

Lindsay Dixon Pryor:

Setting Foundations for Australian Campus Landscapes

Associate Professor Andrew Saniga
Melbourne School of Design
University of Melbourne
Victoria, Australia
ajsaniga@unimelb.edu.au

Lindsay Dixon Pryor (1915-1998) is best known for his contribution to the landscape of Canberra when employed as landscape manager and landscape architect by the Department of the Interior between 1944 and 1958. Pryor was trained as a forester and subsequently applied himself to cognate fields of botany, landscape design and management, and academia as Foundation Professor of Botany at the Australian National University from 1958 to 1976. His role as advisor and designer for Canberra's landscape enabled a range of commissions including the landscape for the ANU and subsequently for various new Australian universities including those of the 1960's expansion era. Pryor's engagement in university planning and design advanced a role for landscape architects that hitherto had only sporadically surfaced. This paper briefly outlines Pryor's career with emphasis on his contribution to the emerging profession of landscape architecture in the 1960s. In documenting and analysing his university landscapes it will identify his key approaches to planting design, the nature of his commissions and associations, the outcomes of his work, and ultimately the legacies that he created for landscape architecture in Australia.

Keywords — *Lindsay Dixon Pryor; campus landscapes; landscape architecture*

INTRODUCTION

The institutionalisation of the profession of landscape architecture in Australia was significantly advanced in August 1966 when a diverse group of practitioners decided to form the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (AILA). Its founding members constitute an interesting group, being made up of everything from the self-styled practitioner to the trained horticulturist or forester, to the overseas-trained landscape designer. Australia was experiencing a development boom that in part spurred a new wave of environmental consciousness. The need to attend to environmental impacts of development and the corresponding requirements for more thoughtfully designed amenity landscapes provided a platform for individuals to step-up to the challenge. Simultaneously, and fortuitously for landscape architecture, the Australian government's commitment to advance the city of Canberra as the nation's capital had seen the establishment of the National Capital Development Commission (NCDC) within which landscape architecture was delivered a role alongside planning, engineering, architecture and civic design (Saniga, 2012, pp. 172-176). A significant protagonist in this respect is Lindsay Dixon Pryor, a trained forester whose career became more closely aligned with the discipline of landscape architecture in the 1940s at a time before the profession had been given due regard. Pryor was relatively autonomous in his unique professional trajectory despite the fact his consultancies were clearly aligned with the professional jurisdiction that AILA would seek to command. The aim of this paper is twofold: first, to provide some essential biographical information that helps define Pryor's career and contribution; and second, to analyse aspects of Pryor's campus design commissions, shedding light on the nature of his pioneering work of the period. Ultimately, this paper aims to expand an understanding

of the planning and design of modern campuses in Australia, a field of research with few, albeit significant, scholarly contributions to date (for example see: Garnaut, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014; Goad and Tibbits, 2003; Holden and Bird, 2013; Lewi and Saniga, 2017; Saniga, 2012).

THE MAN FROM MOONTA

Lindsay Dixon Pryor (1915-1998) was born in Moonta, approximately 160 kilometres north-west of Adelaide, South Australia. After commencing his tertiary studies at the University of Adelaide, Pryor completed his training as a forester at the Australian Forestry School in Canberra (1934-35) and after a short period of work experience in the field (mainly in Queensland) he took up a position as Assistant Forester in 1936 with ACT Forests under Cyril R Cole, ACT Forester (O’Keefe, 1994, pp. 11-12). This position initially took him into the field for extended periods of time, plotting pine plantations in locations such as the Brindabella Range in the Lees Creek and Bushrangers Creek areas (O’Keefe, 1994, p. 14). Between 1939 and 1943 he was Acting Forester and then took up the position as Superintendent of Parks and Gardens for the Department of the Interior between 1944 and 1958, the latter part of which he served as Director. While with the Department, Pryor developed his occupational role from landscape manager to more closely fit that of a landscape architect, even though he was formally trained in forestry.

