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1.0 DRAFT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2005 the consultant team were contracted to review the current status, purpose and objectives of the Avondale Discovery Farm. Employing its expertise in tourism business assessment and heritage and conservation planning, the study team specifically evaluated these visitor based operations in the context of how the Avondale Discovery Farm meets the objectives and resources of its owner manager - the Western Australian Department of Agriculture [the Department].

The project team comprises RBA Consulting and Heritage and Conservation Professionals and boast some 50 years combined consultant experience across their respective fields. The prospect of reviewing the Avondale Discovery Farm [ADF] was approached with both enthusiasm and an eye to achieve favourable, yet financially sustainable outcomes for all stakeholders over the long term horizon.

Avondale is a unique visitor attraction located within the Avon Valley region. It differs most notably from other typical visitor enterprises in that it is owned and managed by a government department; used principally as a promotional vehicle for public relations purposes rather than to generate profit; and has been attracting visitors to its eclectic collection of heritage, landcare and agriculture based assets for the past 26 years. This management structure has delivered both positive and negative outcomes. Whilst it has enabled the ADF to operate for over a quarter of a century, the government funded and managed facility has largely inhibited any real growth in its commercial activities.

While the daily operational and financial management of the ADF has remained predominantly the responsibility of the Department, an active and dedicated group of community based volunteers work to promote, conserve, organise events and secure additional funds for the benefit of the ADF. This is a strength of the venture. The Avondale Discovery Farm Project Committee is an incorporated body drawing on a wide range of representatives from the local shire and the various community groups of Beaufort.

A key requirement of the project brief has been to consult widely with interested individuals and stakeholder group representatives. To date, the project team has made three separate site visits and consulted widely with government agency representatives, community stakeholders and local government.
Summary of Report Findings

The Department has undertaken a recent review of its Research Station operations on a statewide basis and it is possible that the research station activities at Avondale will be either closed or relocated. Within this context the role of the ADF and the level of resources allocated towards it by the Department needs to be reviewed.

As a public relations vehicle for the Department the ADF is not considered to be delivering cost effective outcomes and largely failing to achieve its overall corporate objectives. From a purely promotional and educational perspective these resources could be better utilised by the Department in other media and more flexible promotional vehicles. To illustrate this point, based upon the current Departmental investment of $160,000pa an approximate "audience reach cost" is around $14 per visitor. This is considered expensive and not an effective vehicle to achieve the goals of the Department of Agriculture.

Options for the future operations of the ADF can be grouped into either operating as an ongoing concern or full closure to the general public. While full closure will be distasteful for many interested stakeholders it is a genuine alternative and therefore must be reviewed as part of this report. A summary of the options facing the Department and stakeholders are therefore;

**Full closure to general public – Department retains full ownership**

The Department could close the tourist and visitor based activities of the ADF. If the Research operations were also relocated then Avondale could operate as a typical commercial farming operation (most likely the arable land of the farm would be leased by the Department to local farming interests). The machinery collection would need to be relocated (disposal process by the Department) and the historic farm buildings left to deteriorate. From a financial perspective this is one of the more attractive options facing the Department. As the Department would retain ownership of the ADF then there is no legal requirement to undertake conservation work of the farm buildings. Saying this, as the ADF is included on the Heritage Council of Western Australia’s Register of Heritage Places it would be unwise to neglect these assets and the Council has the power to impose work orders if it deems appropriate.
The social and heritage implications of this approach are also considered significant. As the ADF has been operating for some 26 years there is considerable support for the facility amongst local community. Most of the machinery featured in the collection was donated and therefore contact with donors prior to disposal will also be required. The ADF contains a significant collection of farm buildings and again, there would be opposition from many stakeholders if these assets were left to deteriorate. Although considered within this report, this is not an option recommended by the consultants.

The report is therefore written on the assumption that the ADF will operate as an ongoing concern.

Continuing as an ongoing concern
There are 6 basic options available where the variables of opening times, management and business models have been assessed. Underlying these options are the heritage and conservation considerations both statutory and best practice recommendations.

Ownership and disposal options available to the Department for future management of the ADF facility include,

- Retention of the ADF by the Department, or
- Disposal to a third party source including to the Shire of Beverley, an independent Trust, the National Trust, or to the private sector.

Each of these options is reviewed within the report however divestment or disposal of the ADF by the Department could work to achieve two clear and important outcomes,

1. Provides the ADF with immediate access to a range of government funding programs as well as non-government sponsorship opportunities.

2. Over the medium to long term enables the Department to better allocate human and financial resources in order to achieve its stated objectives.

If disposal is the preferred approach then there are mandatory legal requirements that the Department must undertake. As a minimum the Department will be required to refer to the Heritage Council for approval and to prepare of a Conservation Plan and a Heritage Agreement. This is valued at around $45,000 plus GST and is considered the bare minimum.
In terms of heritage issues the study found that the various heritage assets at Avondale are of sufficient significance and interest to provide the basis of a meaningful interpretive display. They are unlikely to be income generating on their own with the best opportunity for success lying in the creation of a tourist precinct featuring a range of visitor based services and infrastructure. The heritage assets of the ADF are likely to require ongoing funding whether this be from grants or ADF operational surpluses.

In order to fully capitalise on the heritage assets of the ADF their conservation, management and presentation requires considerable improvement. The works required to bring the various assets up to the standards of a contemporary interpretive facility require considerable investment of time and resources.

Three levels of conservation investment have been reviewed ranging from an essential minimum of work valued at $45,000 plus GST (mandatory) to a best practice approach of up to $320,000 plus GST. The variance between these approaches relates largely to the level of conservation works undertaken.

A range of options have been highlighted, reviewed and made available to the Department within this report. At this stage a recommended option has not been formulated rather a range of options provided for the Department and other stakeholders to consider, assess in terms of achieving respective objectives, and then collectively make a decision to move forward.

The ADF faces many challenges and operating within modern day commercial realities is one of these. The future of the ADF therefore lies not just with the Department but with the ADF Project Committee, the Shire of Beverley and interested members of the local community. Achieving an acceptable balance amongst this range of stakeholders will not be easy and requires consensus, a shared vision, and solid commitment from all involved. A key outcome of this report therefore is to ensure the objectives of the Department are met while still providing the necessary resources for the ADF to operate as a financially sustainable tourism venture over the long term.
2.0 INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

2.1 Background to Study

The following information is compiled from various Department of Agriculture sources and observations made by the consultant team and is provided as a useful background to the review work undertaken.

In 1924 some 1,700 acres of arable land at Beverley including the original pioneer homestead (circa 1850) was vested in the Department of Agriculture [the Department] and has been used as a working Research Station since then to the present date. Over this 80 year period the original farm buildings have been maintained and added to with the farm acting as a repository for a range of early farm machinery donated by local farmers. This collection continued to grow and evolve over time and when combined with the heritage buildings located on the farm, a significant museum precinct was created. In 1979 the Avondale Discovery Farm [ADF] was officially opened to the public to celebrate Western Australia's 150th celebrations.

Although co-located and both funded by the Department, the ADF and Avondale Research Station continue to operate largely as separate entities. Whilst the consultant brief for this review focuses solely upon the operations of the ADF, it is acknowledged that resource sharing occurs through the everyday management of the two operations and that the working farm (or research station component) provides an additional element to the ADF visitor experience.

The Department is now reviewing its Research Station program across Western Australia and an assessment of the role and purpose of the ADF is now considered timely.

2.2 Current Environment Analysis

Although largely unplanned and unstructured in its development the ADF evolved as a vehicle for the Department to undertake various public relations and educational activities promoting the significance of agricultural processes within the history of socio-economic development of Western Australia.
The ADF is now in its 26th year of operation. Various private industry and government agency partners have contributed minor financial amounts to the project over this time, however it is the Department of Agriculture that has remained the primary financier of the ADF activities. In 2004/5 the budget cost allocation by the Department for the operations of the ADF is $160,000.

Reflecting its primary role as an educational facility, no admission fee structure is in place for entrance to the attraction however donations from visitors are accepted.

The ADF comprises:
- The Agricultural Machinery Museum,
- The Animal Nursery and Aviary,
- Avondale Landcare Education centre and Swan Avon Catchment Caravan,
- Historical farm buildings including stables (circa 1890's) housing 4 Clydesdale horses, silage silo (circa 1920's), and partially fitted out blacksmith's workshop and horseworks to drive chaff-cutter,
- Avondale Homestead (circa 1850's) and colonial style garden,
- Picnic area and infrastructure.

Other components available to visitors to the ADF but are the responsibility of the Avondale Research Station Unit are,
- Avondale Landcare Drive Trail (6kms in length),
- Avondale Sanctuary Reserve (50ha remnant bushland),
- On farm diversification displays in conjunction with Fisheries WA.

As stated in the brief to consultants, "should the research station unit ever close or relocate then these elements would not be available to ADF".

ADF also stages two key special events named Avondale Harvest Festival and the Vintage Ploughing Day. The Harvest Festival is staged in November of each year and is the more popular of the two events attracting approximately 2,500 people each year. The Vintage Ploughing Day occurs in July and is more of a local festival typically attracting around 200 people.
The ADF is open to the public 7 days per week all year round. A review of graph 1 below also illustrates the fluctuating visitor numbers received on a monthly basis over the 1996/7 to 2001/2 periods. A consistent seasonality trend can be identified. The month of November achieves the greatest visitation levels due to the staging of the Harvest Festival in this period.

The months of April through to October also receive largely consistent visitation levels while the hotter months of December through to February attract historically low visitor numbers. These consistent visitor seasonality trends are an important consideration when determining potential financial viability of the operation.

Graph 1. ADF Visitor Seasonality 1996/7 - 2002/3

2.3 Strategic Context

The Department is reviewing its Research Station operations on a statewide basis and a potential outcome is that the research station activities at Avondale may be either closed or relocated. Within this context the role of the ADF and the level of resources allocated towards it by the Department needs to be reviewed.
The underlying purpose of the ADF is to educate the general public on the importance of agriculture to the community both in an historical and present day sense. As stated in the ADF Business Plan (1999) “the expected outcomes (of the ADF) are a raised awareness of sustainable agriculture and Agriculture WA’s role, and the value of agriculture to the state’s economy by the wider community”.

The ADF attracts between 10,000 and 13,000 visitors each year with the Department investing around $160,000 per annum to cover operational expenses. If the activities of the ADF are analysed from a purely economic perspective then this significant annual investment by the Department equates to a cost of around $16.00 to $12.30 per visitor with a midpoint estimate of approximately $14.15 per visitor.

Without detailing the actual activities that could be undertaken in lieu of the ADF, it is fair to suggest that this level of investment could be more effectively used to achieve the corporate objectives of the Department. While difficult to measure, it is believed that the opportunity cost of this annual allocation of $160,000 could deliver far wider exposure to potential educational markets when implemented through other media and/or more flexible promotional vehicles. The ADF is not considered a cost effective vehicle to achieve the core business objectives of the Department and in its current form does not align with the role and core business of the Department.

The current ownership/management structure of the ADF is also considered inadequate and is most likely inhibiting the growth of the ADF as a viable visitor attraction. Regionally based destinations/commercial operations boasting similar significant heritage components would typically be well placed to apply for and receive a range of conservation, tourism and community development based grants from state and federal government programs. However, while the ADF remains under the direct management control of a state government agency such as the Department of Agriculture, these additional funding sources are not available.
Divesting control of the ADF to a community based entity by the Department works to achieve two important outcomes.

1. Provides the ADF with immediate access to a range of government funding programs as well as non-government sponsorship opportunities.

2. Over the medium to long term enables the Department to better allocate human and financial resources in order to achieve its stated objectives.

If this divestment of the ADF facility to a third party entity was to occur then additional questions are then raised as to,

- What organisational structure would replace the Department's current management of ADF?
- How will it be funded and how will it function on a day to day basis?
- Will this new organisation inherit a viable commercial enterprise?
- What, if possible, does the Department need to provide to facilitate the long term financial sustainability of the ADF?

These questions are addressed in the following sections of this report.
3.0 HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Introduction

The following section outlines issues associated with the heritage values of the Avondale Discovery Farm. This includes an assessment of the relative values of the heritage assets.

3.2 Establishing the Avondale Discovery Farm (ADF)

Avondale Discovery Farm, known as the Avondale Project, was opened by His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales on 16 March 1979. About 3,000 people, many in period costume, attended the opening at which the Prince commented:

'Rural life was not so dull in the old days as city people think.'

The ADF originated as the Agriculture Department’s contribution to the State’s 1979 sesquicentenary celebrations. The site was chosen because it linked 150 years of agriculture in WA with ongoing research. The proposal included restoration of the homestead and stable and a display of antique machinery. The Department launched an appeal for machinery and donations were received from farmers across the State. The machinery was restored by Department of Agriculture mechanics.

The project also included the establishment of a cultivar garden to show a range of historic plant varieties including some from the nineteenth century. Seeds came from museums around Australia as well as from the Department’s own seed archives. A display of the principle livestock breeds in WA was also established and three Clydesdale mares were purchased from South Australia for the restored stables. The garden and livestock displays were discontinued due to cost, but the Clydesdales were kept. The project also included the preservation of an area of remnant vegetation as a nature reserve after years of grazing.

---

2 Ibid
3 Ibid
3.3 Origins of Avondale Discovery Farm

For a full history of the development of the Avondale Discovery Farm, refer to:
The Story of Avondale, written for Agriculture Western Australia in 1998 by Henry Jones and David Johnston.

The earliest records date the homestead at Avondale to circa 1850s. However the original building was destroyed by fire in the late nineteenth century and rebuilt. The homestead became part of the State Farm, subsequently the research station, and was used for accommodation from the 1920s to the 1970s when it was restored to its turn of the century appearance to become part of the ADF display.

Of the farm buildings at Avondale, the stables built circa 1900, to a reputed Yorkshire design, are unique in Western Australia. The silo was built to a standard Public Works Department design in 1927 and the laboratory was built for the specific purpose of investigating braxy-like disease in sheep in 1930. The employment of internationally renowned veterinary pathologist Dr Harold Bennetts, who developed a preventative vaccine for the disease at the laboratory, is considered the greatest achievement in the history of the research station.

The site also contains a number of cottages built from the 1920s. Of these, the weatherboard cottage to the north west of the homestead, is a married men’s quarters built circa 1924. This building is of some heritage significance.

3.4 Management of Heritage Assets at 2005

The heritage assets at the ADF are currently managed by a site warden with support from the volunteer based Avondale Committee. The homestead and the homestead collection are maintained by the warden with the Beverley Historical Society. Members of the Tree and Garden Society manage and care for the homestead gardens. A photographic record of the furnishing and fittings in the homestead has been prepared.

4 Ibid p15
5 Ibid p31
There has been some work carried out to record the machinery collection. It is believed that details of original donations were kept by the Department of Agriculture, but these have not been found as part of this project. Since her employment in 1995, the site warden has kept records of machinery donations. The site warden has also prepared a photographic record of the machinery collection.

The machinery collection is maintained by volunteers who have contributed their time and resources to the restoration of many of the machines. The issue of liability has been addressed by the committee. Anyone working on the collection must pass an induction process that is run by the chair of the Avondale Committee. Those that have passed the induction process are protected by the Department of Agriculture.

The ADF receives several offers of machinery each year and has instigated a process of review before accepting donations to determine whether the new item will contribute to the collection as a whole.

The restoration of the machines in the machinery collection requires specialist expertise. Links have been established with the Machinery Preservation Club who's members have brought items to Avondale for open days. Avondale volunteers have attended workshops at Whiteman Park, run by the Ministry of Planning, to improve their conservation skills. The ADF is also a member of the Avon Valley Vintage Vehicle Association based at Northam. There are a several vintage vehicle based associations in the region including the Quarring Vintage Machinery Club, and a number of owners bring vehicles to Avondale for special events.

Representatives from Museum's Australia have visited Avondale and provided practical advice on conservation and presentation of the collection. Reports in 1994 and 1996 provided a range of practical advice, however these have not been implemented due to lack of resources. In 1994 Museums Australia recommended the appointment of a curator with qualifications in the heritage industry to manage the collection. Other recommendations included practical processes for protecting the movable heritage items in the house including protection from light. Recent recommendations have included interpretation strategies for the machinery collection, however again lack of resources has prevented their implementation.
Physical conservation of the heritage buildings has been the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. A program of conservation was carried out in 1978 when the ADF was initially established. This included replacement of floorboards with boards from His Majesty's Theatre.6

Ongoing works have been general maintenance and repair. There is no evidence of any more extensive conservation programs. The buildings are in fair condition, however there is evidence of the need for a more thorough program of works than would normally be part of ongoing maintenance. The Ministry of Housing and Works Narrogin office is believed to have commissioned a report on the physical condition of the buildings in about 2002/3, however no evidence of a report have been found.

The following urgent works were identified as part of the inspection of Avondale for this project:7
- Remediation of rising damp
- Repair or replacement of gutters and downpipes
- Restoration and re-pointing of some areas of brickwork
- Repair of internal cracks to southern wall of the east wing

3.5 Heritage Values

Avondale Discovery Farm contains the following heritage assets:
- Homestead Group
- Farm Group and Laboratory
- Machinery Collection
- Area of natural vegetation (nature reserve)
- Cultivated land

The following heritage listings apply:
Municipal Inventory of the Shire of Beverley 26.04.1996
Classified by the National Trust 06.06.1995
Register of Heritage Places (Permanent Status) 19.03.2004

There is no formal heritage listing for the items in the machinery collection.

6 Ibid, p45
7 Note that a full and detailed inspection of the fabric of the place was beyond the scope of this project, but is recommended as part of a conservation plan for the place.
3.6 Implications of Heritage Listing

Because Avondale Discovery Farm has been included on the Heritage Council of Western Australia's Register of Heritage Places, it is protected by the provisions of the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990. Avondale was given permanent status on the register on 19 March 2004.

