', in *People's Places: Identifying and Assessing Social Value for Communities*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra

Johnston, Chris 1994, *What is Social Value?* Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra

Kindler, A.M., Pariser, D.A., van den Burg, A., Liu, Wan Chen and Dias, Belidson, 2002, 'Aesthetic Modernism, The First Among Equals? A Look at aesthetic value systems in cross-cultural, age and visual arts educated and non-visual arts educated judging cohorts', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8, 2, 135-152

Lacy, S., ed. 1995, *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, Bay Press Seattle, USA

Laidley Shire Council, *Draft Heritage Study Brief*, 10 July 2000

Lowenthal, David 1998, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge University Press, London

McGuigan, J. 1996, *Culture and the Public Sphere*, Routledge, London

McKay, J. 1988, *Brisbane Sculpture Guide*, Society of Sculptors Queensland, Brisbane

Noosa Council 2002, *Historical Cultural Heritage of Noosa Shire: Report*, <http://stratplan\psreview\planning\planning\planning studies\cultural heritage\historical report.doc>, date accessed 13 November 2003

Miles, M. 1997, *Art, Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*, Routledge, London

Pinkus, L. 1998, *Developing a Draft Strategic Plan for Sculptures, Monuments and Outdoor Cultural Material*, Arts Queensland, Brisbane

Protocol Queensland, 2003 'Queensland Framework for Considering Proposals to Establish Memorials and Monuments of Significance'

Queensland Government, 1992, *Queensland Heritage Act, 1992*, (Reprinted as in force on 19 July 2000), Queensland Government, Brisbane

Queensland Government, 1997, *Integrated Planning Act, 1997*, Queensland Government, Brisbane

Ramsay, J. and Paraskevopoulos 1994, *More Than Meets the Eye: Identifying and Assessing Aesthetic Value*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra

Raymond, M. ed. 1995, *Leonard and Kathleen Shillam: A Tribute*, Queensland Art Gallery, Brisbane

Redland Shire Council, 2003, *Public Art Guidelines*, Redland Shire Council

Save Outdoor Sculpture, *About Save Outdoor Sculpture*, <http://www.heritagepreservation.org/PROGRAMS/SOS/sosmain.htm>, accessed on 14 November 2003

Scarlett, K. 1980, *Australian Sculptors*, Thomas Nelson Australia Pty. Ltd., Melbourne

Selwood, S. 1996, *The Benefits of Public Art: The polemics of permanent art in public places*, Policy Studies Institute, London

Senie, H. and Webster, S., eds. 1992, *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*, Icon Editions, New York

Society of Sculptors Queensland, 1988, *Brisbane Sculpture Guide*, Society of Sculptors Queensland, Brisbane

Tepper, S. 1999, *Unfamiliar Objects in Familiar Spaces: The Public Response to Art In Architecture*, Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Princeton University, USA

UNESCO 1978, *UNESCO Recommendation for the protection of Moveable Cultural Property 1978*, <http://www.unesco.org/general/fre/legal/cltheritage/moveable78.html>

Usherwood, P., Beach, J. and Morris, C. 2000, *Public Sculpture of North-East England*, Liverpool University Press, UK

Victorian Consolidated Legislation, [http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol\\_act/ha199586/](http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/ha199586/), accessed 02/07/04

Winkworth, Kylie 1998, *Review of existing criteria for assessing significance relevant to moveable heritage collections and objects*, Department of Communications and the Arts, Canberra

Zukin, S. 1995, *The Cultures of Cities*, Blackwell, USA

# **APPENDIX ONE**



## **Public Art and Heritage Project Publication Outcomes:**

---

### **DEST Publication Categories:**

#### **A1 Authored Books:**

Gibson, L. and Besley, J. 2004, *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape*, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane

#### **A2 Authored Books – Other:**

Gibson, L. 2004, *The Governance of Heritage Significance and the Protection of Public Art*, Queensland Government.

#### **C1 Refereed Journal Articles:**

O'Regan, T., Gibson, L. and Jeffcutt, P. eds. 2004, 'Creative Networks', *Media International Australia*, 112, August, 5-8.

