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Executive Summary

As one of Canberra's iconic cultural landscapes, the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct is an historic place with outstanding heritage values, recognised at the Commonwealth level. Significant as an academic, research and scientific facility as the headquarters of the Australian National University's (ANU) Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics (RSAA), it is also a major visitor attraction for the Canberra region.

Twelve years after the devastation of the 2003 fires which destroyed many of the buildings at the Observatory and left many more in ruins, 2015 is an appropriate time to reflect on the changes to the site and its landscape context and its future management. It is timely to assess the impacts of regrowth and rebuilding, to consider the role of its heritage ruins and to reassess the heritage values of the site holistically and of the elements individually.

The role of the ANU in the development and conservation of the site and the evolution of its scientific achievements is a nationally significant story, and its stewardship of this iconic place has led to the commissioning of GML Heritage to prepare this Heritage Management Plan (HMP), which reassesses the heritage values and provides detailed policies which provide direction to guide the ANU in the future conservation and development of the Observatory.

Volume 1 of the HMP is the main body of the report, containing a comprehensive heritage assessment of the Mount Stromlo Observatory against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria. The HMP assesses the site as significant as a whole; as a cultural landscape for its historic, Indigenous and natural heritage values.

To assist decision making for each of the key heritage elements of the Observatory, individual heritage inventory sheets will be prepared by the ANU in this separate Volume 2 of the HMP. The first of these sheets has been prepared by GML, for the Director's Residence, which provides a template to be used for the assessment of each element of heritage values.

The inventory sheets will provide individual descriptions, historical information, and specific management policies for conservation and development of the element, additional to the overarching policies of the main HMP. These inventory sheets will be an important management tool for the ANU,
facilitating a detailed, measured approach to managing change at the site with full consideration of the heritage values.

As stewards for an exceptional site with potential National Heritage values, the ANU site managers balance the operational requirements of an active scientific precinct with visitor/public engagement, and conservation responsibilities for the care and interpretation of the heritage elements and values on a daily basis.

When development or change is proposed, it will be considered for its impact on the significance grading of each element using the management system of 'tolerance for change'. This useful tool indicates the extent to which the Commonwealth Heritage values and key attributes are able to tolerate change without adversely impacting the nature or degree of its heritage values and enables the university to carefully assess each proposal, case by case.
1.0 Heritage Inventory

1.1 Background and Structure of the Report

GML Heritage (GML) was commissioned by the Australian National University (ANU) in April 2013 to prepare a Heritage Management Plan (HMP) for the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). A HMP is a requirement of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cwlth) (EPBC Act).

The HMP contains two volumes. Volume 1 comprises the heritage assessment of the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct against the Commonwealth criteria, the historical and environmental context and policies for management, and an interpretation framework of the site. The HMP assesses the site as significant as a whole; as a cultural landscape for its historic, Indigenous and natural heritage values.

Volume 2, this report, comprises the Heritage Inventory—a series of individual heritage assessments of the important elements including the buildings and heritage ruins on the site.

The individual inventory sheets for Volume 2 will be prepared by ANU Heritage, following the pilot assessment prepared by GML for the Director’s Residence. The inventory format is based on a template developed for similar inventories for the ANU Acton Campus Heritage Study by GML in 2012. The inventory was developed in association with the ANU and with advice from the then Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPAC), now Department of the Environment, and allows the ANU to continue to add individual assessment inventories.

1.2 Study Area

The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct (part Block 38, Stromlo) is located on the summit of Mount Stromlo, west of Canberra in the ACT (Figure 1.1). The study area for this report is the Commonwealth Heritage listed boundary (Figure 1.2).

1.3 Heritage Listings

1.3.1 Statutory Listings

Commonwealth Heritage List

The Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) was created under the EPBC Act to recognise places of Commonwealth Heritage value which are owned by the Commonwealth Government. The official citation determines that Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct meets the threshold for listing on the CHL for six of the nine Commonwealth Heritage criteria. Volume 1 of the HMP reassesses the heritage values of the whole site.

1.3.2 Non-Statutory Listings

ACT Heritage Register

The ACT Heritage Register includes places of natural and cultural significance, including Indigenous places. It was set up under the Heritage Act 2004 (ACT) and legally recognises and
protects significant heritage places within the Australian Capital Territory. Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct was recently rejected for provisional listing (25 July 2013) by the ACT Heritage Council. This is because the site is located on National Land, under the control of the Commonwealth, so the ACT Heritage Register has no statutory legal effect.

**Register of the National Estate (RNE)**

Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct (Place ID: 13353). The site was registered on the RNE on 11 August 1987. The RNE ceased to have statutory effect in February 2012 and the RNE listing does not provide direct legal protection or prescriptive requirements for management. The RNE is retained by the Commonwealth as an archival database of places. The RNE citation matches the CHL citation.

**National Trust of Australia (ACT)**

The National Trust of Australia (ACT) maintains a Register of Significant Heritage Places. The places included on the register are places the National Trust considers to be valued by the community. Listing by the National Trust is non-statutory; it provides recognition of heritage value. Mount Stromlo Observatory was classified on 24 November 1980 as well as the Duffield Grave at Mount Stromlo, meaning that the Trust’s heritage committee (a group of professionals volunteering their expertise to the organisation) had investigated potential heritage values of the site and conferred the highest level of public community recognition.