Avondale comprises two lots, Lot 16 comprising an area of 148.4 ha and Lot 3 comprising 557.12ha. The area included on the Register of Heritage Places is the whole of Lot 3. This includes the area of the heritage precinct and the associated agricultural land. The implication of heritage registration is that all proposals for development, including changes of use or demolition of buildings, must be referred to the Heritage Council for comment.

Because Avondale belongs to the Department of Agriculture any proposals for disposal, including sale to the private sector or transfer to the Shire of Beverley or any other government agency, requires the Government Heritage Property Disposal Process to apply. This means that the proposed disposal must be referred to the Heritage Council for approval. As the place is already on the Register of Heritage Places the Heritage Council will probably require the preparation of a Conservation Plan and a Heritage Agreement.

A Heritage Agreement is a legally binding agreement between the new owner and the Heritage Council that commits the owner to the conservation of the registered place. The conservation plan is attached to the Heritage Agreement, as is a schedule of conservation works that the new owner commits to undertake. The schedule of works is usually prepared as part of the conservation plan process. This process is standard practice for the disposal of government property and applies to all government buildings more than sixty years old.

3.7 Heritage Opportunities

Avondale contains a range of heritage assets that are of intrinsic value in themselves and also have the potential to provide significant attraction for visitors. This potential however is not being fully achieved at present. To fully capitalise on the heritage assets...
their conservation, management and presentation requires considerable improvement. The works required to bring the various assets up to the standards of a contemporary interpretive facility require considerable investment of time and resources. Planning is essential. The processes required for each of the heritage resources identified are outlined in the following sections.

3.8 Heritage Buildings - Homestead Group

The homestead group comprises two rectangular brick and iron buildings in a garden area defined by a recent post and rail fence. The south eastern (front) block contains two main rooms either side of a central hall and rooms at either end of the front and back verandahs. The building is furnished with traditional farm homestead furniture and the building is presented as an early farm residence. The north west wing comprises a commercial kitchen with a dining room adjacent, toilets and a laundry.

The buildings have undergone considerable change and brick paving, covered areas between the two buildings and landscaping are recent.

The homestead buildings are substantially intact and in fair to good condition. The face brickwork is particularly fine, but with some areas of fretting brickwork and some evidence of rising damp.

The collection of furniture and other fittings presented in the south-eastern homestead block are not original to the building. However many items are local to the Beverley area having been donated by local residents and neighbours. Some items were purchased specifically for the display by the Department of Agriculture. The homestead collection has been photographed and a catalogued photographic record of approximately 70 items has been prepared. A copy is held by the Department of Agriculture. There is no detailed inventory or database however and full details of the origin of all items, their condition and status has not been prepared.

The homestead kitchen has been converted to a commercial kitchen however it has not been assessed for compliance with current building and health requirements, it is unlikely on the basis of visual inspection to be at a level for commercial use.
Opportunities

The homestead group has considerable potential for interpretation of the early settlement history of the region. The kitchen block contains a commercial kitchen, which could be used for activities such as afternoon teas. The kitchen is unlikely to meet current health standards for a commercial catering facility. In the future it would be desirable to relocate any commercial kitchen facilities out of this building. The room could be used for displays or for functions and a new purpose built kitchen provided. This would incur some costs however and is not recommended as part of this strategy.

Recommendations

- A conservation plan is required for the homestead group to address issues of conservation of the fabric of the buildings and grounds. This would be required as a mandatory minimum if the Department was to divest itself of the ADF facility. If the Department retained ownership of the ADF then a conservation would not be legally required however would be strongly recommended.

- Funds should be allocated to carry out some conservation works including remediation of rising damp, repair of roof drainage and restoration of fretting brickwork. This should be undertaken regardless of who owns the ADF.

- Consideration should be given to the future intentions regarding interpretation and presentation of the homestead group and works required to implement any proposed changes.

- If the ADF is to continue as a visitor attraction, an interpretation plan should be prepared and provision made for its implementation.

- The collection of furniture and fittings requires professional curatorial services and cataloguing using an appropriate electronic database.

('Collections Mosaics Plus' by Information Services and Technology Pty Ltd is recommended)

- Consideration should be given to the incorporation of commercial enterprises into the homestead buildings without loss of heritage significance. This may include upgrade of the kitchen to commercial standards for example which would range between $30,000 and $40,000 for a typical small scale operation.
3.9 Heritage Buildings - Farm Group and Laboratory

Avondale contains a significant collection of farm buildings. This includes the stables (circa 1900), silo (c1927), various sheds including the shearing shed and the former laboratory (1930). The stable building is highly intact and significant and the silo is a typical example of a standard building type from the period.

The laboratory built in 1927 is a typical government building of that era and is significant because it represents the role of the Department of Agriculture at Avondale and the work of the research station.

Opportunities
The stable building and the silo are both of considerable significance and should be kept for interpretive and museum purposes. Other buildings and structures in the group have the potential for re-use for other purposes, including potentially commercial enterprises.

The laboratory is significant and is ideally placed to showcase the work of the research station. This however can be done in a way that also allows for adaptive re-use for other including commercial purposes.

Recommendations
- A conservation plan is required for the significant farm buildings and laboratory to address issues of physical conservation and future site planning. For instance, new buildings should be located away from the significant farm buildings.
- Funds should be allocated for general maintenance and conservation works.
- Consideration should be given to the future intentions regarding interpretation and presentation of the farm group and laboratory. Some of the buildings should be used for interpretation only, but the majority can be adapted for ongoing use.
- If the ADF is to continue as a visitor attraction, the preparation of an interpretation plan for the farm buildings is recommended.
- Consider how, new uses including commercial enterprises can be incorporated into the farm buildings and laboratory. Generally a range of uses would be possible.
3.10 Heritage Machinery Collection

The Machinery Collection comprises over 200 items of mostly agricultural machinery that have been donated to the Department of Agriculture since 1978 for the purpose of showcasing agricultural activities. There is a photographic record of the items and a card system which has been initiated by the site warden. There is no database or other professional museum cataloguing system in place and details of the origin, purpose etc of all items have not been recorded.

There are a number of operating items including a collection of working tractors that are used for special events such as Harvest Festival.

The machinery collection is stored in a purpose built shed. Some items have been prepared for display and signage and some special displays have been prepared. Generally this aspect of the collection is incomplete and of varied quality.

Significance

The machinery collection may contain some individual items of special significance however more information is required to determine this. Generally the significance of the collection can be defined as follows:

- The collection contains a rare collection of tractors, most of which are operable.
- The collection contains some rare Western Australian and Australia manufactured items and some items that have been designed or modified to address local conditions.
- The collection contains machines that together have the capacity to demonstrate the history of various agricultural themes that relate to the history of Avondale or the surrounding Beverley region. These include but are not limited to the growing and harvesting of wheat; the pastoral industry and shearing; controlling rabbits; working with horses.
- The collection represents a resource that has been collected, managed and restored mainly through the generosity of the local community who have donated the items, their time, skills and money. As such the collection has high social value.
The condition of the collection is varied. Some items have been restored and some are awaiting restoration. Restoration work has generally been carried out in an authentic manner with restorers sourcing appropriate items, sometimes at considerable personal cost. There is a process of retaining and labelling items removed from machines as part of the restoration process.

Opportunities
The machinery collection has potential for use for interpretive purposes, for operational use for open days etc and for teaching techniques of machinery conservation. There is also the opportunity to move part or all of the collection to more high profile locations. As an example if the Shire of Beverley were to undertake a major town revitalisation program then some or all of the collection could provide the central feature of this.

Recommendations
- The machinery collection should be rationalised by a professional curator and a process for disposal or storage of excess items established. This requires consideration of the fact that items have been donated to the Department for the purpose of creating a museum to showcase the development of agriculture in Western Australia. Any disposal process should involve contacting individual donors prior to disposal.
- The collection should be accessioned on an appropriate database and under professional supervision.
  ('Collections Mosaics Plus' by Information Services and Technology Pty Ltd is recommended)
- Proposals for interpretation have previously been made. These require review and a plan for their implementation should be prepared.
- Consideration should be given to means by which future conservation of machines can be implemented, managed and funded. This could include using Avondale to showcase expertise in machinery conservation.
- Consideration should be given to the incorporation of commercial enterprises into the machinery museum. For example machinery conservation workshops etc.
3.11 Nature Reserve and Cultivated Land

The remainder of Avondale Estate (Lots 3 and 16) comprises the area of the natural reserve and the area under cultivation. While not of specific significance, the whole of Lot 3 has been entered on the Register of Heritage Places. All proposals for development, future use or disposal must be referred to the Heritage Council of WA for approval.

Opportunities and Recommendations

The opportunity exists to use the area of cultivated land to interpret agricultural processes as a component of the ADF. The existing Landcare Drive Trail and the walk trail through the Avondale Sanctuary Reserve, already provide valuable visitor experiences in this regard.

The opportunity also exists to use the agricultural land for profit generation to help support the ADF.

It is recommended that the future of these areas be considered as part of the overall future vision for the ADF. This should be a component of the conservation and management planning, and interpretation planning for the place.
4.0 HERITAGE RECOMMENDATIONS

The various heritage assets at Avondale are of sufficient significance and interest to provide the basis of a meaningful interpretive display. They are unlikely to be income generating on their own with the greatest chance for ongoing financial viability lying in the creation of a tourist precinct featuring a range of attractions, activities and accommodation. The heritage assets of the ADF are likely to require ongoing funding. This could be provided from grants, income from other on site activities or from benefactors.

While the option of closing the ADF to visitor access and retention by the Department has been reviewed this is not considered a viable alternative. Under this scenario the machinery collection would need to be relocated (disposal process by the Department) and the historic farm buildings left to deteriorate. From a financial perspective this would require one of the smaller investment levels. As the Department would retain ownership of the ADF then there is no legal requirement to undertake conservation work of the farm buildings. Saying this, as the ADF is included on the Heritage Council of Western Australia’s Register of Heritage Places it would be unwise to neglect these assets and the Council has the power to impose work orders if it deems appropriate.

The social and heritage implications of this approach are also considered significant. As the ADF has been operating for some 26 years there is considerable support for the facility amongst local community. There are therefore potential political ramifications if undertaking this approach. Most of the machinery featured in the collection was donated and therefore contact with donors prior to disposal will also be required. The ADF contains a significant collection of farm buildings and again, there would be opposition from many stakeholders if these assets were left to deteriorate. Although considered within this report, this is not an option recommended by the consultants.

The following recommendations assume that the ADF will operate as an ongoing concern (either the Department maintaining current operational environment or through the disposal by the Department to other interests) regardless of who owns and manages the facility.
The following actions are required in order to bring the heritage assets to a professional level appropriate for museum or interpretive centre presentation.

4.1 Conservation Plan

A conservation plan is required to cover the whole of Avondale. This should be prepared on the basis of the Brief for Conservation Plans used by the Heritage Council of WA. The conservation plan should consider all of the land, buildings and other features included in the registered area (Avondale Estate Lot 3). Specific policies are required for the buildings of the homestead group, farm buildings, and laboratory, as well as for the farm lands, nature reserve and other open spaces. The study area should be the whole of Lot 3 as this is the area protected under the Heritage Act. Preparation of the Conservation Plan will be a legal obligation of the Department if disposing (either sale or divestment) of the ADF. If the Department retains ownership then although not mandatory it would be strongly recommended that a Conservation Plan still be undertaken.

The conservation plan should be prepared by professionals with expertise in this area.

4.2 Management Plan

Prepare a management plan for the site. This should focus on opportunities for future development, location of future development, services and other facilities that may be required for ongoing use. The separation of any new farm buildings from the farm buildings in the heritage precinct is recommended. The management plan could be prepared as a component of the conservation plan. In this instance the brief should ask for specific expertise in agricultural property management and planning.

4.3 Interpretation Planning

An interpretation plan should be prepared for the whole place. This should provide themes for the place as a whole as well as recommendations for implementation and staging of the proposals. The interpretation plan should focus on the presentation of the homestead group, farm buildings, machinery collection, agricultural areas, history of the research station, etc. The overriding theme of 'Landcare' is appropriate.
4.4 Curatorial Services

Professional curatorial services are needed for the following:
- Curate and rationalise the machinery collection including determining which items should be retained for their interpretive potential, which stored and which disposed of by returning to donors.
- Implement a museum database (for example Mosaic Collections Plus) and train volunteers to input the accession the machinery collection in a professional manner.
- Curate and accession the homestead collection in a similar manner.
- Assist in the implementation of interpretation proposals.

4.5 Conservation Works

Implement a staged program of conservation works to the significant buildings to ensure their ongoing conservation and maintenance. This should have as a priority the conservation of fretting brickwork and repair of roof drainage to the homestead buildings. Conservation works should be overseen by appropriately qualified heritage professionals.

4.6 Volunteer Services

Define the role of volunteers. Volunteer services are essential to the ongoing feasibility of Avondale. They include representatives of other organisations such as the Historical Society.

It is important that the work of the volunteers is carried out in accordance with guidelines established and overseen by the professional curator. The opportunity exists for possible shared curatorial services to work with volunteers. Shared arrangements already exist in nearby shires and could be further investigated.
4.7 Implementation

Works to be undertaken in the next 12 months

- Commission the preparation of a Conservation and Management Plan for Avondale.

- Commission a professional curator to review and accession the machinery collection and make recommendations regarding rationalisation and disposal of excess items. In the event of disposal of items, this must include making contact with original donors and returning unwanted items or determining the appropriate means of disposal.

- Carry out the most urgent physical works to the homestead group as recommended in the conservation plan (probably roof and ground drainage, and brick restoration and re-pointing).

- Review the existing interpretation proposals and prepare strategy for their implementation.

- Obtain estimates for the implementation of the works and prepare a financial plan.

- In the event of disposal of Avondale by sale or vesting, prepare a Heritage Agreement in consultation with the Heritage Council of WA.
5.0 OPTIONS FOR MANAGEMENT & RESPECTIVE HERITAGE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Management Options Available

There are a number of options for the future management of the ADF. These include:

- Retention of the ADF by the Department
- Disposal of the ADF to the Shire of Beverley
- Disposal of the ADF to an independent Trust
- Disposal of the ADF to the National Trust
- Sale of the ADF to the private sector

A common underlying assumption is that the Department's Research Station operations may no longer operate at Beverley. The implications of the options are as follows:

5.1.1 Retention of the ADF by the Department

Management;

Under this option the status quo is maintained. The Department would remain the owner manager with ongoing support received from the ADF Project Committee. Financial implications of this option would be that the Department would continue to provide funding and employ human resources to oversee everyday management of the facility. Although it has been determined that the ADF is currently not cost efficient in achieving the public relation objectives of the Department, it is also highly likely that this level of annual investment would need to be increased substantially or at best remain at the current $160,000 per annum.

Heritage;

Although not mandatory, it is strongly recommended that the Department would need to prepare a conservation and management plan and an interpretation plan. Future planning for heritage aspects of the place should be based on these documents. Additional curatorial services or support should be provided to assist the site warden and a proactive approach to providing training to the ADF volunteers taken, to improve Avondale as an asset of the Department. The ongoing theme of 'landcare' should be exploited for the purposes of community education.
The Department of Agriculture is not eligible for heritage grant funding for the physical fabric of the place. Funding for services such as curatorial support and training may be sourced through the Avondale Committee which is an incorporated entity, and as such is eligible for some community funding programs for events.

5.1.2 Disposal of the ADF to the Shire of Beverley
Under this option the Shire takes responsibility for the buildings and other physical elements of the place. The Shire is eligible for grant funding primarily through Lotteries West initiatives. Generally a conservation plan is required as a first stage to access funding.

Prior to disposal to the Shire the Heritage Council would probably require the preparation of a conservation plan and a Heritage Agreement as a minimum.

It is also recommended that the Department consider preparing the interpretation plan to assist the shire. The interpretation plan should address as a preliminary the future of the machinery collection. The items in the collection were donated to the department for the purpose of interpreting 150 years of agriculture in Western Australia. The disposal of such a collection either separately or as part of the ADF requires resolution.

As a flow on alternative, if the machinery collection was divested to the Shire it could be relocated to neighbouring Beverley with the opportunity to create a tourist attraction within the actual townsite. This relocation would work to extend visitor length of stay in the town and ultimately increase visitor expenditure amongst mainstreet retail businesses. Relocation to within the townsite would need to be part of a wider townscape improvement plan that would specifically focus upon lifting the tourist profile of Beverley and by developing a tourist focal point or precinct. This option would require a substantial investment by local government and although the relocation idea has some merit would need to be part of a major town redevelopment project by the Shire.

5.1.3 Disposal of the ADF to an independent Trust
Under this option a separate Trust is formed to take responsibility for the place. The Trust would be eligible for grant funding through Lotteries West initiatives. A conservation plan would be required.
Disposal to a Trust would require the preparation of a conservation plan and a Heritage Agreement as a minimum in the same manner as disposal to the Shire. The same recommendations for additional works prior to disposal apply.

5.1.4 Disposal of the ADF to the National Trust
The National Trust is a not-for-profit organisation that manages a number of heritage properties in Western Australia. In the immediate region National Trust properties include the York Courthouse Complex and the Mangowine Homestead (c.1876) located at Karomine in the eastern wheatbelt.

For the National Trust to consider the place it would be necessary to provide a detailed business plan that would support the ongoing viability of the place.

The National Trust is already heavily committed and must compete in the grants field for scarce resources for its present property portfolio. It is unlikely that the National Trust would commit to the ADF without considerable support from the Department.

5.1.5 Sale of the ADF to the Private Sector
Sale of the ADF to the private sector could be considered. A private owner would be eligible for grant funding through the Heritage Council’s grants program.

Prior to disposal by the Department a conservation plan would be required together with a Heritage Agreement. Disposal of such places is usually by auction or public tender and is handled by Landcorp on behalf of the relevant department.

