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Abstract

The Adelaide Park Lands and the ‘City of Adelaide Plan’ (1837), as prepared by Colonel William Light, have long been held up as an international precedent in town planning literature. The celebrated model, embraced by Ebenezer Howard to describe his Garden City theory, has several layers of cultural landscape heritage. The ‘Plan’, in recent years, has been subject to a rigorous investigation of its Indigenous and colonization evolutionary layers to inform moves to list the landscape as possessing national heritage status under relevant Australian heritage regimes, and more recently under the National Heritage List regime, as a pre-emptive strategy towards an eventual World Heritage nomination of the cultural landscape and ‘Plan’.
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Introduction

On 7 November 2008, at the foot of a statue commemorating Colonel William Light—‘Light’s Vision’—the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, the Hon Peter Garrett MP, announced the National Heritage listing of the ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’. Garrett observed that the listing of the ‘influential urban design of Adelaide—Australia’s first planned city—… recognizes the 1837 Adelaide Park Lands and City layout as a technical masterwork which went on to influence the planning of other towns in Australia and overseas’ (Garrett & Ellis 2007, pp. 1–2). This paper reviews the cultural heritage position of the Adelaide Park Lands, the importance and uniqueness of its heritage recognition in Australia, and the criteria upon which such listing was based.

The landscape itself is a ‘cultural landscape’ and comprises approximately 900 ha. It is a multi-layered tract possessing Indigenous and post-contact associations, meanings and physical expressions both tangible and intangible (Aplin 2007; Cleere 1995). Accordingly it falls within the ambit and definitions of cultural heritage used by the former Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975, the present Australian Heritage Council Act 2003, the ‘Burra Charter’ as authored by Australia ICOMOS (2005), and the meaning under the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, which provides the following definition:

37. The term ‘cultural landscape’ embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between human kind and its natural environment.

38. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment that are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhances natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.

39. Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories, namely:

177
The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by main. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constricted for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles. ...

The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (WHC 1995, sections 37–42).

As a definition, and given the nature of the recent National Heritage listing, the listing is for the ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’. Thus, the listing includes the ‘park lands’ but also the squares within the ‘layout’ as well as all roadways and several tracts of state government administered land including the Adelaide Botanic Garden. It is important to note that most published literature separates the ‘park lands’ from the ‘squares’ in their narratives and definitions, but that under the Listing both tracts of land are included and that this spatial definition is used in this article. Further, most published literature also interchangeable uses ‘park lands’ or ‘parklands’ as a descriptor for the tract.

Adelaide Park Lands

The Adelaide Park Lands exist as a recognizable international town planning theoretical model as articulated by Ebenezer Howard in 1898 (Howard 1898, 1902, 1946). But there is more to the place and its evolution than the model. The City of Adelaide sits within and is enveloped by the Park Lands that were reputedly consciously ‘designed’ in the survey plan as prepared by Colonel William Light in late 1836. The Corporation of the City of Adelaide Council (the Corporation), historically, includes the North and south Adelaide residential portions together with the Park Lands; culturally, the Adelaide Plains was the country of the Indigenous Kaurna people.

In formalizing their real estate venture, in the ‘Province of South Australia’, the South Australian Colonization Commissioners charged Colonel William Light in 1836 to both select a suitable site of the ‘capital city’ of this new colony but also survey and layout a plan for the city (Colonisation Commissioners 1836, p. 34). While there is local debate about the actual authorship of the survey ‘design’, and the nature of influences that may have directed and underpinned the origins of the ‘design’, the fact remains that it was surveyed under Light’s hand as colonial Surveyor-General, that Light was empowered by the Commissioners to undertake this task, and the subsequent ‘plans’ prepared bear his name as author and surveyor (Johnson 2004, 2006; Johnson & Langmead 1986; Langmead, 2004). It is not the intention of this article to enter into this local debate, but to consider the consequences of the ‘design’ and its heritage recognition.

The imperative to survey the landscape for a capital city was important to enable spatial certainty about the physical location of the place on the Adelaide Plains. It resulted in easy and efficient sale and purchase of allotments to enable settlement to proceed quickly and in an orderly manner. Such was the purpose of the Commissioners in seeking to establish the colony. But this aim was nested in ‘selling’ the real estates venture in being a refuge of socio-democratic values, mixed with the virtues of Edward Wakefield Gibbon including equality of religion and social reformism. These objectives were clearly established quickly by Light, were repeated in subsequent survey ‘designs’ under later colonial Surveyor-General George Goyder, and continue to underpin the cultural ethos of the state of South Australia and the City of Adelaide today (Bunker 1986, pp. 21–33). These are points that Henderson (2007) and Porter (2007) have reinforced with additional research.