**Australian Institute of Architects Register of Significant Twentieth Century Architecture**

The Australian Institute of Architects (AIA) maintains a National Register of Significant Twentieth Century Architecture and a local ACT Chapter Register of Significant Twentieth Century Architecture. Additionally, there is an International Union of Architects (UIA) World Register. Listing by the AIA and UIA are non-statutory and provide recognition of their architectural heritage value.

Mount Stromlo Administration Building (RTSCA No. R023), referred to in this report as the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building, was listed in 1984 on the ACT Chapter Register.

**ANU Heritage Database**

The ANU developed a heritage database to meet its obligations under the EPBC Act. It is a register of places under the management of the ANU with either Commonwealth Heritage value or recognised heritage significance to the university’s community. Numerous listings for Mount Stromlo Observatory and individual buildings are included in the database (MSO0001–MSO0016).

### 1.4 Assessing Heritage Value of Individual Elements

**1.4.1 Assessment against Commonwealth and National Heritage Criteria**

Section 6.0 of Volume 1 explains that the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct as a whole is ranked as having exceptional heritage value. Volume 1 is an assessment of the place as a whole, rather than individual elements, buildings and sites, while Volume 2 provides the individual assessments of elements, buildings and sites within the campus against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria. The criteria are included in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1 Commonwealth Heritage criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Commonwealth Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A—Historic</strong></td>
<td>The place’s importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B—Rarity</strong></td>
<td>The place’s possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C—Scientific</strong></td>
<td>The place’s potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **D—Representative** | 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—Aesthetic** | The place’s importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group. |
| **F—Creative/Technical** | The place’s importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period. |
| **G—Social** | The place’s strong or special associations with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. |
| **H—Associative** | 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—Indigenous** | The place’s importance as part of Indigenous tradition. |

1.4.2 Ranking of Significance at the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct

The methodology for ranking the significance of the individual elements, buildings and sites is explained in full in Section 6.0 of the HMP (Volume 1) and a précis is as follows.

The individual elements possess an array of identified heritage values to a greater or lesser degree. The purpose of understanding the significance of the various elements is to enable a flexible yet consistent approach to the management of the place.

Table 1.2 Definition of the ranking, or grades, of heritage significance for cultural heritage values at the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Explanation of the Heritage Significance Ranking/Grade</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Rare or outstanding element which significantly embodies and demonstrates National and Commonwealth (or other) Heritage values in its own right and makes a direct and irreplaceable contribution to a place’s significance/value. They are of Outstanding value to the nation (as assessed against the National Heritage criteria). Generally these elements include an exceptional degree of original fabric or attributes with heritage values, and include non-tangible components such as views and functional relationships which directly contribute to their Outstanding/Exceptional values. These may include some alterations which are of a minor nature and do not detract from significance. Loss or alteration would significantly diminish the National or Commonwealth (or other) Heritage values of the place. At Mount Stromlo Observatory, the site as a whole is considered to meet the Exceptional level.</td>
<td>Likely to fulfil criteria for National Heritage List.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ranking Explanation of the Heritage Significance Ranking/Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Explanation of the Heritage Significance Ranking/Grade</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Element which demonstrates Commonwealth (or State) Heritage values in its own right and makes a significant contribution to the place’s heritage value. Existing alterations do not detract from its heritage values. Loss or unsympathetic alteration would diminish the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place. At Mount Stromlo Observatory, there is a high proportion of elements with High level heritage significance.</td>
<td>Likely to fulfil Commonwealth and State Heritage criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Element that reflects some Commonwealth (or other local) Heritage values but only contributes to the overall significance/values of the place in a moderate way. Loss or unsympathetic alteration is likely to diminish the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place. At Mount Stromlo Observatory, there is a high proportion of elements with Moderate level of heritage significance.</td>
<td>Likely to fulfil Commonwealth Heritage criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Element that reflects some (or a low level) Commonwealth Heritage values and only contributes to the overall significance/values of the place. Loss will not diminish the Commonwealth or local Heritage values of the place.</td>
<td>Likely to meet local heritage criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Element that does not reflect or demonstrate any Commonwealth or local Heritage values and detracts from the overall heritage values of the place. Does not fulfil criteria for heritage listing.</td>
<td>Does not have Commonwealth or local Heritage value on its own merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive</td>
<td>Damaging to the place’s heritage values. Loss may contribute to the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place. Does not fulfil criteria for heritage listing.</td>
<td>Does not fulfil criteria for Commonwealth, or local listing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 Tolerance for Change Applied to the Site

#### 1.5.1 Explanation of Tolerance for Change

In the case of a large site such as the Mount Stromlo Observatory, the concept of sensitivity or ‘tolerance for change’ is a useful management tool which assists with managing any proposed change to the site’s heritage values, in particular the built and landscape character.

Tolerance for change can be applied to individual elements, buildings or sites at the Mount Stromlo Observatory that identified in this site heritage Inventory. It indicates the extent to which the Commonwealth Heritage values and key attributes are able to tolerate change without adversely impacting the nature or degree of its heritage values to the site overall.

Table 1.3 below sets out the rankings of tolerance for change used in this report and explains their potential application to the individual elements of the Mount Stromlo Observatory. It will help the Facilities and Services Division identify the extent to which they retain and/or provide important evidence of the site’s significance in their existing form, fabric, function and/or location.