It is recommended that if disposal to the private sector is considered, then the disposal should include the whole of the Avondale Estate (Lots 3 and 16) and not be limited to the ADF. This would give an investor the opportunity to use the cultivated land to offset the costs required to upgrade the ADF to a going concern.

5.2 Recommended Option
Subject to significant stakeholder support being identified the most attractive management option lies in the disposal of the ADF to an independent community based Trust entity.
6.0 ADF BUSINESS MODELS

Ensuring the underlying business model is financially sustainable on an ongoing basis is the key to any commercial venture. The ADF is an unusual operation in that its original and primary role has been one of education rather than to generate operational profit for its stakeholders. Over its 25 year history the ADF has been used to promote the importance of agriculture in the economic development of Western Australia. However, over recent years its educational role has lessened and a more commercial or bottom line viewpoint adopted.

Although funded almost entirely through the resources of the Department the cost effectiveness of the ADF to achieve its educational goals is now being questioned. Striking an acceptable balance between ensuring commercial viability whilst maintaining its core educational objectives is the challenge now facing the Department and other ADF stakeholders.

When assessing potential viability two key areas are important to the ADF operations:
- visitor seasonality to the region, and
- income generating potential.

6.1 Seasonality & Opening Times

When reviewing the potential viability of the AOF three basic seasonality operational options are being reviewed.

- Baseline option; the ADF is made available for limited visitor access only. This may be reduced to simply opening on weekends during the high visitor periods April through to November or group bookings via pre bookings. The range of products and services offered would be significantly reduced from current levels.
- Reduced business model; the ADF operates under normal conditions, open 7 days per week however closes to visitor access over the low visitor periods of December through to March each year.
- Full business model; the ADF operates all year round offering a full range of visitor based products and services.

These scenarios are examined in greater detail under the following section.
6.2 Income generating potential

In addition to the existing machinery museum and other displays there are a number of opportunities to establish additional enterprises and to generate revenue sources.

A key component of any successful tourism destination is the availability of accommodation options to potential markets. Accommodation forms one of the six commonly accepted "A's" of tourism development the others being Access, Attractions, Activities, Amenities, and Attitudes. The need for commercial accommodation is even greater when considering geographically remote regional locations.

If the ADF is to have any chance of financial success within the visitor industry then the establishment of commercial accommodation options at the ADF is considered a major priority.

Accommodation options include,

- Creation of basic caravan and camping sites with communal facilities,
- Conversion of existing staff houses into fully self contained farm stay cottages,
- Creation of dormitory style accommodation facility (perhaps conversion of existing farm infrastructure).

Creation of tourism based revenue sources,

- Admission prices to the machinery collection and wider ADF facility,
- Food and beverage operations.

Creation of non tourism revenue sources,

- Establish a revenue stream from the 700 hectares of arable land owned by the Department and currently used by the Research Station. The structure for this revenue stream could be derived from,
  - a community cropping arrangement between the Department and local Beverley farmers that wish to support the ADF facility through provision of in-kind farming services (use of machinery and human resources), or
  - a simple lease arrangement between the Department and an independent private third party grower with the annual lease proceeds allocated towards the operation of the ADF facility.
6.3 Potential Business Model Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue sources</th>
<th>Opening times</th>
<th>Baseline; open only weekends April to November or via group booking arrangements.</th>
<th>Limited Opening; open 7 days per week April to November, closed December to March.</th>
<th>Fully operational; open all year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinery museum entry fees</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan / camping sites</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self contained farm stay cottages</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory style accommodation</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage operations</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cropping of AOF arable land or lease arrangement with proceeds to ADF</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above matrix describes a range of potential business models available to the ADF. When combined with whether the Department retains or divests itself of full management, six basic options are presented and these are discussed in section 7.0 of this report.

Full Closure & Asset Disposal Option

In addition to these 6 options, the closure of the ADF and disposal of the machinery museum collection, however distasteful it may be to the local Beverley community, is an option that must also be considered. Enterprises where expenses far exceed their revenue generating capabilities can only exist where their operation achieves a significant non-financial outcome and is underwritten by substantial third party financing. This describes the present situation involving Department funding and use of the ADF as an educational and promotional tool.
The reality is however that these Department resources could be utilised in a more cost efficient and outcome effective manner. The argument for ADF achieving a "significant non financial outcome" therefore cannot continue to be justified by the Department. Whilst community and stakeholder support for the ADF remains strong this option will remain unlikely with more positive approaches favoured.

6.4 Analysis of Business Model Options

Under its current configuration and without the establishment of new revenue sources the ADF remains an unviable proposition. If however additional resources and significant infrastructure funding can be sourced and allocated towards the ADF then additional options then become available.

Although operating as a visitor attraction for many years, the venture has been hamstrung by a lack of commercial focus and management practices. As an example, marketing and promotion for a geographically remote destination or visitor attraction would be a key factor for success. A review of ADF's marketing activities reveals an under resourced and largely ineffective attempt to achieve outcomes. This is not surprising considering a government based management structure is in place with non commercial objectives as its key priority.

At the crux of any financial viability analysis is the strength of the business model being proposed. The aim of any commercial business is to essentially generate profit for its shareholders. Although typically having an underlying community or specific development objective, even not for profit organisations will operate along standard revenue generating processes in order to remain viable and be able to deliver their respective products and services. The ADF must focus its efforts upon generating significant revenue opportunities.

What has not been tested for the ADF is the creation of a tourist precinct that includes a range of commercial accommodation infrastructure and other revenue sourcing options (both tourism and non tourism based).
Preliminary financial modelling has been undertaken as part of this review and based upon the options of generating income from improved ADF assets indicates a range of financial sustainability scenarios could be achieved over the long term. A copy of the projections spreadsheet and assumptions are found in section 8.0 of this report. To achieve long term financial sustainability a considerable level of investment is required to develop infrastructure that has the capacity to generate significant business cashflow.

In addition to this dollar investment it is considered critical that substantial support and long term commitment to the project be secured from local shire and community before any major investment program can be implemented.

6.5 Critical Success Factors

Based upon the experience of the consultant team in assessing tourism business potential in regional WA, the following factors are considered essential for ADF success.

- Management entity in place that is highly focused upon the commercial realities of generating an income surplus to total expenses.
- Investment of funds to achieve professional conservation works program.
- Short to medium term financial reliance upon the Department and a long term commitment from other interested stakeholders including the local shire and dedicated community groups.
7.0 SUMMARY OF OPTIONS AVAILABLE

OPTION 1 - DEPARTMENT RETAINS WITH BASELINE OPERATIONS

Baseline operations:
Open only weekends April to November each year, closed all other times. This would reduce variable operational costs such as casual wages, cleaning, electricity and the like however may not reduce fixed costs such as regular building maintenance and animal feed and care costs. Wages would be the greatest saving however it would be difficult to retain good quality staff under this arrangement.

Management: ownership and management remains with the Department and the ADF Project Committee under status quo. Whilst the Department retains ownership and management control of the ADF there are limited third party funding sources available therefore it is highly likely the entire funding remains the responsibility of the Department.

Income potential: funded by the Department, admissions to machinery museum and ADF, operation or lease of food and beverage services on weekends during visitor period, farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land to offset ADF operational costs. Annual financial contribution by the Department estimated to be $100,000+ per annum.

Heritage: as the Department has not disposed of the ADF asset there are no statutory requirements regarding heritage planning and conservation work. Saying this, it is strongly recommended the Department prepare the following “one-off” planning documents:
  o Conservation Plan - estimated cost $35,000.00 plus GST
  o Heritage Agreement - estimated cost $10,000.00 plus GST
OPTION 2 - COMMUNITY BASED TRUST WITH BASELINE OPERATIONS

Baseline operations:
Open only weekends April to November each year, closed all other times. As with Option 1 this would work to reduce variable operational costs however may not reduce fixed costs. The community based entity would need to rely upon significant volunteer commitment to ensure operations were maintained (eg farm animals were cared for and maintenance programs implemented) and may be in a position to employ a part time manager however as with option 1 it would be difficult to retain good quality staff under this seasonal arrangement.

Management: under this scenario the Department would divest the ADF facility to a community based independent management trust. Divesting provides the ADF with immediate access to a range of government funding programs as well as non government sponsorship opportunities. Divesting will also enable the Department to better allocate human and financial resources in order to achieve its stated PR objectives.

Income potential: the community based Trust would be able to apply for a range of state and federal government tourism and heritage conservation funding programs not accessible under the current management structure. Limited admission revenue to the machinery museum and ADF, operation or lease of food and beverage services on weekends during visitor period, and farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land provided by the Department on an annual basis to offset ADF operational costs. Ongoing annual direct financial support from the Department (over at least the medium term) most likely will be required along with a heavy dependence upon local volunteer commitment.

Heritage: as the Department has disposed of the AOF asset to the not for profit Trust entity strict compliance with the requirements of the Heritage Council and the Government Heritage Property Disposal Process must be adhered to. This includes the preparation of the following plans (as a minimum) prior to disposal:
  - Conservation Plan - estimated cost $35,000.00 plus GST
  - Heritage Agreement - estimated cost $10,000.00 plus GST
OPTION 3 - DEPARTMENT RETAINS WITH LIMITED OPENING & ADDITIONAL INCOME SOURCES

Limited Opening:
The ADF to be open 7 days per week only April to November and closed December through to March each year. The machinery museum, landcare display, stables and homestead, food and beverage services, and the new accommodation services of caravan/campground and converted farm stay cottages would be made available 7 days per week April through to November.

Management: ownership and management remains with the Department and the ADF Project Committee under status quo. This option would require an onsite manager over the 8 month period to coordinate the accommodation operations however would also generate important cashflow for the ADF venture. As with the current situation only limited government grant sources will be available.

Income potential: funded by the Department, admissions to machinery museum and ADF, food and beverage, accommodation revenue, farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land to offset ADF operational costs. Onsite manger wages required for a minimum 8 months per year therefore annual financial contributions by the Department likely to remain around the $100,000+ per annum level.

Heritage: similar to option 1 where there are no statutory requirements for heritage planning and conservation work to be undertaken. Saying this, it is strongly recommended as a minimum that the Department prepare a Conservation Plan and a Heritage Agreement and should also consider undertaking the "good practice" version (as highlighted in section 8.0 of this report) involving a commitment to provide some basic conservation works to the facility.
OPTION 4-COMMUNITY BASED TRUST WITH LIMITED OPENING & ADDITIONAL INCOME SOURCES

Limited Opening:
The ADF to be open 7 days per week only April to November and closed December through to March each year. The machinery museum, landcare display, stables and homestead, food and beverage services, and the new accommodation services of caravan/campground and converted farm stay cottages would be made available 7 days per week April through to November.

Management: under this scenario the Department would divest the ADF facility to a community based independent management trust. Divesting provides the ADF with immediate access to a range of government funding programs as well as non-government sponsorship opportunities. Divesting will also enable the Department to better allocate human and financial resources in order to achieve its stated PR objectives. The Trust would need a professional management team in place and adopt a highly commercial approach to business development.

Income potential: the community based Trust would be able to apply for a range of state and federal government tourism and heritage conservation funding programs not accessible under the current management structure. The campground and cottage income will add significantly to the admission revenue of the machinery museum and ADF, food and beverage proceeds, as well as farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land provided by the Department on an annual basis. Seed funding will be required to establish these new income sources. Annual financial support from the Department will also still be required over the medium term however self funding of the ADF will be a 4 year operational goal.

Heritage: as the Department has disposed of the ADF asset to the not for profit Trust entity it is a statutory requirement that the Department prepare a Conservation Plan and a Heritage Agreement and as with option 3, should also consider undertaking a good practice version involving a commitment to provide some basic conservation works to the facility prior to disposal. This will require significant seed funding as highlighted in section 8.0.
OPTION 5 - DEPARTMENT RETAINS WITH FULL OPENING & ADDITIONAL INCOME SOURCES

Full Opening:
The ADF to be open 7 days per week, 12 months per year.

Management: ownership and management remains with the Department and the ADF Project Committee under status quo. This option would require an onsite manager for the full 12 months of operations.

Income potential: operations remain largely funded by the Department, admissions to machinery museum and ADF, food and beverage, campground, cottage and school group dormitory accommodation revenue, farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land to offset ADF operational costs. Onsite manager wages required year round and annual financial contributions by the Department likely to remain around the $80,000+ per annum level assuming additional new income sources are achieved as detailed above.

Heritage: similar to options 1&3 where there are no statutory requirements for heritage planning and conservation work to be undertaken. As the facility will be operational all year round a greater level of investment in conservation would be expected and it is recommended that the “best case” scenario be considered (see section 8.0) and will require significant seed funding.
OPTION 6 - COMMUNITY BASED TRUST WITH FULL OPENING & ADDITIONAL INCOME SOURCES

Full Opening:
The ADF to be open 7 days per week, 12 months per year.

Management: the Department would divest the ADF facility to a community based independent management trust. Divesting provides the ADF with immediate access to a range of government funding and sponsorship. Divesting will also enable the Department to better allocate human and financial resources. A full time manager and part time/casual marketing and administration person would be required to oversee accommodation and other business activities. Continued Volunteer commitment from local community would also be essential.

Income potential: the community based Trust would be able to apply for a range of state and federal government tourism and heritage conservation funding programs not accessible under the current management structure. The campground, dormitory style and cottage income will add significantly to the admission revenue to the machinery museum and ADF, food and beverage proceeds, as well as farm lease or farming proceeds from arable land provided by the Department on an annual basis. A highly commercial focus would need to be adopted. Annual financial support from the Department will be required over the medium term with a goal to be self funding from year 4 onwards. Seed funding for new accommodation enterprises will also be required.

Heritage: as the Department has disposed of the ADF asset to the not for profit Trust entity it is a statutory requirement that the Department prepare a Conservation Plan and a Heritage Agreement. As the facility will be operational all year round a greater level of investment in conservation would be expected and it is recommended that the "best case" scenario be considered and will require significant see funding (see section 8.0).
8.0 OPTION COST IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Heritage Cost Implications

The following presents three heritage and conservation costing scenarios for the ADF. Note: These costs are estimates only. Accurate costs can only be obtained on the basis of response to detailed briefs or schedules of works developed on the basis of conservation and management plans and detailed proposals for interpretation.

A) Essential (Total cost $45,000 plus GST)

The following requirements are based on strict compliance with the requirements of the Heritage Council and the government Heritage Property Disposal Process only. If the Department was to undertake disposal then this would be mandatory, if the Department retained ownership then these activities would not be mandatory however would be strongly recommended.

- Conservation Plan
  Approx. $35,000.00 plus GST
- Consultant to Liaise with HCWA and prepare a Heritage Agreement
  $10,000.00 plus GST

Note: This scenario takes no account of requirements for disposal of the machine collection which is not included in the registration of the place under the provisions of the Heritage Act.

B) Good Practice- Basic Version (Total cost $135,000 to $185,000 plus GST)

Based on a commitment to provide some basic conservation works to the facility.

- Conservation and Management Plan
  $50,000.00 (This price includes a museum curator to make recommendations regarding the management and/or disposal of the collection. This should be included as an addition to the standard brief).
- Consultant to Liaise with HCWA and prepare a Heritage Agreement
  $10,000.00 plus GST.

- Prepare costings to implement the recommendations of the Conservation Plan
  Quantity Surveyor allow $5,000.00 plus GST approximately.

- Conservation Works (implementation of conservation plan recommendations)
  Works to Homestead Group and Farm Group buildings. Allow an indicative budget
  of $50,000.00 to $100,000.00 plus GST for general conservation works prior to
  disposal. Works should include ground and roof drainage to the homestead group
  General maintenance and conservation works to other heritage farm buildings
  and the laboratory based on the recommendations of the conservation plan.
  Please note that cost estimates do not include any potential upgrade of facilities
  such as the commercial kitchen, ablution blocks etc.

- Curatorial Services (implementation of conservation plan recommendations)
  Employ a professional curator to oversee the disposal/rationalisation of the
  machinery collection in a professional manner by contacting donors and arranging
  for return of items, or disposal. Allow an indicative budget of $20,000.00 plus GST
  for the consultancy plus costs associated with dispersal or relocation.

C - Best Practice Version (Total cost $270,000 to $320,000 plus GST)
Based on a commitment to provide some upgrading to the facility prior to disposal.

- Conservation and Management Plan
  $50,000.00 (This price includes a museum curator to make recommendations
  regarding the management and/or disposal of the collection. This should be
  included as an addition to the standard brief)

- Consultant to Liaise with HCWA and prepare a Heritage Agreement
  $10,000.00 plus GST

- Prepare detailed costings to implement recommendations of Conservation Plan
  Quantity Surveyor allow $10,000.00 plus GST Approx
- Conservation Works (implementation of conservation plan recommendations)
  Works to Homestead Group and Farm Group buildings. Allow an indicative budget of $150,000.00 to $200,000.00 plus GST for general conservation works prior to disposal. Works should include ground and roof drainage to the homestead group, re-pointing of brickwork, remediation of rising damp, repair of cracks. Consider removing the commercial kitchen and restoring the western block, or upgrading to appropriate standard for use on the basis of recommendations of the conservation plan. General maintenance and conservation works to other heritage farm buildings and the laboratory based on the recommendations of the conservation plan.

- Curatorial Services (implementation of conservation plan recommendations)
  Employ a professional curator to oversee the assessment, documentation, interpretation etc of the machinery collection and disposal of unwanted items of machinery in a professional manner by contacting donors and arranging for return of items or disposal. Allow an indicative budget of $50,000.00 plus GST for the consultancy plus costs associated with preparation of display material and/or dispersal or relocation and return of machines to donors as appropriate.

8.2 Tourism Business Asset Cost Implications

To establish the revenue generating assets such as a range of accommodation, visitor infrastructure and food and beverage facilities, it is estimated that around $260,000 will be required over the first two years. This may be sourced from either direct funds and/or the provision of in-kind services depending upon the management option adopted.

