

architecture institutions and change

Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand Vol. 32

Edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan

Published in Sydney, Australia, by SAHANZ, 2015
ISBN: 978 0 646 94298 8

The bibliographic citation for this paper is:

Paine, Ashley. "Institutional Polychromy: The Striped Architecture of Don Watson and Spence Jamieson." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 32, Architecture, Institutions and Change*, edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan, 469-479. Sydney: SAHANZ, 2015.

All efforts have been undertaken to ensure that authors have secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may contact the editors.

Institutional Polychromy: The Striped Architecture of Don Watson and Spence Jamieson

For nearly three decades, Brisbane-based architects Donald Watson and William Spence Jamieson have employed striped polychrome masonry in their respective architectural practices. Indeed, the two ostensibly have much in common: both are of the same age; studied at the University of Queensland; and for many years they worked side-by-side – although never together – on a similar array of institutional buildings for the Queensland State Government. Some of their work even looks similar, due in no small part to the common use of horizontal stripes. However, through a closer examination of Watson and Jamieson's banded masonry, and through discussions with the architects themselves, quite different attitudes towards colour and surface are revealed. While Watson's stripes tend to engage with matters intrinsic to construction, annotating the building's surface with bands that mark its material and organisational discipline, Jamieson's seem to embrace extrinsic meaning, including historical and cultural references, and often appear to have an independent logic all of their own. What is also curious about their work is that it seems to repeat opposing nineteenth-century positions on polychromy, mirroring the debate between proponents of the High Victorian Movement. More precisely, Jamieson's stripes seem to reprise aspects of William Butterfield's work, and the influential arguments of John Ruskin, whilst Watson's banding appears to follow the ideas of G. E. Street, who advocated for a "constructional" school of polychromy in contradistinction to Ruskin's "incrusted" approach.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, it will document the use of striped polychrome masonry in the institutional architecture of Watson and Jamieson. Second, it will attempt to establish a critical understanding of their adoption of such distinct concepts of colour, more than a century and a half after they were first debated on the other side of the world.

The institutional architecture of Brisbane and its surrounding regions is frequently dismissed as a dull and colourless affair. Government and cultural buildings of the central business district and Southbank are particularly notable in this regard – the most dominant ones are large, blocky constructions from the 1970s and early 1980s. Most of them are concrete, textured and stained: heavy monochrome masses in brown or beige. The drab characterisation of the institutional architecture of the city and its surrounding regions is, however, not entirely deserved, and this paper is an attempt to begin to redress the presence of colour in Brisbane’s architecture. In particular, it looks at a group of less prominent but more colourful works produced over the past three decades by two local architects – Donald Watson and William Spence Jamieson (known simply as Spence Jamieson) – working under the auspices of Queensland’s Department of Public Works’ Project Services. This was the body responsible for the design and documentation of many of Queensland’s institutional projects until funding cuts and reforms by the LNP Government led to its demise between 2012 and 2013.

What is interesting about these architects is that both have made extensive use of horizontally banded polychrome masonry to articulate the surfaces of their buildings – a technique with a long tradition in Western architecture. For Watson and Jamieson, the use of the coloured stripes is particularly salient in their institutional works, and appears characteristically in two-toned brick or concrete block. It is not surprising then, that the work of these two architects can appear quite similar. But Watson and Jamieson have more than just a predilection for stripes in common: both are highly regarded architects; are the same age; and share strikingly similar professional histories. In more detail, both Watson and Jamieson studied at the University of Queensland (UQ) in the 1960s, were employed by some of the same local firms in the early part of their careers (albeit at different times), and both spent the last two decades of their practice working for the Queensland Government on a similar range of projects, including TAFE (Technical and Further Education) colleges and other institutional works.¹

While Watson and Jamieson were not the only ones at Project Services designing banded masonry structures, theirs are certainly the most conspicuously and consistently striped. Watson says that this was largely coincidental, as design project teams worked independently of one another, and there was never any internal design discussion. Jamieson confirmed this, and simply suggests: “Perhaps there was, as they say, ‘something in the air.’”² Still, Watson and Jamieson were aware of each other’s work. For example, Watson’s subtly striped Gateway TAFE project was designed in response to Jamieson’s more decoratively banded design for Southbank TAFE.³ And, while Jamieson says it was not a conscious influence on his own TAFE project, he was aware of Watson’s much earlier striped Southpoint office building located nearby.⁴