Mathew Higgins, amateur historian, has produced perhaps the most extensive account of Pryor’s life, having conducted a series of interviews between 1990 and 1994 (Higgins, 2016, p. 12). In reading Pryor’s own recollections of his early forestry days in the ACT one gets a sense of the importance of field research and a self-styled career: “...I did a lot of work that was not conventional forestry – in botanical – which was personal research, really which continued into Parks and Gardens.” (Pryor in O’Keefe, 1994, p. 63). When practicing forestry, Pryor lived in the field, including as Chief Fire Control Officer in the ACT during the impactful 1939 fires (O’Keefe, 1994, pp. 21-24). Exploring plant materials first-hand helped build an interest in field research, trials and innovation. Despite Pryor commanding a workforce of the magnitude of around 250 men in the Department of the Interior, he remained personable with his workers and took an active role on site while major works were being implemented (Higgins, 2016, p. 13). He continually developed his botanical knowledge, particularly of eucalypts, and applied this knowledge in plant selection for a broad range of applications. Ultimately his command of botany became an academic pursuit when in 1958 he became Foundation Professor of Botany at the Australian National University (ANU), a position he held until 1976.

In the two decades following the Second World War there were no courses in landscape architecture available in Australia, so Pryor used travel as a way of developing design knowledge. In 1946 a trip to Japan gave him an understanding of a “sparing use of accent in design” and of pruning techniques, notably applied to Plane trees in Manuka (Higgins, 2016, p. 12). His 1947 trip to the United States of America and to Europe was a world tour of great landscape architecture to learn the principles of the discipline, particularly Washington as a national capital, and institutional landscapes generally in the other places he visited including Britain, France, Italy, Spain and Scandinavia (Higgins, 2016, p. 13). These travels informed his design language, both in terms of what was unsuitable for his work in Australia, such as the parterres of Versailles, and, suitable precedents, such as botanic gardens in Scandinavia (Higgins 2016, p. 13). Pryor took the concept of a botanic garden for Canberra that had been in place from its early years and advanced it in a practical way including contributing to its long-term development as a garden for Australian native plant materials (Dyson, 2015). Importantly, Pryor’s astute attention to plant materials created opportunities for introducing exotic plant materials for specific benefits in the Australian urban landscape, including university campuses (Higgins and National Trust of Australia, 1992). He traded with plant suppliers Herbst Brothers (New York), Vilmorin (Paris), Hilliers (UK) and collected seed for testing in Australia (Higgins, 2016, p. 15).

This brief overview of Pryor’s career trajectory brings forth three key aspects which will be discussed in turn. These include: his breadth of disciplinary experience and influence; the scope of collaborative work on significant projects with leaders in multidisciplinary working groups; and, the breadth of geographical impact across Australia.

First, his self-styled career defies simple classification, largely because at the time the NCDC was launched (1958) Pryor changed his role from landscape manager and landscape architect to that of an academic at the ANU. As result, when the AILA was forming in the early 1960s, Pryor was not an active participant (Clough, 2003) despite continuing to engage in landscape consultancies via his academic position. Yet Pryor made important contributions to landscape architecture as a discipline, especially in Canberra, because he managed trees on a large scale, setting up strategic bases for the profession that transcended previous horticultural roles linked to the domestic landscape (Clough, 2003). He also mentored others, particularly those with a forestry background, and thus introduced practitioners such as Raymond Margules and John Gray to the landscape architecture profession (Margules, 2000; Gray, 2003). Pryor sought to manage plant material in a practical way, removing trees when appropriate to do so, despite the possibility of public dismay. And whilst he was mindful of conservation, as a landscape manager, pragmatism was often paramount. For example, when the Royal Canberra Golf Course was moved to Westbourne Woods (ACT Heritage Council, 2011) to make way for the filling of Lake Burley Griffin with water, which eventuated in April 1964, Pryor contributed to ensuring a successful integration into what was a historically significant plantation by horticulturist and arboriculturist for Canberra, T.C.G. Weston (1866-1935). He also did so while cognisant of the ensuing loss of public access to the site, an outcome that had been controversial in Canberra and thus his participation in the project he did not take lightly.

Second, the associations Pryor made with plant enthusiasts, town planners and architects were a product of his eminence in Canberra coupled with his breadth of knowledge and experience. Architect and master planner for La Trobe University, Roy Simpson, collaborated on projects in Canberra, the success of which led Simpson to subsequently nominate Pryor as a landscape consultant for La Trobe University (Simpson, 1989, p. 45). The ANU, Simpson felt, was “a shining example of environmental design” (Simpson, 1989, p. 41) and Pryor a person capable of “bringing botanical delight into the then vast, empty spaces of the national capital’ with unique skills of ‘indispensable dimension to our enterprise.” (Simpson, 1989, p. 45). Pryor assisted the NCDC in plant selection for key sites including Anzac Parade, leading to an association with NCDC landscape architect Richard Clough (1921-2014). Clough stated: “We frequently consulted him...he would always be happy to give us advice. And his advice was always sound. I worked with him of course at La Trobe and Flinders Universities, as well as at the ANU...he was a very perceptive person...” (Clough 2003). The Pryor-Clough partnership on campus work set a precedent that others university administrators sought to emulate. In 1966, Monash University’s Vice Chancellor Louis Matheson directed his Buildings Officer, G.P.H. Boycott, to visit Flinders University in Adelaide to make observations of that university’s successful campus landscape development, a significant part of which, Boycott concluded, resulted from the Pryor-Clough team and the acceptance of their plans (Boycott, 1966). Archival records at Flinders University reveal extensive correspondence and collaborative decision-making between Pryor and Flinders University Staff Architect, Geoffrey J Harrison, across a range of landscape, planning and design issues. Harrison believed Flinders would make future generations aware of the importance of landscape and spoke to the AILA to that effect (see Harrison, 1970). L.W. Harvey, Superintendent of Grounds, implemented Pryor’s proposals and sought his approval for his own initiatives for Flinders’ landscape development (see Harvey, 1969).