#### Table 1.3 Explanation for the range of ‘tolerance for change’ levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerance for Change</th>
<th>Definition of the Application to Mount Stromlo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low tolerance for change</td>
<td>The element and its key attributes (form, fabric, function and/or location) embody the heritage values and contribute strongly to Mount Stromlo. The element usually retains a high degree of intactness with no major change or alterations, or only very minor alterations that do not detract from the heritage values of the element itself or the site. General management guideline to be applied: the element should be retained, interpreted and conserved. Most elements of high heritage significance have a low tolerance to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tolerance for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerance for Change</th>
<th>Definition of the Application to Mount Stromlo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some tolerance for change</td>
<td>The element and its key attributes (form, fabric, function and/or location) embody the heritage values of the element and its contribution to the site. The element has undergone some alteration, but it does not detract from the heritage values of the element itself or the site. General management guideline to be applied: the element should generally be retained, interpreted and conserved. However, they may be sensitively changed to some degree without adverse impact on the heritage values of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to tolerate moderate change</td>
<td>The element and its key attributes (form, fabric, function and/or location) only partly embody the heritage values of the site, or have been considerably modified. General management guideline to be applied: the element should be retained and conserved. There is greater opportunity for moderate change with less adverse impact on the heritage values of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to tolerate reasonable change</td>
<td>The element and its key attributes (form, fabric, function and/or location) have relatively little heritage value, but it may contribute to the overall significance of the site. Past alterations to the element detract from the heritage values and are difficult to interpret. General management guideline to be applied: the element can be changed to a reasonable degree provided this does not impact the heritage values of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to tolerate substantial change</td>
<td>The element and its key attributes (form, fabric, function and/or location) have little or no heritage value that contributes to the overall site. General management guideline to be applied: the element can be changed substantially, or removed, provided this does not impact the heritage values of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5.2 Application to the Site

While the whole site offers opportunities for interpretation, new development, adaptive re-use or conservation of some elements, the application of the tolerance for change tool will help with a quick reference management and development guide.

The sum of all parts adds to a ranking of ‘exceptional’ for the whole site. While the whole site is of exceptional significance, the heritage value of the individual elements varies. The variable significance of the elements can tolerate different degrees or levels of change. Generally, the higher the heritage value, the lower the tolerance for change. For example, the management of the Director’s Residence should be commensurate with its High level of significance, which means that it has a Low tolerance for change.

### 1.6 Authorship

Section 1.0 to this Volume 2 report and the pilot inventory were prepared by GML’s project team including Sarah Webeck Consultant, Rachel Jackson Senior Associate, Sheridan Burke, Partner with research input and drafting by Kirsty Altenburg.
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Figure 1.1 Location of the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct in relation to Canberra (Source: GML based on Google Earth Image)
Figure 1.2 The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct, showing key buildings. CHL boundary outlined in red. (Source: GML edit on ANU base plan)
Figure 1.3 Significance rankings of the built elements at the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct. (Source: GML on ANU base plan)
Figure 1: Location of the Director’s Residence and outbuilding within the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct (CHL boundary shown in red). Source: GML edit on ANU base plan
The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct—Heritage Management Plan—Volume 2—Director's Residence Inventory, July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>1927-28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Ranking</td>
<td>High—Commonwealth Heritage value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Listing</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) however it forms part of the listed Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Significance**

A pre-2003 fires statement of significance for Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct (Place ID:13335) from the Register of the National Estate is not available: (<http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl?mode=place_detail;place_id=13353>).

The following significance assessment for the Director’s Residence comprises the statement of significance and identified Commonwealth heritage values from the Mt Stromlo Observatory Precinct CHL citation (Place ID: 105309, 22 June 2004).

**Summary statement of significance**

Initially conceived in 1905 by the solar astronomer, Dr WG Duffield, to fill a solar recording gap in the Western Pacific, the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct has incorporated phases of development that encompass structures dating from 1911. Significant features with a strong association to the historic phases of the precinct’s development include the standing walls of the Director’s Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area, which contribute to information on the early period, and reflect a time when directors were accommodated at an institution.

The pattern of the precinct layout remains a feature of the cultural landscape. This is reflected in the arrangement of buildings and building ruins in their function areas, with some separation by landscape space. The Director’s Residence centrally located as a focal feature on the ridge spine contributes to the significant layout. The layout on the mountain takes advantage of spectacular views and informal tree plantings, with simple paths, and stone retaining walls. The landscaping pattern close to the Main Administration Building, Director’s Residence and staff housing is more formally arranged and with a greater variety of exotic trees and plants.

The place is significant for its strong association with scientists who have made a substantial contribution to astronomy and astrophysics such as WG Duffield, R Woolley, B Bok and O Eggen.

Although aesthetic significance was reduced by the 2003 bushfire the period character of the remnant 1926 architecture contributes to the aesthetic value.

The ruins of the Director’s Residence reflect that style of administrative arrangements associated with scientific and other government institutional establishments during the early development of Canberra (School of Forestry, Canberra Hospital, Institute of Anatomy).

**Commonwealth Heritage values**

**Criterion (a)**

Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct, an optical astronomical research complex arranged across the ridge of a mountain, is a significant cultural landscape with a surviving richness of features including the mountain top landscape setting. Despite serious damage by the January 2003 bushfire, significant elements continue to contribute to the heritage values of the place including housing, gardens, remaining landscape features and the layout pattern of the complex.