These projects are discussed later in more detail, but what is significant is that Jamieson and Watson describe their use of stripes in very different ways. A detailed analysis of their

built projects seems to support these differing claims, revealing distinct approaches to colour, and seemingly opposing conceptions of the building surface. In Watson's work, the stripes, and their expression of horizontality, tends to annotate the building surface with the constructional logic and intrinsic organisational discipline of the building while, in Jamieson's designs, the bands of colour often exhibit greater independence from the constructional determinants of the building, and have an arguably more ambiguous relationship to its organisation. But what is also interesting is that these two different approaches appear to repeat the polarising positions held by nineteenth-century proponents of the High Victorian Movement on the use of colour (including striped colour) and its relation to structure.

A detailed examination of these concepts is beyond the scope of this paper, but in short, it was G. E. Street who categorised these two groups, dividing the work of his contemporaries into so-called "structural" and "incrusting" schools of polychromy.⁵ The former, which Street himself advocated, used colour as an integral part of the building fabric, and to explain, or make more explicit, the structural logic and internal organisation of a building. The "incrusting" school, by contrast, often applied colour with greater independence from the building structure. This idea was used to describe an approach characterised by the writings of John Ruskin, and manifest in built works by the likes of William Butterfield. About these two schools, Street wrote that: "It might almost be said that one mode [the incrusting mode] was devised with a view to the concealment, and the other [the structural school] with a view to the explanation, of the real mode of construction."⁶ Despite both Watson and Jamieson demonstrating a keen interest in the history of architecture, neither acknowledges any direct influence of these ideas on their work.

This paper therefore has dual functions. First, it documents the striped institutional architecture of these important Brisbane architects. Second, it attempts to locate their stripes within a broader architectural history, and to understand this body of work through its use of polychrome masonry. In particular, it explores nineteenth-century architectural debates on colour to establish key conceptual differences. Drawing heavily upon original interviews conducted with the architects, the paper also provides a timely re-appraisal of the architecture of Watson and Jamieson. Their work has been subject of almost no research to date,⁷ and some of their most significant designs have been demolished or substantially altered in recent years. It is therefore important to begin redressing these largely overlooked projects, starting with Watson below.

The striped architecture of Don Watson

Graduating from UQ in 1969, one of Watson's earliest jobs was in the renowned office of James Birrell & Partners (1967-9), where he worked while completing the final years of his studies. After graduation he went on to work for a number of other important Brisbane-based firms, including Hayes & Scott (in 1970) and Geoffrey Pie (1972-4). It was in the offices of the latter that Watson first experimented with banded colour. His first striped project was in 1972 for an office refurbishment over two floors of 333 Queen Street, Brisbane, where Watson designed painted bands of red and yellow to enliven the plasterboard fitout. In the

second half of the 1970s, Watson continued his experiments in banded colour through private commissions, including the interior supergraphics for Brisbane Airport's Temporary International Terminal in 1975, composed of stylised striped clouds in various shades of blue.

In 1979, Watson took on a teaching appointment at UQ, which he continued in a part-time capacity between 1981 and 1989. Watson's teaching pattern allowed him to spend considerable blocks of time dedicated to private commissions and research. His research activities included collecting and exhibiting architectural drawings at the university, as well as biographical investigation into the architects of Queensland with Judith McKay.⁸ Although he did not register as an architect until 1990, his private works from this time include the Southpoint building at Southbank, Brisbane (undertaken within the office of Frank Spork & Associates, 1981-2) (Figure 1), and the Campbell residence in Graceville, Brisbane, 1984-6.⁹ These are both key projects in Watson's career, but for this research, are also formative examples of his use of banded polychrome masonry.



Fig. 1 Southpoint Office Building, Brisbane, 1981-82, Donald Watson (undertaken within the office of Frank Spork & Associates). Image: Google Maps, c. 2010.