The ‘plan’ embodies simple altruistic virtues. It locates a settlement not crushed against the coastal edge or a port venue, but positions it in the centre of a broad umbrageous plain from which circulation systems radiate in an organized efficient manner. The ‘city’ itself exists as two places, dissected east-west by the River Torrens/Karravirra Parri corridor, with a main settlement to the south and a smaller North Adelaide settlement to the north. The former was envisaged as the core functional and business heart of the settlement and city, and the latter as a subsidiary residential environment. Within the main settlement space was a central square – Victoria Square/Tarndanyangga – that was perhaps envisaged by Light to form the central business
and civic nucleus of the settlement, but in the outcome it did not thus evolve. In addition, four minor squares—Light, Hurtle, Hindmarsh and Whitmore—equidistant from the central square provided green spaces or village greens for what might have been envisaged as the focal points for four residential villages. This planning notion has merit and still today influences cultural and social planning activities in the city. North Adelaide was slightly different in its design. Raised higher above the main settlement, on a limestone plateau, it afforded prospect on its flanks, included a central square—Wellington Square—that was envisaged as a residential village hub, and two smaller residential segments in design were very much successfully determined by topography.

These are the subtleties in the overall ‘plan’; a model template that possessed equity in village green access and a sense of control over the landscape where people were supposed to congregate, assemble and trade. In addition to this template was a ‘park land’, a wide expansive green space that enveloped the surrounds of the two settlements, separating them from the prospective farmlands beyond which are now the suburbia of Adelaide. Therefore, instead of a typical European imperial encircling wall that kept the ‘hordes’ and invaders at bay, there was a green landscape ‘moat’ that provided a wide separation between city and suburb perhaps providing a ‘green lung’ to the city, but certainly characterizing and determining the future iconographic representation and standing of Adelaide. This expanse quickly became known as the ‘Park Lands’ and thankfully colonial Governor George Gawler acted to ensure its public purchase and reservation as a ‘Government Reserve’ thereby pre-empting land claims, London-issued government Land Grants, and any private and governmental real estate ventures (Worsnop 1879).

It was not until 1898 that Adelaide and the Park Lands gained any international prominence. Prior to this, the colonial administrators accepted that they had an unique design template, and the colonial Surveyor-General’s department under George Goyder expressed the design criteria in word and plan to guide and direct new town and layout survey activities of all surveyors in the colony thereby ensuring that nearly all government settlements created between 1860 to 1900 possessed the essential park land town model (Bunker 1986: 21–33; Goyder, 1879; Williams 1974). These principles were carried forth into the surveying of Northern Territory, a tract of land north of the colony of South Australia that the colony was entrusted with administering on behalf of the Colonial Office in London, and which was later ceded to the Commonwealth of Australia upon federation in 1901. But they also appeared in the basic structure and design of ‘private towns’ often established in the colony by entrepreneurs or mining investment companies to provide villages for new mining developments of which there were many in the Mid North.

International notoriety commenced with the publication of an abstract representation of the ‘Plan of Adelaide’ by Ebenezer Howard in his Tomorrow: a peaceful path to real reform (1898), and subsequent re-issues under a different title (Howard 1902, 1946). The representation, to Howard, epitomized the essential characteristics of the Garden City theory that he was championing in the United Kingdom and it quickly became the theoretical representation of this theory; a theory that carries strong resonance in the disciplines of town planning, surveying and landscape architecture today as a model of city design (Cheesman 1986).

In the ensuring years following survey in late 1836, and plan printing and land sales in early 1837, the Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains were disempowered and dislocated, and a colonial local government administration was established. To the Kaurna, this was their country to curate and care for, and it has only been the early 1970s that formal reconciliation and recognition has started occurring as to their original ‘ownership’ of this landscape, including the adoption of dual nomenclature of places within Adelaide by the Corporation such as the designation Victoria Square/Tarndanyangga over the central square (Draper et al, 2005; Hemming, 1998; Jones 2007).

With the formation of a Corporation came a local government administrative regime to cater for ‘rates and roads’. But it also had to manage the park lands expanse that was entrusted to them by the colonial government (Jones 2007). The latter expanse quickly became a source for lease and royalty revenue from agistment and tree felling activities. It was not until the 1860s that tree planting commenced in the park lands and the squares. An extensive system of perimeter shelterbelts were created in the Park Land blocks under
the guise of creating shelter for grazing sheep and cattle but more to establish the foundations of an aesthetic planting design for the park lands. In the squares, the village greens were extensively planted with ornamental trees, and progressively dotted with statuary and fountains. The late 1870s – early 1880s heralded a cultural renaissance in the Adelaide, where statements and icons of cultural progress were embraced and an agenda for ‘beautifying’ the Park Lands unfolded. Corporation Mayors championed city improvement and beautification programs, resolution of physical and visual polluting places, and set about renovating the deeply eroded and polluted River Torrens/ Karrawirra Parri corridor into a landscape waterway complete with European settings and a lake.

A core thesis to this endeavour was the Report on a System of Planting the Adelaide Park Lands (1880), a Gardenesque landscape design vision document, prepared by the second colonial Conservator of Forests, John Ednie Brown (Brown 1880; Jones 1998b). Like most government documents, it supposedly disappeared onto a dusty shelf never to be sighted again but instead it was used fervently by successive City Gardeners, and successive Mayors and Lord Mayors quoted extensively from the Report, as a master plan to design and plant the Park Lands. This Report represents the first landscape master plan in Australia and it has long been incorrectly assumed that it was never implemented in part or its entirety (Jones 1998a).