A third defining feature of Pryor’s career was the geographic reach of his commissions in Australia. This occurred at a time when landscape architects were a loosely defined group, and those individuals expanding their practices were often limited to the cities in which they were based. Denis Stephenson, architect, landscape designer and Divisional Manager (Buildings and Grounds) at La Trobe University in 1997 reflected that at the time La Trobe formed there was a lack of skilled practitioners available on the local scene in Victoria whose horticultural knowledge in native plants he deemed capable enough to guarantee success (Stephenson, 1997, p. 261). Pryor’s reputation led him to multiple engagements across Australia but there is also anecdotal evidence to suggest that Pryor completed a landscape consultancy for a campus in Papua New Guinea (Hawke, 2006, p. 6) although details of this commission are not yet known. In this sense, his campus work defines him as having a nation-wide impact in terms of advancing the emerging profession of landscape architecture. One also needs to be mindful of the critical roles played by on-ground horticultural staff who incrementally applied and developed Pryor’s ideas while Pryor himself remained in Canberra. For example, in the case of La Trobe University, Head Gardener and Curator of Grounds Franz Saul (employed 1965-77) was critical in manifesting Pryor’s and others’ advice in practical and successful ways (Glenn, 1989, p. 27). At Flinders University, Laurence W. Harvey,

Curator of Grounds, was pivotal in advancing the campus landscape in concert with Pryor's recommendations.

PRYOR AND THE SUBURBAN CAMPUS LANDSCAPE

University campuses in Australia can be categorised by the historic contexts in which the institutions materialised and in turn their geographic distribution. The universities that were born of a period of tertiary institutional expansion commencing in the late 1950s predominantly formed on large greenfield sites ranging from approximately 10-20 kilometres from the CBD. The planners of such campuses sometimes still looked to Cambridge and Oxford as models, but perhaps more significantly they were influenced by campuses in California, where similar forces of suburban expansion were occurring. New suburban campuses were often based around cars, parking and transport – infrastructure that held the potential to detract from environmental quality. The campus was often planned to be inclusive of dormitories, internal pedestrianisation systems, and large open spaces. Landscape became a resource for recreational amenity as well as a visually defining feature in terms of institutional character: questions of identity became paramount. Pre-existing landscape settings were often ex-agricultural land, cleared and nondescript, allowing the generation of a total environment, the unifying impact of which often relied on extensive use of Australian plant materials in green belts, vegetative screens, and the like. It was in such contexts that the skills of Lindsay Pryor found application. He developed commissions with the new campuses for the Australian National University (from c. 1946); University of Tasmania (from 1957 to 1963); Flinders University (from 1963); La Trobe University (from 1965); and, Monash University (in 1966).

Planting the campus: a pragmatic approach

Pryor's forestry background was crucial in defining his pragmatic approach to the campus landscapes. Practical landscape management often outweighed overarching aesthetics though he was appreciated by others for contributing an aesthetic vision (Glenn, 1989, p. 27). His ideas were based on appropriateness in terms of comfort, functional effectiveness, and sound economic grounds (Pryor, 1978, p. 58), the practical-nature of which seems first and foremost reflective of his scientific training combined with the landscapes of the ACT. Pryor himself noted that people considered him to be a 'renegade forester' but that he persisted in attempting to combine science and economics as practical dimensions with a sensitivity for site, context and aesthetic values (Higgins and National Trust of Australia, 1992, p. 3). Simpson commented in relation to La Trobe University: "While his approach was no less scientifically-oriented than those of the engineering consultants, there was an underling aesthetic consequence to his contributions which he understood and manipulated to splendid effect...." (Simpson, 1989, p. 45). But pragmatism ultimately came first, particularly in his early consultancies. In this sense the University of Tasmania (UTAS) provides a good case in point.