If disposal to a Trust entity, then in-kind support from local government and local community is assumed in the form of provision of earthwork machinery and services to establish caravan park grounds, visitor ablution blocks and the like.

An increased financial investment in revenue generating infrastructure will not be all that is required. To date, the ADF has not been run as a commercial enterprise. Its core functions have centred around educational goals with minimal regard for revenue generation.
A substantial shift in mindset (regardless of whether the Department retains or divests) is therefore required by management if the ADF is to have any chance of achieving ongoing financial sustainability.

Direct infrastructure and conservation funds could be sourced from Department of Agriculture if management is retained by the Department, or other State and Federal Government community and/or conservation based funding programs if the Trust entity is in place. Site preparation and road works could be provided by a combination of Shire and committed local farmer volunteers. A cooperative approach amongst all stakeholders is required and the level of potential commitment tested prior to adopting a preferred option.
9.0 FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

9.1 ADF Capital Works Budget
The tables below highlight indicative capital works budgets that will be required to establish the ADF under various option scenarios being considered. Capital work items are grouped into either conservation or tourism business asset activities.

9.1.1 Options 1 & 2

Table 1. Options 1&2- Minimal conservation & Baseline business model assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Capital Budget</th>
<th>2005/6</th>
<th>2006/7</th>
<th>2007/8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Conservation Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Management Plan</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Agreement</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Conservation costs</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Business Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of food and beverage facility</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Business costs</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING REQUIRED</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.2 Options 3 & 4

Table 1. Options 3&4- Good Practice conservation & Limited business assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Capital Budget</th>
<th>2005/6</th>
<th>2006/7</th>
<th>2007/8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Conservation Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Management Plan</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Agreement</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Surveyor to Prepare costing for Implementation of Conservation Plan</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conservation &amp; Homestead Works</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curatorial Consultant Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Conservation costs</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Business Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF Business Plan</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Caravan and Camping facilities</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of visitor infrastructure such as ablutions, showers</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of existing houses to farm stay cottages</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of food and beverage facility</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Business costs</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING REQUIRED</td>
<td>$188,500</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1.3 Options 5 & 6

Table 1. Options 5&6- Best Case conservation & Full business model assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Capital Budget</th>
<th>2005/6</th>
<th>2006/7</th>
<th>2007/8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Conservation Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Management Plan</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Agreement</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Surveyor to Prepare costings for implementation of Conservation Plan</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conservation &amp; Homestead Works</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curatorial Consultant Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage &amp; Conservation costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Business Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF Business Plan</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Caravan and Camping facilities</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of visitor infrastructure such as ablutions, showers</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of existing houses to farm stay cottages</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of existing farm building into group dormitory accommodation</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of food and beverage facility</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism &amp; Business costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$173,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td><strong>$305,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Heritage Funding Options

There are a number of assistance programs available to owners of heritage places, however state or federal government departments, such as the Department of Agriculture, are not eligible for assistance under community funding programs.

Funding for heritage through community funding programs is extremely limited and is generally intended to supplement the owner's own resources. In the case of local government this has often involved dollar for dollar contributions to assist conservation of heritage assets. In the case of community groups and not-for-profit organisations where little other funding is available, grants often provide the only means for carrying out conservation works. The process usually involves repeated grant applications over the years. Not-for-profit organisations include the National Trust that is also subject to limited grant funding resources.
Generally heritage funding is limited to maximum grants of only $15,000.00 and competition for scarce resources is high. Reliance on funding for full conservation of a place is therefore not practical, however the system does provide for supplementary funding for organisations with no other funding source.

In order for the ADF to become eligible for grant funding the Department would have to dispose of the place through vesting to either a dedicated trust or similar structure, the Shire of Beverley or the National Trust. Given the limited funds that are available it is recommended that if disposal to another entity is proposed, that the Department consider providing some initial funding for conservation works and interpretation as the funding system is unlikely to meet the level of need required.

The following table provides a summary of heritage funding programs available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Heritage</td>
<td>Sharing Australia's Stories</td>
<td>Not for Profit Community Organisations Schools Individuals Local Councils</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($5,000-$50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTTERYWEST</td>
<td>Interpretation of Cultural Heritage ($15,000 limit)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>8 July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assessment managed by Museums Australia WA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTTERYWEST</td>
<td>Conservation Of Cultural Heritage ($15,000 limit)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assessment by Department of Housing and Works following short listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTTERYWEST</td>
<td>General Grants. Including for Museums and Historical Societies (approx $10,000)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCWA Heritage Grants Program</td>
<td>Private Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 May 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Business Enterprise Funding Options

Potential funding for the business enterprise aspects of the ADF could be funded from one or more of the following sources:

- Federal Government tourism and community development grant programs,
- Western Australian Government tourism and community development grant programs,
- The Shire of Beverley,
- Local community,
- Corporate sponsorship.

Currently the Federal Government is implementing a range of tourism and community development funding programs that ADF could apply for. These include,

- Australian Tourism Development Program
- Tourism And Conservation Partnership Initiative
- Regional Tourism Program

The State Government programs include,

- Western Australian Regional Initiatives Scheme.
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Report on Community Workshop 15th February 2006

Brief for the Preparation of a Conservation Plan
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Certificate of Title - Avondale Estate

Site Plan and Location Plan as provided by the Heritage Council of WA

Role of a Curator, Discussion Paper provided by WA Museum

Assessment Documentation for Entry on the Register of Heritage Places
Report on Community Meeting – 15 February 2006

The Consultant team conducted a workshop in Beverley on the evening of Wednesday 15 February 2006 for the purpose of gaining comment on the contents of the “Avondale Discovery Farm Review of Operations – October 2005”.

In attendance were representatives from the Avondale Project Committee, President, CEO, Councillors Shire of Beverley, Community Members and Volunteers, Member for Avon, Tourism Western Australia, Department of Agriculture Staff (Avondale) – a total of 25 attendees.

The workshop was facilitated by Ray Bird (RBA Consulting) with responses given by Matt Bird (RBA Consulting) and Rosemary Rosario (Heritage and Conservation Professionals) and consisted of a powerpoint presentation of fourteen slides comprising,

- Project team
- Background
- Impacting issues
- Review findings
- Major considerations
- Options 1 to 7
- Critical success factors
- Workshop discussion

Clearly, there is a great deal of passion and personal involvement and commitment by many members of the local community for the Avondale Discovery Farm. The Shire of Beverley has confirmed its desire to have the ADF remain operational.

In discussion, the Avondale Project committee Group indicated that the members were undecided as to the future approach however saw the potential of having a more commercial focus (and the advantages that could flow) but stated the need for “substantial” monies to be spent by the Department of Agriculture to provide improved facilities. The Shire expressed concern that should a local community trust be established to manage the ADF, it may have to “financially rescue” the group if it was unable to source grant monies and/or sponsorship, it did not want to be left “holding the baby”.

General comments indicated some recognition that by the Department divesting the ownership a trust entity could access Government grants however the audience was swayed towards the belief that grants/sponsorship may not be secured and thus they were not prepared to take the risk.

In seeking to arrive at a general direction for reporting back to the Department, the Shire indicated that they did not wish to have the responsibility (“simply can’t afford it”). They would continue to support the ADF – even extend that support (however highly unlikely to be in financial terms), however based on the information provided so far, Shire is unable to give any indication as to the level of future support.

The meeting concluded with the unanimous vote that the Department should retain ownership and it was suggested that there could be opportunities to develop partnerships with it (and other entities) and thus seek a meeting with the Department and a small representation group from Beverley to further explore the options.
Conservation Plan

STUDY BRIEF

Introduction to Conservation Plans
This Study Brief was originally derived from a base document developed by the Department of Contract and Management Services. The Heritage Council of Western Australia acknowledges and appreciates the opportunity to utilise this brief.

This Study Brief was reviewed and amended in October 2002. It provides an outline of the sections and information to be included when preparing Conservation Plans.

A Conservation Plan is recognised as the primary guiding document for the conservation and future use of a place. The main objective of the Conservation Plan is to ensure that all future decisions about a place are carried out with regard to its cultural heritage significance.

The Conservation Plan should be presented in a manner, which is suitable for use by the Heritage Council of Western Australia, by conservation practitioners, and by owners and occupiers who may not be familiar with conservation philosophy and practice.

Background information should include:

- why the Conservation Plan is being prepared including acknowledgment of funding as appropriate;
- brief description of the history of the place including former uses;
- information about the place from the client and/or other relevant bodies;
- drawings or references to known primary and secondary sources; and
- heritage listings/status for the place.

Specific requirements are as set out in this brief. In general, the work should be carried out in accordance with the guidelines and principles of J. S. Kerr's *The Conservation Plan* and the Australia ICOMOS *Burra Charter, 1999* (or *The Illustrated Burra Charter*). Reference should be made to the 'Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance', 'Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy' and 'Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for undertaking studies and reports'. The document should also be produced in accordance with *Style Manual for Authors, Editors and Printers, 2002*.

The Australian Natural Heritage Charter: Standards and Principles for the Conservation of Places of Natural Heritage Significance should also be used when relevant.

When providing quotations for Heritage Grants Program funded Conservation Plans, consultants are requested to make clear to the Heritage Council if any parts of the information required by this brief are excluded from the quotation.

If there have been time or other constraints during the preparation of the Conservation Plan, these should be addressed in the relevant sections.

Where the Heritage Council is not a client, variations to Conservation Plans not in accordance with this brief should be agreed between the consultant and the commissioning body. For such Conservation Plan reports, the Heritage Council would appreciate the opportunity to offer review comments at draft stage, and to receive a copy of the final report for Heritage Council records.

Conservation Plans should include the following sections:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The principal findings of the report should be summarised and appear at the beginning of the Conservation Plan as an Executive Summary. This section should be concise, self-contained and easily understood by a broad audience.

The Executive Summary should include: why the study was prepared; a description of the study area; a brief historical overview; a brief physical description; the Statement of Significance; the intentions of the Conservation Policy; and, a summary of the Conservation Policy and Implementation Strategy.

INTRODUCTION
The introduction should include:

- background information about the place and the study including a description of the study area and a list of all buildings/features on site;
- a location plan showing the regional (broad) context of the place, a location plan showing the local context of the place, and a clearly defined study area/site plan, shown graphically, listing all buildings on site, including land title information and also showing a defined curtilage/boundary for the site;
- current heritage listings of the place;
- an outline of the methodology employed by the consultant in the preparation of the report;
- study team and management structure for the project; and
- acknowledgments.

EVIDENCE
The sections of the report presenting the documentary and physical evidence should avoid subjective statements and critical assessment of the implications of the evidence.

The assessment should be carried out in accordance with the ‘Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance’. In the preparation of documentary and physical evidence, consideration should be given to the items listed in Section 3.2 of the Burra Charter Guidelines. These are as follows:

Collection of Information
Information relevant to the assessment of cultural significance should be collected. Such information concerns:

- the developmental sequence of the place and its relationship to the surviving fabric;
- the existence and nature of lost or obliterated fabric;
- the rarity and/or technical interest of all or any part of the place;
- the functions of the place and its parts;
- the relationship of the place and its parts with its setting;
- the cultural influences which have affected the form and fabric of the place;
- the significance of the place to people who use or have used the place, or descendants of such people;
- the historical content of the place with particular reference to the ways in which its fabric has been influenced by historical forces or has itself influenced the course of history;
- the scientific or research potential of the place, including, for archaeological features, special consideration for the potential of material to reveal information;
- the relationship of the place to other places, for example in respect of design, technology, use, locality or origin; and
- any other factor relevant to an understanding of the place.

Illustrations, plans and photographs (with sources and captions) which illustrate and/or support the documentary and physical evidence should be reproduced in the relevant section. Other items supporting information in the evidence may also be included as an appendix. These may include Certificates of Title, HCWA assessment documentation or municipal heritage listings.
The documentary and physical evidence should be presented as separate sections in the report. Note: Technical expertise should be used appropriate to the condition and nature of the place. This evidence should also be presented as a separate section in the report. Other experts may include a landscape architect, historical archaeologist, or structural engineer.

1. DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE (to be prepared by an historian)

The documentary evidence is to provide:

i) pre-European occupation (where relevant);

ii) historical context - for example, its place within the development of a locality/region or its association with the development of a particular industry;

iii) a history of the place from its establishment/construction up to the present day including its role and associations; and

iv) a summarised chronology of major events.

Dates of registration/listing on various heritage registers should be included in the documentary evidence.

The documentary evidence should be based on primary source material where possible. If no primary sources have been located, secondary source material should be used. In the event that the documentary evidence has been based on secondary information, this should be acknowledged in the introduction to the section.

Where an unsuccessful attempt has been found to locate information, this should be noted in the documentary evidence (types of sources and depositories/locations searched).

Potential oral sources of information may also be investigated and, where possible, archival plans and photographs are to be provided to document the development of the place.

2. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE (to be prepared by an architect, historical archaeologist, engineer and/or landscape architect or other person with expertise as appropriate to the nature and condition of the place)

The physical evidence is to provide:

i) the context of the building(s)/features within the landscape/setting;

ii) a description of the current function of the place and building(s); and

iii) a description of the surviving fabric (including any artefacts/movable heritage) for each physical element.

For complex sites with a number of buildings and/or physical features, each element should be discussed in a separate sub-section.

For archaeological sites, a description of all features remaining on the site and the relationship between structures remaining on the site, artefact scatters and any exotic vegetation should be included. The description should also include any depressions or mounds that do not appear to be natural.

Floor plans of major built elements should be included in the physical evidence. Current photographs should be taken to document the present form and the internal and external condition of the place and building(s). Plans and photographs should be sourced and dated.

Room by room schedules should be prepared noting the nature of the principal elements, their condition and authenticity. These schedules should be included as an appendix.

If there are buildings on site that are unlikely to be significant under the HCWA criteria, it may not be necessary to prepare room schedules for such buildings.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE DOCUMENTARY AND PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

This section should address the following points:

i) The sequence of development of the place based on the documentary and physical evidence. This should be presented as a chronology focussing on major changes to the fabric of the place, including changes to earlier finishes and decorative details, and identifying structural alteration to the fabric. For archaeological sites, any later building or activity on the site which altered the use patterns should be described and the impact of that activity on previous occupancy noted. It is recommended that this sequence also be presented graphically.
ii) Discuss and identify any questions not resolved about the development of the place or any conflicts arising from the documentary and physical evidence. This sub-section should also identify any areas of further research such as archaeological investigations, historical research, etc.

iii) Comparative analysis of the place. The purpose of this sub-section is to provide supporting evidence for the assessment of the rarity and representativeness of the place. This could discuss a range of issues such as use, period, region, association or style. Suggested sources of comparative information are the HCWA database, the Department of Housing and Works database, Thematic Hi stories, and Municipal Heritage Inventories. A conclusion should be stated, rather than merely providing a list of comparative places.

Note: The analysis section should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the documentary and physical evidence.

4. ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The aim of this section is to discuss the issues arising from the documentary and physical evidence which contribute to the significance of the place. The assessment of significance must derive from the evidence presented in previous sections and no new information should be introduced.

The assessment of significance is set out using the Heritage Council’s ‘Criteria of Cultural Heritage Significance for Assessment of Places for Entry into the Register of Heritage Places’. It aims to establish the ‘nature’ and ‘degree’ of significance in terms of aesthetic, historical, scientific and social significance, as well as rarity and representativeness.

The assessment of significance should take into account:

i) the assessment of the complex as a whole (within both a state and a regional context);

ii) the assessment of component parts or aspects;

iii) the identification of elements/aspects of particular significance; and

iv) the assessment of the authenticity (fabric), integrity (use) and condition of the place and the identification of elements of little significance or those that are considered to be intrusive.

Note: The assessment of significance and the Statement of Significance should be cross-referenced to the evidence in the previous sections.

5. STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

The Statement of Significance is the primary means by which a place is preserved and conserved. It must be based on the statements made in the assessment of significance (no new information should be introduced) and it must form the basis of the conservation policies and policy implementation. This section must address whether the place is significant, why it is significant and how it is significant.

The values identified in the assessment of significance should be summarised into a concise and succinct Statement of Significance. Statements should be written in descending order with each point able to stand and make sense on its own.

Note: The assessment of significance and the Statement of Significance should be cross-referenced to the evidence in the previous sections.

6. GRADED ZONES, SECTIONS AND ELEMENTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The purpose of this section is to identify and discuss zones, sections and elements of the place that have varying degrees of significance. These gradings should be considered in relation to the evidence, the assessment of significance and authenticity. All parts of the study area, including landscape, setting, building(s), physical features and elements should be assessed in this section.

The graded levels of significance must be presented graphically with the various zones, sections and elements easily distinguishable. Separate plans may be provided for ease of presentation. Whether to include graded zones, sections and/or elements will depend on the nature and complexity of the place.

Do not use colours to indicate different zones and elements on diagrams, as they do not reproduce well. Hatching/shading should be used to show different gradings, with a key to this grading included on the same page as the plan.
Generally, a five tier grading system is used to identify those parts of the place that are of:

- exceptional significance;
- considerable significance;
- some significance;
- little and/or no significance (neither contributes nor detracts from the significance of the place); and
- intrusive (detracts from or has an adverse affect on the significance of the place).

Refer to Section 7.2 (iv) below for further explanation of these gradings.

All five tiers may not apply to each place. This will depend on the nature of the place and the assessment of significance. Conversely, if a place is particularly complex, additional gradings may be required.

**Note:** Integrity, authenticity and condition should be considered in association with the zones of significance in the conservation policy section.

### 7. Conservation Policy

The aim of this section is to establish clear policies based on the Statement of Significance and the evidence presented in the previous sections. In general, the policies should address how to:

1. retain or reveal significance of the place;
2. identify feasible and compatible uses for the place;
3. meet statutory requirements; and
4. work within procurable resources.

Policies should be clearly numbered and highlighted using a **bold** or *italicised* format. Policies should be discussed in supporting text.

The following points must be addressed in the Conservation Policy.

