Western Australian battlers and coastal squatter settlements: heritage from below versus regulation from above
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Abstract

The informal, frequently illegal vacation shacks and settlements hugging Western Australia’s coast are expressions of the Aussie Battlers’ pioneering spirit and reminiscent of the early Australian squatters who opened up the country. From the early twentieth century onward, these coastal destinations have become for many Australian families a holiday experience spanning several generations. However, the campers and shack dwellers of the unplanned settlements are increasingly threatened by the authorities who are seeking to upgrade these communities and impose order on the coastal environment. Destruction of the settlements not only represents the removal of the rudimentary dwellings; it also signifies the destruction of shackies’ holiday traditions, their lifestyle and their cultural heritage. These processes are illustrated by reference to Western Australia’s south-west coast, where former holiday squatter sites have now become permanent communities and up to the state’s North West Cape, favoured by long-stay, seasonal and ‘unmanaged’ campers.
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Introduction

Much Australian myth has been built around ‘the battlers,’ pioneering spirit, their survival in the face of adversity, their fierce independence, their rejection of upper class pretension and their resistance to conformity. Tied in with this concept is the early history of Australian colonial settlement and the role of the squatters who were central to the effective occupancy of substantial areas of the eastern interior. The beach and the coast have also played a central role in Australian iconography. Families, and sometimes larger groups travelled from cities and from inland mining and farming districts to bays and beaches where they camped or erected basic shelters for their vacation enjoyment. From the early 20th Century onwards these coastal destinations have become the sites of quintessentially Australian holiday experiences. However the denizens of these informal and often illegal settlements now threatened by, not only to their holiday experiences and to their simple accommodations, but to their way of life and even their heritage. This will be illustrated by reference to a range of Western Australian coastal sites ranging from the southern coast, where former holiday squatter camps have now become legitimate, to permanent coastal resorts and settlements, and to the coastline well north of Perth which was, until very recently, much less accessible (Figure 1). The original settlements were generally produced by so-called Aussie ‘battlers’, working class, down-to-earth, practical, self-sufficient pioneers—manly personages with the ability to ‘make do’ (Bean 1934; Ward 1966; White 1981; Page and Ingpen 1982;
Jones and Birdsall-Jones 2008). Such descriptors contain an element of truth and the settlements are often perceived as symbols of the cultural heritage of the common people.

Proximity to the coast has always been highly valued and sought after by Australians. Although there have been regular waves of population movement inland as immigrants took up land for agricultural settlement (Meinig 1970; Powell 1970) or to discover and develop mineral resources (Blainey 2003), with mechanization and corporatization the populations of many inland towns have subsequently declined, in what demographer Bernard Salt (2001) has termed the “big shift”, and Australia’s population is becoming increasingly coastal once more. This modern “Seachange” (Burnley and Murphy 2004) movement, fuelled by an increasingly affluent, mobile, ageing and growing population, is generating strong development pressures for second home, retirement home and tourism-related growth in many scenic coastal localities around the country.

However, in many coastal regions of Western Australia, a number of scenic locations had already been colonized—albeit informally and seldom on more than a seasonal basis—by what might be termed recreational pioneers. In the early 20th Century many such pioneers were farming families from adjoining inland properties seeking pasture for their stock in the drier months and who subsequently returned to those coastal locations for recreational reasons (Selwood et al. 1996). With development of the crayfishing industry shortly after World War II, fishermen took up moorings and temporary accommodation along the coast. These developments were accelerated after the mid-20th Century by rising motor vehicle ownership and four wheel drive vehicles, leading to the creation of networks of tracks to the embryonic settlements. More recently, city dwellers, especially from metropolitan Perth, have sought holiday sites at the settlements (Selwood and May 2001: Selwood and Tonts 2004; 2006). Over time, the rudimentary camp sites became more permanent in nature as people shipped in and constructed shacks from timber, corrugated iron and any other material that could be put to good use (Gabbedy 1988; Bolton 1994; Jones 2001). While these structures were characteristically Australian, they were also an Antipodean variant of the English interwar plotland developments described by Hardy and Ward (1984, 2):

It was invariably a world of single-storey houses, simply built and often using wood, though never refusing whatever material (corrugated iron, asbestos, precast concrete and bricks) lay at hand. Some could have taken their place alongside more conventional bungalows but others, a colourful kaleidoscope of shacks and shanties, were a world apart.

Thus, by what has been a fundamentally spontaneous process over several decades and generations, ‘ordinary’ Western Australians have camped, built shacks and enjoyed the opportunity for unsupervised and unregulated coastal holiday experiences. In a ‘frontier’ state, their right to camp, to fish and even to build ‘shacks’ largely went unchallenged until the late 20th Century and came to be seen as a part of their heritage. Like the 19th Century squatters before them (Powell 1970), they had moved into areas arbitrarily claimed by distant imperial or colonial authorities that lacked the means to control and administer them. They were characteristically Crown lands that, at the time, were not being used by any other elements of the settler population. Unlike the pastoral squatters, however, the shackies generally did not and do not possess the same economic or the political power as their forebears.