In the late 1950s, the UTAS was developing a new campus on a large site at Sandy Bay, having decided to move from its original site at the Domain adjacent to the city of Hobart. In terms of the scale of Hobart as a metropolis, this shift constituted a move to the suburbs, despite the fact the actual distance from the CBD was a mere 3.5 kilometres or so. The design of the campus had initially been prepared by Professor Leslie Wilkinson in 1944, a scheme that was "inspired by Georgian architecture of early Australia" (Petrow, 1997, p. 154). Petrow has explained that by the mid-1950s pressure from the local modernist architecture community combined with the support from the Tasmanian Public Works Department resulted in a campus that "contributed to the modernist uglification of Hobart...[by way of]...a Spartan collection of buildings devoid of artistic sensibility and working against the sense of place" (Petrow, 1997, p. 154). Clearly the campus in these early years was cause for consternation. The UTAS's Professor of Botany, H.N. Barber, wrote that the question of landscape layout for the new university was raised and that he "really did not know where to start" (Barber, 1957) other than offering his own department's assistance along with other UTAS employees in raising plant stock and thus saving money.

Barber proposed that given the urgency of the matter that an "expert on lay-out, planting schedules, labour force,

necessary for the successive stages of development" (Barber, 1957) be employed and that no local would suffice. He claimed that Pryor was unrivalled in knowledge and experience in Australia, that he understood modern landscape internationally, and "would be interested in helping us" (Barber, 1957). In response to invitation to be a part of a team to consult on the new UTAS campus, Pryor reminded Barber of his expertise and status in consulting on campus landscapes, having served on the buildings and grounds committee at ANU preparing "all the plans and [carrying] out all the landscape work done on the site." (Pryor quoted in Barber, 1957). On 1 October 1957 Pryor formally accepted the invitation to lead the Advisory Committee consisting of FR Dowse (Superintendent of Reserves, Launceston [Tasmania], HN Barber (Professor of Botany and Chairman of Professorial Board) and JM Gilbert (of the Forestry Department [Tasmania]). He stated his previous association with Mr Dowse (Pryor, 1957), which is further illustration of Pryor's professional reach.

The team's first report (Pryor et al., 1958) illustrated their belief that the campus's planting could provide an anodyne for the visual impact of UTAS's early buildings. The report proposed "Maximum Integration of Landscape Construction with Building Contracts" (Pryor, et al., 1958, p. 1) in a bid to effectively advance topsoiling, irrigation, paving and surfaces via architectural commissions, leaving plant material to be resolved via the Committee and additional landscape consultancies. Their report proposed that a "General Landscape Plan" be prepared by the Committee, and suggested that prime concern would be the "main architectural axis" – presumably referring to Wilkinson's axial arrangement capitalising on the site's aspect to the Derwent River – and that a "vertical section" of this axis be provided to assist the Committee in preparing landscape recommendations (Pryor et al., 1958, p. 2). An area of natural bushland, which today is distinctive in UTAS's landscape character, was considered a significant "backdrop" and ear-marked for conservation yet with the pragmatic concern of forestry and fire management linked to their recommendations (Pryor et al., 1958, p. 3).

The character of UTAS's landscape design was to be largely defined by plant selection and arrangement. The Committee proposed planting in an informal style in a bid to create a "matrix" (Pryor et al., 1958, p. 2) that could potentially bind what they perceived to be strong and distinctive architectural character on the site. In one location Pryor proposed the termination of a long vista with planting consisting of a distinctive species not found elsewhere on campus (Pryor 1958). Generally, Pryor's advisory committee proposed the use of a wide range of species that could be found to have grown successfully in the area. Australian native species were to be used across the campus. Within the areas immediately adjacent to buildings, non-Australian deciduous vegetation was to be used.

In terms of impact, it is difficult to gauge the extent to which aspects of the Committee's contribution is extant. Pryor's Advisory Committee appears to have been mainly active around the time of their 1958 report, with only occasional meetings thereafter (Preshaw, 1963). Pryor did offer further assistance intermittently (University of Tasmania, 1969) however the UTAS utilised more regularly the services of a Mr Chilvers, Superintendent of Reserves for the City of Hobart from the early 1960s onwards (Preshaw, 1963). In a report on UTAS's campus development written by Professor Gordon Stephenson in 1972, the contribution of the Advisory Committee's recommendations is not clear (Stephenson, 1972, pp. 13-14). However, the Committee's scheme for UTAS signals an ethos defined by an essential divide in plant selection (Australian native versus non-Australian plants) and arrangement (formality versus informality). This coupled with corresponding ameliorative effects that different plants could provide would form Pryor's unshakeable maxim for practically all his proposals.