In 1989, Hassell was commissioned by the Corporation to prepare a master plan for the future management of the Park Lands; the first such document to provide a co-ordinated management framework for this estate (Hassell 1999). In 2001, the Park Lands was considered and included on the Register of the National Estate by the now defunct Australian Heritage Commission under the Commonwealth Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975 (Australia 1975; Australian Heritage Commission 2009; Lloyd 2001, p. 33). From 2004–2008 the Corporation undertook the preparation of Community Land Management plans as required under amendments to the state Local Government Act 1999, to guide the micro-level management of public or ‘community land’ resources vested in their control by the state (Adelaide 2004–2008). As part of this planning process the Corporation also commissioned the Adelaide Park Lands & Squares Cultural Landscape Assessment Study (Jones 2007) and the Community Land Management Plans: Adelaide Parklands and Squares – Aboriginal Heritage (Draper, et al 2005) reports. The former undertook a rigorous and detailed examination and inventory of the cultural components and places within the Park Lands and the latter focused upon Indigenous heritage values and associations for both Kaurna and Aboriginal peoples. Both reports form the evidence to the subsequent National Heritage listing deliberations by the Commonwealth.

Subsequently the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005 was gazetted establishing the Adelaide Park Lands Authority, a quasii- local and state governance board, and a legislative framework for the management of the Park Lands (South Australia 2005). In early 2008 QED (now Aurecom) was commissioned to review and prepare a revised management plan. Nominated in 2005, in late 2008 the Commonwealth approved the National Heritage listing of the ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’ under the Commonwealth Australian Heritage Council Act 2003, which is directly linked to the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Australia 1999; Australian Heritage Council 2008).

State Legislation

Contextually, SA has its own heritage regime but the SA Heritage Council has been reluctant to entertain a nomination and registration of the Park Lands under the state Heritage Places Act 1993. Thus, the Corporation and the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Society separately lodged nominations to the Australian Heritage Commission and the Australian Heritage Council, which a citizen or entity were/are allowed to do respectively, for consideration of the listing of the Park Lands which were considered together administratively as one nomination.

In terms of the state Heritage Places Act 1993, the state Minister for Environment and Heritage may list places in the State Heritage Register as possessing heritage merit based upon criteria set out in Section 16 of the Act (SA 1993). Thus, a place may be deemed of being of State heritage value if it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:
Under this Act, there are no State Heritage Areas applicable for the Adelaide Park Lands and Square, however, there are over 70 individual places registered, including most notably buildings at and including the State Library, South Australian Museum, The University of Adelaide, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide Botanic Garden, Old and New Parliament House, amongst other large and small places.

**Australian Heritage Commission Registration**

In executing an election platform item, the incoming Whitlam government established a Committee of Inquiry into the National Estate in 1973. The Inquiry recommended the establishment of a national-level environmental heritage regime to identify and conserve places of national heritage merit but also address the threat of damage and potential destruction of places due to the influence and pressures of development and other human action. The *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975* originated from this Inquiry and was primarily concerned with the identification and registration of items comprising the National Estate which were taken to consist of:

> those places being components of the natural environment of Australia or the cultural environment of Australia, that have aesthetic, historic or social significance or other special value for future generations as well as for the present community (Australian Heritage Commission 1974, section 54, clause 1).

It is important to understand that, given the nature of the Australian federal system, the powers of the Commission under this Act were related solely to properties controlled by the Crown and did not extend to privately owned property. However, the Register listed those places that had been identified as comprising part of the overall nation's heritage.

Under this Act, a ‘place’ included:

(a) a site, area or region;
(b) a building or other structure (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure), and
(c) a group of buildings or other structures (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures), and, in relation to the conservation or improvement of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of the place (Australian Heritage Commission 1975, definitions).

The Adelaide Park Lands were included in this Register in August 2001 with the following extract of a statement of significance:

> The Adelaide Parklands are significant in reflecting early nineteenth century planning ideas about the provision of a belt of common or reserved land around a city for its aesthetic qualities, public health and recreation, and as a form of concentric zoning. Adelaide is the only capital city in Australia that is surrounded by a continuous belt of Parklands. (Criteria A.4 and B.2) (Australian Historic Themes: 3.3.5 Laying out boundaries; 4.1.4 Creating capital cities; 4.6 Remembering significant phases in the development of settlements, towns and cities; 8.1.3 Developing public parks and gardens).
The Adelaide Parklands are important to many South Australians, including community groups such as the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association. They are highly regarded for their aesthetic qualities, and as a place for recreation and other community activities. The Parklands provide an attractive contrast to the surrounding urban environment and provide a number of important views, especially from Light's Vision on Montefiore Hill. (Criteria E.1 and G.1)

The Adelaide Parklands are a potential source of archaeological evidence that may make a substantial contribution to understanding the history and development of the City of Adelaide. The Parklands were used for a range of commercial, recreational and sporting activities during the nineteenth century, and were the site of an early rubbish dump. (Criterion C.2) (Australian Heritage Commission 2009).

The Park Lands were included on the basis of 5 of the overall 8 criteria under the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975, as follows:

- **Criterion A**: Its importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history  
  A.4 Importance for association with events, developments or cultural phases which have had a significant role in the human occupation and evolution of the nation, State, region or community.