So, when in the late 20th Century many coastal sites were becoming increasingly prized real estate and pressure grew for greater regulation of coastal development, the shackies had to confront growing challenges to what they saw as their idyllic and, in many ways, quintessentially Australian, lifestyle. They had to face the opposing and official position that the flaunting of formal legal and proprietorial constraints is a transgressive form of behaviour not to be condoned. Nevertheless, condemnation and removal of the shackies and their shacks can also be considered another instance of the widespread disregard for elements of society that represent the heritage of the common people or, as observed by Robertson (2008), another example of embattled heritage from below. In response to recent events,
shackie communities have progressed down different paths. Especially on the south coast, at Windy Harbour, Peaceful Bay and elsewhere, settlements have gradually been incorporated into approved coastal holiday settlements, whereas at many localities on the west coast they are being replaced by permanent towns, temporary holiday parks, or recreation grounds. At this point, only the substantial settlements at Grey and Wedge Point are holdouts. However, an anomaly is Naval Base, a shack community within the Perth metropolitan area (Figure 1) which has been allowed to remain in place and now is formally designated a heritage site. These issues will be explored more thoroughly employing detailed case studies of the southern and western coastal areas undertaken by the authors in recent years, supplemented by monitoring of newspapers and government documents up to the present.

**Southern Coastal Settlements - Moving to the Mainstream?**

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, settlers moved into the Lower Great Southern region of Western Australia to develop farms and to establish a forestry industry. These developments tended to occur inland. Nevertheless, some farm families were allowed to take out pastoral leases on the coastal scrub around Peaceful Bay to provide grazing for their cattle in the drier summer months. Residents from the nearby town of Denmark also camped at the bay to take advantage of the good local fishing. The area’s reputation as a camping and fishing spot grew and, particularly after the track to Peaceful Bay was upgraded in 1954, the numbers of campers grew and some began to erect shacks at the site (Selwood et al. 1995).

This growth raised concerns locally and at the state level. In 1956, the engineer for the Denmark Road Board (1956) (the local authority, renamed Denmark Shire in the 1960s) reported his disquiet about the growing number of campers and the poor sanitation standards at the bay. In the same year the Department of Lands and Surveys expressed concern over the proliferation of coastal shacks throughout the southwest of the state. In an attempt to regularize the situation, the road board/shire developed a subdivision plan for 160 small lots behind the frontal dune at Peaceful Bay. By 1963 these had all been taken up on ten-year leases, largely by farm families from the local area who had become regular campers at the site. During the 1960s, the Shire used income from the leases and grants from the Tourism Development Authority to improve road access and to develop water supply and drainage systems. When proposals for dwellings to install and pay for septic tanks were made in 1961, a local Progress Association was formed to fundraise, to coordinate local volunteer projects and to lobby for infrastructure improvements (Figure 2). The association has since agitated to obtain improved telephone and refuse collection services for the settlement and has even brought about the expulsion of consistently disruptive tenants.

By the 1990s, further change was occurring. The Shire approved a new subdivision for larger, more permanent second (or even first) homes; the leases on the original plots were extended from 10 to 21 years and the annual fee quadrupled to $600 per year (still well below market rates for equivalent property). The first calls were made by some residents to obtain freehold title to their plots and the custom whereby plots and shacks had characteristically been passed on to relatives and friends began to give way to sales through estate agents. These moves facilitated two other changes. Firstly, Peaceful Bay was ‘discovered’ by visitors from Perth. Even though the majority of leaseholders are still from the largely rural Great Southern and South Western regions of the state, the proportion of leaseholders from metropolitan Perth grew from five per cent in 1964 to 15 per cent in 1994 and continues to rise (Selwood et al. 1995, 155). At the same time, many shacks were upgraded. With improved power, water, telephone and sewer systems, sealed road access and rapid population growth in the nearby town of Denmark (Selwood et al. 1996), permanent occupancy became increasingly feasible (Figure 3). This practice was nonexistent in 1964, but it had risen to include five percent of the leaseholders by 1984 and eight percent by 1994.

Further to the west along the coast, a parallel but, as yet, a more gradual process is occurring at Windy Harbour (Selwood...
and Tonts 2004; 2006). In the 1920s, workers from the timber towns to the north began camping and fishing at the coastal reserve at Windy Harbour. In the 1940s some locals began building shacks there. By the 1950s there were about 80 at the site and the local road board/shire sought to regularize the settlement by surveying blocks, laying out streets and (at least partly) funding this through a system of annual one-year leases. The squatter/leasee settlement has continued to grow and there were around 220 second homes at the site in 2002 (Selwood and Tonts 2004). Development has not progressed to the same extent as at Peaceful Bay. Windy Harbour still depends on generators (which must be shut off at 10 p.m.) for power and this has caused divisions between those who see the ‘basic’ nature of Windy Harbour as part of its charm and those, currently in the majority (Selwood and Tonts 2004, 158), who advocate its development as a more mainstream tourist and second home destination. With the recent decline of local employment in the timber industry, many see tourism and second home development desirable ways to economically diversify.