#### 7.1 Introduction

This section should contain:

1. an explanation about the purpose of conservation policy;
2. a summary of the major issues considered and cross referenced to more specific policy statements; and
3. key policy statements which establish a conservation framework for all future decisions and work.

#### 7.2 Policies Arising out of the Cultural Heritage Significance of the Place.

The following points should be discussed as appropriate:

1. **The relevance of the Burra Charter.**
2. **Identification of general actions and controls to conserve the cultural heritage significance of the place.** This should be directly related to the Statement of Significance.
3. **Opportunities arising from the Statement of Significance.**
4. **Policies arising from the graded zones, sections and elements of significance.**

To ensure a consistent approach to the conservation of places, it is recommended that the policies for the different zones and elements be based on those provided below. It is expected that these will be developed to include reference to site specific issues such as landscape, archaeology, moveable heritage, etc.

**Zones of exceptional significance**

The fabric of such spaces or elements should be preserved or restored in such a way as to demonstrate their significance. Furnishings and decoration should respect the historic character of the place and activities controlled so as not to prejudice the association of the spaces with their significant use(s).

Intrusive elements should be removed (after photographic recording) and new finishes that are detrimental to the significant fabric should not be applied. Building elements that are damaged are to be restored.
Adaptation is acceptable to the extent of introducing new services, provided this does not adversely affect the significant fabric of the space or element. Structural adaptation is generally unacceptable. However, minor structural adaptation may be considered if it is in keeping with the overall aims of the conservation policy and has minimal impact on the significant fabric. Any alterations to the building fabric should be documented.

For archaeological sites, the area should not be disturbed except in the event of an archaeological dig.

Landscape elements should not be removed without due consideration of their heritage values. Where removal of significant trees is necessary due to their condition, replacement plantings of the same species should be made.

There should be no new works in open space areas which will adversely affect the setting of the place or obscure important views to and from the site.

Zones of considerable significance

The significant fabric of such spaces or elements should be preserved, restored, or reconstructed as appropriate. Reconstruction is desirable provided sufficient detailed information is available. Adaptation is acceptable to the extent of installing reversible small fixtures, services, and partitions, provided this does not affect any external or internal fabric which is of exceptional or considerable significance. No significant fabric should be removed or action taken to confuse the sense of the space. Structural adaptation is generally unacceptable. However, minor structural adaptation may be considered if it is in keeping with the overall aims of the conservation policy and has minimal impact on the significant fabric. Any alterations to the building fabric should be documented.

For archaeological sites, disturbance of the area should be avoided where possible. Where disturbance cannot be avoided, an archaeological examination should be undertaken prior to other works taking place.

Landscape elements should not be removed without due consideration of their heritage values. Where removal of significant trees is necessary due to their condition, replacement plantings of the same species should be made.

There should be no new works in open space areas which will adversely affect the setting of the building or obscure important views to and from the site.

Zones of some significance

The significant fabric of such spaces or elements should be preserved, restored, or reconstructed as appropriate. Adaptation is acceptable to the extent of installing fixtures, services, and reversible partitions, provided this does not affect the significant external and internal appearance of the building. Discrete structural additions and openings can be made. New or different finishes are acceptable, provided these do not obscure or damage important evidence of significant materials and finishes. Any alterations to the building fabric should be documented.

For archaeological sites, disturbance of the area should be avoided where possible. Where disturbance cannot be avoided, an archaeologist should be present when works are undertaken in order to identify and/or collect material of archaeological significance.

Landscape elements should not be removed without due consideration of their heritage values. Where removal of significant trees is necessary due to their condition, appropriate replacement plantings should be made.

There should be no new building work in open space areas which will adversely affect the setting of the building or obscure important views to and from the site.

Zones of little or no significance

The fabric of such spaces or elements may be retained or removed depending on the future use requirements. However, care should be taken to ensure that any such works do not detract from the significance of adjoining spaces or elements. Before removal ensure that comprehensive photographic and graphic recording is completed.

Intrusive zones

Intrusive spaces or elements have been identified as detracting from the significance of the place and their removal and/or replacement with more appropriate detailing should be encouraged. Their removal needs to be assessed against other considerations, such as function and economics, before implementation. Before removal/demolition, ensure that comprehensive photographic and graphic recording is completed.
Policies Related to the Physical Setting

a) Any landscape issues within the study boundaries which may not have already been addressed above.

b) The impact of the setting, surrounding development and/or use in relation to the significance of the place.

Interpretation

It is considered desirable to interpret the history and significance of a heritage place for visitors and/or users. This policy section should discuss broad principles or themes for appropriate methods and expertise for interpretation, use of interpretive material, and/or future recommendations.

7.3 Policies Arising from the Physical Condition of the Place

The implications of the current physical condition of the place should be assessed and policies developed in this section. Structural engineering reports may be commissioned as appropriate and the findings/recommendations used to develop policy.

The following points should be considered:

i) The nature, urgency and potential impact of any current or proposed maintenance works.

ii) The nature and urgency of any maintenance works identified as being required (as part of the physical inspection for this report). These may be used in the development of future works and/or maintenance.

iii) Any other relevant issues, such as the possibility of hazardous materials or the need for pest inspection/control.

Works should be prioritised in terms of urgent works (to be actioned immediately), short term works (two years), medium term works (five years), long term works (ten years) and desirable works.

7.4 External Requirements

The following issues should be considered and policies developed accordingly:

i) Current Heritage Listings/Registrations

Discuss current heritage listings for the place, including a description of what is registered, the date of the listing and the implications of the listing. Discussions of listings should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Register of Heritage Places (Heritage Council of Western Australia);
- Classified List (National Trust of Australia [WA]);
- Municipal Heritage Inventory (refer to the relevant local government);
- Town Planning Scheme (refer to the relevant local government);
- Register of the National Estate (Australian Heritage Commission).

If the place is entered into the State Register of Heritage Places the implications of registration should be discussed in detail, particularly in relation to the statutory requirements regarding the development process. This issue should also be discussed if the report is recommending that the place be considered for entry into the Register.

Further to the above and based on the findings of the assessment of cultural heritage significance, if the Consultant believes the place is worthy of inclusion in any heritage list (and has not yet been considered for that list), a recommendation to that effect should be made.

ii) State Government Policy

If the place is owned by the State Government reference must be made to the Government Heritage Property Disposal Process. Also discuss other Government policy that may be relevant to the use or function of the place.

iii) Statutory Requirements

Consider the possible impact of Town Planning Schemes, Health Acts, Building Code regulations, the Disability Discrimination Act, fire safety regulations, and any other restraints which may affect the place. Identify issues arising from the statutory requirements that may have future implications.
7.5 Requirements and Resources of the Client, Owner, Occupants and/or Users

The following issues should be considered and policies developed accordingly:

i) Constraints or opportunities arising from the requirements, resources and expectations of the client, owner, occupants, users and/or any other interested parties of the place based on consultation with the relevant parties.

ii) Possible community attitudes and expectations regarding the place.

iii) Social, religious or other cultural constraints which may impact on the place.

7.6 Compatible Use

Issues that should be considered are:

i) the current use, proposed new uses and/or future development and possible impact on the cultural heritage significance of the place;

ii) areas and/or zones where future development may be appropriate (this should be presented graphically).

Principles:

The use to which a place was originally built is always the preferred ongoing use, but if this is not viable then compatible uses are preferred. For example:

i) maintain the integrity of the place, including retention of interior and exterior spaces;

ii) require only adaptations that can be easily reversed without causing damage to the significant fabric;

iii) not require partitioning or fixtures that cannot be easily removed without damaging other fabric;

iv) not destroy the opportunity for interpretation of the place; and

v) take the opportunity to conserve fabric described in other sections of the document.

7.7 Other

Identify any other areas not addressed in the above policy sections and develop specific policies on these issues.

If an interpretation or other plan is to be recommended, then specific issues to be addressed in this plan are to be stated and justified. If such a plan is required, the consultant should recommend/determine the relevant professional expertise to be engaged.

8. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The Consultant must determine/identify who will be responsible for policy implementation, a timeframe for the policy implementation, and the process involved:

i) Identify who will be responsible for implementing each policy. This may include the identification of a management structure through which the Conservation Plan may be implemented, day to day management and decision making responsibilities, and the means by which security and regular maintenance can be provided. It may also be appropriate to identify particular skills which should be part of this management structure. Any management structures already in place should be discussed in this section.

ii) Determine when each policy should be implemented. This should be in the form of a time frame that identifies which policies will require immediate action as well as those which may be implemented in the medium or long term. Ongoing implementation requirements should also be covered. A clear definition of the recommended time frame should be included.

iii) Determine how each policy should be implemented. This should indicate/discuss any specific process which should be followed in the implementation of policy.
APPENDICES

Any information which may be critical to an understanding of the Conservation Plan report or its preparation should be included as an appendix. Appendices could include such things as:

i) documentary and physical evidence, for example, title deeds, reports and plans, building schedules, etc.;

ii) 'Guidelines to The Burra Charter: Cultural Significance' and/ or 'Guidelines to The Burra Charter: Conservation Policy';

iii) the Heritage Council's 'Criteria of Cultural Heritage Significance for Assessment of Places for Entry into the Register of Heritage Places';

iv) details of heritage listings/registrations; and

v) the Conservation Plan Study Brief.

Other issues to be addressed:

REFERENCING

Referencing should follow the format laid out in the Heritage Council's Style Notes for Assessment Documentation dated 25 August 2000. This will be made available to the consultant on request.

In general referencing should be consistent and include the following information: Authors Name, Title of Document, Publisher, Place Published, Year of Publication, Page Number.

All figures, including illustrations, photographs and plans, should have captions and be sourced. The caption should be a description of the item and must be dated.

Footnotes

The source of information, including all quotations, must be footnoted and referenced.

Cross Referencing

The Conservation Plan should be cross-referenced to ensure that information contained within the report is clearly supported by the evidence and that related sections and policies are easily identifiable. Cross-referencing should include:

i) reference to relevant photographs and figures in documentary and physical evidence;

ii) reference to relevant sections of the documentary and physical evidence in analysis of evidence;

iii) reference to relevant sections of the documentary and physical evidence and the analysis of evidence in the assessment of significance and Statement of Significance;

iv) reference to the graded zones and elements of significance when discussing the corresponding policies;

v) reference to related policies within the conservation policy section;

vi) reference to relevant conservation policies in the policy implementation section; and

vii) other appropriate sections.

Bibliography

A full bibliography (with a complete list of all sources used in the documentation and consulted during the compilation of the report) should be included as an appendix to the report. Primary sources and secondary sources should be listed in separate sections in this Bibliography. Please note that sources should be listed in alphabetical order by author's surname.

CONSULTATION

Consultation is an important part of the Conservation Plan. Consultation should be carried out throughout the preparation process and any issues should be addressed/included into the Conservation Plan. Consultation should be undertaken with:

i) the Client to identify requirements for the place, any proposed major changes to the place and relevant sources of information that may be held by the Client;
i) the occupiers/tenants/users of the place to identify their requirements for the use of the place;

ii) the local government for information about the place and referrals to local sources of information;

- relevant community groups;
- the Heritage Council of Western Australia;
- the National Trust of Australia (WA), Australian Heritage Commission and Department of Indigenous Affairs to ascertain prior listings and assessments of cultural heritage significance; and
- others as appropriate.

All people consulted during the preparation of the Conservation Plan should be acknowledged in the report's introduction.

Letters of introduction can be supplied on request.

REPORT

i) The report is to be in A4 portrait format, with A3 drawings if necessary.

ii) The report must have a table of contents including references to page numbers and must be followed by a list of figures (a list of all plans and photographs).

iii) Each page of the report should be numbered and contain a header/footer denoting the title of the report and date.

iv) All plans should be orientated with the north point facing in the same direction.

v) Draft reports should be of a quality acceptable for review purposes. The word 'draft' should be clearly visible on the draft report.

vi) One (1) copy of the draft report is to be provided.

vii) Three (3) bound, laser quality black and white photocopies of the final report are to be provided. (Note: Archival standard unbound copies are no longer required.) The provision of an electronic version of the final document on floppy disc or CD and in addition to the hardcopies is optional.

REPORT STANDARDS

The standards to be followed are:

Photographs: Photographs are to be genuine black and white only (not colour printed black and white) or digital. If using either digital photographs or scanned images, laser quality, black and white photocopies of the computer print outs are required (as the long-term stability of computer generated images has not yet been established).

If including original photographs in one (1) final report, these should be attached by archival tape or glue (i.e., wheat starch adhesive, neutral adhesive, gummed linen tape).

Photographs, negatives and/or slides may be lodged with the Heritage Council of Western Australia. They should be labelled numerically, and packaged in archival quality slide pockets, with an index describing each image attached.

The Heritage Council would appreciate receiving a representative selection of electronic images, in jpeg format, for Heritage Council records and assessment purposes.

Paper: Should be of a good quality (i.e., Reflex 80 gsm).

Photocopying: Copying must be done on black and white (carbon based) laser quality photocopiers.

Binding: It is preferred that copies be bound with plastic coated metal spirals. The front cover should be protected with a sheet of clear film.

COPYRIGHT

The contract between the Client and the Consultant should contain appropriate clauses defining who owns copyright of the completed Conservation Plan report.
PRESENTATION MEETING
The Consultant should allow for a progress meeting with the Client before the draft report is submitted. The Consultant should also allow for a meeting to present the document to the Client and other interested parties.

REVIEW
The draft document will be reviewed by the Heritage Council of Western Australia. The Consultant is expected to respond to any comments in writing outlining how comments were incorporated into the final document, or giving reasons why particular comments were not addressed.

STUDY TEAM
It is envisaged that the study team will need to incorporate the skills of a variety of relevant professionals. Specific expertise must include:

- Historical
- Architectural

Other expertise may include:

- Landscape.
- Archaeological.
- Engineering.
- Planning.
- Property Consulting.

The Consultant is to clearly identify personnel working on the Conservation Plan, their credentials and experience, and the management structure for the project.

TIME FRAME
The Consultant is to commence the project one week after appointment.

It is essential that the Consultant maintain a close working relationship with the Client and advise of progress regularly.

The due date for the final draft is 12 weeks after appointment. The final draft should contain information addressing all aspects of the project brief.

The final report is due four weeks after the review period.
NOTES

(1) Purpose and scope of this policy

The purpose of this policy is to provide a clear framework for the identification, assessment, and management of the heritage value of government property, and to ensure that appropriate conservation and management strategies are developed and implemented.

(2) Prior notification to the Heritage Council

Notification of a proposed disposal should be supplied to the Meritage Council, and the Heritage Council, at least 28 days prior to the disposal. The notification should include the proposed disposal details, the reasons for the disposal, and any relevant legal or planning considerations.

(3) Notification criteria

Buildings and structures are generally not required to be considered as part of the process if they:
- are over 30 years old or those
- are already listed on an existing heritage register
- have no evidence of potential significance in terms of aesthetic, scenic, social or scientific value.

(4) Assessments and commissions

Assessments may be commissioned by the Heritage Council, the Heritage Branch of the Department of Local Government, Planning, and Heritage, or by the community, where appropriate.

The Heritage Council must be supplied with a copy of the assessment to ensure that the advice is not given without the assessment. The assessment must be submitted to the Heritage Council, and the advice must be given to the recipient.

The Heritage Council may also request that the assessment is considered as part of the disposal process, or to assess the significance of the property for the purpose of the disposal.

(5) Local government liaison

This process does not replace the need to consult with local government where an agency is considering a disposal of an asset. Local government should be consulted at an early stage of the process to ensure that the disposal process is consistent with local planning requirements.

Heritage Council of Western Australia

P.O. Box 6301, East Perth 6004
Ph: (08) 9221 4177 or 1800 644 177
Fax: (08) 9221 4193
Email: heritage@warawine.gov.au
For further information about the Government Heritage Property Disposal Process or any of the items offered by the Heritage Council, please contact:

Heritage Council of Western Australia
105 Ascot Vale, East Perth 6000
P.O. Box 620, East Perth WA 6892
Ph: (08) 9221 4177 x 1450, 9 640 177
Fax: (08) 9223 6181
Email: heritage@hcwa.wa.gov.au
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>REGISTERED</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve No. 37765 for the purpose of &quot;Agricultural Research Station&quot; and</td>
<td>Sundry Doc.</td>
<td>E514307</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested in Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose changed to &quot;Agricultural Research Station and Historical</td>
<td>Sundry Doc.</td>
<td>E514307</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities&quot;. In G.G. 14/12/1990.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested in Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Agriculture with</td>
<td>Sundry Doc.</td>
<td>E514307</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to lease the whole or any portion thereof for any term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In G.G. 14/12/1990.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As to Avonvale EstateLot 3 only: Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodged 20.11.03 at 11.54 hrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crown Land Record

The undermentioned land shown on the sketch in the First Schedule hereto is land of the Crown subject to the interests, easements, encumbrances and notices shown in the Second Schedule hereto.