While not an institutional project, the recently demolished Southpoint building is particularly interesting for its demonstration of some of the recurrent themes of Watson's later work. Here, single height courses of orange brick strike regular datums across the dominant dark brown brick surface at intervals of three and ten courses alternately, providing a regular order to the building as it steps down to account for the fall across the corner site. The arrangement is carefully controlled: the orange bands begin as the heads of windows and doors, continue across the façade to mark the levels of the window sills and planter boxes as the building steps one half storey, and finally return to the alignment of the window heads as the building completes the change of one full floor level. While Watson is clear that the strict organisation of the building came first, the stripes consciously highlight the geometric and material rigour of the design.¹⁰ Here, the building form and envelope reinforce the regular organisation of each other, akin to Street's concept of the "structural" school of polychromy. But despite the conceptual and visual similarities to the work of some High Gothic revivalists (there was

even a diaper pattern on the end wall, scaled to suit the window openings) Watson says he was unaware of their work at the time, and considers his brick patterning as simply a kind of “disciplining” of the building, derived from its own material and constructional logic.

Regarding his influences, Watson says that his university education skipped the history of Victorian architecture which was seen as a terrible mistake, noting that “polychrome brickwork was the worst of it.”¹¹ And while he says that he recalls seeing, and liking, Butterfield’s stripy Keble College in 1971, he actually cites the use of patterned brickwork by Venturi as a more likely influence.¹² Curiously, neither Butterfield nor Venturi’s work exhibits the strict discipline Watson instills in his own design.¹³

After missing out on a tenured position at UQ, Watson left academia and began working for the State Government in 1989, where he remained until 2012.¹⁴ It was during this period that Watson completed a number of award-winning institutional works, of which many incorporate banded masonry, including: the Technology Buildings at the Southern Queensland Institute of TAFE (SQIT)¹⁵ in Toowoomba (1992-5), incorporating two systems of stripes in brick and block; Gateway TAFE, Brisbane (1992-5); the more eccentrically patterned Student Centre, Southbank Institute of TAFE in Morningside, Brisbane (1996-7); the Redcliffe City Library and Gallery (1998-9); and the more recent Block B (2002-6) and Automotive Building (2008) at SQIT, Toowoomba. The suite of banded campus buildings in Toowoomba, and in particular the Block B project, are discussed in more detail below. First, however, an overview of Jamieson’s use of coloured masonry will also be established.

The striped architecture of Spence Jamieson

Jamieson graduated from UQ one year earlier than Watson in 1968 and, like Watson, was employed in practice during his final years of study. As a student in 1966, he spent a short but important time in the office of Hayes & Scott. In fact, Jamieson cites the influence of Campbell Scott on his own understanding of masonry construction, noting the way in which his mentor would carefully measure the chosen bricks in the office to precisely set out the dimensions of the project.¹⁶ It should also be noted that in 1967, the year following his time working with Scott, Jamieson won a travel grant from the Clay Product Manufacturers’ Association of Queensland, and produced a report titled “Brick: An Idea” exploring the system of brick construction and its conceptual, philosophical and symbolic significance.¹⁷

Jamieson was later employed by a number of other notable practices – including: John Andrews International (19745); Robin Gibson (1976); Goodsir Baker & Wilde (19778); and James MacCormick & Associates (197980) – but it wasn’t until he began work for the Commonwealth Government between 1981 and 1989 that he undertook some of his first banded masonry projects.¹⁸ These include an Army Housing project at Canungra in 1984, and the Arms and Services Building at Enoggera in 1985. In the former project, Jamieson consciously used the blockwork stripes to tie the cluster of small houses together on a sloping site. He says he was also aware of a correspondence between the bands and the striped decorations of military uniforms to signify importance and identity.¹⁹ Similar associations were also present in the later Arms and Services building, but Jamieson also

describes his use of stripes here as “a screen that could collect the vagaries of the briefed accommodation into one identifiable building.”²⁰ Regarding these projects, therefore, two brief observations might be made. First, and unlike Watson, Jamieson engages openly with external references in his early projects. Second, he consciously used stripes to achieve visual continuity on these projects, and has thereby placed the stripes in opposition to the building form and its inherent fragmentation. This is in contrast to Watson’s attempts to make legible the organisation of the Southpoint project, and implies an independence of Jamieson’s striped building skin from its structure, recalling aspects of Ruskin’s ideas concerning colour, ornament and the “wall veil”.²¹

This approach to stripes remains consistent in Jamieson’s two decades of practice with the State Government between 1990 until 2009. This is demonstrated in his design for the aforementioned Block E building at Southbank TAFE²² from 1996, and its associated landscape works. Here, Jamieson used brick in two colours for the extensive diapering on the building, and for the very stripy landscape walls. These patterns are also extended into the paving. Again, both optical and semantic ideas seem to be present: the latter walls, which terrace the TAFE site in small parts, would seem to have some connection to Ruskin’s association of horizontally banded masonry with geological strata, but Jamieson has emphasised that their function was to give a consistent identity to the TAFE campus and to mark its extents.²³ More so than in his earlier works, here there seems to be a greater emphasis on the pattern itself, which is largely independent of other parts of the design – many of the stripes on the landscape walls are arranged irregularly, or perhaps cadenced to an internal organisational order. The diapers seen on infill spandrel panels of the building also bear no resemblance to the building organisation, and instead, are intended as a development of the banded pattern used elsewhere.²⁴ They also recall the patterned brickwork of Butterfield and some other of his nineteenth-century contemporaries.