Initially conceived in 1905 by the solar astronomer, Dr WG Duffield, to fill a solar recording gap in the Western Pacific, the Observatory has incorporated phases of development that encompass structures dating from 1911. Significant features with a strong association to the historic phases of the precinct’s development include:

- The standing walls of the Director’s Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area, contribute to information on the early period, and reflect a time when directors were accommodated at an institution.

- The pattern of roads leading to the buildings.

- The pattern of the precinct layout remains a feature of the cultural landscape. This is reflected in the arrangement of buildings and building ruins in their function areas, with some separation by landscape space. The Director’s Residence centrally located as a focal feature on the ridge spine contributes to the significant layout. The layout on the mountain takes advantage of spectacular...
views and informal tree plantings, with simple paths, and stone retaining walls. The landscaping pattern close to the Administration Building, Director’s Residence and staff housing is more formally arranged and with a greater variety of exotic trees and plants.

Evidence of the bushfires of 18 January 2003 constitutes historical significance.

**Criterion (b)**

Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct is a rare example of an optical observatory complex in Australia (the only other Australian complex of comparative size being the Siding Spring Observatory). Although many of the buildings are in ruins, it is rare in its array of historical telescope building structures.

**Criterion (d)**

The ruins of the Director’s Residence reflect that style of administrative arrangements associated with scientific and other government institutional establishments during the early development of Canberra (School of Forestry, Canberra Hospital, Institute of Anatomy).

**Criterion (e)**

Although aesthetic significance was reduced by the 2003 bushfire the period character of the remnant 1926 architecture contributes to the aesthetic value.

**Criterion (h)**

The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for its strong association with scientists who have made a substantial contribution to astronomy and astrophysics such as WG Duffield, R Woolley, CW Allen, LGH Huxley, RG Giovanelli, DF Martyn, B Bok, O Eggen, DS Mathewson, AW Rodgers and JR Mould.

| Condition—Date | A structural condition assessment was not undertaken for this inventory. The Director’s Residence was inspected on 17 December 2013 and is in poor condition. The building stands as a ruin following the 2003 fires. |
| Relevant Documentation | A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was prepared by Tanner Architects, October 2004 for the Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics (RSAA) and the Australian National University (ANU) shortly after the 2003 fires. It includes a history of the Director’s Residence, a description of the structure, an assessment of heritage values and management policies. A Heritage Management Plan (HMP) is being prepared by GML (2014) to guide the conservation and management of the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct. |
Context of the Building

Figure 2: Context of the Director’s Residence (and outbuilding) at Mount Stromlo Observatory. Source: GML edit on ANU base plan

Brief Historical Overview

Construction and Early History

Walter Duffield, appointed as the first Director of the Commonwealth Solar Observatory on 1 January 1924, was closely associated with the planning, design and construction of the Director’s Residence. At the time Mount Stromlo was a very remote, isolated location within the Canberra region. The Director’s Residence, purpose built for residential accommodation for the director and his family, was to be located in a prominent location on the spine of the ridge east of the Main Administrative Building. £5,000 was allocated for the building’s construction. However the public tenders were too expensive and in November 1926 the Federal Capital Chief Commissioner Sir John Butters requested Duffield review the plans to suggest savings. On 9 November 1926 Butters directed the architect ‘to prepare new plan altogether showing what can be got for £5,000’. In a file note of 25 November 1926 marked Duffield noted that ‘It is not considered equitable that the surcharge of £1,000 should be made on necessary accommodation. If it must be drawn upon for the provision of basins in rooms, central heating, cupboards, Hardwood floors and good wood in Living Rooms, the Director will agree though in his opinion an official residence of this character should be of a good standard.’

On 18 January 1927 M Fizelle was directed ‘to sketch out plan for Director’s Quarters’ and on 18 March 1927 a plan and specification was sent to Mrs Duffield at Hotel Canberra requesting her decision on any minor revisions to the specification. The drawings for the built design were signed off by Henry Maitland Rolland, Architect for the Federal Capital Commission (FCC). On 30 March 1927 Rolland advised the Chief Commissioner that a tender had been accepted from builder and contractor WH Mason of Crawford St Queanbeyan. The ‘total amount will be £5,623 which will be in excess of the amount authorised by the Minister for Home & Territories viz: - £5,500.’ By 30 August 1928 costs had reached £7,263/12/6 of which £4,935/15/- was originally approved, with an extra £683/6/5 approved. The balance of £1,644/1/6 was outstanding.

Costs for the construction of Westridge House can be compared as the Australian Forestry School and the Commonwealth Solar Observatory were the only two institutions for which the FCC was responsible that were not related to the transfer of government. In 1927 the FCC was building Westridge House in Yarralumla as a residence for the Principal of the Forestry School and newly appointed Commonwealth Inspector-General of Forests, Charles Lane-Poole. Costs increased from the expenditure originally allocated at £3,000 and then £4,250, had escalated a further £562.10.0. Apparently, Lane-Poole had
evidently driven a pretty stiff bargain for consenting to come to Canberra, the completed cost of the house was £4880/12/4, a very high price [even in Canberra] for a house in those days.10