At La Trobe University, Pryor deemed plants crucial as a screening device. He proposed ameliorating the visual impact of surrounding housing, factories and even a cemetery with heavy planting on the site's margins. He also claimed that this resulted in a green belt for shelter and habitat for birds, and importantly, an overall cohesive campus character once linked via intermediary planting of groupings of trees and shrubs and expanses of lawn extending to the external environments of campus buildings at the core of the site (Pryor, 1978, p. 58). The lack of geometric alignment in the loose or seemingly random deployment of trees and shrubs en masse he contrasted with a geometric configuration within the internal courtyard spaces or those spaces associated with buildings. Internal courtyard spaces such as the Agora and the Peribolos were in the main surrounded by multi-level buildings where "the need for winter sun and the interest from seasonal change is supplied by the use of reliable deciduous species as the main trees, such as London Plane

(*Platanus orientalis*) and English Elm (*Ulmus procera*)” (Pryor, 1978, p. 58) (see Figure 1). It seems here that Pryor’s design philosophy was in part intended to ensure a clear and effective design strategy in the context of limited budgets and perhaps limitations in terms of direct control. Formality versus informality were simply expressed as products of geometry versus non-geometric arrangements, and in turn, distinction and contrast. He wrote:

Some geometrical formality in design is used here to signal these central places and contrast with the remainder...[spaces]...detached from the surrounding more extensive landscape are seen as places for change and contrast in materials and to suggest a mood different from the busy exterior (Pryor, 1978, p. 58).

In this sense, Pryor found a place for aesthetics linked to the European examples he had observed whilst travelling the world to gain a design language. The application of this sensibility to site design was no doubt aided by his close working relationship with Department of the Interior employee Otakar (Otto) Ruzicka (1920-96), a Czechoslovakian émigré formerly trained in garden design in Europe. Ruzicka worked within Parks and Gardens from 1952 and together with Pryor helped design parts of the ANU. In the internal garden space at the John Curtin School of Medical Research (1954) at the ANU, Pryor is said to have included Japanese design styles, (Higgins, 2016, p. 12) and although detailed planting plans of this scheme are yet to be found, early photographs of the School reveal deciduous plantings of Maple and Gleditsia and large natural stone and aggregates used in a fashion reminiscent of the materiality of traditional Japanese gardens.



Figure 1: The Agora and plane trees at La Trobe University. Photograph: A Saniga, 2016.

Plants for science and environmental quality

Pryor believed the establishment of a cohesive collection of trees and shrubs was essential to a satisfactory result. To achieve successful results, he needed to establish the reliability of certain species and ultimately to be able to test species in a controlled manner. His experimental plantings at the ANU in the late 1950s and 1960s were linked to tests within Canberra’s landscape generally (Godden, Mackay & Logan, 2012a, p. 114) and the findings of such research became the basis upon which some of his planting expertise found footing on sites further afield. Experimental plantings at ANU included *Eucalyptus bicostata* in the vicinity of Garran Hall and Ursula College; and *Eucalyptus aggregata* along both sides of the Sullivans Creek in the early 1950s (Godden et al., 2012a, p. 114). Further experimental non-native plantings of mixed conifers and deciduous trees occurred in the northern part of the campus as well as poplars planted near Burgmann College and a stand of eucalypts near the Forestry building at Dickson and Daley Roads (Goddon et al., 2012a). The Australian Forestry School grounds were a focus and expression of his work (Higgins, 2016, p. 16). These examples suggest a bid to establish on campus collections of trees consisting of liberal mixes of Australian and non-Australian plants (see also Godden, et al., 2012b, p. 512); planting research and design were essential elements of Pryor’s contribution.

The infusion of a sense of unity was a critical Pryor maxim but with the aim of striking a satisfactory balance with the need for variety in a bid for a robust environmental quality. As a key design principle at Flinders University, Pryor proposed variety in planting type: “substantial clumps of large trees”; “evergreen forest plantations”; and accent planting by way of intermittently placed deciduous plant materials. (Stephenson and Harrison, 1964, pp. 40-42). Pryor sought to achieve harmony in planting via consideration of points of transition between one tree group and another, utilising for example South Australian Blue Gum and Yellow Box in sequence with the Flinders site’s pre-existing plantings of Peppermint (*Eucalyptus* species) and Native Apricots (Stephenson and Harrison, 1964, pp. 40-42). Courtyards and forecourts at Flinders were to be predominantly a product of the buildings in terms of character, with unity between these spaces being achieved through a consistency of paving and turf with perhaps a fountain for accent. The overall ensemble, as with other of Pryor’s commissions, consisted of larger and more densely planted areas of Australian native plants at some distance from built form, and more open turfed spaces inclusive of non-Australian plants in association with buildings at the core of the site. Pryor wanted to ensure planting satisfied both functional requirements and aesthetic appeal and that landscape would become essential to achieving high environmental quality. He reflected, decades later, that the Flinders campus landscape was “far more than mere trivial embellishment” (Pryor, 1993, p. 1). The substantial pine tree plantations at Flinders University flanking the steep slopes of two ridges separating the student accommodation area and the main campus buildings, gave a bold utilitarian feel – as would a forest plantation of trees planted for timber resources – that pedestrians walked through via a dramatic footbridge spanning the valley in-between (see Figure 2). Harrison later explained that the plantations were a practical solution: they were straightforward to implement given the steep grade and harsh growing conditions (soil, moisture, etc); they promised satisfactory effects in the short and long terms in providing green coverage throughout the year; and, they simultaneously reduced risk of grass fires (Harrison, 1986, p. 22).

Pryor respected indigenous plant material and the value this could bring to a new campus landscape. At La Trobe University, he identified the site as having “no dramatic natural features” (Pryor, 1978, p. 58). This must have been noted in terms of land form or other feature such as geology because he went on to state that the site had River Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) and Yellow Box (*Eucalyptus melliodora*) and that this vegetation needed to be integrated and preserved as a matter of “high priority” (Pryor, 1978, p. 58). He envisaged the views of La Trobe’s academic buildings, the colleges, and the car parks would be predominantly Australian native shrubs and ground covers. In the late 1970s, Pryor acknowledged the aesthetic value of Australian native plants in the context of popular culture. He wrote: “They (native species) satisfy the growing country-wide appreciation of native Australian species and add to further appreciation of landscape use of indigenous plants by the users.” (Pryor, 1978, p. 58). Higgins noted that Pryor was “concerned about what he saw as the overzealous use of natives from the 1970s onward” and felt that there was an inherent risk in using native plant materials in applications that had not been sufficiently tested (Higgins, 2016, p. 13). His moderate stance on



Figure 2: The pine plantations at Flinders University in November 2017. Photograph: A Saniga.

the mixing of both Australian and non-Australian plant species in at least one instance cost him a consultancy. At Monash University's Clayton campus (Victoria) the heartfelt and activist debate over the sole use of Australian native plants underpinned the early decades of the development of the campus landscape. In this instance, Monash's Professor Alan (Jock) Marshall, a particularly powerful advocate of Australian native plants, lobbied Vice Chancellor Louis Matheson to desist in giving Pryor "carte blanche" with the campus's planting design (Saniga, 2012, pp. 160-162). Matheson had endorsed Pryor's "intermediate position in the Australian versus exotic planting controversy" (Matheson, 1966).

Here is an essential distinction to be made among the early founders of a profession of landscape architecture in Australia. As the landscape architecture profession developed in the 1960s and 1970s Pryor's contemporaries advocated the reconstruction of facsimiles of Australian landscapes, as a complete ensemble, an approach that does not come through strongly in Pryor's accounts of his own work (see Pryor, 1978, p. 78; Higgins and National Trust of Australia, 1992). Pryor was less interested in the creation of 'bush' gardens as facsimiles, even though he consistently advocated campus landscapes as rich repositories "providing an aesthetically appropriate environment with much intrinsic interest from the plants and the associated animals – birds and insects – which they attract" (Pryor, 1981, p. 1). He also emphasised the value of Australian native plants as individual specimens in a manner demonstrating thoughtfulness. For example, regarding La Trobe University he wrote: "The preservation of the single large Red Gum, outside Menzies College, above its abutting placed boulders is symbolic and signals stability and purpose." (Pryor, 1978, p. 58) (see Figure 3). Here Pryor seemed to be linking the enduring presence of pre-colonial vegetation and the corresponding prospect of endurance of La Trobe University as a new institution on the Australian academic scene. It is not entirely clear if this was post-rationalisation or accurate recording of initial design intentions, however, it does suggest that beyond pragmatic and managerial concerns, Pryor also had the ability to appreciate trees as having a meaningful role in the way people might perceive the modern campus landscape.