In its 1999 Management Plan for Windy Harbour, the Shire of Manjimup appears to be leaning towards preservation, rather than further development. It advocates maintaining leasehold tenure, and limiting development in terms of building size and design. However, leases are being extended from one to 21 years and state building codes will require that standards of building safety and sewage disposal are raised significantly above those of the early postwar ‘shacks’. Almost inevitably, the extra costs of providing better services to the settlement will create pressures on the Shire to allow further development to fund these changes. Many residents of both the Denmark and Manjimup Shires view the extensive (and expensive) tourism and second home developments elsewhere in the southwest corner of the state with apprehension (Selwood and Tonts, 2006). They fear that the character of their own smaller and more informal coastal settlements would be lost if comparable developments were to occur locally. But it is clear that both Peaceful Bay and Windy Harbour are experiencing regulatory and development pressures which are gradually drawing these idiosyncratic communities into the mainstream. Although they retain some of the informality associated with their origins, they are losing the distinctiveness that would earn them heritage status.

West Coastal Settlements – Moving to Oblivion?

The coastline north of Perth likewise became the site of numerous shack settlements from the early- and mid-twentieth century onwards (May and Selwood 1992; Suba and Grundy 1996; Selwood and May 2001). Farmers from the adjacent inland only began to make the (at the time, two day) journey to west coastal camp sites in the interwar years. During World War II, however, tracks to some coastal sites were upgraded and wells were sunk to provide facilities for a military coast watch service. In the immediate postwar years, fishers’ campsites and shacks were established as the Western rock lobster industry grew rapidly (Suba and Grundy 1996). This led to the gazettal of several townsites along the Central Coast during the late 1950s into the 1960s, some of which became legitimate communities. Jurien, for example was gazetted in 1956, Leeman in 1961 and Cervantes in 1963 (Landgate 2009). However, others were never properly established, although some, for example Grey, became favoured sites for squatters (Figures 4 and 5). Because the Central Coast is only 100-300 kilometres north of Perth, once 4WD vehicles became more popular, its colonization by Perth-based recreationists became increasingly intense. By 1997 the Grey Community Association (now Grey Conservation and Community Association) was claiming that around 4,000 shackies/holidaymakers were using Grey in the summer and a further 6,000 the nearby settlement of Wedge Point (Selwood and May 2001).

Possibly because of their greater numbers and their greater proximity to Perth, the west coast settlements received more critical government attention than did those on the south coast. In 1968, state cabinet set up a committee to report on the unlawful use of Crown land on the west coast north of Perth and the resultant “Stokes” Report of 1970 recommended the removal of squatters and their settlements (Suba and Grundy 1996). In 1980, legislation was enacted “for the express purpose of providing the necessary means to remove squatters from public lands” (Suba and Grundy 1996). A Government Position Paper
on Coastal Planning and Management in Western Australia, released in 1983, stated that coastal squatter shack development was unacceptable. A statewide policy for the administration of coastal squatter shacks developed in 1988 forbade the construction of squatter shacks on Crown land along the coast (Figure 6).

Although the state government adopted these measures, it was the shires, as the local planning agencies, that were required to implement them. As yet progress has been patchy. The Shire of Gingin, which is closest to Perth, cleared all its shacks in the early 1980s, as did the Shire of Coorow in 1994, followed by Irwin and Carnamah in the mid-1990s. Both the threats to remove the shacks and their actual destruction had two possibly predictable results. The first was the ‘domino effect’ whereby shackies dismantled their properties in shires where they were under greater threat and reconstructed them in shires where such settlements were still tolerated or where lack of resources and poor coastal access made it difficult to police and control illegal structures. The second was that shack dwellers, most of which already had well established local associations/pressure groups, were galvanized into more fervent defense of their interests. The strong social and community bonds that had developed between families who had been holidaying in these settlements for generations facilitated this process. The Grey Community Association was formed in 1974 and, like its south coast counterparts, collected membership fees and in a bid to gain respectability and acceptance spent increasing amounts on improvements such as “tip maintenance, removing car bodies, dune and rehabilitation, improving ‘roads’ and planting native trees” (Grey Community Association 1992, 2). Other settlements have done likewise and, in an era of rapid electronic communication, these groups can readily share information and coordinate their actions.

The status of the remaining west coast shackie settlements is still not totally clear. