

Ngā Pūtahitanga / Crossings

Cite as: Anna Temby, "Municipal Parks versus Glorious Gardens: The Tensions of Inter-Governmental Management of Urban Park Space." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 39, Ngā Pūtahitanga / Crossings*, ed. Julia Gatley and Elizabeth Aitken Rose, 592-603. Auckland: SAHANZ, 2023. Accepted for publication December 1, 2022.
DOI: 10.55939/a5048pbpg7



Graphic by Amber Anahera Ruckes

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL
HISTORIANS, AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND (SAHANZ)
VOLUME 39

Conference hosted by Te Pare School of Architecture and
Planning, University of Auckland, Waipapa Taumata Rau,
Auckland, 25-27 November 2022.

Edited by Julia Gatley and Elizabeth Aitken Rose.

Published in Auckland by SAHANZ, 2023.

ISBN: 978-0-646-88028-0

Copyright of this volume belongs to SAHANZ; authors retain
the copyright of the content of their individual papers. All
efforts have been undertaken to ensure the authors have
secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images
illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may
contact the editors.

Ngā Pūtahitanga / Crossings was a joint conference between SAHANZ and the Australasian Urban History Planning History Group. It was the 39th annual SAHANZ conference and the 16th AUHPH conference.

Municipal Parks versus Glorious Gardens: The Tensions of Inter-Governmental Management of Urban Park Space

Anna Temby
University of Queensland

Abstract

In the early twentieth century the view of urban parks as health-giving, vital spaces in modern cities had been firmly established, however, a stark contrast was present in the position of small urban parks, funded and managed by municipal governments, and the state-funded, pseudo-scientific Botanic Gardens. Using Meanjin (Brisbane) as a case-study, this paper examines how conflict between local and state governments drastically hindered the construction of accessible and functional municipal parks, while simultaneously limiting the access of working-class and marginalised citizens to state government-funded spaces such as the Botanic Gardens. Lack of cooperation between the tiers of government, and the privileging of the Botanic Gardens as a site of middle-class leisure, also led to citizen-intervention and investment in council-run park space, which sought to exclude or limit the use of these spaces by those perceived to be 'unrespectable' members of the population. This paper asserts that the unequal and oppositional practices in the governing of park and reserve spaces in the early twentieth century, and the tensions between local and state authorities, led to a further entrenching of social demarcations in public park spaces, and negatively impacted upon the significance of park spaces in urban centres.

During an 1889 estimates debate, the Queensland parliamentary member for Bulimba, John Francis Buckland, proposed that the control of parks and reserve spaces in the colony of Queensland should be handed over to municipal governments. The intention behind Buckland's proposal was not to advocate for the ability of local councils to successfully govern park spaces, but rather to suggest that so much of the Legislative Assembly's time was consumed by deliberations around the parks' budgets that it would be more cost effective to see them removed from estimates altogether.¹ Buckland's statement was made a few months after an 1889 conference of local

government passed a collective recommendation that control of all parks and reserve sites should be vested in municipalities, rather than state government or trustees.² And yet, nearly two decades later in 1918, the Brisbane City Council and the Queensland State Government were still locked in fierce – and often litigious – debates around the condition, governance and ownership of the state capital's urban parks and reserves.

In the late nineteenth century, Australia's urban parks were the loci of complex governmental interactions around their ownership, management and use. As public spaces they were unique in their inter-governmental interest, often owned by colonial – and later, state – governments, governed by public trustees and policed by local municipal councils. This layering of accountability, and unclear governance structures, created predictable hindrances to the development and use of urban park spaces, an issue that was felt particularly acutely by the smaller, under-funded municipal parks. Coupled with this perplexing management structure was an emerging tendency to view parks as symbols of governmental beneficence and urban progress due to the increased perception of urban park spaces as morally reforming sites of respectable recreation. This image of park spaces as health-giving symbols of government beneficence exacerbated the competition of interests already coalescing around park spaces, further entrenching their position as subjects of governmental debate and interference.