- **Criterion B**: Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history  
  B.2 Importance in demonstrating a distinctive way of life, custom, process, land-use, function or design no longer practised, in danger of being lost, or of exceptional interest.

- **Criterion C**: Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history  
  C.2 Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of the history of human occupation of Australia.

- **Criterion E**: Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group  
  E.1 Importance for a community for aesthetic characteristics held in high esteem or otherwise valued by the community.

- **Criterion G**: Its strong or special associations with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons  
  G.1 Importance as a place highly valued by a community for reasons of religious, spiritual, symbolic, cultural, educational, or social associations (Australian Heritage Commission 2008).

Thus, importance as a representative of Australian cultural history, importance as an unusual and significant design, importance as a text in influencing Australian development, importance as a community-recognized aesthetic feature, and importance as possessing spiritual and cultural meaning to one of more groups were adequately demonstrated and deemed the criteria for its acceptance and registration. The place was not deemed as satisfying criteria that sought a demonstration of significant human activity types or forms, or a place that demonstrated a high degree of creative or technical accomplishment or endeavour.

Following amendments to the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003, the Register of the National Estate was frozen on 19 February 2007 meaning that no new places could be added, or removed. By this date, some 13,000 places had been included on the Register. With the gazettal of the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003 responsibility for maintaining the Register shifted to the Australian Heritage Council, and the Register will until February 2012 continue as a statutory register. During this transition period the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts will be required to continue considering the Register when making some decisions under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. This period also allows states, territories, local and the Australian Government to complete their respective tasks of revising their heritage places to appropriate heritage registers where necessary and to amend their legislation that refers to the Register as a statutory and enforceable list. From February 2012 all references to the Register will be removed from the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Protection Act 1999.
Conservation Act 1999 and the Commonwealth Australian Heritage Council Act 2003, and the Register will be maintained after this time on a non-statutory basis as a publicly available archive.

Thus, at this point in time, the Register of the National Estate has no statutory effect as it relates to the Adelaide Park Lands except as it pertains to Commonwealth properties and therein as an advisory document.

National Heritage System

With the repeal of the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975 a new legislative ‘regime’ for national heritage was brought into effect in Australia. The new regime consolidates national heritage protection into the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 and establishes the Australian Heritage Council under the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003. The Council is constituted as an expert body to advise the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage & the Arts on issues regarding the listing of heritage areas. The Council also continues to manage the Register. But the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 re-defined ‘heritage value’ of a ‘place’ as including ‘the place’s natural and cultural environment having aesthetic, historic, scientific or social significance, or other significance, for current and future generations of Australians’ (Australia 1999, section 528). The ‘Indigenous heritage value’ of a place sought a demonstration of significance to Indigenous persons in accordance ‘with their practices, observances, customs, traditions, beliefs or history’ (Australia 1999, section 528). ‘Place’ included:

(a) a location, area or region or a number of locations, areas or regions; and
(b) a building or other structure, or group of buildings or other structures (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated or connected with the building or structure, or group of buildings or structures); and
(c) in relation to the protection, maintenance, preservation or improvement of a place--the immediate surroundings of a thing in paragraph (a) or (b) (Australia 1999, section 528).

Thus, the definition of place was very similar in structure, scope and content to that used under the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975, except that multiple places linked to an overall listing could now be included and thereby multiple elements or components associated with such places, and that the predominance of ‘buildings’ as a heritage expression or representation was negated in favour of the holistic attributes, components and/or qualities of the place(s).

Criteria for inclusion in the new National Heritage List are set out under Section 22 of the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003 and requiring a place to meet, in essence, one or more of the following features:

The area is important to the natural or cultural history of Australia.
The area contains rare endangered parts of Australia’s natural or cultural history.
Has potential to give information on Australia’s natural or cultural history.
Has unique characteristics of a class of Australia’s natural or cultural places or environment,
Exhibits characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.
Is important in demonstrating a high degree of technological achievement of a particular period.
Has special association with the life or works of a person or a group of people, for spiritual or cultural reasons.
Has importance to indigenous tradition (Australia 2003, section 22).

This criterion seeks to establish a limited National Heritage List of places with outstanding natural, Indigenous or historic heritage value to the nation rather than an exhaustive list of heritage per se.

In assessing nominations for inclusion on this new List, the subject place is assessed against the criteria but also against a second test that seeks to determine a ‘significance threshold’. Significance threshold asks the essential question, ‘just how important are these values [to Australia]?’ To be accepted on the List, a place must clearly demonstrate 'outstanding' heritage value and importance to the nation, that is, to the Australian community as a whole. Thus, a comparative evaluation is now employed to consider the nominated place in the wider Australian context against other places to determine whether it is ‘unique’ or is 'more' or 'less' significant compared to other similar places. The degree of significance may also pertain to the geographic area of a place's significance whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.
By late 2008 there were some 79 places included on the National Heritage List including places cross-state and territory borders and in external territories managed by the Commonwealth of Australia.