Gibson, L. and Stevenson, D. 2004, 'Urban Space and the Uses of Culture', *International Journal of Cultural Policy Studies*, 10, 1, 1-4

Gibson, L. 2002, 'Managing the People: Art Programs in the American Depression', *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 31, 4, 279-292

Gibson, L. 2002, 'The Real Business of Life: Art and Citizenship during the Australian Post-War Reconstruction', *Cultural Studies Review (formerly UTS Review)*, 8, 1, 45-58

Gibson, L. 2002, 'Creative Industries and Cultural Development: Still the Janus Face?' *Media International Australia*, 102, February, 25-34

Gibson, L. and O'Regan, T. 2002, 'Culture: Development, Industry, Distribution', *Media International Australia*, 102, February, 5-8

#### **C3 Journal articles—letter or note:**

Gibson, L. 2004, 'Art, Government and War - Lessons From the Past', *Arts Hub News*, 25 April, <http://www.artshub.com.au/ahau1/news/news.asp?Id=60463&ref=#>

Gibson, L. 2003, 'Review: Gray, Clive: *The Politics of the Arts In Britain*', *Media International Australia*, 109, November, 191

Gibson, L. 2003, 'We are the Square State', *The Courier-Mail*, Wed. 27 August, 17

Gibson L. and Besley, J. 2003, 'Heritage Drowns in Coffee', *The Courier-Mail*, Sat. 5 July, 25

Gibson, L. 2003, 'Review: Bennett, T. and Carter, D. (eds.): *Culture in Australia: Policies, Publics and Programs*', *Media International Australia*, 107, May, 147-148

#### **E1 Conference—full written paper refereed proceedings:**

Gibson, L. 2002, 'Cultural Industries and Cultural Development: Still the Janus Face?' 'Cultural Sites, Cultural Theory, Cultural Policy, The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research Proceedings', Te Papa, Wellington, New Zealand

#### **E2 Conference—full written paper non-refereed proceedings:**

Gibson, L. 2004, Guest speaker, 'Cultural Planning and the Creative Tropical City', *The Creative Tropical City, Charles Darwin Symposium Series 2004*, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, June, 2004, <http://www.cdu.edu.au/cdss/about.html>

Gibson, L. 2004, Keynote speaker, 'Port Phillip's Creative Class' at *Recreating Urban Culture*, Port Phillip City Council, Melbourne, March, 2004, [http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/understanding\\_gentrification.html#L2](http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/understanding_gentrification.html#L2)

Gibson, L. 2003, Guest speaker, 'Cultural policy and the built environment—Cultural Vitality for Who?' at *Beyond Cultural Policy—A Cultural Vitality Symposium*, Port Phillip City Council, Melbourne, July 2003, [http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/conferencespapers\\_resources.html](http://www.portphillip.vic.gov.au/conferencespapers_resources.html)

#### **E4 Conference— Unpublished Presentation**

Gibson, L. 2002, (and convener of session) 'Urban Space and the Uses of Art' at *Ute Culture: The Utility of Culture and the Uses of Cultural Studies*, The University of Melbourne, December

Gibson, L. 2002, 'Cultural Policy and the Built Environment- Pump Priming for Whom?' *Cultural Returns: Assessing the Place of Culture in Social Thought*, Pavis Centre for Social and Cultural Research, Open University, UK, September

Gibson, L. 2001, Keynote Speaker, 'Public Art and Heritage: Which public? Whose heritage?' *Public Art in Perspective*, RMIT, November

#### **E4 Conference—edited volumes of conference proceedings:**

Gibson, L. 2002, 'Creative Industries and Cultural Development: Still the Janus Face?' *Culturelink Special Issue 2001: Convergence, Creative Industries and Civil Society, The New Cultural Policy*, 99-110

#### **Other academic outputs- non-DEST measured:**

##### **Edited Journals:**

O'Regan, T., Gibson, L. and Jeffcutt, P. eds. 2004, 'Creative Networks', Media International Australia, (forthcoming)

Gibson, L. and Stevenson, D. eds. 2004, 'Urban Space and the Uses of Culture', *International Journal of Cultural Policy Studies*, 10, 1

Gibson, L. and O'Regan, T. eds. 2002, 'Culture: Development, Industry, Distribution', *Media International Australia*, 102, February

#### **Public Lectures and Seminars- unpublished presentations:**

Gibson, L. 2003, Keynote speaker, 'An Eccentric History of Queensland Public Art' at *Queensland Connections: People, Places and Connections*, Queensland Museum, November

Gibson, L. 2003, Guest speaker, '(Big) Pineapples from the Dawn of Time: Cases for Cultural Heritage' at *Cities, Popular Music and Urban Cultures Symposium*, Cultural Industries and Practices Research Centre, The University of Newcastle, August

Gibson, L. 2003, 'Outdoor Cultural Heritage and Public Art in the North-East of England and Queensland, Australia' at *The Australian Centre Seminar Series*, University of Melbourne, April

Gibson, L. 2002, Keynote speaker and convenor, *Public Space, Cultural Practice and Participation in Australia and the Asia Pacific: An Afternoon Forum*, The University of Melbourne, August

Gibson, L. 2002, Keynote speaker, *Neita Bell Annual Visual Arts Lecture*, 'Which Public? Whose Heritage?' Lynceneum Club, Brisbane, June 2002

Gibson, L. 2001, Panel member, Australian Public Intellectual Network Online Symposium, *Creativity and the New Economy*, <http://www.api-network.com/cgi-bin/forum/creative.cgi>, July

Gibson, L. 2001, Guest presenter, 'Public Art and Heritage' at the final meeting of the National Executive of the Sculptures, Memorials, and Outdoor Materials (SMOCCM) group of the Australian Institute of Conservation of Cultural Materials, Sydney, November

**APPENDIX FIVE****List of artworks discussed in *Monumental Queensland: Signposts on a Cultural Landscape (2004)***

<b>Artwork</b>	<b>Artist and date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>State and national heritage status</b>
CHAPTER 1			
'The Emperor of Lang Park'	John Underwood and Artbusters, 1992	Suncorp Stadium, Milton, Brisbane	
'The Human Factor'	Artbusters, 1988	Various around the state, including Mackay Airport; Public Works Building, 80 George Street, Brisbane; and cnr Adelaide and George streets, Brisbane	
'Footballers'	Nickolaus Seffrin, 1969	Brisbane, missing, originally at Queensland Rugby League Headquarters, Lang Park	
Ornamental pool and water sculpture	Nickolaus Seffrin, 1968	Brisbane, missing, originally at 40 Queen Street	
CHAPTER 2			
'Queen Victoria'	Thomas Brock, 1906	Brisbane, Queens Gardens	State Register and Register of the National Estate
'TJ Byrnes'	Sir Bertram Mackennal, 1902	Brisbane, Centenary Place	
'King George V'	E. Kohler, 1938	Brisbane, King George Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
'Queen Elizabeth II'	John Dowie, 1986	Brisbane, State Works Centre, George and Alice streets	
'TJ Ryan'	Sir Bertram Mackennal, 1925	Brisbane, Queens Gardens	State Register and Register of the National Estate
'TJ Byrnes'	Unknown Italian sculptor, 1902	Warwick, Palmerin Street	Register of the National Estate
Bertie Barton memorial clock	Unknown, 1984	Tara	
'Sir Bruce Small'	Mark Andrews, 1986	Surfers Paradise, corner Elkhorn and Orchid avenues	
Walter Hill Ornamental Drinking Fountain	Charles Tiffin, architect; John Petrie, stonemason, 1867	Brisbane, City Botanic Gardens	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Mooney Memorial Fountain	William Holloway Chambers, engineer; William Webster, sculptor,	Brisbane, Eagle Street	State Register

	1880		
Blackall Memorial Fountain	FDG Stanley, 1879	Ipswich, Denmark Hill	
<i>The Progress of Civilization in the State of Queensland</i>	Daphne Mayo, 1925	Brisbane, Brisbane City Hall	State Register and Register of the National Estate
<u>Enlightenment</u>	Leonard Shillam, 1959	Brisbane, former State Library, William Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Mosaic	Lindsay Edwards, 1959	Brisbane, former State Library, William Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
<i>Petrie Tableau</i>	Stephen Walker, 1988	Brisbane, King George Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Stanthorpe Post Office crest	1901	Stanthorpe	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Woolloongabba Post Office crest	1901	Woolloongabba, Stanley Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Disinterred Federation fountain	Unknown, 1901	Roma, Memorial Park	
Croydon Chinese temple site	Hans Pehl, 2001	Croydon, Anzac Park	
Hughenden community arts projects	Sam Brown and Terry Lindsay, 2001	Hughenden, Hughenden Public Library	
Goondiwindi Pillars	Chris Mackenzie, 2001	Goondiwindi, Border Heritage Precinct	
CHAPTER 3			
Edmund Kennedy memorial	1948	Cooktown	
Jackey Jackey cairn	1961	Bamaga Airport	Register of the National Estate
Gold discovery monuments	Jupiter Mossman memorial, erected by Sydney Williams, 1947; cairn, 1972; sculpture by Hugh Anderson, 1988	Charters Towers, 198 Gill Street, Towers Hill and Centenary Park	
<i>Jimmy Crow's Nest</i>	Fred Gardiner, 1969	Crow's Nest, Centenary Park	
Kal-Ma-Kuta memorial	1962	Bribie Island Road, Sandstone Point	
Johnny Allen's grave	–	Mundoolan, St John's Church cemetery	State Register
Wangerriburra cairn	–	Green Mountains, Duck Creek Road	
Kalkadoon/Kalkatunga memorial	1984	Kujabbi, Kujabbi Bush Pub	Register of the National Estate
Kalkadoon/Mitakoodi memorial	David Harvey Sutton, 1988	Corella Creek, Cloncurry–Mount Isa Highway	
Cook memorial	Colonial Architects Office, 1887	Cooktown, Charlotte Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
James Cook statue	Stanley Hammond, 1988	Cooktown	
Cook's landing memorial	1926	Round Hill Head	State Register and Register of the National Estate

'The Singing Ship'	Peggy Westmoreland	Emu Park, Kele Park	
Cunningham's Gap cairn		Cunningham's Gap	Register of the National Estate
Mitchell memorial clock	1946	Blackall	
John Campbell Miles clock	1960	Mount Isa	
'Charles Archer and Sleipner'	Arthur Murch, 1978	Rockhampton, Archer Street	
Burke and Wills obelisk	1961	Corella Creek, Cloncurry Highway	
Leichhardt Tree		Taroom	State Register
Big Captain Cook		Cairns	
Hull River Aboriginal Settlement Interpretive Centre	Mosaics by Lilly Hart and Leonard Andy, 2003	South Mission Beach	
CHAPTER 4			
Hay family cairn		Rannes	
James Morrill's grave	1964	Bowen, Bowen General Cemetery	
First Free Settlers Memorial	1938	Nundah, Sandgate Road	State Register
Petzler memorial		Eukey	
Atherton monument		Sarina	
'Weary Willie'	Pat Davis, 1967	Charleville	
Sealing of road memorial	1976	Richmond	
Bronze saddle and roadside diorama	2001	Nebo	
Teamsters Memorial	1977	Craiglie	
Kenniff brothers sculpture	Peter Baulch, 1996	Mitchell	
Mary Watson's memorial	1886	Cooktown, Charlotte Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Eliza Fraser memorial	1979	Boreen Point, Lake Cootharabra	
Monument to the women of Fassifern	H. A. Krause, 1968	Moogerah Dam	
'Swaggie'	Daphne Mayo, 1956	Winton	
'Banjo Paterson'	Perides Art Foundry, 1995	Winton	
Fibreglass 'Waltzing Matilda' scene		Winton	
'Crystal Trumpeteers'	Peggy Westmoreland, 1989	Jericho	
Fountain	Tom Risley, 1979	Malanda, Malanda Environmental Centre	
Drafthorse and sled	Vivien Plant, 1999	Malanda	

Condamine bell	1977	Condamine, Bell Park	
Cow kicking bucket	Vivien Plant	Millaa Millaa	
1916 Flood Memorial	George Bird, 1979	Clermont	
Boonarga Memorial Hall		Boonarga, Warrego Highway	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Cactoblastis obelisk		Dalby	
Cactoblastis memorial	Rhyll Hinwood, 1985	Miles, Historical Village	
CHAPTER 5			
Pimpama/Ormeau war memorial	A. L. Petrie and Son, 1919	Miles, Historical Village	
Evelyn Scrub war memorial			State Register
Caskey Memorial	Stonemason, William Busby, 1902	Brisbane, Toowong Cemetery	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Dulacca war memorial	Bruce Brothers, 1921	Dulacca	
Herberton war memorial	A. L. Petrie & Sons, 1922–23	Herberton	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Montville war memorial gates	A.L.Petrie & Sons, 1921	Montville	
Victor Denton memorial	Bruce Brothers of Toowoomba, 1915	Nobby, Nobby Cemetery	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Warwick footballers memorial	Troyahn, Coulter & Thompson, 1917	Warwick, Town Hall, Palmerin Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
North Ipswich Railway Workshops war memorial	John Whitehead & Sons, London, sculptor of statue; Vincent Price, architect, 1919	North Ipswich, Railway Workshops	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Beaudesert war memorial	Design by Standard Masonry Works, Melbourne; modified by Atkinson and Conrad, architects; stonemason, W. E. Parsons, 1921	Beaudesert	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Atherton war memorial	1924	Atherton	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Maryborough war memorial	Architect, P. O. E. Hawkes; stonemason, F. W. Webb; statuary, Anselm Odling, 1922	Maryborough	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Broweena war memorial bridge	L. S. Smith; piers, F. W. Webb, 1921	Broweena, Biggenden–Woolooga Road	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Toowoomba Mothers' Memorial	Burcham, Clamp & McKellar, architects, 1922	Toowoomba	
Bundaberg war nurses pavilion	E. H. Boden, architect, 1949	Bundaberg	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Weeping Mother Memorial	Frank Williams & Co.,	Gatton	State Register and Register of

	1922		the National Estate
Hector Vasyli memorial	Daphne Mayo, 1918	South Brisbane, former Victoria Bridge pylon	State Register
Shrine of Remembrance	Buchanan and Cowper, 1930	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Queensland Women's War Memorial	Daphne Mayo, 1932	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
'The Scout' Boer War memorial	J. L. Watts, 1919; pedestal by stonemasons P. J. Lowther & Sons	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Korea, Malaya, Borneo war memorial	Rhyll Hinwood, 1988	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Vietnam War memorial	Dorothea Saaghy, 1988	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
World War II nurses memorial	John Underwood, 1992	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
World War II Shrine of Memories, mosaic	Don Ross, 1962	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
World War II Shrine of Memories, sandstone panels	Andor Meszaros, 1962	Brisbane, Anzac Square	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Rats of Tobruk memorial	1997	Rockhampton, Jeffries Park	
<i>Centaur</i> memorial	1968	Caloundra Headland	
<i>Centaur</i> memorial		Point Danger	
Sandakan memorial	1995	Brisbane, New Farm Park	
Yugambah war memorial	1992	Burleigh Heads	
Tieri war memorial	1984	Tieri	State Register
Temple of Peace, Toowong Cemetery	Richard Ramo, 1924; stonemason, W. E. Parsons	Brisbane, Toowong Cemetery	State Register and Register of the National Estate
CHAPTER 6			
'The Ringer'	Eddie Hackman, 1988	Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame, Longreach	
'Jackie Howe'	1988	Blackall	
Big Merino	Sue and Bob Linton, 1984	Blackall	
Kanaka Memorial	Leo Favell, 1972	Hervey Bay	
South Sea Islander cancutters memorial	Artbusters, 1994	Mackay	
Kanaka Memorial		Childers	
Canecutters memorial	Renato Beretta, 1959	Innisfail	State Heritage Register
Rockhampton bulls	various dates	Rockhampton, various locations	
'Seven Mile Peter'	B. J. Gentry, John Mangan, Owen Scott, 1998	Nanango, Tipperary Flats	
The Big Rig	1929	Roma	



Ipswich Railway Memorial	1965	Ipswich	
'The Workers Who Built Bridges'	1888	Beenleigh	
Flying Doctor Service memorial	1953	Cloncurry	
Dr Beet's Drinking Fountain	Karl Langer, K. and L. Shillam, 1958	Beaudesert	
Koch Memorial Fountain	1903	Cairns	State Heritage Register
Sister Kenny Memorial Garden	1958	Nobby	
Sister Kenny memorial		Toowoomba	
Barcaldine Tree of Knowledge	–	Barcaldine	State Heritage Register and Register of the National Estate
Australian Labor Federation memorial		Blackall	
Queensland's first labour strike	1981	Ipswich	
Art and Working Life Program, Federated Clerks Union	1984	Originally various locations, temporary artworks	
'The Tree of Knowledge'	Anthony Prior, 1987	Townsville, The Perfume Garden	
<i>David</i>	Franco Cerviatti, 1989	Surfers Paradise, Raptis Plaza	
CHAPTER 7			
Big Pineapple	Peddle, Thorpe and Harvey, 1971	Nambour	
Qantas cairn	1965	Winton	
CSR monument	1970	Ingham	
The Red Cube	Ken Reinhard, 1986	Brisbane, Cultural Centre	
Colour in People	Ken Done, 1988	Bowen	
Memories of Wind	Fumio Nishimura, 1988	Brisbane, King Edward Park	
Continuous Division	Greg Johns, 1988	Brisbane, King Edward Park	
Still Life with Landscape	Robert Parr, 1988	Brisbane, King Edward Park	
<i>Strength, Plenty and Production</i>	Elvin Harvey and Fred Gowan, 1934	Brisbane, 229 Queen Street	State Heritage Register
MMI building badge	Tom Bass, 1966	Brisbane, missing, originally 344–354 Queen Street	
ANZ Bank mural	Pavel Forman, 1973	Brisbane, demolished, originally foyer of corner of Creek and Queen streets	
'The Golden Fleece'	1886	Townsville, Hollis Hopkins Warehouse	

The Banker	Leonard Shillam, 1970	Brisbane, Post Office Square facing façade of Westpac Bank, 260 Queen Street	
Banking	Leonard Shillam, 1970	Brisbane, missing, Adelaide Street façade of corner of Albert and Adelaide Streets Commonwealth Bank	
Chat	Sebastian Di Mauro, 2002	Brisbane, 175 Eagle Street	
Big Cow		Nambour	
Big Swagman		Rockhampton	
Big Cassowary		Service station between Tully and Mission Beach	
CHAPTER 8			
SS <i>Dicky</i> memorial	1963	Caloundra, Dickey Beach	
'Destructo the Cockroach' memorial	1981	Cunnamulla–Eulo	
Bernborough memorial	Fred Gardiner, 1977	Oakey	
'Gunsynd the Goondiwindi Grey'	Tom Farrell, 1974	Goondiwindi	
Charters Towers country music cairn	Mike Tracey, 1981	Charters Towers	
Steele Rudd cairn	1950	Toowoomba	
George Essex Evans cairn	1909	Toowoomba	
Margaret Curran cairn	1962	Toowoomba	
'Robert Burns'	Samuel Willis, 1929	Brisbane, Centenary Place	
'Mary'	Cyril and Kasia Hartmann, 2001	Maryborough	
Yowie memorial	John Sheehan, 1980	Kilcoy	
'Arno's Wall'	Arno Grotjahn	Winton	
'The Emerald Easel'	Cameron Cross, 1999	Emerald	
CHAPTER 9			
Architectural sculpture— 'Agriculture and Mining', 'Commerce and Industry'	1903 and 1920, W. P. McIntosh	Brisbane, Queens Gardens; George Street	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Staghorn keystone	Attributed to L. J. Harvey	Brisbane, Parliament House	State Register
Queensland Coat of Arms	Leonard and Kathleen Shillam, 1979	Brisbane, Parliamentary Annex	
Sculpture Column	Norma Redpath, 1972	Brisbane, Adelaide Street	
Suspended Sculpture	Michael Santry, 1987	Brisbane, Elizabeth Street	
111 George Street	Merilyn Fairskye, James Meldrum, Rodney Spooner, 1995–96	Brisbane, George Street	
Brendan Hansen Building	Fiona Foley, 1999	Hervey Bay	