Duffield’s approval was sought on many details throughout the construction of the residence. On 13 May 1927 ’work was at a standstill’ as a list of changes Duffield and his wife had requested and agreed to personally pay for required Duffield’s approval.11 Architect HM Rolland sent the contractor specific details on the brickwork and tile surrounds for the fireplaces in the living room, dining room and first floor bedroom. Dark blue bricks from Sydney were for the back hearth in the living room and the main bedroom.12 On 21 July, Rolland sought Chief Commissioner’s approval for a builder’s quote following ‘a visit in company with the Director, you thought a brick patio and steps should be provided at the entrance to the building.’13 Other changes in a long list of extras Duffield requested included changing the colour of one third of the roof tiles to create a mottled appearance; a large manhole in the ceiling, cut away brick wall under servant’s stairs, additional cupboards throughout, wooden floor on concrete in the sleep out, opening in kitchen chimney, extra basin in servants no 1 bedroom, provision of cold water taps in upstairs WCs, provision of a cellarette to store wine in the study, altering the shape of the horns on the window sashes, electric installation for range. Duffield agreed to pay £1377/6 for additional extras, which included tiling, additional electrical installations and sanitary fittings (28 July 1927).14

In hand written notes on 11 and 12 July 1927 the architect Fizelle detailed the kitchen furniture, hatchway, scullery and pantry furniture and cupboards, family and maids’ bedrooms and cloak room cupboards Mrs Duffield required.15 The following day Architect Rolland forwarded a sketch plan of a design for garden layout in front of the Director’s Residence he understood to have been done by Mrs Duffield to the Assistant Chief Engineer who was ‘taking action in regard to the gardens etc at Stromlo’.16 While in Melbourne Mrs Duffield selected electrical lighting fittings, locks and door furniture and the bathroom tiles.17

The National Archives file on the construction of the Residence includes an American brochure on a solar hot water heater, The Day and Night Hot Water Heater with the notation ‘Stromlo Directors Res’ and ‘60 gall. cylinder per W.D. from Mr Rolland’18. Given Duffield’s efforts to establish a solar observatory he clearly must have been interested in solar heating. However, following discussions on the hot water system Executive Architect Thomas Casboult advised that the Commission would supply an IDEAL boiler with Automatic Damper and Thermometer with a rise to a 100 gallon copper hot water cylinder and a 50 gallon cold water feed tank provided with overflow and tray in the roof area.19

On 1 October 1927 Duffield, requested to approve changes to the newels of the main staircase, agreed to the proposed alterations.20 Duffield paid £25 for alterations to the windows in the two maids’ rooms, inserting a window which was omitted in maid’s room no 2, changing two small windows in maid’s room 1 to a large window and including a basin in maid’s room 1.21 A memorandum initialed by Fizelle on behalf of Casboult, notes that ‘the Executive Architect has given a decision that the eaves and window frames etc. shall remain chocolate brown as at present.’22

Duffield approved the interior and external paint colours, the skirtings to be scribed and with a splayed top, the architraves and picture rails were not to have moulds, and in January 1928 the construction of the clothes line.23 Duffield had understood that the Ward no 6 Royal kitchen range he had selected would also include a boot boiler24. Duffield agreed to pay the extra cost for the kitchen range.25

Following a discussion between the FCC Commissioner Sir John Harrison, Executive Architect Thomas Casboult and the Superintendent, Building Construction Branch regarding completion dates for works at the Observatory, the Residence must be to be completed and ready for occupation by 30 January 192826. A sketch plan for the garages was circulated in February 192827. Later in 1928 the Duffield family who had been living in the First Assistant’s house moved into the Residence, originally known as Observatory House.

As envisaged by Dr Duffield the Residence was used for social functions in addition to providing residential accommodation for directors and their families. Many Observatory Directors fostered strong links with politicians, holding dinners and social functions in the house. ‘When ‘Observatory House’ was finally completed, the Duffields hosted musical evenings for staff and visitors with recitals from a selection of instruments including the family’s Steinway grand piano.’28

Following the death of Dr Duffield on 1 August 1929 Mrs Duffield and her daughter Miss Joan Duffield continued to live at the Director’s Residence until the end of 1930.29

Although built for the Director and his family, staff often occupied the Residence. During and after the war the building was used to accommodate bachelors. A Department of Works plan from 1947, Alterations to Director’s Residence converts the building into two separate flats.30 Olin Eggen, the fourth Director from 1966-77 was a bachelor who slept in the house ‘but solved the problem of its upkeep by giving the run of the house to the Observatory gardener and his wife’. 31

The building accommodated nine Director’s until 2002. Penny Sackett was the first Director who opted to live off site, and at this time the residence became available through the ANU Accommodation Service and was soon occupied by the Braddick Family. The Director’s Residence had been in continuous use since its construction for residential purposes, and was occupied up until the 2003 fires which devastated the Mount Stromlo site.
Post-2003 fires

The Director’s Residence and outbuilding were severely damaged in the 2003 fires with the roof, much of the interior as well as the doors and windows destroyed. Following the initial removal of debris from the site, and the installation of some structural supports the building had been left as a ruin and closed to access.

From 2013-2014 the building was stabilised and conserved as a managed ruin, and interpretive installations were included in the building which is now open to the public.

Figure 4: Plan for the Director’s Residence c1926  Source: Tanner Architects, 2004, Conservation Management Plan, page 85, Illus.2.67.
Description

Building

The Director's Residence is a two-storey brick building centrally located as a focal feature on the ridge spine, to the east of the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building. The scale and prominence of the building, set at a higher elevation than other buildings along the ridge, illustrates the commanding role this building was designed for. Although severely damaged in the 2003 fires, it remains a dominant feature of the precinct, even in a stabilised and semi-ruinous state.