This paper examines the impacts, both social and material, of this inter-governmental tension in the management of Brisbane's park spaces in the early twentieth century. It is concerned not just with the material outcomes for parks due to the oppositional and combative practices of both state and local government, but also considers the social consequences for Brisbane's residents and visitors. The contentious position of park spaces served to further entrench existing demarcations and delineations present within the public sphere. Parks are considered here not as natural, open or accessible spaces, but rather the products of aspirational city-building by governmental managers and owners – heavily regulated and imbued with moral and social imagining. By bringing governmental records – such as the Queensland Parliamentary Debates and Proceedings (QPD) and the minutes of the Brisbane Municipal Council (BMC), and later Brisbane City Council (BCC) – into contact with broader social understandings of park spaces, this paper illuminates the significant disconnect between the imaginative and literal functions of park spaces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Place of Parks

Despite the ubiquity of parks and reserve sites in Australian colonial cities, their governance has not figured prominently within urban scholarship. Botanic Gardens and Acclimatisation Society Gardens have garnered some historical interest over the years, mostly in relation to their scientific and horticultural endeavours, or as sites of middle-class recreation.³ Urban parks garner even less scholarly attention, often situated on the periphery of historical urban analysis – as the site of other points of historical inquiry, rather than the focus of it.⁴ Where urban parks in Australia have been considered is in histories of urban planning and design, particularly through the inexhaustible work of Robert Freestone,⁵ although the scope of these works precludes dissection of the significant social role that parks were expected to play by the beginning of the twentieth century.

The notion that parks could “raise the intellectual character of the lowest classes of society” was one shared by the Scottish botanist and ostensible ‘father’ of the Victorian park, John Claudius Loudon.⁶ When making this assertion in the 1820s Loudon was straying from contemporary understandings of the role of park spaces. As demonstrated by historian Peter Borsay, for many years privatised gardens and private nature walks had been the expected system in Britain, a practice of literal gatekeeping that was exclusionary of working-class participation.⁷ In spite of this legacy, throughout the nineteenth century the view of British parks as improving spaces was on the rise – a desperate antidote to the apparent disorder of urban life and, echoing Loudon, an important civilising influence on the lower classes.⁸ The nebulous moralising around working-class leisure and its associations with “irrational indulgences,” so prevalent in the nineteenth century, gave way to the importance of physical exercise as a healthy pastime that could be both morally and physically improving, and also theoretically accessible to all genders.⁹

This perception of the beneficial nature of urban parks was well-established in Australian cities by the early decades of the twentieth century – firmly transplanted into the Australian psyche through the process of British colonisation. It was common to see parks referred to as the “lungs” of a city, and Brisbane’s parks were often described as “breathings spaces” or “breathing spots.”¹⁰ The supposed healthiness of park spaces was not inherent, however, but rather the condition of parks was subject to similar risk of degradation and disrepair as any other type of public space, particularly as a result of mismanagement or misuse. In 1890 the Municipal Health

Inspector filed a report to the BMC regarding an apparent nuisance caused by the dumping of refuse into the ravines of Wickham Park – situated on top of Spring Hill, overlooking Brisbane’s inner-city. The health officer’s investigation had been commissioned in the face of several complaints from local residents of the malodorous conditions and also concerns that the debris might contain broken glass or sharp tins.¹¹ In the report, the health inspector claimed the nuisance had been overstated, with no detectable odour to the earth unless “stooping down quite close to it,” and suggested that a small addition of clean earth or gravel would be enough to resolve any potential risk.¹² The relative risks when visiting a park space where refuse dumping took place may have been quite low, as suggested by the health officer, but the practice demonstrates an important disconnection between the management of public parks and their social and public use. Brisbane residents likely expected to engage with park spaces without the risk of injury or being accosted by rank odours. The municipal council also maintained the right to manage and develop park and reserve spaces in whatever manner the deemed most beneficial, and likely also cost effective.

This dichotomous position of urban park spaces illuminates the divide in the practical versus imaginative understandings of parks, both in how they have been treated by modern scholars and considered by their historic occupants. In *Melodramatic Landscapes* (2009), landscape architect Heath Massey Schenker suggests that urban scholars’ view of parks as ‘natural’ spaces, rather than constructed or artificial spaces, has skewed our modern understandings of their historic significance.¹³ Schenker asserts that parks should not be removed from their associations with industrial capitalism – as “stage sets” demonstrative of perceived ideals of natural spaces, similar to the highly aesthetic but divisive private gardens of the British middle and upper classes.¹⁴