National Heritage Registration

On 7 November 2008, the ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’ was listed on the National Heritage List by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage & the Arts, the Hon Peter Garrett MP. In endorsing this Listing, the Minister accepted that the place fulfilled six of the nine values for Listing evaluation under section 324JJ of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, and that the ‘significance threshold’ was successfully fulfilled. A review of the basis of this judgment, per criteria, is relevant.

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ in influencing the ‘course [and] … pattern’ of the nation’s ‘cultural history’, as per criterion (a) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23; Bunker 1986, pp. 7–20; Freestone 2006, 2007; Garnaut and Round 2005; Hutchings 1986, 2006; Jones 2007).

First, the physical expression of the Plan draped over the Adelaide Plain, including its park lands, squares, roadways, and overall subdivision configuration was considered as possessing high integrity to the original survey design authored under Light. It also continued to maintain this high integrity in its authenticity and had suffered minimal compromise in amendments and changes to the overall configuration and road circulation system.

Second, the Plan was deemed a precedent in the nature of settlement planning in the Australian colonies, being the first place to be settled in the absence of a penal settlement or military installation. Thus, the shift in Colonial Office agenda from a penal depot to a commercial real estate venture, but also the recognition that land survey and sale was essential to ensure certainty of land ownership and thereby investment. To achieve the latter, it was perceived by the South Australian Colonization Commissioners that an aesthetically embellished ‘city plan’ was essential to raise the hopes of investors as to the prospective financial stability and success of the ‘Province’ and its ‘capital city’. Accordingly, wide boulevards, generous open spaces reminiscent of London’s town squares, and an implicit aesthetic ethos in the design and its physical depiction were essential and successfully executed by Light.

Third, it was observed that the overall ‘Plan’ has existed within one municipal unit or Corporation enabling a single co-ordinated management regime over the place. While plans, Mayors, Town Clerks, City Gardeners, Park Lands Rangers, and government officials have each sought to plant, change, modify, erect installations within the place, the basis remains that it has historically been managed and curated by one local government entity irrespective of the present Adelaide Park Lands Authority. This longevity of curatorial role, deemed valuable as part of the criteria applicability, was equally matched by a citizen or community-based action group—the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association or equivalent—that has since 1869 formally sought to monitor, critique and express a collective concern about the quality of management, acts of alienation or development, and the general aesthetic and environmental quality of the Park Lands.

Fourth, it was concluded that the Plan exists as an international town planning precedent that had theoretical and practical ramifications outside Adelaide, and over the rest of SA and the Northern Territory often influencing other British colonial government surveying regimes and approaches. As an international precedent, it possesses the essential model characteristics of the influential Garden City planning philosophy and movement, and continues to hold an international precedent role in planning and landscape architecture literature being embraced by contemporary ‘greenway’ and ‘greenbelts’ proponents.

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ as it possesses ‘uncommon, rare … aspects’ of the nation’s ‘cultural history’, as per criterion (b) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23; Bunker 1986, pp. 7–20; Freestone 2006, 2007).

The Plan and its components were viewed as a rare and relatively intact exemplar of nineteenth century colonial planning ideals. It was a design based upon colonial surveying experience under Light, with a clear performance criteria as to siting and design expectations determined by the Commissioner’s, and informed by advanced nineteenth century town planning thought. Such rarity lies in its integrity; that roadways have
not been changed nor has the overall park lands expanse been compromised by additional subdivision, development and roadway intrusions. This integrity results, from the Minister’s opinion, in ‘the most extensive and substantially intact nineteenth-century park lands in Australia’ (Garrett & Ellis 2008, p. 1).

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ as it demonstrated the ‘principal characteristics of ... a class of Australia’s ... cultural places’, as per criterion (d) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23; Jones 2007).

While the overall ‘Plan’ is of significant, so too was considered the micro-level attributes and components of the design and the way it sculpts with the landscape. The quality characteristics of this plan include the:

- clearly defined spatial boundaries of development to open space as established by the park lands;
- formal geometric road system organization that enables ease and efficiency of movement;
- quality of this road system in terms of dimensions and their inter-linking to squares, main boulevards, and vistas beyond;
- squares as unique expressions of open space theory within the residential ‘Acres’;
- creation of ‘Acres’ as expansive yet organized residential allotments for sale and continued development embrace; and the,
- wider expansive park lands that provides a commons, a ‘domain’, a ‘Government Reserve’ that enables the hosting of civic institutions and amenities including the larger Gardenesque and in-progress Indigenous revegetated landscape.

As an ensemble, the spatial arrangement of these components, their over-arching aesthetic characteristics, and their integrity today in demonstrating the theory and ideals of the Garden City movement makes for an exciting dynamic exemplar.

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ as it demonstrates ‘a high degree of creative or technical achievement’ as a plan and as a design, as per criteria (f) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23).