Figure 3: Large eucalypt outside Menzies College, La Trobe University that Pryor cited as symbolising stability and purpose. Photograph: A Saniga, 2018.

CONCLUSION

This paper has only scratched the surface of Lindsay Pryor's impact on the development of Australian campus landscapes. In some respects, his contribution is difficult to define: it is often embedded in planning reports, written recommendations and even on-site discussion perhaps more so than is determinable from detailed design in the form of plan drawings, diagrams or other graphic representations. His contribution is notable in terms of the botanical advances he brought of the knowledge and use of trees in Australian cities, itself a product of the active ways in which he engaged in research and development for designing, implementing and managing plant materials in urban landscapes. The city of Canberra,

its institutions, streets and parks, along with the campus of the Australian National University, were Pryor's testing ground and today parts of that city's repository of plants stand as manifestation of his efforts. The relics of individual plantings to have survived recent decades of building expansion at the universities Pryor contributed to also represent his contribution. But perhaps equally important is the representations that Pryor made in board rooms and committee meetings, pronouncing the importance of landscape considerations, of appropriate management and ultimately for the inclusion of landscape architecture in the ongoing management of the Australian campus for high environmental quality. In this way, Pryor's landscapes for Australian campuses set foundations for the discipline of landscape architecture upon which to become an increasingly important consideration in urban development on the Australian scene.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research presented here was funded by an Australian Research Council Discovery Grant, DP160100364, 'Campus: Building Modern Australian Universities'. Thank you to all our co-investigators, and, in particular, Narelle Bethune, Christine Garnaut, Andrew Murray, Susan Holden and Cameron Logan. Special thanks to the archivists and librarians at: ANU Archives; Flinders University Archives; La Trobe University Archives; Monash University Archives and the Tasmanian Archives and Heritage Office, Hobart. Thanks to all the correspondents who verified information, the interviewees and the professional staff at various universities, and finally, to the academic referees for their invaluable commentaries on the paper.

REFERENCES

- ACT Heritage Council, 2011. Entry to the heritage register for Westbourne Woods, Dunrossil Drive, Yarralumla. ACT Heritage Council, 2011. Available from: <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/ni/2011-497/current/pdf/2011-497.pdf> [Accessed 23 August 2017].
- Anonymous, 1978. *La Trobe University, Architecture Australia* 67. No. 4, September 1978, 34-66.
- Barber, H. N., 1957. Letter from Barber H. N. to Professor Hytten, 12 March 1957, Item AE463/1/118 Description UT47/24(59) Buildings and Grounds – Sandy Bay Site – Landscaping. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.
- Boycott, G.P.H., 1966. Letter from Boycott to Matheson Landscaping and Planting, Mon 22 folio 203, 19 April. Clayton: Monash University Archives.
- Clough, R., Interview with Andrew Saniga. 1 March 2003. NSW: Double Bay.
- Dyson, C. R., 2015. National identity, Australian plants, and the natural garden in post-WWII Australia, 1945 to 1986. PhD Thesis. The University of Melbourne.
- Garnaut, C., 2010. Gordon Stephenson and Campus Planning in Australia. In: N. Gulersoy et. al. *Urban Transformation: controversies, contrasts and challenges*. Proceedings of the 14th International Planning History Society Conference. 12-15 July. Urban and Environment Planning and Research Centre, ITU, Istanbul, 35-48.
- Garnaut, C., 2011. Gordon Stephenson and the Radburn Idea in University Planning. 3rd World Planning Schools Congress, Perth 4-8 July 2011, CD ROM publication.
- Garnaut, C., 2012. Gordon Stephenson and university planning: a pleasurable professional pursuit. *Town Planning Review* 83 (3), 377-395.
- Garnaut, C., 2014 'The Planning and Design of Murdoch University: The foundation years. *Circa: The Journal of Professional Historians*, 4, 27-38.
- Goad, P. and Tibbits, G., 2003, *Architecture on Campus: a guide to the University of Melbourne and its colleges*. Melbourne University Press. Carlton.
- Glenn, J. R. A., 1989. The Planning Phase. In: Breen, W. J. and Salmond, J. A., eds. *Building La Trobe University: Reflections on the*

First 25 Years, 1964-1989. Melbourne: La Trobe University Press, 21-29.

Goad, P. and Tibbits, G., 2003. *Architecture on Campus: a guide to the University of Melbourne and its colleges*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Godden, Mackay, Logan, 2012a. ANU Heritage Study Acton Campus Volume 1. Heritage Study.