Agnes Water Rural Transaction Centre	Judith Miller, 2002	Agnes Water	
Kowanyama Community Justice Centre	Leonard Gregory etc.	Kowanyama	
<i>Justice</i> , Queensland Coat of Arms	John Vink	Brisbane, George Street	
Themis	Maria Papacostantinou	Brisbane, George Street	
Maryborough Courthouse	Glen Manning, 2001	Maryborough	
'Labyrinth of the Law'	Paul Brown	Wynnum	
' <i>Ned Hanlon</i> '	1938	Brisbane, Royal Women's Hospital	
Mother and Child	Erwin Guth, 1957	Longreach	
Cairns Base Hospital	Jandy Pannell, 1999	Cairns	
Offshoot	Clement Meadmore	Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery	
<i>Approaching Equilibrium</i>	Anthony Pryor	Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery	
<i>Leviathan Play</i>	Ron Robertson-Swan	Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery	
<i>Pelicans</i>	Leonard and Kathleen Shillam	Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery	
Sisters	Ante Dabro	Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery	
<i>Pacific Nexus</i>	Lawrence Daws	Brisbane, Performing Arts Centre	
Fountain	Robert Woodward	Brisbane, Performing Arts Centre	
The Arts	Val Pinsker	Mount Isa, Civic Centre	
Brolga Theatre	Kasia Hartmann, 1998	Maryborough	
Entrance artwork, Global Arts Link	Rodney Spooner, 1999	Ipswich	
Pawpaw and mango trees, GPO	L. J. Harvey 1908	Brisbane, Elizabeth Street	State Register
Great Court	Various	Brisbane, University of Queensland	State Register and Register of the National Estate
Schonell Memorial Fountain	Inge King 1971	Brisbane, University of Queensland	
Stained-glass window, Mayne Hall	Nevil Matthews	Brisbane, University of Queensland	
Sandstone sculpture, UQ Union	Leonard and Kathleen Shillam	Brisbane, University of Queensland	

Genesis	Nevil Matthews, 1976	Brisbane, Griffith University, Nathan	
Nundah	Rick Roser, 2000	Logan City, Griffith University, Logan	
<i>Sentinels Attempting Flight</i>	Mona Ryder, 2000	Logan City, Griffith University, Logan	
<i>The Wind Tree</i>	Nola Farman, 2000	Logan City, Griffith University, Logan	
<i>Oodgeroo, the Woman of the Paperbark</i>	Virginia Jones, 1996	Brisbane, Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove	
<i>Oodgeroo Continuum</i>	Ron Hurley, 1996	Brisbane, Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove	
CHAPTER 10			
Townsville Aboriginal and Islander Health Service Centre mural	Carol Ruff, Emu Nugent, Chips Mackinolty, 1980	Townsville, demolished	
Alpha murals	Alice McLaughlin, Benny Fuentes and Alpha Cultural Group, 1991	Alpha, various locations	
'Colourful Cooloola' murals	Lizzie Connor and team, 2000–2002	Cooloola, various locations	
Friends of Gordonvale townscape project	Andrew Prowse, Brian Guy and Raymond Meeks, 1993	Gordonvale, various locations	
Bloomfield Street project	John Mongard and team, 1994	Cleveland, Bloomfield Street	
Mackay Horizons	Suzanne Holman and team, 1993	Mackay, City Heart Shopping Park	
Merthyr Village bus shelter	Peter Dwyer, 1997	Brisbane, in storage, originally Merthyr Road	
Stones Corner SCIP	Multiple	Brisbane, Stones Corner, various locations	
'Trail of Reflections'	Tom Farrell, 2001	Caboolture, King Street	
'Headspace'	Craig Walsh and David Thomasson, 2001	Brisbane, Brunswick Street train station entrance	
'New Farm Riverwalk'	2001	Brisbane, Merthyr Park	
'Riveredge'	Bill Kelly, 2002	Brisbane, CBD bikepath	
The Woolcock Park project	John Coleman, Stephanie Outridge-Field and Daryl Mills, 2002	Brisbane, Woolcock Park	
Reconciliation Path	Bianca Beetson and Paula Payne, 1998	Brisbane, Boondall Wetlands	
Kangaroo Point Cliffs boardwalk	Multiple, 1994–96	Brisbane, Kangaroo Point Cliffs	

project			
<i>Mairwair Warril</i> (Brisbane River)	Vanessa Fisher, 2001	Brisbane, Roma Street Parklands	
Antipodean Collection	Rhyll Hinwood, 2001	Brisbane, Roma Street Parklands	
'George Street Fountain'	Rhyll and Rob Hinwood, 1982	Brisbane, George Street at the junction of Roma and Herschel Streets	
Public Art and Young People Project, South Bank	Multiple, 2002	Brisbane, temporary installation originally in South Bank Parklands	