While it is a ‘Plan’ on paper and title, it is also a manifestation in three-dimensions. Every surveyor sets forth a two-dimension survey for the subdivision of land but it is those surveys that successfully envisage a three-dimensional environment that more often enrich our lives and activities within our built environments. Thus, the quality execution of a plan in crafting an urban design environment that enables progressive and incremental development and change, providing opportunities and clues, but also informs our dialogue as occupants within the place and the larger landscape. These are unique characteristics and qualities in this Plan. The Minister concluded that here was an international ‘masterwork of urban design’. Here was a plan that heightens ‘design excellence’ opportunities that is enriched by ‘the encircling park lands’ and that both are instrumental in the spatial and cultural orchestration and organization of the city and Adelaide metropolitan area. This three-dimensionality recognized and responded to the topography of the site enabling prospect and drainage, engaged and celebrated the watercourse as a core human resource institutionalising it as a public common resource, and also configured the design to enable ease of geographical orientation to compass directions but also the distant Adelaide Hills escarpments. The latter appreciation was enhanced in the hierarchical road dimension design, ‘alternating narrow and wide streets in the east-west direction’, and the overall appreciation of the genus loci of the place (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23; Garrett & Ellis 2008, pp. 1&2).

The accomplishment is relevant as we know the authorship of the design, we have an appreciation of his words and aspirations for the ‘Plan’ and the city thereon, and we have a certain level of quality primary source documentation that depicts, paints, describes and discusses the design in Light’s hand as well as through the eyes of period surveyors and administrators. The Minister, despite minor local debate about ‘Plan’ authorship, ascribed the ‘Plan’ embodiment as being a ‘pioneering technical achievement of William Light’.

Following allotment sale and Corporation management came city beautification under the conscious hand of successive landscape designs, city gardeners, mayors, town clerks, conservators, all of whom had an aesthetic aim in their actions of enhancing, planting and beautifying the landscape of the Park Lands. While the ‘Plan’ is instrumental, the consequential actions of humans in enriching and crafting the three-dimensional botanical
and scientific experience of the place are also important, and in particular their landscape and botanic ‘plans’ that added successive cultural imperative micro-level qualities onto the overall ‘Plan’ thereby enriching this urban design. Here George Francis, William O’Brien, Wilhelm Pelzer, Orchard as City Gardeners, here Bungey, Edwin Smith and Lewis Cohen as (Lord) Mayors, here Thomas Worsnop and ‘Colonel’ Veale as Town Clerks, and here George Francis, Richard Schomburgk, Ednie Brown and Charles Smythe as ‘conservators’, respectively, all had a direct role in planting, embellishing, selecting plant species and planting design philosophies, determining planting spatial locations, trialling Adelaide-relevant street and park land tree species, and also creating specific horticultural and botanical living collections in portions of the park lands and the streetscapes and terraces (Jones 2007).

The transmission and adoption of this Garden City design model elsewhere, particularly throughout the British Empire and American colonies, have also been recognized and noted. Advocates of the Garden City and later City Beautiful movements, in the 1890s–1930s period, pointed to the idealized template that Adelaide offered in structuring an efficient and equitable built environment that afforded ‘green lungs’ to re-invigorate its residents but also offer civic pride. The role of Howard and his Garden Cities of To-Morrow was instrumental in this advocacy but so were his disciples like Charles Reade and the very foundations of the professional town planning discipline in Australia. In this regard, Adelaide hosted the first Government Town Planner in the role of Reade but also the first Australasian Town Planning Conference to debate and consider town planning initiatives and directions (Freestone 1989; Cheesman 1986).

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ as it possesses ‘strong or special association’ to particular social or cultural groups for ‘social, cultural or spiritual reasons’, as per criteria (g) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23).

Fundamentally, Adelaide and SA are iconographically identified by the symbol of the park lands and the plan. Both are typified and linked to such origins in the first instance, and such continues to be embraced in civic celebrations and subliminal media messages. The park lands constitute a ‘commons’ or a ‘domain’ for all Adelaideans and South Australian’s to identify with but also knowingly as the venue which hosts the state’s pre-eminent civic, cultural and scientific institutions and activities. The park lands are an icon, but they are also a hindrance as a common associated by all are a place ‘owned’ by all in spirit, meaning and concern. Thus, the Adelaide Park Lands are perceived to be ‘owned’ in ideal by the community in the same way that all park lands for SA country town country towns are ‘owned’ by their communities; this is a different concept of ‘ownership’ as it is tied to archetypal spiritual ‘ownership’ of space that originates in the very social-democratic thesis that established the colony.

Such ‘ownership’ has therefore, uniquely, spurred agencies and vehicles of community expression that more often spread elsewhere in Australia as exemplars. The Preservation Society originated here, Wattle Day and Arbor Day originated here, the first war memorial tree plantings originated here as well as expressions of war memoriam, and the Australian Natives Association and National Trust here, all as expressions and vehicles ‘in campaigning for the protection and safeguarding’ of colonial and post-colonial cultural heritage (Jones 2007).

The place was deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ as it possesses ‘special association with the life … of a person … of importance in Australia’s … cultural history’, as per criteria (h) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23).

The attribution of the Minister’s determination lies in the role and contribution of Colonel William Light to Adelaide and South Australia.

While six criteria were successfully addressed, three criteria were not successfully addressed.

The place was not deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ in its ability ‘to yield information’ to the future enhancement of Australia’s … cultural history’, as per criteria (c) (Australia 2008, pp. 1–23).