Although reserves may have been imaginatively constructed or perceived as spaces affording an authentic experience of nature, towards the end of the nineteenth century, as ideas around the civilising influence of parks became firmer, increasingly park spaces were expected to perform their redemptive purpose.¹⁵ Unsurprisingly, it was also around this period that contestation between the municipal and state governments over the proper use and management of park spaces began in real earnest. The role of parks as an outward projection of the council’s ability to provide for their constituents appeared to be of great importance to the BMC and later BCC. In annual mayoral reports it was common to find comparisons between the leisure spaces and reserves

of Brisbane and those of other capital cities.¹⁶ During one of the first surveys of Brisbane in 1842, Governor George Gipps – driven by his notion that Brisbane would never be more than a “pokey village” – scaled back several of the proposed design features, including the amount of reserve spaces for recreation.¹⁷ Precedent was instead given to primary and commercial use of land. The placement of parkland at the bottom end of the hierarchy of needs was not uncommon – Robert Freestone described the reservation of parklands and reserves in the face of a ferocious colonial penchant for land speculation as a “major achievement” in early Australian town planning.¹⁸ While the process of land speculation presented an early threat to Brisbane’s reserve spaces and parklands, it was the potential for alienation of land by the colonial government that later emerged as an imminent threat. Land was alienated and portioned as sites for hospitals, railways, orphanages, schools and technical colleges – all of which are institutions outside the control of municipal management but built on land that had been maintained and policed by municipal government since Brisbane town was founded. This obfuscation of responsibility, along with the pervasive threat of colonial or state government intervention, situated parks as liminal or ephemeral spaces, significantly influencing governmental decision making around their design and use.

Mismatched Management

In 1909 the Queensland Under-Secretary of the Department of Public Lands raised a submission to the BCC regarding the illegal dumping of refuse on a block of land in the city’s inner north.¹⁹ The small parcel of land, at the Wickham Terrace and Albert Street junction, was actually owned by the state government, not the local council, and yet the Under-Secretary appeared to believe that it was the responsibility of the BCC to maintain and police the space. This dynamic was true of most public reserve spaces since the initial 1842 survey – they were owned by colonial or state government and managed by the BMC or BCC. In some instances, this arrangement was formalised through leases, giving council certain powers in the use of reserve sites, but their ability to perform maintenance or make improvements on the park was subject to negotiation with the state government, or their appointed trustees. As evidenced by the submission to the BCC in 1909, even in the absence of a formal lease there was still an expectation that the city council would perform some oversight and maintenance of the reserve space, despite having no authority to assert any real control over the space itself. Even when a formal lease agreement was in place, it did nothing to undermine the process of legislative alienation or resumption of land by the state

government. Placing the BMC and BCC as trustees of these small reserve and park spaces, rather than the managers or owners, led to a natural hesitancy in engaging in any public works or improvements that might see the parks influence and use amongst the population bolstered.

The practice of placing parks and public reserves in the care of boards of trustees was a convention established in Queensland during its separation from New South Wales in 1859.²⁰ It was also the method by which the Brisbane Botanic Gardens was managed from 1855 until the amalgamation of the Brisbane City Council in 1925.²¹ In the case of the Botanic Gardens, it was not uncommon for a Member of Parliament or public servant from the Department of Agriculture (the 'owners' of the Gardens), to also act as a trustee, ensuring the process of management and approval was narrow and contained. Brisbane historian John Laverty has suggested that the endowing of trustee powers to the BMC for Brisbane's other urban parks was only intended to be a temporary measure in establishing the town's system of local parks and reserves, with the intention that full ownership and control would instead be invested in the municipal council.²² Instead a latent mistrust of the BMC by colonial government interrupted the process of vesting the council with any real power. It took over 30 years, until 1887, before any deeds to the reserve sites were officially granted to the BMC, and even then only two of the eleven agreed upon were finalised within that year.²³ It was not until 1892 that the deed for Albert Park, which would become the most eminent of Brisbane's municipal urban parks and is the site of the modern Roma Street Parklands, would be honoured, despite being one of the first agreed upon.²⁴

The impetus of the mistrust held by the state government towards the local council is unclear, however it may not have been entirely unfounded. By 1899, seven years into their lease of Albert Park, a mayoral deputation of the BMC described it as still being in "a rough state."²⁵ It is possible that this assessment of the park as "rough" may have been coloured by personal interest – the deputation comprised members of the Queensland Cricket Association who were concerned about the paucity of sports grounds and amenities in the inner-city. When meeting with the council, the association's vice president noted that they had previously invested their own funds in improving a small section of Albert Park for the purpose of constructing a cricket pitch, only to have the land annexed by the colonial government for railway expansion.²⁶ A promise was made by the colonial government that an alternative site would be found, but it does not appear that the promise was fulfilled.