Dated 20th December, 1900

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

LAND REFERRED TO

Avondale Estate Lots 3 and 16 on Land Administration Plan Avon 1380

FIRST SCHEDULE

Total Area = 705.5137 ha
REGISTER OF HERITAGE PLACES
Permanent Entry

1. DATA BASE No. 05566
2. NAME
   Comprising
   Avondale Research Station (1880s+)
   Homestead (1880s)
   Stables (1890s)
   Silo (1927)
   Laboratory (fmr) (1930)

   OTHER NAMES Avondale State Farm, Avondale Seed Farm, Discovery Farm
3. LOCATION
   Waterhatch Rd, Beverley

4. DESCRIPTION OF PLACE INCLUDED IN THIS ENTRY
   Portion of Avondale Estate Lot 3 on Land Administration Plan Avon 1380
   being part of Reserve 37765 and part of the land contained in Crown Land
   Title Volume: 3093 Folio: 215

5. LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA
   Shire of Beverley

6. OWNER
   State of Western Australia
   (Vested in Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Agriculture)

7. HERITAGE LISTINGS
   • Register of Heritage Places: Interim Entry 15/08/2003
     Permanent Entry 19/03/2004
   • National Trust Classification: Adopted
   • Town Planning Scheme:
   • Municipal Inventory: Adopted 06/06/1995
   • Register of the National Estate:
     Adopted 26/04/1996

8. CONSERVATION ORDER

9. HERITAGE AGREEMENT

10. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
    Avondale Research Station, comprising a single storey brick and corrugated
    iron Homestead (1880s) in the Victorian Georgian style, a vernacular single
    and double storey corrugated iron Stables (1890s), a vertical concrete grain
    Silo (1927), a single storey brick and iron former Laboratory (1930), workers'
dwellings (1928 and 1957) and the museum (1979), has cultural heritage significance for the following reasons:

established as a State Farm in 1919, the place has been a venue for agricultural research since 1924, and was the site of an important research project into braxy-like disease in sheep in the early 1930s, with the research Laboratory constructed specifically for the project;

the place has a landmark quality within its picturesque rural landscape;

the Stables dating from the 1890s feature very well-detailed timber horse stalls and roof structure, and are a rare example of innovative design;

the place is valued for its role in agricultural research and education, born out by the local community's financial contribution to the establishment of the Laboratory in 1930 and the contribution of farm machinery for the Discovery Farm museum in 1979;

the various components that comprise the place demonstrate specific government initiatives in the establishment and the subsequent development of the place as a site of agricultural research and a showcase of rural work and life;

the Avondale property was one of the earliest pastoral properties established in the Beverley district and the farm's development since 1838 has been indicative of and contributed to the development of the area; and

the place contributes to the local and wider community's sense of place for its links to the early settlement of the Avon Valley and for its ongoing contribution to agricultural research and education in the State.

The workshop (former barn), dwelling associated with the Laboratory, weighbridge, and 1979 entry statement are of little significance.

Other buildings of little significance include the various workers' dwellings dated c. 1960s and later that are scattered around the site, steel framed and clad farm sheds in the vicinity of the Stables and workshop and toilet buildings.
GUIDELINES ON THE WORK AND APPOINTMENT OF A CURATOR IN A SMALL MUSEUM

Small museums include many community, local government, specialist, university and school museums. The appointment of a paid curator to a small museum, possibly more than any other initiative, has the potential to improve significantly professional standards in that institution. However, while the potential rewards are great, they will only be realised if the appropriate person is appointed. Museums Australia does not currently have a formal policy on the employment of staff for positions in small museums. Nevertheless, following requests for advice on this matter, some broad guidelines on the duties of curators and the appointment of people to such positions are provided below.

Most small museums are usually only able to employ a single paid curator. As such, their duties usually encompass the full spectrum of museum work with differing emphases according to the nature of the museum, its priorities and the resources at its disposal. Nevertheless, the duties below are common to most curators working in those museums which aspire or adhere to professional management practices:

MUSEUM PRACTICE

Collections Management:
- Collections acquisition
- Documentation of the collection
- Organisation of incoming and outgoing loans
- Managing relevant information technology systems
- Collections research
- Development and supervision of a research library
- Conservation and storage of the collection
- Liaison with conservators in assessing collection needs
- Collection security and disaster preparedness
- Insurance of collection
- Addressing legal issues and requirements
- Development of policy for all of the above

Exhibition:
- Display planning and design
- Research and Interpretation
- Artefact selection
Writing exhibition text
Display fabrication installation
Budgeting and seeking grants
Negotiating and managing travelling exhibitions
Managing publicity

Public Programmes and Educational Services
Understanding the principles of interpretation and museum education
Planning, developing and delivering successful public programmes including education programmes for schools and community groups
Keeping abreast of school curriculum changes and liaising with educational institutions
Evaluating the success of such programmes
Supervising practicums and work placements

Marketing And Public Relations
Forging close links with the community
Marketing the Museum, its programmes and special projects
Utilising information technology and the print and electronic media for promotion purposes
Initiating and delivering public addresses
Networking with individuals and organisations
Facilitating public access and responding to public inquiries
Understanding and facilitating cross-cultural awareness

Management and Administration
Defining mission, setting goals and ensuring their achievement
Strategic and forward planning
Policy development for all areas above
Finance and budgeting
Addressing legal issues and requirements
Liaising with government, administering bodies, other museums, organisations and individuals

Project management
Establishment and management of a volunteer programme
Establishment and working with a Friends organisation
Working with consultants
Organising insurance
Attending to correspondence and ‘front of house’ duties
Purchasing supplies and equipment
Conducting or organising routine maintenance of buildings and equipment
Enacting occupational health and safety policies and procedures
Enacting equal opportunity policies
Working within Museums Australia ethical guidelines and facilitating and disseminating the policies of the Association (eg Previous Possessions, New Obligations)
Professional Development

Keep abreast of professional developments and policies via information technology and professional literature
Attend training courses, professional seminars and conferences
Actively participate in professional associations
Liaise with other museums and museum professionals
Facilitate the professional development of voluntary staff
Keep abreast of professional developments and policies in related areas such as heritage issues

Building an authoritative personal knowledge of the museum's discipline/spécialty area
Researching, and interpreting the museum's discipline/spécialty area
Writing publications and disseminating knowledge about the discipline/spcialty
Keeping abreast of knowledge and developments in the discipline/spécialty area
Establishing, maintaining and providing public access to an archive and research library on the discipline/spécialty area

Understand the relationship between museums and other institutions of cultural heritage and bodies of knowledge
Develop a working knowledge of important related disciplines and professional areas including the management of heritage buildings and sites, natural sites, archive practice, library practice, local government operations and others

Who should be appointed?
The type of person appointed will be dictated to some degree by the nature of the museum and the task at hand. Similarly, factors such as personality and ability will obviously be important. However, as can be seen from the above, the responsibilities of an average community museum curator are considerable and are extremely diverse. Therefore, in addition it is essential that such a person possess suitable qualifications, experience and other important qualities such as the ability to work with the community.

Suitable qualifications
A paid curator should possess tertiary qualifications relevant to the above duties.
An excellent orientation to museum practice is often provided through short courses offered by agencies such as State Museums or Museum advisory services. The WA Museum through their annual 'Curator's Course' is a good example of this. However, these and seminars and workshops conducted by the Association and others are only introductory in nature and do not provide the necessary level or amount of training for
a participant to professionally manage a museum. Apart from exceptional cases where a person has received considerable training and experience 'on the job' in a reputable museum from paid professionals, tertiary qualifications in this area are essential. This should consist of at least a bachelor's or higher degree in a discipline relevant to the type of museum. For example, a history degree for a history museum or a natural science degree for a museum with a natural science emphasis. In addition, the person should have a formal qualification in museum curatorship. Given the skilled nature and diversity of tasks that have to be performed single-handedly in small museums, together with the fragility and value of collections being managed, in most cases this is absolutely essential. Similarly, there is not usually the time, support or qualified personnel to provide the appropriate 'on the job' training as there might be in a larger institution. In most small museums a newly appointed lone curator will need to 'hit the ground running'.

For those where the management of a museum and its collections is the main task, perhaps the most appropriate postgraduate qualification likely to provide the necessary training for the diversity of tasks involved is a postgraduate diploma in museum studies (sometimes termed 'material culture') or a similar qualification such as Cultural Heritage providing it includes a substantial museum /collections management component. Such courses usually provide good grounding in most of the areas outlined above. However, it is important that the qualification reflects an appropriate balance between the necessary practical dimensions to managing a museum/collection and the important philosophical and theoretical considerations that underpin the work of museums.

Should the emphasis of the job vary from solely the management of the museum and its collections, then other qualifications in place of or in addition to this may be more appropriate. For example, where there is a heavy emphasis on education programmes an additional teaching qualification would be an advantage, or essential in the case of an education officer. Similarly, if the position was one that involved predominantly the management of archival material or possibly an art collection then one might look to employ someone with qualifications in these respective areas. In addition, positions such as those of some municipal heritage officers deal with the broader heritage field including the built environment, natural and historical sites and museums. For such positions qualifications in some of these specialties or in cultural heritage management would be appropriate, again depending on the emphasis of the
job. However, even with responsibilities in related areas, if museum work is the major responsibility then the qualifications should reflect this.

Experience
In addition to the appropriate qualifications, experience is most important. This should be directly in the museum area, gained from a reputable professionally staffed museum and preferably aligned to the type and size of museum in which the curator will be working. Nevertheless, the principles of museum practice in small museums are somewhat universal and experience gained working in one type of museum is often applicable to others. Experience in related fields would also be an advantage. However, many of the comments above relating to qualifications according to the emphasis of the job are relevant when considering a candidate's experience.

Other Considerations
It is often thought that in the case of a community or specialist museum a good knowledge of the local history or the museum's specialty area should be the predominant criteria for the selection of a paid curator. While this is most important, it should not be the prime criteria except perhaps in more specialist museums performing an academic or pure research role (eg some university museums). Directly relevant qualifications and experience, possibly in that order, are ultimately more important. A good candidate through their tertiary education should possess the skills necessary to readily research and learn the local history of an area or of a particular specialty. Furthermore, much of this information will exist within the institution or community and can be acquired with time.

Similarly, there is often a perception that a paid curatorial position in a museum representing a particular profession or economic activity should be filled by a practitioner in that field or profession. Again, while such a background would be a distinct advantage, it is the qualifications and experience in museum and collections management that are more important. Someone who had both would of course be ideal.

For a museum to be successful it must work closely within the community or institution it serves. Similarly, for the museum to function efficiently the curator will need to work closely with volunteers, donors and members of the wider community. Therefore, it is essential that a curator has the ability to work with people and the community at large.
Who should select a curator in a small museum?
Curators in small museums often find themselves as the sole museum professional within a community or organisation. Similarly, the appointment of paid professional curators is a comparatively recent trend and as such institutions sometimes have little experience at employing such people. Therefore, it is understandable that selection panels are often drawn from within a community or organisation with little understanding or experience of the work of a small museum curator. Similarly, there is sometimes little recognition of the position's professional status and the importance of appropriate qualifications and experience. It is appropriate for the employing body to have control over the selection process and for selection committees to include suitable representatives of that body (e.g. a human relations officer or a line manager). However, it is also essential that appropriate outside expertise be integrally involved with the appointment. Such person(s) should be suitably qualified and experienced with an intimate understanding of small museum curatorship. Personnel from the museum advisory services that exist in most states or representative(s) nominated by the State branch of Museums Australia are examples of the types of people who should be invited to join selection panels.

Remuneration
Museum curatorship is a profession in its own right. It is highly skilled, intellectual in nature, responsible and challenging and as such should be appropriately recognised by a professional level of pay. The calibre of person outlined in this document is high. They have completed at least four years of tertiary study, are very experienced and have the flexibility and skill to perform a large number of diverse tasks. Their remuneration should reflect these qualifications and level of experience and be equal to that of others working within the museum's profession or comparable professions. The local branch of Museums Australia can be approached for up to date suggestions on relevant levels of pay.

Stephen Anstey
Curator
Edith Cowan University Museum of Childhood
© S Anstey 2000
11. ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

The criteria adopted by the Heritage Council in November, 1996 have been used to determine the cultural heritage significance of the place.

PRINCIPAL AUSTRALIAN HISTORIC THEME(S)
- 3.5 Developing primary production
- 8.10.5 Advancing knowledge in science and technology

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA THEME(S)
- 301 Grazing & pastoralism & dairying
- 402 Education & science

11.1 AESTHETIC VALUE

Avondale Research Station has aesthetic significance as an interpretive example of a rural farming property that has evolved over time, and that provides a visual experience of the rural working lifestyle. (Criterion 1.1)

The 1880s Homestead is a good example of a Victorian Georgian style rural dwelling that evolved over time and has retained its rural context in a picturesque setting. (Criterion 1.1)

The Stables dating from the 1890s feature very well-detailed timber horse stalls and roof structure, and are a rare example of innovative design. (Criterion 1.2)

Avondale Research Station has a landmark quality within the picturesque rural landscape. (Criterion 1.3)

Avondale Research Station makes an important contribution to the historic landscape of the Avon valley in complementing and enhancing the historic fabric of the region. (Criterion 1.4)

11.2 HISTORIC VALUE

The Avondale property was one of the earliest pastoral properties established in the Beverley district and was developed by Nicholas Carey and his grandnephew William Herbert deLisle from 1838 to 1904, before
being acquired by the government for agricultural subdivision in 1910. It was subsequently developed as State Farm from 1919. (Criteria 2.1 & 2.3)

The early history of Avondale Research Station illustrates the development of pastoral and agricultural pursuits in the Avon Valley in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the initiative of the Mitchell government in promoting agriculture and closer land settlement, including World War One soldier settlement. (Criterion 2.1)

The various components that comprise Avondale Research Station form a rural cultural environment that demonstrates historic associations with the early European settlement of the Avon Valley. It demonstrates specific government initiatives in the establishment and the subsequent development of the place as a site of agricultural research and a showcase of rural work and life. (Criterion 2.1)

Avondale Research Station was the venue of an important research project into braxy-like disease in sheep in the early 1930s, and the research Laboratory was constructed specifically for the project. (Criterion 2.1)

The significant buildings of Avondale Research Station, namely the Homestead (1840s, 1880s), Stables (1890s), Silo (1927) and former Laboratory (1930), together with less significant post-World War Two buildings, are indicative of the various stages of development and use of the property over the years. (Criterion 2.2)

Avondale Research Station is associated with Dr Eric John Underwood, first chair of the School of Agriculture at the University of Western Australia, who worked on various projects at Avondale. (Criterion 2.3)

Constructed in the 1890s, the Stables are a very fine example of innovation in the design of the feeding chutes to the horse stalls and of architectural detail in the timber roof structure. (Criterion 2.4)

The Silo, built in 1927 to a non standard Public Works Department plan, demonstrates the important scientific research into wheat production carried out at that time at the Avondale Research Station, known then as Avondale Seed Farm. (Criterion 2.4)

Avondale Research Station has been a research station since 1926, and is the site of the only known research laboratory purpose built at an agricultural research station during the Inter-War period. (Criterion 2.4)

11.3 SCIENTIFIC VALUE
The interpretation of Avondale Research Station contributes to the understanding of agricultural research, as reflected through the buildings and the landscape and plantings. (Criterion 3.1)

11.4 SOCIAL VALUE
Avondale Research Station is valued for its role in agricultural research and education, born out by the local community's financial contribution to the establishment of the Laboratory in 1930 and the contribution of farm machinery for the Discovery Farm museum in the late 1970s. (Criterion 4.1)
Avondale Research Station provides an interpretive experience for visitors, demonstrating a rural way of life underpinned by the Avon Ascent Landcare Drive tours and the operation of the Discovery Farm education facility. (Criterion 4.1)

Avondale Research Station contributes to the local and wider community's sense of place for its links to the early European settlement of the Avon Valley and for its ongoing contribution to agricultural research and education in the State. (Criterion 4.2)

12. DEGREE OF SIGNIFICANCE

12.1 RARITY

Constructed in the 1890s, the Stables are believed to be a rare example of their type in the State with horse stalls containing self-filling fodder bins. (Criterion 5.1)

12.2 REPRESENTATIVENESS

Avondale Research Station is representative of government initiative in the early twentieth century in establishing state farms and agricultural research stations as places of scientific study and education. (Criterion 6.1)

12.3 CONDITION

Avondale Research Station is generally in good condition. The corrugated iron roofs mostly appear to be in good condition, although there is some evidence of rust on the Stable roof. The brick walls of the Homestead are in fair to good condition with minimal evidence of fretting except for the stone buildup walls on the front of the east wing, which require some attention where the mortar has fretted in places. The Homestead has been restored and the interior is in good condition. The Stables are in good condition on the interior and exterior. The Silo appears to be structurally stable and in good condition. The former Laboratory is in well-maintained condition.

12.4 INTEGRITY

Avondale Research Station has a moderate to high degree of integrity. The place has continued to be used and developed as an agricultural research and training facility since its establishment as a State Farm in 1919.

12.5 AUTHENTICITY

The original structure, form and fabric of the buildings that comprise Avondale Research Station are mostly intact, however the restoration of the Homestead resulted in the loss of some original fabric including original timber verandah floors, and some floors in the west wing, and the installation of fitouts in the bathrooms and kitchen. No structural alterations are evident to any of the buildings, except the removal of a wall in the west wing (kitchen) of the Homestead and, although small changes have taken place, there is more than sufficient evidence to determine authentic detail and fabric of the buildings at all stages of their development. Avondale Research Station demonstrates a moderate to high degree of authenticity.
13. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The documentary evidence has been compiled by Irene Sauman, Historian. The physical evidence has been compiled by Laura Gray, Conservation Consultant.

13.1 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Avondale Research Station comprises a single storey brick and corrugated iron Homestead (1880s) constructed in the Victorian Georgian style, a vernacular single and double storey corrugated iron Stables (1890s), a concrete grain Silo (1927), and a single storey brick and iron field Laboratory (fmr) (1930). There are a number of other buildings on the site including: workshop (possibly the former barn), dwelling associated with the Laboratory (1931), weighbridge, three workers' dwellings (1928, 1938 & 1957), other various workers' dwellings dating from the 1960s, various steel framed and clad farm sheds, entrance structure and museum (1979) and toilet buildings. Originally developed as a pastoral property from the 1840s, Avondale was purchased by the Government in 1910 for subdivision into farms. The Homestead block became a State Farm in 1919. All State Farms were renamed Research Stations in 1936. The Homestead and Stables were restored and a machinery museum established as part of a bicentennial project, completed in 1979. The restored buildings and the museum are currently leased by the Shire of Beverley and Alcoa Australia Limited as Avondale Discovery Farm education facility, while Avondale Research Station continues to operate as an agricultural research facility.