Godden, Mackay, Logan, 2012b. ANU Heritage Study Acton Campus Volume 2. Heritage Study.

Gray, J., 2003. Interview with Andrew Saniga. 26 February 2003. ACT: Canberra.

Harrison, G. J., 1970. Landscaping at Flinders University Talk to A.I.L.A. Group, 28.10.70, Flinders University Archives.

Harrison, G. J., 1986. Interview with Averil Holt for Flinders University Oral History Project. 15 September 1986 [location unknown].

Harvey, L. W., 1969. Letter from L. W. Harvey to L. D. Pryor, 14 July 1969.

Hawke, A., & Australian National University, 2006. The inaugural Lindsay Pryor memorial lecture. Canberra: Australian National University.

Higgins, M. and National Trust of Australia (A.C.T.), 1992. Transcript of Oral History Lindsay Dixon Pryor interviewed by Matthew Higgins, July 1992. ACT: National Trust of Australia.

Higgins, M., 2016. Lindsay Pryor: planting the capital. *Australian Garden History*, 27 (4) April 2016, 12-16.

Holden, S. and Bird, J., 2013. An Open Plan: The Development of the Griffith University Nathan Campus Plan, 1966-1973. In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*: 30. Edited by A Brown and A Leach, Gold Coast, Queensland: SAHANZ 2013, 723-736.

Lewi, H. and Saniga, A., 2017. Carte Blanche On Campus? In: *Fabrications: The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. Vol 27 No 3, 322-351.

Margules, R., 2000. Interview with Andrew Saniga. 17 February 2000. ACT: Canberra.

Matheson, L., 1966. Monash University: Landscape Design in the University, MON 22, 23 August 1966. Clayton: Monash University Archives.

O'Keefe, B, 1994. A social and economic history of forestry within the ACT Oral History Interviews, Transcript of Interview with Professor Lindsay Pryor. ACT: ACT Government.

Petrow, S., 1997. Modernism in Tasmania: The University of Tasmania Moves House, 1944 to 1962. *Tasmanian Historical Studies*, 5 (2), 153-174.

Pryor, L. D., 1957. Letter from Pryor L. D. to Preshaw, A. S., 1 October 1957. Item AE463/1/118 Description UT47/24(59) Buildings and Grounds – Sandy Bay Site – Landscaping. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.

Pryor, L.D., 1958. Letter from Pryor L. D. to Preshaw, A. S., 11 August 1958. Item AE463/1/118 Description UT47/24(59) Buildings and Grounds – Sandy Bay Site – Landscaping. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.

Pryor, L. D., 1978. The Landscape [La Trobe University]. *Architecture Australia* 67, No. 4, September 1978.

Pryor, L. D., 1981. The Flinders University of South Australia: Landscape Review and Development Proposals. South Australia: Flinders University.

Pryor, L. D., 1993. The Flinders University of South Australia: A Review of Landscape. South Australia: Flinders University.

Pryor, L.D., Dowse, F. R., Barber H. N., and Gilbert, J. M., 1958. Preliminary Report by the Committee on Landscape Development. The University of Tasmania, 5 February 1958, Item AE463/1/118 Description UT47/24(59) Buildings and Grounds – Sandy Bay Site – Landscaping. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.

Preshaw, A. S., 1963. Letter from Preshaw, A. S. to Pryor, L. D., 24 September 1963. Item AE463/1/118 Description UT47/24(59) Buildings and Grounds – Sandy Bay Site – Landscaping. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.

Saniga, A., 2012. *Making Landscape Architecture in Australia*. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Simpson, R. 1989. The Master Plan. In: Breen, W. J. and Salmond, J. A., eds. *Building La Trobe University: Reflections on the First 25 Years, 1964-1989*. Melbourne: La Trobe University Press, 39-49.

Stephenson, D., 1997. From Silent Spring to Paradise Regained: La Trobe University – Bundoora Campus. *Landscape Australia*, 3, 259-266.

Stephenson, G., and Harrison, G. J., 1964. The University of Adelaide at Bedford Park: Site Planning Report. South Australia. Stephenson, G., 1972. University of Tasmania Campus Development: Report of Gordon Stephenson. July 1972. University of Tasmania, 1969. Landscaping Committee, Minutes of a meeting of the Landscaping Committee held in the Committee Room on 21 October 1969 at 3pm. Item AE99/1/1, Description UT435/4 Minutes of Meetings of Landscaping Committee. Hobart: Tasmanian Archives and Heritage.