When faced with the threat of reclamation and resumption of land, it is evident why the council would have some hesitancy in spending municipal funds on improving parks and public reserves. Albert Park was a particularly acute site for these types of anxieties owing to its adjacency to Roma Street station – one of the largest and busiest stations in Brisbane at the time. After several small resumptions across 1886 and 1887, the BMC took an oppositional stance, supported by the community trustees of Albert Park, and it is likely these resumptions that provided the impetus for their concerted push to secure a deed and seize greater control of the site.²⁷

By far the most combative instance of land resumption in Albert Park came in 1911, several decades after the BCC had gained full control of the park. The Railways Commission requested that 7 acres of the site, representing nearly a third of the total space, be alienated to once again support railway expansion.²⁸ The contentious parcel of land had only recently been improved upon by the BCC, who had constructed a kiosk on the site, and also contained a large amount of old tree plantings that were too delicate to be relocated. As a result, the Railways Commissioner agreed to compensate the council for the loss of land and sunk costs – funds which the council planned to put towards the improvement of existing parklands, or the purchase of more.²⁹ The Works Committee of the BCC, responsible for the construction of park improvements, suggested in a council meeting that they would ordinarily oppose any plans they saw as an “interference with the city recreation grounds,” however, this proposed railway expansion had become emblematic of the increased prosperity of significance of Brisbane, and thus the council was initially not prepared to raise any objection.³⁰ This amicability was short lived though, and when the City Valuer and the Park Ranger (both employees of the council) arrived at a figure of £16,350 for the land and improvements, the situation quickly soured.³¹ What ensued was a nearly decade-long combative dispute with surprisingly wide-reaching consequences. By November of 1912, when the BCC initiated legal action against the state government in the hopes of resolving the issue, the urgency of the Railways Commission’s need for the land meant that works on the railway expansion had already commenced.³² It was not until 1919 that the battle was actually resolved, however, a BCC councillor had stated that the relentless battle meant that Albert Park was rendered more or less useless as a recreative space in the meantime.³³

The Impacts of Infighting

The overall influence of these economic and political factors ensured that by the beginning of the twentieth century the majority of Brisbane's urban municipal parks were un- or under-developed and lacked basic amenities. In 1901, a *Brisbane Courier* article described Victoria Park, in the city's north, as "a piece of waste land of the most barren description."³⁴ During a 1902 discussion of the BCC it was highlighted that no council-run park had a bandstand, which was a ubiquitous feature of parks at the time, and a prominent feature of the state-run Botanic Gardens.³⁵ A significant influencer was budgetary – the entire annual parks budget of the BCC was around £1000, which included a small endowment from the Department of Agriculture of around £100.³⁶ The compensation that the BCC hoped to receive from the Albert Street resumption therefore represented almost sixteen times their typical annual budget, and would have made a significant impact on the state of Brisbane's municipal parks. The Botanic Gardens, by comparison, had an operating budget of £1118 in 1863,³⁷ rising to £2134 in the 1890s,³⁸ which secured dedicated staff, usually a curator and at least one overseer, whose sole responsibility was the management and maintenance of the gardens. This significant divide in budgets meant that the Botanic Gardens could serve its function as an outward symbol of government beneficence in a way that the municipal parks never could.

Improvements to park spaces requested by the public were generally slow to be actioned by the council, except for when a petitioner was willing to contribute some or all of the costs, such as the addition of a water tap requested by the Tabernacle Club in 1907.³⁹ Often the facilities themselves were built through the fundraising efforts of local sporting clubs and other community groups.⁴⁰ When faced with budget shortfalls for some tennis courts on the grounds of Albert Park, for example, the council considered a private lease with the Brisbane Lawn Tennis Club in exchange for maintenance, meaning the facilities were not accessible to the broader public.⁴¹ While the Trustees of Public Lands Act 1869 meant that park trustees could not profit from public land, there were no rules against allowing special privileges to those willing to invest in public spaces themselves. This situated specific citizens and groups, particularly those with means, as the literal gatekeepers to the facilities under their charge, allowing them to dictate not just what type of activity but also what *type of person* was permitted to use them.