The Avon Valley district was settled early following the discovery of good pastoral lands in 1830, by a party led by Ensign Robert Dale of the 63rd Regiment. Dale made three expeditions to the region between 1830 and 1831. On his third journey, he was instructed by Governor Stirling to examine the country within fifty miles north and south of Mount Bakewell. During this expedition, the party discovered a tributary of the Avon River, which was later named the Dale River. In 1836, Stirling took up a 4,000-acre (1,620 ha) grant, Avon Location 14, in the vee of the river junction. The adjoining Avon Location K, of 3,000 acres (1,215 ha), was granted to Captain Mark John Currie, the first Harbour Master of the colony.

In September 1838, Nicholas Carey purchased Location K for £330, raising a mortgage for the full amount with Mark Currie. The mortgage was registered as paid on 19 October 1842. In December 1838, Carey leased Location 14 from Governor Stirling, subsequently purchasing the land for £750 in January 1846, at the end of the lease period. In June 1839, he purchased the 3,000-acre (1,215 ha) Avon Location m from George Leake, and later added Locations 52 and 53 to the landholding. These locations were adjoining and formed a property of some 13,330 acres (5,400 ha).

2 Land Grant No. 121, Avon Location K; Land Grant No. 396, Avon Location 14.
3 Deeds of Memorial, Book 1 no. 634, 13 September 1838 & no.635, 14 September 1838; Book 2 no. 395, 19 October 1842.
4 Deeds of Memorial, Book 1 no. 682, 11 December 1838 & Book 4 no. 143, 10 December 1847.
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which Carey named Avondale, for its position in the V of the junction of the Avon and Dale rivers.\(^5\)

Nicholas Carey was from Frogmore, on the island of Guernsey. He had arrived in the Swan River Colony in 1830-1831 and was living at York by 1835. He was appointed a Justice of the Peace in 1837.\(^6\) Carey visited Britain between 1841 and 1843 and, in 1844, he leased Avondale to James Bartram and George Kersley for four years, for an annual rental of £35 and improvements. The improvements included a 'good and substantial dwelling house with a stone foundation and rammed earth walls' to the value of £100 sterling, a barn worth £50 and 50 acres (20 ha) of land cleared.\(^7\) The southwest portion of Location 14 was the site of soldiers barracks, a mud brick structure built in the 1830s and most likely used by the lessees of Avondale. In 1849, Carey returned to Britain after appointing Charles Wittenoom as his agent in the Colony. A letter written in December 1849, just before he left, mentions stables, as well as the barn, both of which were still under construction. In 1852, Bartram and Kersley renewed their lease of Avondale for another five years.\(^8\) The buildings they constructed were most likely those marked on a 1910 survey map of the property and situated some distance northwest of the current Homestead.\(^9\)

Other pastoral lands were taken up in the Beverley district in the 1840s and 1850s, and the town of Beverley was surveyed in 1868, on the Perth-Albany Road on land adjoining Avondale.\(^10\) In 1871, Nicholas Carey appointed James William Broun as his attorney and agent, and Broun arranged a ten-year lease of Avondale to William Smith, at a yearly rental of £100.\(^11\) The following year, Nicholas Carey surrendered a half-acre (2,023 sqm) site on Avondale for a school. The site was designated Reserve 8017 and was adjacent to the house and farm buildings believed to have been constructed by Bartram and Kersley.\(^12\) Smith was also required to make improvements on Avondale, including the construction of a new house. In March 1884, Nicholas Carey wrote to James Broun, commenting that:

It is very satisfactory to know that Mr Smith has nearly finished the house and that you considered he had done as much as could be expected of him under the disadvantages of dear labour and material.\(^13\)

\(^{5}\) Deeds of Memorial, Book I no. 779 & no. 780, 26 June 1839; Deed of Memorial, Book II no.1038, 17 February 1894, a memorial of Nicholas Carey's will and the land which comprised Avondale.

\(^{6}\) Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, p. 12; Erickson, Rica, Bicentennial Dictionary of Western Australians, Perth, UWA Press, 1988, p. 469.

\(^{7}\) Broun family papers, 1844-1884, MN 1572, ACC 4957A, Battye Private archives, item 8, Indenture of lease, 15 August 1844.

\(^{8}\) Broun family papers, op cit, letter of instructions to Charles Wittenoom, 6 January 1849, item 2, copy of rent accounts for 1847 & 1848; item 9, Lease of Avondale, 18 August 1852; Thomas, A.T., The History of Beverley 1946, A.T. Thomas, Perth, [1946], pp. 36 & 74.


\(^{11}\) Broun family papers, op cit, Items 11 & 12, Lease and power of attorney, 24 March 1871.

\(^{12}\) Deed of Memorial Book 7 no. 751, 9 April 1872; DOLA Reserves Index Enquiry, Reserve 8017; survey map of estate by surveyor John Hall, 1910, op cit. The school reserve was cancelled in 1910 when the Government purchased the property.

\(^{13}\) Broun family papers, op cit, item 7, letter from Nicholas Carey to James Broun, 4 March 1884.
This would be the house currently standing and referred to as the Homestead.

In the 1880s, Western Australia was not producing enough wheat for local consumption and had to import flour from the eastern states. To encourage agriculture and closer land settlement, the Government arranged the construction of the Great Southern railway line linking Perth with Albany. The line, which was opened to Beverley in 1886, passed through part of the Avondale property, where a railway siding was established. 14

On 1 March 1889, Nicholas Carey died. He left Avondale to his sixteen-year-old grandnephew, William Herbert Delisle, son of the Reverend Hurzel Carey deLisle, of Guernsey. Avondale at that time was still largely a pastoral station, mostly unfenced and uncleared.15

Between 1889 and 1894, the Government surveyed 'agricultural areas' in at least forty localities throughout the south and central regions of the State, as part of its activities to encourage settlement and wheat production. The Homestead Act 1893, The Agricultural Bank Act 1894, The Agricultural Lands Purchase Act 1896, and the establishment of the Bureau of Agriculture (later Department of Agriculture) were all instigated for the same purpose.16 One of the Bureau's first resolutions involved a request to Government to finance the establishment of agricultural colleges and experimental farms. The first Experimental Farm was established in 1895, at Hamel, near Waroona, and three farms had been established by 1904.17 The Experimental Farms were initially required to train students and migrants, and to show that it was possible to make farming pay in the locality.18

It was during this period of Government investment in agriculture that William Herbert Delisle arrived in Western Australia to take control of Avondale. Title to Avondale was transferred to him on 17 February 1894. Delisle subdivided half the property into smaller farm lots, most of which were sold by July 1896. Among the new owners were Samuel Adamson, who established a farm known as Drumcleyer on part of Location K and Hubert Moncrieff Fisher, who established The Barracks on part of Locations 14, 52 and 53, named for the ruins of the soldiers barracks on the property.19 Delisle developed the remaining 6,186 acres (2,504 ha) of Avondale. By 1901, he had cleared 800 acres for cultivation, and was

15 Deeds of Memorial, Book 11 no.1038 & 1039, 17 February 1894.
18 'Students for Experimental Farms', Department of Agriculture Journal, September 1903, pp. 238-239; Shea, Greg & French, Dr Bob, Background historical information for the assessment of the heritage significance of buildings on Merredin Research Station', Dryland Research Institute, Merredin, 16 December 1998, Kelsall Binet Architects & Bizzaca and Assoc., op cit, Appendix I, p. 5.
19 Deed of Memorial, 17 February 1894; Certificate of Title Vol. 59 Fol. 193, 16 July 1894.
running 2,000 sheep and 200 pigs. The Stables are believed to have been built by deLisle. The timber-framed iron-clad structure is reputed to be of Yorkshire design, comprising twenty stalls, ten along each side. The building was designed to allow hay or other fodder stored above in the loft to gravitate down into the feed bins of each stall. The Stables are identified on a 1910 detailed site plan of the property.

William deLisle did not reside at Avondale but generally lived in Beverley with his sister, Ethel Elizabeth deLisle, who appears to have accompanied him to Western Australia. Ethel deLisle married Dr Frederick House in 1902. William DeLisle also spent some time in Perth and Britain. He was known locally as 'The Toff' and had the first motor vehicle in the district. He was a committee member of the Beverley Race Club, member of the Roads Board, a JP, and acted as judge at several district agricultural shows. In 1904, deLisle sold Avondale and purchased a flourmill. DeLisle died five years later, aged 36, in York hospital. In 1914, his sister had a tower erected on the Beverley Anglican Church in his memory but it had to be removed in 1926 as it was destabilising the church structure.

Avondale was purchased by brothers Charles John Hunt Butcher and William James Butcher. They had arrived in the State in 1876 in the company of their father, after forming the Murchison River Squatting Company with several other Victorian investors. The Company held various North-West stations, including Boolathana near Carnarvon, and property near Guildford. William Butcher served as MLA for Gascoyne, 1901-1911 and Roebourne 1915-1917. By the time the brothers purchased Avondale, the Murchison River Squatting Company had been dissolved. The Butchers enlarged the Avondale landholding to 9,635 acres (3,900 ha) with the repurchase of some of the original Avondale lands which William deLisle had sold, including Drumcleyer and The Barracks, and the addition of other land.

In 1908, the Butcher brothers offered Avondale to the Government for £5-10-0 per acre. A counter offer of £5-5-0 per acre was accepted in March 1910. Avondale was purchased for £51,494-12-6, under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act. The property was mostly cleared and well fenced by 1910, and was considered 'suitable for immediate settlement'. As well as the Avondale Homestead, barn, stables, well and windmill, there were the homesteads and farm buildings that made up the former farms of Drumcleyer and The Barracks, which added to the value of the place for subdivision purposes. The buildings constructed by Bartram and Kersley in the 1840s are marked on the survey plan for the property but are not mentioned in correspondence, so are assumed as being in poor condition.

---

21 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, pp. 14-15. This plan was not copied due to its condition, but the stables are also shown on the 1919 sketch plan of Avondale State Farm in DOLA correspondence file, Avondale Estate, op cit, Vol. 3.
22 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, p. 15; Twentieth Century Impressions of Western Australia, op cit, p. 530; Erickson, Rica, op cit, p. 808. There is an entry for Ethel deLisle (later wife of Dr F. M. House) but not for William Herbert.
23 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, p. 16; Erickson, Rica, op cit, p. 420.
24 Certificates of Title Vol. 80 Fol. 197, 15 November 1904, Vol. 321 Fol. 60 & Vol. 477 Fol. 53, 8 December 1910. Location 913 and part of Location 848 were added to Avondale by the Butchers.
by this time. The Avondale Estate subdivision survey was carried out by Lands Department Surveyor John Alexander Hall. The property was subdivided into nine farms of varying acreage and a number of smaller blocks of 5 to 20 acres each along the railway line. The Avondale Homestead and farm buildings were situated on Lot 3, of 1,787 acres (723 ha).25

Avondale was under the control of the Lands Department, whose Minister, James Mitchell was also Minister for Agriculture. Throughout his political career, which included two terms as Premier in 1919-1924 and 1930-1933, Mitchell pursued policies of agricultural land settlement and migration, and was instrumental in establishing the Soldier Settlement and Group Settlement schemes.26

The Avondale Estate was gazetted open for selection on 21 December 1910.27 A handsome profit of some £10,000 was expected from the sale of the farms and during the sale period, the Government managed the farming operations. George Stanley (Stan) Makin was appointed resident manager, and operations were overseen by John Robinson, who was manager of the Nangeenan State Farm (later Merredin Research Station). Four of the nine farms on the Avondale Estate were taken up in 1911. Brothers George and Richard John Hancock (father and uncle of the late Lang Hancock) took up Lots 1 and 2, Sir Newton Moore purchased Lot 4 and G. W. Isbister selected Lot 13. The remaining land was used to agist sheep from dry districts, and privately owned horses and cattle were grazed on the Estate. Some 1,110 acres were under fallow.28

Late in 1911, when no further selections had been made, John Robinson suggested that four of the remaining five farm lots be reserved for an agricultural college, with Drumcleyer remaining available for selection. In 1914, Drumcleyer was still unselected, and the severe drought of that year resulted in the Hancock brothers and George Isbister relinquishing their farms, leaving the 780-acre (316 ha) farm of Sir Newton Moore as the only part of Avondale in private ownership. The conditional purchase price had proved too high for farmers with limited capital, and the advent of World War One meant that further settlement was unlikely in the immediate future.29

The Government had established another three experimental farms by 1914 and, under the control of the Agriculture Department, systematic experiments and investigations into farming in Western Australian conditions were being undertaken.30

30 Keisall Binet Architects & Bizzaca and Assoc., op cit, Summary of findings, pp. 5-6 & Appendix 1, p. 7.
By 1916, consideration was being given to settling returned soldiers on the land and the Avondale Estate was considered suitable to subdivide into twenty smaller soldier settlement farms. The reduced land prices considered appropriate for returned soldiers, however, meant that the Government would sustain a loss of some £29,653 on the Avondale Estate. The Minister for Lands felt that the loss was too large to be justified and, in July 1918 after some debate, the Government approved the surveying of six blocks for returned soldiers from the Beverley district, with the Avondale Homestead block being retained as a training farm, known as Avondale State Farm. The soldier settlers who took up the farms were James Isaac Mann (Lot 1, The Barracks); Milton Lucas (Lot 2, Avon); Arthur Edward Sewell (Lot 7, Drumclyer); John Taylor (Lot 13, Fair View Hill, later known as Annandale) and Hubert David Smith (Lots 15 and 16, Chocolate Hills). Lots 3 and 16, comprising 1,742 acres (705ha), made up Avondale State Farm.

Returned soldier trainee farmers were resident at Avondale State Farm from 1919 to, possibly, 1921. Stan Makin continued as farm manager and his wife provided meals for the trainees. Between 1919 and 1924, various propositions were put forward for the future use of Avondale State Farm. Among the suggestions for the place were: a training farm run by the Ugly Men's Society, a State Farm for the production of pure cereal seed; a training farm for former British officers; an agricultural college; and subdivision into more soldier settler farms or small dairy farms. Avondale, unlike most other State Farms, had not been established with a particular research purpose in mind, having been acquired by the government by default.

On 4 April 1924, Avondale was transferred to the Agriculture Department and placed under the control of the Superintendent of Wheat Farms for the production of pure seed wheat and oats. The Agriculture Department Annual Report for 1924 lists the place as Avondale Seed Farm. For the first few years, however, the Farm was used as a holding ground for dairy cattle for dispatch to the Group Settlements in the south-west, and was largely concerned with growing cattle feed. Research work eventually commenced at Avondale in 1926 and involved experiments with wheat concerning seeding rates and the use of superphosphate. A cottage for a married farm labourer was added in 1928, constructed by G. J. Fairbanks for £549-17-0. The Silo, with a capacity of 100 tons, was constructed in 1927, originally for the storage of cattle feed. It was built by Silos Ltd of Perth for £310, with an alternative tender that allowed for 4-inch (10 cm) thick walls, while the standard plan appears to call for 6-inch thick walls (15 cm).

---

33 Department of Agriculture, Annual Report, 1924, p. 3. This is the only occurrence in the Annual Reports of the place being called Avondale Seed Farm. It continued to be referred to as Avondale State Farm.
34 Department of Agriculture, Annual Report, 1925, p. 29.
Following construction of the Silo, a demonstration in silage making was given at the first Avondale Field Day, held in 1928.36 Other State farms were established in the 1920s at Wongan Hills (1923), Salmon Gums (1926), Yilgarn (1926) and Damperwah (1926). The 1920s was a period of increased land settlement and agricultural growth as a result of Government promoted migration and the establishment of Group settlements and Soldier settlements.37

In 1930, Avondale became the venue for investigations into the braxy-like disease in sheep, also known as infectious enterotoxaemia, or pulpy kidney. The disease originated in the Beverley-York district in 1915 and spread throughout much of the agricultural area. It caused death in sheep within hours of onset, with flock losses of five percent and occasionally as high as thirty per cent. A field Laboratory and quarters were constructed at Avondale to house the research and the research scientists. The Laboratory cost £847, of which the Beverley community contributed £200 and the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (later CSIRO) provided £500 for equipment, making the Avondale Laboratory one of the best equipped in the State. The quarters cost £197. Both were constructed by G. J. Fairbanks.38 Dr Harold William Bennetts, the first veterinary pathologist appointed to the Department of Agriculture, was in charge of the research on braxy-like disease at Avondale. He identified the cause of the disease and developed a vaccine. Bennetts was awarded a Doctorate in Veterinary Science from the University of Melbourne for this work, which has been described as 'the most important achievement' of Avondale's history in agricultural research.39

Other experiments in sheep husbandry were conducted at Avondale in the 1930s, including breeding lambs for export, botulism in sheep and the effect of sulphur on wool growth. Dr Eric John Underwood, first chair of the School of Agriculture at the University of Western Australia and Dr Bennetts both worked on projects at Avondale, staying at the quarters when necessary, while also working on projects in other parts of the State. During the 1930s, the production of pedigree seed was an important function of Avondale State Farm. Pedigree seed was purchased in small quantities by farmers, and sown and harvested to provide enough seed for the following season's crop. This method allowed farmers to take advantage of the new improved wheat varieties as they were developed.40

Between four and six men were employed at Avondale under the farm manager. Two of the men were teamsters who handled the Clydesdale horse teams, and the rest were general farm labourers. Henry John (Jack) Bailey was farm manager from 1925 to 1940, the longest serving manager

---

36 PWD Plan 2520/4, 'Reinforced Concrete Silo'. May 1927; Western Australian Government Gazette, 1 July 1927, p. 1616; Department of Agriculture, Annual Report, 1928, p. 5. The Thematic History states that the Silo was constructed by community efforts during a field day, but this is incorrect and appears to be a misreading of the reference to the place in the 1928 Annual Report.
37 Keith Binet Architects & Bizzaca and Assoc., op cit, Summary of Findings, p. 6.
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in the history of the place. In December 1936, the State farms were renamed Research Stations, and Avondale became Avondale Research Station. At that time, accommodation included the Homestead, which was occupied by the farm manager and his family, singlemen's quarters and one cottage for a married farmhand (1928 cottage).