The building is L-shape in plan with a projecting bay on the east façade, the front elevation, with horizontal mouldings providing definition over the main entry. Symmetry provides a formal sense to this façade. The Director's Residence was constructed in the Federal Capital architectural style with rough cast rendered walls, a Marsellaise pattern tiled hipped roof with deep eaves and sun motif rondels over the porch on the south façade, and was designed to harmonise with the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building and other residential accommodation. Canberra Commonwealth bricks were with set with roughly ground lime mortar.

Prior to the fire the external walls were painted white with brown trim and the interior walls rendered and painted.

Entry to the ground floor was by access from a porch on the south elevation to an inner hall with a WC adjacent, a study and living room facing east, a hall and main staircase, dining room on the north east side, and in the rear wing a kitchen, maid's sitting room, scullery, laundry, pantry, back stairs and a WC with external access on the western side. On the first floor were four bedrooms, an upper hall accessed by the main staircase, an open sleep out with a bathroom and WC adjacent, two maids bedrooms separated by the maids' bathroom and accessed by back stairs at the rear of the building. Fireplaces on the ground floor were in the study, living room, dining room, maids room and on the first floor in the main bedroom and the south east corner bedroom. The fireplaces in the living room, dining room, study and upstairs bedrooms were detailed in brickwork with tile surrounds. The main staircase and living room floors were jarrah and redwood was used for other timber joinery.

A rough cast rendered brick outbuilding housed garages and boiler room.

The 2003 fires caused extensive damage to the building and outbuilding. The roof and ceilings were completely destroyed and the buildings were gutted along with all internal joinery, floors and joists. Photographs taken after the fire shows the extent of debris. The brick walls and chimneys are standing. Their structural condition is unknown. Some reinforcing has been installed.

A pergola constructed on the eastern façade of the Director's Residence in 1995 was destroyed by the fires. Crazy paving east of the entrance remains.

Landscape

The house was designed to sit within a landscaped garden with exotic trees, a croquet lawn located to the east of the house, a bulb garden to the east and stone retaining walls. There was also an orchard planted by Mrs Duffield in the eastern part of the garden.

The 2003 fires and the subsequent ruined condition of the Director's Residence has resulted in the loss of the landscaped gardens and trees. The English Oak planted in the 1920s remains adjacent to the Director's residence, as does an Ash on the north side planted late in the post 1952 fire period and Viburnum tinus shrubs on to the southern and eastern sides of the house.

Other remaining features are portions of the stone walls in the gardens, with bulbs in undisturbed soil pockets, the flattened area of the croquet lawn and stump remnants of the orchard. Eucalypts have grown to the northwest of the house.

The road south of the building, as shown in the 1927 photograph during the construction of the house continues in use.
Summary Significance Assessment against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria

The Director's Residence is not individually listed on the CHL, however is included within the CHL citation for Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct. The following significance assessment for the residence has been prepared against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria. The italicised text below has been drawn from the official precinct citation. Additional commentary has been added where it provides updated information and verifies the heritage significance of the place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment against Commonwealth Heritage Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Historic</td>
<td>The Director's Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director's Residence: Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct, an optical astronomical research complex arranged across the ridge of a mountain, is a significant cultural landscape with a surviving richness of features including the mountain top landscape setting. Despite serious damage by the January 2003 bushfire, significant elements continue to contribute to the heritage values of the place including housing, gardens, remaining landscape features and the layout pattern of the complex. Initially conceived in 1905 by the solar astronomer, Dr WG Duffield, to fill a solar recording gap in the Western Pacific, the Observatory has incorporated phases of development that encompass structures dating from 1911. Significant features with a strong association to the historic phases of the precinct's development include: - The standing walls of the Director's Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area, contribute to information on the early period, and reflect a time when directors were accommodated at an institution. - The pattern of roads leading to the buildings. - The pattern of the precinct layout remains a feature of the cultural landscape. This is reflected in the arrangement of buildings and building ruins in their function areas, with some separation by landscape space. The Director's Residence centrally located as a focal feature on the ridge spine contributes to the significant layout. The layout on the mountain takes advantage of spectacular views and informal tree plantings, with simple paths, and stone retaining walls. The landscaping pattern close to the Administration Building, Director's Residence and staff housing is more formally arranged and with a greater variety of exotic trees and plants. Evidence of the bushfires of 18 January 2003 constitutes historical significance. Additional Commentary The direct involvement of Dr Duffield and Mrs Duffield in the design and planning of the Director's Residence and their financial contribution to the construction contributes to the significance of the historic fabric of the building and the garden remnants. Remaining fabric which embodies their personal association and commitment includes the south porch, fireplaces, the maids' room windows and kitchen chimney. Views within the site which connect the Director's Residence with the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building are important to demonstrate the social and visual connection between two of the earliest buildings of the observatory. The Director's Residence together with the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building were designed to provide a formal, public presentation for the observatory. The Director's Residence meets CHL criterion (a) for historic values. Attributes The building form, standing walls of the Director's Residence, including the south porch, the fireplaces, maids' room windows, kitchen chimney, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area Evidence of the fires of 18 January 2003 on the physical fabric of the standing walls, outbuildings and garden remnants. The road pattern which links the Director's Residence into the precinct layout. The pattern of the precinct layout with the arrangement of buildings in function areas with separating landscape spaces; the Director's Residence on the ridge spine. The formally arranged landscaping with exotics around the Director's Residence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Significance Assessment against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria

**The views showing the relationship of Director’s Residence with the Commonwealth Solar Observatory Building.**

### (b) Rarity

**Commonwealth Heritage citation**

The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director’s Residence:

*Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct is a rare example of an optical observatory complex in Australia (the only other Australian complex of comparable size being the Siding Spring Observatory). Although many of the buildings are in ruins, it is rare in its array of historical telescope building structures.*

**Additional Commentary**

The Director’s Residence is uncommon in demonstrating the Commonwealth Government’s commitment to the institution and administrative arrangements for scientific endeavour in Australia. It is indicative of the Government’s interest in astronomy and related areas of research shortly after Federation. The Residence is one of few representations of the Director of Scientific or other Commonwealth institutions being accommodated on site in Canberra.