This stark contrast in the budgets of the Botanic Gardens and the council-run parks may appear innocuous at first viewing. When brought into contact with contemporary ideas coalescing around the civilising influence of parks in the early twentieth century, however, this preferencing of ornate government gardens over small community parks gains a distinct moral caste. The inequitable approach to the management of access and public enjoyment of the Botanic Gardens is evident in myriad ways, no doubt exacerbated by the relationship of the state government to the Botanic Gardens, as ‘owners’, caretakers, frequent visitors and neighbours. The Botanic Gardens, and associated Queens Gardens, were directly adjacent to Parliament House, and its occupants were afforded the best view of the gardens and their lush plantings. Debates on the gardens often bled into other parliamentary discussions – when a dangerous barbed-wire fence was erected, the members of parliament spent several minutes discussing the “scandalous” fence, and the risk it posed to women and children.⁴² Member for Toombul, Michael Gannon’s fervent desire for the riverwalk around the gardens to be opened at night was raised every year for several years – a cause furthered by other members long after Gannon left office in 1893.⁴³

For the wealthier classes, congregation in the Botanic Gardens was a fairly routine affair. The correspondence files of the Department of Agriculture are littered with requests – and demands – from society’s elite planning private garden parties, high teas and soirees on what was ostensibly public land.⁴⁴ In 1889 the Brisbane Socialists, on the other hand, sought permission to hold a small open-air meeting on the park grounds and were promptly denied.⁴⁵ That same year it was revealed by Patrick Perkins, parliamentary member for Aubigny and Cambooya, that several “privileged individuals” had been obtaining flowers and exotic plants from the gardens for their own private gardens.⁴⁶ Conversely, when Margaret Brownrigg – a working class woman – picked some flowers in the gardens to gift to a local hospital she was imprisoned for seven days for the floral ‘theft’.⁴⁷ When Lulu Wynand was charged for a similar act in 1908, she was described as “stylishly dressed” and “half-frightened” and was let off with only a warning.⁴⁸ When sports fields were constructed in the gardens, certain organisations were allowed leases to the facilities at a cost that would have been exclusionary to the broader public, and which were tacitly understood to unofficially grant them privileged levels of access.⁴⁹

These allowances made for the wealthy and elite citizens of Brisbane to the Botanic Gardens, formal or otherwise, highlight how it was considered as a public space.

Ultimately, there was little incentive for the managers and caretakers of the gardens to factor in its accessibility to the working classes or urban poor. Rather the exceptionalism afforded to the gardens by its close proximity – both physically and politically – to society's elite exacerbated already extant social demarcations prevalent in public space. Even though access to the gardens was, on paper, fair and equal, the space was expected to serve different functions for those special few. Despite this inequity, the council-run parks did not serve as a counterpoint to the exclusionary gardens. The Brisbane Socialists were not granted permission to meet in any municipal park either.⁵⁰ Instead, it appears the municipal government subscribed to the same imaginative and aspirational process of constructing park spaces in an ideal way, just with less money and mixed results.

Conclusion

In 1925 all park and reserve spaces within greater Brisbane came under the control of the BCC as part of the local government amalgamation, bringing the obfuscation of responsibility for Brisbane's park and reserve spaces to an anti-climactic end. As this paper has demonstrated though, for decades prior to this the competition of interests between state and local governments interfered with the construction and use of Brisbane's parklands, which in turn served to further entrench forms of social demarcation already present in the public sphere. With the state government intent on ensuring the provision of parklands to their peers – the wealthy classes and social elites – and the municipal government unable to financially keep pace with public demands for park assets, the enjoyment and use of parks can be considered a quotidian aspect of the lives of the upper classes in a manner unachievable to ordinary citizens. Instead of the BCC adapting to their financial circumstance and adopting a fresh approach to park management – such as attempts to enhance the naturalness of the experience, or a more passive approach to altering reserve sites – the imagined position of parks as symbols of government beneficence saw them competing to achieve a prescriptive model of park construction that was unachievable at best, and actively exclusionary at worst. The imaginative positioning of parks as symbols of urban health and progress made them susceptible to considerable politicisation in their construction and governance. The latent mistrust between the layers of government can be seen as emblematic of this fact, and therefore parks should be more broadly understood as another form of delineated and deeply regulated space, rather than anything remotely natural.

¹ *Queensland Parliamentary Debates and Proceedings (QPD)*, 14 October 1889, 2173.

² *QPD*, 14 October 1889, 2172.