An inspection of the buildings in the mid 1930s, by Public Works Department District architect Gordon Clifton, revealed that the Homestead (referred to as the Administrative Block and the Kitchen Block) were 'very old and generally in a bad state of repair'. A programme of works was undertaken, which included replastering, pointing up brickwork and stone foundations, repairing plaster and brickwork around window and door frames, the replacement with concrete of a section of timber floor on the west side verandah of the Kitchen Block, and the installation of false partitions to the inside of two external walls in each of four bedrooms to combat problems of severe rising damp. The barn was repaired following storm damage in the early 1930s.

The shortage of quarters for married workers was a concern, as it was considered that married men were more contented and therefore took more interest in their work. As a matter of urgency, a second cottage was built at Avondale Research Station. A contract for the construction was let to G. J. Fairbanks, for £639. In the 1940s, variety trials on wheat and oats and studies in the nutritional value of hay and pastures were undertaken. During World War Two, trials on flax production were established when the import of flax fibre was restricted.

The post-World War Two period was another boom period for agriculture, with increased land settlement, high production and returns, and the development of new farming technologies and machinery. Avondale Research Station was one of a number of sites where ongoing research into clover disease was carried out in the 1940s and 1950s. In 1948-1949, renovations and repairs were carried out on the existing cottages and the Homestead, the work being undertaken by E. B. Simmons of Beverley. In early 1951, the Clydesdales were replaced with a Chamberlain tractor and Bedford truck. Only two horses were accommodated in the Stables. A new machinery shed was constructed about this time, but it could not house all the new farm machinery that was being acquired, so the use of the Stables as a garage and shearing shed was considered.

---

44 Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, report by Gordon Clifton, 18 November 1935.
45 Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, report by Gordon Clifton, 18 November 1935 & correspondence 18 June 1932.
46 Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, 1937.
47 Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, November 1937-May 1939; Western Australian Government Gazette, 4 March 1938, p. 317.
50 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, pp. 38-40; Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, 26 June 1951, December 1952.
converted for use as a machinery workshop at some time and this may have occurred in the 1950s.51

The Department of Agriculture had 18 research stations under its authority in 1957. That year, a house was built at Avondale Research Station for the accommodation of researcher Robin Goulder, who conducted plant-breeding work there for twelve years. This was most likely the State Housing Commission house, style 16C, which was planned for construction in the mid-1950s.52 Another long serving farm manager, Peter Shervington, was appointed in 1969 and remained for twelve years. Plant breeding at Avondale Research Station was discontinued in the early 1970s, and research into the improvement of carcass quality of crossbred sheep, a study of twin births in cattle and genetic improvement of cashmere fibre in feral goats was undertaken.53

In December 1976, the Avondale Project was initiated as part of the State's 150th year celebrations of European settlement. The Project entailed the restoration of the Homestead and Stables, reconstruction of a blacksmith shop and a horse works, the establishment of a museum of early farm machinery, a cultivar garden of plants dating from the 19th century, a livestock display that included a number of Clydesdales, and construction of an entrance structure for Avondale Research Station. The Homestead was furnished 'in 1900 style' by the Women's Committee of the 150th Year Celebrations.54 Horse works was the term applied to the mechanism of cogs and gears which was central to the use of horse power in operating machinery, most commonly a mill for grinding grain.55 The Avondale Project was opened on 16 March 1979 by HRH Prince Charles.56

Avondale Research Station continued its research function in the 1980s and 1990s, undertaking herbicide trials and research on minimum tillage practices. In 1982, Avondale Research Station was vested in the Minister for Agriculture as Reserve 37765. In 1990, the purpose of the Reserve was altered to Agricultural research station and historical facilities to reflect the fact that the restored buildings and machinery museum were then leased jointly to the Shire of Beverley and Alico Australia Limited, for the operation of a commercially run farming education and awareness program for the public. The program operates under the name of Avondale Discovery Farm.57 As part of the education program, the Avon Ascent Landcare Drive was developed to take visitors on tours around the operating research station.58 In 1996, it was announced that research stations were to be known as research support units, and in April 2000, the number of research support units still operating numbered sixteen.59

52 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, pp. 38-40; Department of Agriculture File, Avondale Research Station buildings, Item 574, op cit, 1955; Kelsall Binet Architects & Bizzaca and Assoc., op cit, Appendix A, p. 23 & Avondale data sheet, house 17 or 20. No PWD tender has been located for this building, indicating it was possibly built by the SHC.
53 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, p. 43.
57 Jones, Henry & Johnston, David, op cit, p. 48; DOLA Reserve Enquiry, Reserve 37765.
59 Kelsall Binet Architects & Bizzaca and Assoc., op cit, Appendix A, p. 32.
During the 1979 restoration of the Homestead, evidence was uncovered that the place had been rebuilt following a fire in earlier times, and that some use had been made of bush timbers. Given the different brickwork pattern for the side wings of the main building, which house the bedrooms, it is reasonable to assume they are of different time periods, and may be a reconstruction in brick of previous timber enclosures under the verandah roof. The 1901 photograph of the Homestead shows the wings in brick at this time.60

In 2002, the Homestead and Stables operate as historical examples of an early farm residence and stable, complete with a group of Clydesdale horses. The former Laboratory is used as an office and the Silo is unused. Avondale Research Station continues to operate as a fully functioning agricultural research facility, committed to developing sustainable farming methods, with Discovery Farm providing an ongoing educational function.

13.2 PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

Avondale Research Station comprises a single storey brick and corrugated iron Homestead, in the Victorian Georgian style, a vernacular single and double storey corrugated iron Stables, a concrete grain Silo, and a single storey brick, an iron Laboratory (former), and 1928 and 1957 workers' dwellings. Other buildings on the site include a workshop, dwelling associated with the Laboratory, weighbridge, and 1979 entry statement, dwellings from c.1960s onwards scattered around the site, other steel framed and clad farm sheds in the vicinity of the Stables and workshops, the museum and toilet buildings.

Avondale Research Station is located on Waterhatch Road, six kilometres west of the town of Beverley. Avondale Research Station is setback from the road, in a typical rural wheatbelt landscape of cropped paddocks and farm buildings. The buildings are located approximately 500 metres from the road, on the north side, with only the 1979 set of three timber post and beam arches that form the entry statement visible from the road. The driveway leads through the entry arches to the steel framed and clad Museum and information centre on the right. At that point, on the left (west) is a parkland area with ablutions facilities, on the right, north of the Museum, is an animal nursery. The bitumen road sweeps around to the left with two tracks off to the right (northeast and north), within 20 metres of each other. The northeast track leads to the front of the Homestead several hundred metres away, the north track traverses the Silo, machinery sheds, Stables and arrives at the current entry into the Homestead, at the south west corner. The bitumen road turns to the west, with a row of mature gums forming an avenue, and the former Laboratory building on the right (north), with the weighbridge behind. Approximately 50 metres further west of the former Laboratory is a timber framed dwelling. The bitumen road soon becomes a well-graded gravel road that traverses the entire research station with a number of vantage points with signage and interpretation informing of the history and current activities of the place. The outlook is undulating hills and valleys of crop, stock and pasture land as well as re-vegetated areas.
Located on a rise to the west, the Homestead frontage overlooks the undulating pasturelands to the east. There are gravel tracks to three sides of the Homestead. The track up the north side intersects with another track to the north on which the 1928 and 1957 workers' cottages are located in close proximity to each other, each in a fenced yard. The east track is across the bottom of the 'front' yard of the Homestead, and continues south west back to the Museum and information office, but it also intersects with another track up the south side of the Homestead, to where the current visitor entry to the Homestead is located. On the south side of the track is a group of farm buildings including the workshop and Stables, the Silo further south and then the intersection where the former Laboratory is located.

Homestead

The Homestead site is delineated by a bush timber post and rail fence that has been constructed in recent years around a defined yard. The 'front' yard on the east side slopes down from the Homestead to the road. It is laid out in a symmetrical manner with a central path leading from the gateway (on the east track) direct to a flight of steps up to the front verandah and main entry. The path is lined with overgrown wormwood on both sides, behind which are orchard plantings. The central path intersects with a gravel path parallel with, and across the front of the Homestead. There are two mature Cape Lilac trees each side of the central path close to the Homestead, obscuring views of the building. The south side garden is laid out in a formal manner with pairs of pencil pines straddling entry paths and a mature palm tree evident. There are no other obvious mature plantings in the area, which is otherwise graveled. There is a paved courtyard space with a covered connection between the two wings of the Homestead and an operational corrugated iron water tank on the southwest corner of the east wing.

The Homestead, a single storey brick and iron two-winged dwelling, displays characteristics of the Victorian Georgian style. Typical of the style is the freestanding rural setting, simple rectangular form, face masonry construction, symmetrical façade, corrugated iron roofs, and colonnade verandah.

The Homestead comprises rectangles buildings with a connecting covered way central between the wings in the central courtyard. Each wing is one room wide with perimeter verandahs. The main entry is central on the east side of the east wing, at the top of a flight of stairs onto the elevated verandah. The entry opens into a central corridor with a room each side and the door ahead opens into the central courtyard space. There is a verandah along the front (east) and rear and enclosed verandahs along the north and south ends of the building, with two rooms each end, each accessed from the respective verandahs. The west wing comprises two interconnected rooms at the south end and two small rooms nearer the north end, both accessed from the courtyard, as is the central room (kitchen) although the southern most room (dining) is accessed from the west side. There is a nib wall, double access and two sets of windows in the kitchen, indicating that it may have been two separate rooms at one time. The north end is the open-ended laundry under the verandah roof.
The Homestead is a brick construction. The main building of the east wing is laid in English Colonial bond, alternating courses of stretcher and header bond. The north and south verandah constructions on the east wing, the west wing building and garden wall are all constructed in English bond (three courses of stretcher bond alternating with one course of headers). The front buildup is a random mortared laterite stone wall. The roofs are hipped, with vented gablets on the east wing, and the verandahs are under the main roof at break pitch. The roofs are clad with corrugated iron. The gutters are ogee profile, but most of the downpipes are PVC connections to the water tank. The chimneys are square in form, face brick with corbelled detail. The verandah across the east frontage of the east wing has vertical timber balusters and a reconstructed timber floor. All the other open verandah floors are concrete. The verandah posts are 0.125 metre milled timber stop chamfered square posts. The posts around the west wing are set into concrete blocks at the base. The window heads on the two windows flanking the front door are detailed in a herringbone brick pattern, but elsewhere on the east and west wing the windows are detailed with a two course header. All the windows have rendered sills. Windows are sets of two casements with two and three panes of glass per sash. The bathroom and toilet windows on the west wall of the west wing have amber glass. The doors are four panelled throughout. The doors at each end of the east wing entry corridor have decorative patterned glass fanlights with the pattern side ways. The door and window hardware is mostly original.

The interior of the Homestead has been restored in recent years. The hard plaster walls remain intact throughout with the original moulded timber skirtings and architraves. There is a hat rack on the wall inside the front door. The floors in the east and west wings are 0.135 metre floorboards and the boards are 0.150 metres wide in the dining room. The timber floors been sealed with a high gloss finish. The remaining floors in the west wing are concrete with vinyl sheet covering the kitchen and ceramic tiles in the bathroom and toilet. The ceilings in the two main rooms and corridor of the east wing are pressed metal all of the same design, with ceiling roses. The north and south verandah rooms have raked ceilings in patterned pressed metal sheeting in a pattern different from the main ceilings. The west wing dining room, kitchen, toilet, and bathroom all have the original ripple iron ceilings. The bathroom and toilet have tiled floors and splashback tiles on the walls. The kitchen stove has splash tiling at the back and around the side of the fireplace opening. Fireplaces and varnished timber mantelpieces are in place in both main rooms in the east wing, and truncated across the southeast corner of the dining room in the west wing. There is a c.1900 built-in wardrobe in the main bedroom of west wing. The kitchen has a recent stove installation, and the bathroom and toilets have fitouts post 1990s. There is a brick 'copper' and c.1950s concrete troughs in the laundry.

Stables

The Stables are a double storey timber framed corrugated iron clad structure with single storey skillions along each side. It is rectangular in plan with symmetrical frontages at the north and south ends. It comprises 10 stalls along each side, within the skillions, at ground level, with an open space through the centre length (north - south) and a single space above.
The exterior walls are clad with vertical sheets of corrugated iron, with a horizontal band of alternating sets of horizontal timber louvres and fixed wire glass windows in a panel along each side on the skillion walls, with corrugated iron on the setback upper walls. The roof is clad with corrugated iron. There are two sets of two steel-framed roof light panels on each side of the double storey gable roof. The structure is bush timber with random dry stone build-up on the east side where the ground level falls away. Concrete spoon drains have been constructed along the east and west sides, and the east side shows evidence of original timber drain outlets from the stalls to the external urine drainage, with more recent metal straps in place. Central on the north and south ends are sets of two timber doors on steel sliding frames. Above the doors is a cantilevered platform, with an open tread staircase access on the north end, providing entry to the upstairs storage area via a door central on that north wall. There is a gantry protruding from the apex of the gable at each end. The ground floor is earthen floored and the upstairs floor is of 0.150 metre wide timber boards across the width of the space. The stalls facing into the centre space are lined with horizontal tongue and groove jarrah boards. Milled timber spaced railings and posts form the divisions between the stalls. The stall gates are vertical boards on a frame. Each stall has a timber boarded fodder bin truncated across the corner next to the gate. The bin receives fodder gravity fed through a chute from the grain store above on the first floor. There is a small angled timber detail on the outside of each stall that is part of the chute system. The upper floor was inaccessible at the time of inspection.

At the south end of the Stables is a reconstructed horse works of no heritage significance. Similarly, in the farm shed to the east of the Stables, at the south end, there is a reconstructed blacksmith shop, of no heritage significance.

Silo

The grain Silo is a formed concrete structure. Circular in plan, it is a vertical element capped with a faceted-hipped roof clad with painted corrugated iron. There is a wind vane on the apex of the roof and a miniature dormer in the roof with a timber hatch opening replicating the vertical series of six openings up the Silo, that are aligned with the dormer. There is also a gantry protruding from the dormer.

Laboratory (fmr)

The former Laboratory is a single storey brick rendered and corrugated iron building of no particular style. The building is rectangular in form with a balanced but asymmetrical frontage featuring a symmetrical porch on the east end. The main roof and porch roof are hipped. The building is brick rendered and the porch has a solid rendered dado wall and stair balustrade with pairs of painted square timber posts above. The porch is in an elevated position due to the slope of the land, and is accessed by a set of concrete steps central within the porch. The double entry doors are aligned with the stairs. The windows throughout are timber framed double hung.
sashes in varying configurations of sets of two and three on the front façade, and single windows elsewhere. The interior was inaccessible at the time of inspection.

13.3 COMPARATIVE INFORMATION

Homestead and Stables

The Homestead is a good example of a simple 1880s farmhouse and associated kitchen building and is in good condition due to restoration work in the late 1970s and its current use as a museum example of its original function. There are a number of farm homesteads of the period located throughout the State. The Avondale Homestead is a relatively intact example of its type. Because it was owned by the Government and used as employee accommodation it has undergone none of the additions and alterations that would be generally expected of a privately owned family farmhouse. Avondale had only minimal farm buildings constructed, most likely because the place was leased out between the 1840s and 1890s, unlike many owner-operated properties that developed a village-like complex of buildings. The Stables, which date from the 1890s, mark the period of development under a new owner.61

Other large stable buildings are located at Glengarry where the stone stable is a rare two-storey building with lunging room, which housed horses bred for the British Army remount trade in India. It also has interesting architectural timber detail in the two-storey conical roof structure of the lunging room, which has been restored. Glengarry Station Complex is entered on the State Register.

Berkshire Valley Station has a two-storey Stable (c.1855) that includes a harness room, blacksmithy, coach house and stalls and was a staging post for coaches. A similar brick stable building to that at Berkshire Valley is located behind the Colonial Inn at Northam and dates from c. 1910. The Swan Brewery stables, which housed 24 Clydesdale horses up to the late 1940s, were destroyed by fire in the 1980s. The Avondale Stables appear to be unique in the State for their feeding arrangement.62

The Public Works Department developed a range of standard plans for barns, stables, machinery sheds and silos and timber-framed houses in the 1920s. The Silo at Avondale was built to a standard plan and examples remain at other research stations, including Wongan Hills, Salmon Gums and Meerdin. The former Laboratory is believed to be unique as a research laboratory purpose built at an agricultural research station in the first half of the twentieth century. Laboratories of individual design have been constructed at Medina, Geraldton, Vasse and Katanning Research Stations in later years.63
Agricultural Research Stations

The Thematic History and Preliminary Heritage Assessment of Agricultural Research Stations has listed both Avondale Research Station and Merredin Research Station as having considerable significance. Merredin, established as Nangeenan State Farm in 1904, is the earliest remaining Research Station and has significance for development of hybrid cereal grains. The Manager's House (1904) is entered on the State Register.

Research stations considered to have some significance are Wongan Hills (1923), Salmon Gums (1926), Gascoyne (1940), Kununurra (1945) and Esperance Downs (1951). Wongan Hills and Salmon Gums are the only surviving stations established during the Inter-War period and were involved with development of the wheatbelt. Gascoyne was associated with the establishment of tropical agriculture in the State and has buildings from the World War Two period. Kununurra was associated with the Ord River scheme and Esperance Downs with Post War development.

13.4 REFERENCES

13.5 FURTHER RESEARCH

The workshop (former barn), dwelling associated with the Laboratory, weighbridge, 1928 worker's dwelling, 1957 worker's dwelling, and 1979 entry statement may require further investigation as they are possibly of little heritage significance.

Possible archaeological interest of sites in the vicinity of the Homestead and further afield.

Investigate the possible significance of any plantings.