**The Director’s Residence meets CHL criterion (b) for rarity values.**

**Attributes**

- The standing walls of the Director’s Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area.
- The road pattern.
- The pattern of the precinct layout with the arrangement of buildings in function areas with separating landscape spaces; the Director’s Residence on the ridge spine.
- The formally arranged landscaping with exotics around the Director’s Residence.

### (c) Scientific

**Commonwealth Heritage citation**

The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation does not identify Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director’s Residence under this criterion.

**Additional Commentary**

The Director’s Residence is unlikely to yield further information that would contribute to significant heritage value.

**The Director’s Residence does not meet CHL criterion (c) for scientific values.**

**Attributes**

- The standing walls of the Director’s Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area.

### (d) Representative

**Commonwealth Heritage citation**

The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director’s Residence:

*The ruins of the Director’s Residence reflect that style of administrative arrangements associated with scientific and other government institutional establishments during the early development of Canberra (School of Forestry, Canberra Hospital, Institute of Anatomy).*

**Additional Commentary**

Dr Duffield endeavoured to ensure that the Director’s Residence was ‘of a good standard’, appropriate for a scientific institution being established by the Commonwealth Government during the early development of Canberra.

**The Director’s Residence meets CHL criterion (d) for representative values.**

**Attributes**

- The standing walls of the Director’s Residence, outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area.
### Summary Significance Assessment against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Commonwealth Heritage citation</th>
<th>Additional Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Aesthetic</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director’s Residence, as follows: Although aesthetic significance was reduced by the 2003 bushfire the period character of the remnant 1926 architecture contributes to the aesthetic value.</td>
<td>Aesthetic values must be demonstrated as being valued by the community to qualify for recognition on the CHL. While community appreciation of the aesthetic value of the Director’s Residence has not been formally tested it is likely that the 1920s Federal Capital period character architecture would continue to reach threshold. The prominent location of the Director’s Residence on the spine of the ridge and architectural relationship to the Main Observatory Building contribute to the aesthetic experience of the precinct. The aesthetic significance of the gardens and landscape features associated with the Director’s Residence have been diminished by the 2003 fires and do not reach threshold for Commonwealth heritage value. The Director’s Residence meets CHL criterion (e) for community held aesthetic values. Attributes The period character remnant architecture; rough cast rendered walls and sun motif rondels on the southern porch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Creative/Technical</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation does not identify Commonwealth Heritage values for the Director’s Residence under this criterion.</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence does not demonstrate sufficient creative or technical achievement to meet threshold for CH values. The Director’s Residence does not meet CHL criterion (f) for creative/technical values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Social</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies that the precinct is valued by the Canberra community, observatory staff, researchers and amateur astronomers who have a strong association with the place. The Director’s Residence is not identified as having a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group.</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence was purpose built, designed to accommodate the director and family. The Director’s Residence was part of the centre of social activity in the early days of the Observatory and was used to entertain politicians and royalty. This contributed to the building’s strong association with Observatory staff in a remote location (as perceived in the 1920s) and the Canberra community. Changing uses of the building for staff and rental accommodation may have changed the place’s strong association with the community. In 2014 the Director’s Residence has strong connections with the ANU, and Canberra community. The presence of social value (strong or special attachment to the place by an identified community group) has not been formally tested. The Director’s Residence has not been formally tested against the CHL criterion (g) for social values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Significance Assessment against the Commonwealth Heritage criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(h) Associative</th>
<th>Commonwealth Heritage citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The place has significant heritage value 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.</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation identifies Commonwealth Heritage values for its strong association with scientists who have made a substantial contribution to astronomy and astrophysics such as WG Duffield, R Woolley, CW Allen, LGH Huxley, RG Giovaneli, DF Martyn, B Bok, O Eggen, DS Mathewson, AW Rodgers and JR Mould. The Director’s Residence is not listed in the attributes. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Additional Commentary</strong>&lt;br&gt;Duffield, the founder and first director of the Mount Stromlo Observatory has a strong association with the Director's Residence. Duffield ensured that the purpose built Director’s Residence was prominently located and of an appropriate standard to represent the newly established scientific institution. Its ongoing association with subsequent directors has further confirmed its role as a place of significance for the institutional head of one of Australia’s principal Scientific establishments. <strong>The Director’s Residence meets CHL criterion (h) for its associative values.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Attributes</strong>&lt;br&gt;The standing walls of the Director’s Residence including the south porch, the fireplaces, maids’ room windows, kitchen chimney outbuildings, garden remnants and croquet lawn area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i) Indigenous</th>
<th>Commonwealth Heritage citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The place has significant heritage value because of the place's importance as part of Indigenous tradition.</td>
<td>The Director’s Residence is not individually listed on the CHL. The Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct citation does not identify any Commonwealth Heritage values for the place under this criterion. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Additional Commentary</strong>&lt;br&gt;No assessment for Indigenous heritage values was undertaken. <strong>The Director’s Residence does not meet CHL criterion (i) for Indigenous values.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photographs

Figure 5: Director’s Residence eastern façade, Mt Stromlo Observatory 1929 Source: NAA Image A3560, 5386 barcode 3152625, Series A3560XM1

Figure 6: Director’s Residence under construction, Mt Stromlo Observatory 1927 Source: NAA Image A3560, 7569 barcode 3235064

Figure 7: Director’s Residence eastern façade after the January 2003 fires. Source: ANU Heritage Officer

Figure 8: Director’s Residence and outbuilding from the North West after the January 2003 fires. Source: ANU Heritage Officer

Figure 9: Director’s Residence, eastern façade. Source: K Altenburg, December 2013.

Figure 10: Director’s Residence, western façade with rondels above entrance porch. Source: K Altenburg, December 2013.
Management Issues

Constraints and Opportunities

Constraints arise from the identified heritage values of the Director’s Residence and the requirement under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cwlth) (EPBC Act) to conserve them.

The significant form, use, fabric and the location of the Director’s Residence, as indicated in the attributes above, is of high heritage significance and should be conserved through effective heritage management and interpretation, and compliance with the relevant legislation.

The January 2003 fires was a calamitous event which destroyed the building. Since the fire the building has remained as a managed ruin.

Demolition, unacceptable loss of significant fabric, unsympathetic reinstatement, inappropriate interpretation or alteration would diminish the Commonwealth heritage values of the Director’s Residence. Any action which will have or is likely to have an significant adverse impact on the Commonwealth heritage values of the Director’s Residence should be referred to the Department of the Environment for the Minister’s decision.

Conservation, management and any future uses for the Director’s Residence and outbuilding are those which will enhance the appreciation of the place and not compromise the heritage significance.

Conservation policies for the Director’s Residence should be in accordance with the Burra Charter.


The Tolerance for Change heritage management tool, which is detailed in Volume 1 of the 2014 HMP will assist in conserving heritage values of the Director’s Residence and its setting through a process of managed change.

The location, external form and envelope of the Director’s Residence have a very low tolerance for change. The standing walls and outbuilding have a low tolerance for change. A structural assessment of the standing walls is required prior to undertaking any further stabilisation and/or reconstruction works. The form of the interior spaces has a low tolerance for change. The interior fabric has suffered extensive loss due to the fire and would tolerate a moderate to high degree of reconstruction and reinstatement of fabric based on documentary evidence to assist in interpreting the heritage values.

Demolition, loss of significant fabric, unsympathetic reinstatement of materials or details, inappropriate interpretation or alteration...
Management Issues

would diminish the Commonwealth heritage values of the Director's Residence. However, the building would tolerate a moderate degree of reconstruction and reinstatement of fabric to the interiors to assist in interpreting the heritage values, including retaining and interpreting evidence of damage from the 2003 fires as a layer of history.

The function of the Director's Residence has low tolerance for change. It has been consistent in providing residential accommodation for the Director of the Observatory, however it has also served as the social centre of the site, and is a prominent public building on the site.

Opportunities arise from the identified heritage values of the Director's Residence.

Despite the devastating 2003 fires the Director's Residence retains Commonwealth Heritage values. While the building is currently maintained as a partially restored managed ruin and visitor attraction, the structure retains the opportunity to reinstate its function as observatory residential accommodation.

The Director's Residence embodies high heritage significance. The structurally stable remains of the standing walls of the house and outbuilding should be conserved.

Following stabilisation, three options should be investigated further for the future management of the element:

- Stabilisation as a managed ruin.
- Interpretation of the history of the buildings including the 2003 fires. The degree of intervention works should be established for the short, medium and long term.
- Reinstatement of the building's function as a staff residence.

Sufficient documentary evidence is held in the National Archives of Australia to provide guidance to interpret and reconstruct the building fully for residential use.

The function of the Director's Residence could be reinstated for residential accommodation with interpretation of the 2003 fires. Reinstatement of the building’s function for residential accommodation would confirm the longevity of the building’s function.

Reconstruction of the Director’s Residence would best maintain the place’s heritage values, provided that the reconstruction is sensitive to its range of heritage values.

Recommendations / Policies

Development Guidelines and Adaptive Reuse

Conserve the structurally stable remains of the standing walls of the house and outbuilding.

Following stabilisation options should be investigated including:

- Stabilisation as a managed ruin, ensuring the structure is safe and access is restricted.
- Interpretation of the history of the buildings including the 2003 fires. For the short to medium term interpretation should be of a temporary nature appropriate to the site. The buildings should not be interpreted in a way which would detract/limit the potential for future restorative works (eg inserting a staircase incompatible with the heritage values, boardwalks). If in the long term the building continues to be managed as a stabilised ruin more durable interpretive works would be required to fully convey the heritage values.
- Reinstatement of the building’s function as a staff residence. This option should be explored in the context of comprehensive interpretation of the 2003 fires on the Mount Stromlo Observatory Precinct. The extent of the devastation should remain comprehensible.

A Heritage Management Plan is required to explore the opportunities for the Director's Residence and provide direction for the planning and implementation of conservation works.
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