³ This narrow historiographical framing is particularly evident in Brisbane. See: Ray Sumner, "The State of Science," in *Brisbane in 1888*, ed. Rod Fisher (Brisbane: Brisbane History Group, 1988), 97-108; Peter Osborne, "Assessing the Acclimatisation Gardens," in *Brisbane: Houses, Gardens, Suburbs and Congregations*, no. 22, ed. Rod Fisher (Kelvin Grove: Brisbane History Group, 2010), 117-25; Jean Sim, "Discovering the Garden...in Brisbane," *Brisbane: Houses, Gardens, Suburbs and Congregations*, 49-65; Catherine Brouwer, "The Acclimatisation Society Gardens," *Queensland Review* 10, no. 2 (2003): 37-46. For a useful example of broader analysis see: Nuala C. Johnson, *Nature Displaced, Nature Displayed Order and Beauty in Botanical Gardens* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2011).

⁴ An illuminating example of this in a Brisbane context can be found in: Clive Moore, "Poofs in the Park: Documenting Gay 'Beats' in Queensland, Australia," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 2, no. 3 (1995): 319-39; Helen Penridge, "Echoes of Home: Park Music Culture in Colonial Brisbane," *Queensland History Journal* 22, no. 6 (2014): 468-73.

⁵ Robert Freestone, *Designing Australia's Cities: Culture, Commerce and the City Beautiful 1900-1930* (Sydney: UNSW, 2007), 210-44; Robert Home, "The 'Grand Modell' of Colonial Settlement," in *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities* (London: Routledge, 2013), 9-37; Robert Freestone, "From City Improvement to the City Beautiful," in *The Australian Metropolis: A Planning History*, ed. Stephen Hamnett and Robert Freestone (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 2000), 27-45. See also: Helen Proudfoot's chapter, "Founding Cities in Nineteenth-Century Australia," in *The Australian Metropolis*, 11-26.

⁶ John Claudis Loudon in Spiro Kostof, *The City Assembled: The Elements of Urban Form through History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1992), 169.

⁷ Peter Borsay, "The Rise of the Promenade: The Social and Cultural Use of Space in the English Provincial Town C. 1660-1800," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 9, no. 2 (1986): 125-40.

⁸ Carole O'Reilly, "From 'the People' to 'the Citizen': The Emergence of the Edwardian Municipal Park in Manchester, 1902-1912," *Urban History* 40, no. 1 (2013): 136; Pauline Marne, "Whose Public Space Was It Anyway? Class, Gender and Ethnicity in the Creation of the Sefton and Stanley Parks, Liverpool: 1858-1872," *Social & Cultural Geography* 2, no. 4 (2001): 423.

⁹ *Australian Etiquette or the Rules and Usages of the Best Society* (Melbourne: People's Publishing Co., 1886): 440-45. For a general history of the rational recreation movement in Brisbane, see Bryan Jamison, "'A Great Social Force Making for Order and Morality': An Analysis of Institutions for Rational Recreation in Late Victorian and Edwardian Brisbane," PhD thesis, University of Queensland, 2002, <https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:193272>; Bryan Jamison, "Making 'Honest, Truthful and Industrious Men': Newsboys, Rational Recreation and the Construction of the 'Citizen' in Late Victorian and Edwardian Brisbane," *Journal of Popular Culture* 33, no. 1 (1999): 61; Mike Huggins and J.A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: Less Virtuous Victorians at Play* (Abingdon, Oxford: Frank Cass, 2004); Mike J. Huggins, "More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England," *Journal of Social History* 33, no. 3 (2000): 585. J.W.C. Cumes asserted that women's leisure (regardless of class) had been particularly contested since early European occupation due to the inherent sexual connotations and gender imbalance evident in the early colonies. See: J.W.C. Cumes, *Their Chastity Was None Too Rigid: Leisure Times in Early Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1979), 86-88, 203-04.

¹⁰ *Brisbane Courier*, 16 February 1912, 3; *Brisbane Courier*, 29 July 1911, 4; *Brisbane Courier*, 5 January 1901, 5; *Brisbane Courier*, 6 November 1884, 6.

¹¹ *Telegraph*, 15 July 1890, 2.

¹² *Telegraph*, 15 July 1890, 2.

¹³ Heath Schenker, *Melodramatic Landscapes: Urban Parks in the Nineteenth Century* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 6.

¹⁴ Schenker, *Melodramatic Landscapes*, 7-8, 11.

¹⁵ Irene Maver, "Glasgow's Public Parks and the Community, 1850-1914: A Case Study in Scottish Civic Interventionism," *Urban History* 25, no. 3 (1998): 323; O'Reilly, "From 'the People' to 'the Citizen'," 136; Marne, "Whose Public Space Was It Anyway?," 423.