The nominators articulated a minor argument that the Park Lands may possess cultural and natural information and evidence yet to be determined or uncovered as part of wider practical and/or theoretical
research investigations. The opinion was formed that there was a ‘small chance’ that additional evidence would expand the scope of knowledge extant about the Park Lands (Australia 2008, pp. 10&11).

The place was not deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ in possessing or demonstrating ‘particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group’, as per criteria (e) (Australia 2008, pp. 12&13).

The nominators argued that the Park Lands did possess high aesthetic merit being inherently linked to the setting of the ‘Plan’, its engagement with and embrace of views and vistas, as well as its three-dimensional execution and the resulting landscape design embellishments. However, the opinion was drawn that the merits of this aesthetic quality and experience were not adequately demonstrated as being of a national level, nor of direct Indigenous association, nor did these aesthetic qualities successfully satisfy the threshold for acceptance of this criterion (Australia 2008, pp. 12&13).

The place was not deemed as possessing ‘outstanding heritage value to the nation’ in possessing or demonstrating ‘importance as part of Indigenous tradition’, as per criterion (i) (Australia 2008, p. 14).

In terms of Indigenous heritage, the landscape of the Adelaide Plains is the traditional home of the Kaurna people. While there is considerable evidence as to the occupancy of the Adelaide Plains by the Kaurna people, that several Dreaming lines traverse the landscape, and that a central Dreaming site pertaining to Tarndanya (the Red Kangaroo) lies approximately at the Adelaide Festival Centre location, it was concluded that there was insufficient evidence submitted in which to make this judgment and accept the validity of this criterion. It was also concluded that such Indigenous tradition was cogently demonstrated having regard to comparable Indigenous tradition-rich landscapes in Australia, and that the threshold for the acceptance of this criterion was not met. This conclusion was formed despite, in 1997, the following Statement being prepared in direct consultation with the Kaurna people:

Tarndanyungga Kaurna Yerta

This is the Red Kangaroo Dreaming place of the Kaurna people. It was an important place for the Kaurna long before the City of Adelaide was established. The Adelaide Park Lands and Squares are part of this place and hold special cultural significance for us – the Kaurna people.

The setting-up of the City of Adelaide and its Park Lands deprived our ancestors of the responsibility for maintaining crucial, culturally meaningful places. On the Park Lands the Kaurna have suffered to the present day as a result of this dispossession. Invasion has meant continuing alienation, oppression and harassment for us and other indigenous people. These injustices have been planted out on the Adelaide Park Lands.

The Park Lands have many culturally significant places. These places should be preserved from further encroachment.

We, as Kaurna people, must walk on these places to maintain our cultural strength (Hemming 1998, p. ii).

While not an indicator of significance, it is interesting to review the context of the ‘Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’ within the extant National Heritage List. It is the only place that possesses planning and formal urban design merit. While several contemporary and period buildings, and often their curtilages and/or gardens, have been included, no representational plan or executed three dimensional expression of an ideal has previously listed. Of the nine criteria applicable, the ‘Plan’ nomination successfully addressed six. Of the 79 places now on the National Heritage List only ten places satisfy six or more of the nine criteria. Places satisfying six criteria include: the Australian Alps National Parks & Reserves, Sydney Opera House in Sydney (included on the World Heritage List), the Tasmanian Wilderness area (included on the World Heritage List), and now the ‘Adelaide Park Lands & City Layout’. Places satisfying seven criteria include: Kingston & Arthurs Vale Historic Area on Norfolk Island, Port Arthur Historic Area in Tasmania, and Uluru – Kata Tjuta National Park (included on the World Heritage List). Places satisfying eight criteria include: Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory (included on the World Heritage List), Mawson’s Huts & Mawson’s Huts
Historic Area in the Australian Antarctica Territory, Point Cook Air Base in Victoria, and Old Parliament House & Curtilage in the Australian Capital Territory.

This should not be considered a measure of heritage value or merit nor of credibility for eligibility for a World Heritage nomination, but simply as an indicator of the relative scope of heritage value and merit inherent in the ‘Plan’ given the criterion.

**Heritage Status and Legacy**

Now that the Adelaide Park Lands has been registered on the Register of the National Estate, and now placed on the National Heritage List, it is a long term objective of the Corporation to continue to enhance this significance and the merit of the place and its design, and to seek in the ensuing years a nomination for inclusion on the World Heritage List. This nomination will only be a matter of political time as considerable evidence now documents in minuitiae the historical evolution of the Park Lands together with extant culturally significant evidence, Indigenous evidence and meaning, the theoretical position and origins of the overarching design and Plan, as well as a suite of management plans and a legislated local-state management authority or structure to guide the curatorship of the landscape.

---

Table 1. Australian Heritage Commission criteria; [http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/rne/criteria.html](http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/rne/criteria.html)


---

**Criteria for the Register of the National Estate**

**Criterion A: Its importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history**

A.1 Importance in the evolution of Australian flora, fauna, landscapes or climate.
A.2 Importance in maintaining existing processes or natural systems at the regional or national scale.
A.3 Importance in exhibiting unusual richness or diversity of flora, fauna, landscapes or cultural features.
A.4 Importance for association with events, developments or cultural phases which have had a significant role in the human occupation and evolution of the nation, State, region or community.