While Jamieson does not acknowledge any direct references to this work (although he recognises some of the earlier uses of brick on this site as important), he says that he was always aware of historical precedents for banded masonry. But rather than identifying any particular source – the stripes of medieval Italian churches, of High Victorian Gothic, or the more recent work of Mario Botta, for example – Jamieson points to a confluence of influences, saying that:

One is never unaware of history. ... All of these sources and others are known. Just how one deals with this knowledge is never clear. ... I think my interest in photography, graphics, puzzles, mathematics (tiled surfaces), science and the like has more to do with my interest in patterns and perceptions, but one would never deny being inspired, even amazed, by history. There is a general interest in twinness [sic] too, that makes one intrigued with combinations and visual readings.²⁵

He later adds:

One should never forget that our natural world is full of astonishing variations and combinations too.²⁶

While Jamieson's work on the Southbank TAFE site has been largely rendered over or demolished by recent renovations, other striped works still remain. Notable examples include the Bremer Institute of TAFE, Inala Campus (2003), a refurbishment of the Government Office Building at 63 George St (2008), and various banded block landscape walls that form part of the design for the Kangaroo Point Park (2009). But it is another project that is of most interest to this paper: the remarkably stripy Roma Street Fire and Ambulance Station in Brisbane's CBD from 2007. Its unrelenting deployment of stripes from top to bottom and are discussed in more detail below.

Comparing stripes

Looking closely at the detail of their works, further differences between Watson and Jamieson's ideas about colour, surface and stripes can be found. In what follows, the paper pays close attention to a recent project by each architect: Watson's Block B at SQIT in Toowoomba (Figure 2), and Jamieson's Roma Street Fire and Ambulance Station in Brisbane (Figure 3). These are both large contemporaneous projects with complex, multifaceted briefs that have tested the utility of coloured stripes by each architect.²⁷



Fig. 2 Street view (l) and (r) detail of Block B, SQIT, Toowoomba, 2002-6, Project Services (Design Architect: Donald Watson). Photographs by Ashley Paine, 2015.

First, regarding the relationship of these projects to their sites, Watson's Block B follows a pattern established by his earlier Technology Buildings on the same campus using both brick and block. Here, Watson had used a consistent roof datum and a regular brick rod precisely 600mm high, made up of six courses in red and one in white. Dimensionally this is paired with the use of blockwork elsewhere in the project in two grey tones wherein each band of three block courses creates a matching 600mm high stripe. According to the architect, it was a means of disciplining the project, and "keeping the whole thing under control" as it stretched some two hundred metres across the sloping site.²⁸ Having already established this striped series of datums, the new Block B continues them in reverse proportions. Here, a grey concrete brick is used for six courses, punctuated by a single row of red bricks. The predominant concrete brick forms a chromatic pairing with the adjoining off-form concrete building with dark red brick infills, while the red bands articulate the surface with the same

600mm annotations of the Technology Buildings, linking it to Watson's previous design, and providing an ever more extensive visual gauge of the campus's undulating topography. Connections can also be drawn to ideas first put into use in the Southpoint building, which was similarly stepped along its length and measured with its stripes.




Fig. 3 Street view (l) and (r) detail of Roma Street Fire and Ambulance Station, Brisbane, 2007, Project Services (Design Architect: Spence Jamieson). Photographs by Ashley Paine, 2014.