- ¹⁶ James Hipwood, *City of Brisbane, Mayor's Report 1887-1888* (Brisbane: J.H. Reynolds, 1889), 23-24; John Allworth Clark, *City of Brisbane Mayoral Report 1891-92* (Brisbane: R.S. Hews and Co., 1893), 24-25; Lesley Gordon Corrie, *City of Brisbane Mayoral Report 1902-03* (Brisbane: Nichols, Larwill and Butler, 1903): 82; Lesley Gordon Corrie, *City of Brisbane Mayoral Report 1903-04* (Brisbane: Nichols, Larwill and Butler, 1904): 72-73.
- ¹⁷ John McMaster, *Volume of Proceedings of the Second Australian Town Planning Conference and Exhibition, 1918* (Brisbane: A.J. Cumming, Government Printer, 1919), 21.
- ¹⁸ Robert Freestone, "A History of Planning," in *Planning Australia: An Overview of Urban and Regional Planning*, ed. Susan Thompson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 70.
- ¹⁹ *Minutes of Proceedings, the Council of the City of Brisbane, 1909-1910*, BCA0002, Brisbane City Council Archives, 124-25.
- ²⁰ John R. Lavery, *The Making of a Metropolis: Brisbane 1823-1925* (Brisbane: Boolarong Press, 2009), 116.
- ²¹ Lavery, *The Making of a Metropolis*, 116.
- ²² Lavery, *The Making of a Metropolis*, 116.
- ²³ Hipwood, *City of Brisbane Mayor's Report, 1887-1888*, 23.
- ²⁴ Allworth Clark, *City of Brisbane Mayoral Report 1891-92*, 23.
- ²⁵ *Brisbane Courier*, 11 May 1899, 3.
- ²⁶ *Brisbane Courier*, 11 May 1899, 3.
- ²⁷ *Telegraph*, 10 December 1887, 4.
- ²⁸ *Brisbane Courier*, 19 October 1911, 6.
- ²⁹ *Brisbane Courier*, 19 October 1911, 6; *Brisbane Courier*, 28 November 1911, 3.
- ³⁰ *Telegraph*, 29 November 1911, 10.
- ³¹ *Minutes of Proceedings, the Council of the City of Brisbane, 1911*, BCA0002, Brisbane City Council Archives, 141; Roughly \$2,343,210 AUD adjusted for inflation in 2021.
- ³² *Brisbane Courier*, 26 November 1912, 9; *Brisbane Courier*, 18 November 1919, 6.
- ³³ *Brisbane Courier*, 18 November 1919, 6; *Brisbane Courier*, 2 August 1918, 6.
- ³⁴ *Brisbane Courier*, 5 January 1901, 5.
- ³⁵ Corrie, *City of Brisbane Mayoral Report 1902-03*, 114.
- ³⁶ Aggregated data from Minutes of Proceedings of the BCC between 1902 and 1914; £1000 is roughly \$143,315 AUD adjusted for inflation in 2021.
- ³⁷ Approximately \$145,879 AUD adjusted for inflation in 2021.
- ³⁸ Approximately \$384,526 AUD adjusted for inflation in 2021; *Record of the Proceedings of the Queensland Parliament*, 14 August 1863, unpaginated; *QPD*, 11 November 1896, 1445.
- ³⁹ *Telegraph*, 3 December 1907, 3.
- ⁴⁰ *QPD*, 14 October 1889, 2172.
- ⁴¹ *Brisbane Courier*, 18 December 1894, 6.
- ⁴² *QPD*, 24 October 1888, 873.
- ⁴³ *QPD*, 24 October 1888, 873; *QPD*, 18 November 1890, 1450; *QPD*, 8 October 1895, 1183.
- ⁴⁴ "Botanic Gardens: General Correspondence" Queensland State Archives, Item ID ITM902829.
- ⁴⁵ "Botanic Gardens: General Correspondence" Queensland State Archives, Item ID ITM902829.
- ⁴⁶ *QPD*, 14 October 1889, 2165.
- ⁴⁷ *Telegraph*, 14 October 1912, 2.
- ⁴⁸ *Truth*, 4 October 1908, 5.
- ⁴⁹ *QPD*, 3 October 1901, 1068.
- ⁵⁰ *Brisbane Courier*, 17 March 1914, 8.