**Criterion B: Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history**

B.1 Importance for rare, endangered or uncommon flora, fauna, communities, ecosystems, natural landscapes or phenomena, or as a wilderness.
B.2 Importance in demonstrating a distinctive way of life, custom, process, land-use, function or design no longer practised, in danger of being lost, or of exceptional interest

**Criterion C: Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history**

C.1 Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of Australian natural history, by virtue of its use as a research site, teaching site, type locality, reference or benchmark site.
C.2 Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of the history of human occupation of Australia.

**Criterion D: Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of: (i) a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or (ii) a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments**

D.1 Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the range of landscapes, environments or ecosystems, the attributes of which identify them as being characteristic of their class.
D.2 Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the range of human activities in the Australian environment (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land use, function, design or technique).

**Criterion E: Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group**

E.1 Importance for a community for aesthetic characteristics held in high esteem or otherwise valued by the community.

**Criterion F: Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period**

F.1 Importance for its technical, creative, design or artistic excellence, innovation or achievement.

**Criterion G: Its strong or special associations with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons**

G.1 Importance as a place highly valued by a community for reasons of religious, spiritual, symbolic, cultural, educational, or social associations.

**Criterion H: Its special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history**

H.1 Importance for close associations with individuals whose activities have been significant within the history of the nation, State or region.
Criteria for the National Heritage List

The National Heritage criteria for a place are any or all of the following:

(a) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history;

(b) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history;

(c) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history;

(d) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of:
   (i) a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
   (ii) a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments;

(e) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;

(f) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;

(g) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;

(h) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history;

(i) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance as part of Indigenous tradition.

Table 3. Please find Table 3 on following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>WH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Academy of Science Building</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Alps National Parks &amp; Reserves</td>
<td>ACT, NSW, Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Fossil Mammal Sites</td>
<td>SA, Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian War Memorial &amp; the Memorial Parade</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia Shipwreck Site &amp; Survivor Camps Area 1629 – Houtman Abrolhos</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondi Beach</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonegilla Migrant Camp – Block 19</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewarrina Aboriginal Fish Traps (Baumes Ngunnu)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickendon Estate</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhi Rin National Heritage Landscape</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascades Female Factory</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences Designated National Heritage Park</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Mines Historic Site</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockatoo Island</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus Heddon L inevitable – Australian Hall</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampier Archipelago (including Burnup Peninsula)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Probation Station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur Stampede National Monument</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Hartland Landing Site 1616 – Cape Inscription Area</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echuca Wharf</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ediacara Fossil Site – Nilpena</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Stockade Gardens</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fintant Government House Site</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders Ranges</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Fossil Site – Yea</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Island</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Prison (former)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass House Mountains National Landscape</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrowan Heritage Precinct</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanerchyna Rainforest of Australia</td>
<td>NSW, Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians National Park (Gariwerd)</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Reef</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Blue Mountains</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMVS Cerberus</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heid &amp; McDonald Islands</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage Historic Precinct</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court – National Gallery Precinct</td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court of Australia (former)</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Barracks</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI Building (former)</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakadu National Park</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park, Long &amp; Spectacle Island Nature Reserves</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurnell Peninsula Headland</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Howe Island Group</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Island</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manwra’s Huts &amp; Manwra’ s Huts Historic Site</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Cricket Ground</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount William Stone Hatchet Quarry</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myall Creek Massacre &amp; Memorial Site</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman College</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Head – Sydney</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Government House &amp; the Government Domain</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Great North Road</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Parliament House &amp; Currieri</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Cook Air Base</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Nepean Defence Sites &amp; Quarantine Station Area</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Arthur Historic Area</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnululu National Park</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recherché Bay (North Peninsula) Area</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Bridge</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippon Lea House &amp; Garden</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Exhibition Building &amp; Carlton Gardens</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal National Park &amp; Garawarra State Conservation Area</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Bay, Western Australia</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Myers Music Bowl</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australian Old &amp; New Parliament Houses</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Range National Park</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Harbour Bridge</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Opera House</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmanian Wilderness</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adelaide Park Lands &amp; City Layout</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree of Knowledge &amp; Currieri</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uluru – Kata Tjuta National Park</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrumbungle National Park</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Hill Walk Off Route</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Tropics of Queensland</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willandra Lakes Region</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodens Estate</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Extract of the ‘Plan of the City Adelaide’ as prepared by Colonel William Light: Source: Reproduced with the permission of the City of Adelaide Archives.
Figure 2. ‘Plan of the City Adelaide in South Australia’ as prepared by Colonel William Light: Source: Reproduced with the permission of the City of Adelaide Archives.
Figure 3. Plan of Adelaide as first published by Howard in his ‘To-morrow: A peaceful path to real reform’ (1898), and reprinted in ‘Garden Cities of To-Morrow’ (1902). Source: Freestone 1989, p. 57.
**Figure 4.** Plan of ‘The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout’ as contained within the National Heritage Listing of the place, 2008. Source: Image courtesy of and reproduced with the permission of the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, 2008.
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