In contrast to the indexical intentions and intrinsic constructional interests of Watson's banded polychromy, Jamieson's stripes on the Roma St Fire and Ambulance Station were conceived to give the project a strong visual presence on the prominent corner site: to mark it as distinct, rather than to forge immediate contextual connections.²⁹ In fact, Jamieson says it was initially intended to be built in concrete block, but brick was chosen because it was able to give some order to the haphazard pattern of fenestration.³⁰ (Except for a few ventilation grilles, most doors and windows align with the stripe datums – as they do in Watson's work – but their distribution across the façade appears almost random.) While the choice of material was pragmatic and somewhat incidental, its banding realises other architectural potentials: the proportions of the red and cream colours, laid in stripes of three or eleven courses, are reversed on the two ends of the building, giving an independent expression to the fire and ambulance occupants with a predominance of red or cream respectively. This is a playful example of Jamieson's interest in patterns and dualities, but also consciously references the use of "blood and bandages" brickwork, and the traditional red brick of fire stations. Again Jamieson introduces external influences whereas Watson purports to reject them.

Regarding the relationship of stripes to building programme, Jamieson's design clearly provides a graphic clue to its twin-functions. At a more detailed level, however, the brick banded wall was conceived in Jamieson's words as a "screen"³¹: it applies a new, extrinsic order to its inherently disordered arrangement of window and door openings. In fact, the bands tell us nothing about the floor levels or other aspects of the interior organisation. Instead, the pattern unifies the surface into a single skin – albeit with two different ends – independent of, and actively interfering with, the legibility of spaces and floor levels within. This is a very different use of coloured stripes than what we see in Watson's work. At Southpoint, for example, the irregular spaced bands help to reinforce the distinction between each level. At Toowoomba, however, the use of banded brick over several storeys of Block

B is a more complex issue. Here the stripes create tall panels of wall that are unified, but Watson's fenestration is much more dominant and, for the most part, allows the organisation of the building to remain visible. Once again it might be concluded that Jamieson's stripes strive towards a complexity in meaning and visual obfuscation, whereas Watson's aim for clarity and organisational legibility.



Fig. 4 Detail, Block B, SQIT, Toowoomba, 2002-6, Project Services (Design Architect: Donald Watson). Photograph by Ashley Paine, 2015.

However, the most revealing detail on each building occurs where the stripes meet the roof. For much of Watson's building, the banded brickwork is kept well below the overhanging roof, allowing it to be stepped up or down as required in full courses – the terracing of the wall only heightening its marking of the site datums (See Figure 2). The only exception to this is on the south, where a portion of wall forms a steep gable end to a pitched roof. Here, the stripes are cut off at the roof angle, but they also follow a fold in this wall, and are capped with a red flashing matching their proportion. The cumulative effect appears to be a conscious play with the formal composition of the striped building elevation (Figure 4). On Jamieson's building, by contrast, the street-facing walls are parapeted and in large part hide the roof – surface mounted window hoods have mostly eliminated the need for overhangs. Still, a number of vantage points reveal the fall of the roof. This is most noticeable on the



Fig. 5 Detail, Roma Street Fire and Ambulance Station, Brisbane, 2007, Project Services (Design Architect: Spence Jamieson). Photograph by Ashley Paine, 2014.

western elevation where the bricks have been cut to follow its shallow fall, and capped with a broad white flashing that seems indifferent to the striped pattern (Figure 5).

The effect of this expressed fall is to make the striped brick skin appear more superficial – like a wallpaper pattern that has been cut to suit the extents of the building. The approach is reminiscent of Butterfield's discordant junctions of striped pattern on his famed All Saints' Margaret Street, London (1849-59), but also Venturi and Scott Brown's Brant House, Connecticut (1970-4). But the perception of the stripes as *applied* also reinforces Jamieson's conceptual intention to create a screen that orders and obfuscates the undisciplined arrangement of fenestration, and his broader semantic plays with extrinsic historical references.

Conclusion

While the differences in Watson and Jamieson's use of stripes are subtle, this paper has shown that they ultimately reinforce some significant differences in the way in which each architect approaches the articulation of the building surface using colour and pattern. While it would be going too far to suggest that Jamieson's work ignores constructional matters, or that Watson's evades semantics entirely, there remains a clear concentration in Watson's work on the internal pragmatics of material construction, which exists in contradistinction to the deliberate absorption of external references by Jamieson. It might also be said that Watson's architecture is largely without rhetoric, while Jamieson's appears to revel in perceptual ambiguity, and the conceptual complexities of its extrinsic references. It remains an unresolved curiosity however that, despite their close paralleling of opposing Victorian concepts of colour, both architects deny any suggestion that their stripes are directly attributable to any specific historic sources. The similarities are difficult to overlook and it would be tempting to conclude that this repetition of nineteenth-century ideas is anything but intentional. It would also be easy to assume that both architects are masking their sources – subconsciously maybe – to maintain a sense of the originality of architectural design and inspiration. But this doesn't appear to be the reason here, or at least, not a very important one.

If we take both architects at their word, and accept that their use of colour is not intentionally historical, and that no conscious connections exist to the concepts of chromatic construction defined by Street, and employed by his contemporaries from both schools of polychromy, then a very different conclusion might be drawn. That is, that both architect's work has (re-)discovered the same problems and potentials of coloured masonry independently. In fact, this is how Jamieson himself views his work in relation to its origins, suggesting that there exists a "certain innate logic and intelligence in design."³² Indeed, the challenges, constraints and constructional logic of masonry building have hardly changed at all in hundreds of years. But this paper suggests something more: that the concepts with which we think about colour in architecture have hardly changed either. They too are incredibly persistent and surprisingly consistent, even over long periods of time. It might even be said that they have established certain techniques and attitudes towards colour – institutions of polychromy – that remain largely unchanged for well over a century.

-
- 1 Watson worked for Lund Hutton Newell Black & Paulsen over his summer break in 1964-5; Jamieson was employed by Lund, Hutton, Newell & Paulsen in 1967-73. Watson worked for Hayes & Scott in 1970; Jamieson in 1966. Watson worked for the State Government from 1989 until 2012; Jamieson between 1990 and 2009.
 - 2 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 3 Donald Watson, e-mail message to author, January 26, 2015.
 - 4 William Spence Jamieson, e-mail message to author, April 14, 2015.
 - 5 George Edmund Street, *Brick and Marble in the Middle Ages: Notes of a Tour in the North of Italy* (London: J. Murray, 1874), 403.
 - 6 Street, *Brick and Marble in the Middle Ages*, 400.
 - 7 Existing research into Watson's work is limited to an undergraduate thesis which includes transcripts of an extensive interview with Watson in 2005. See Clare Hamilton, "Public Works by D.R. Watson" (Undergraduate thesis, University of Queensland, 2005). No research into Jamieson's work has been found.
 - 8 Together, Watson and McKay wrote two important books: *A Directory of Queensland Architects to 1940* (St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Library, 1984) and *Queensland Architects of the 19th Century: A Biographical Dictionary* (Queensland: Queensland Museum, 1994).
 - 9 The latter won the national RAI A Robin Boyd Award for Residential Architecture in 1989.
 - 10 Donald Watson, interview with author, April 30, 2013.
 - 11 Donald Watson, e-mail message to author, January 26, 2015.
 - 12 Donald Watson, interview with author, April 30, 2013.
 - 13 Donald Watson, interview with author, April 30, 2013; Donald Watson, interview with author, January 2015.
 - 14 During a short period of leave, Watson taught at the Queensland University of Technology (1999-2000). In 2009 he was made Adjunct Professor at UQ, and awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the university in 2013.
 - 15 SQIT is now part of a larger amalgamation of colleges known as TAFE Queensland South West.
 - 16 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 17 See William Spence Jamieson, *Brick: An Idea* (Brisbane: s.n., 1967).
 - 18 Jamieson also taught part-time at QUT between the mid-1970s and mid-1990s.
 - 19 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 20 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 21 John Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice. Volume the First. The Foundations*, New ed. (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1873).
 - 22 Now known as the South Bank Campus of TAFE Brisbane, with Jamieson's building re-named B Block.
 - 23 Certainly, the geological connection was important for the Canungra project. William Spence Jamieson, e-mail message to author, March 2, 2015.
 - 24 William Spence Jamieson, e-mail message to author, March 2, 2015.
 - 25 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 26 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 27 A better comparison might have been made between Watson's SQIT buildings and Jamieson's Southbank TAFE work, or Watson's Southpoint project and Jamieson's Fire and Ambulance building. However, the destruction of Jamieson's TAFE building, and the demolition of Watson's Southpoint has made a detailed, first-hand analysis impossible.
 - 28 Donald Watson, interview with author, April 30, 2013.
 - 29 Jamieson does note, however, his awareness of some nearby brick structures. But, the fact that the design was originally conceived in blockwork would suggest that these contextual cues were not significant determinants of the design.
 - 30 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 31 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.
 - 32 William Spence Jamieson, interview with author, December 2014.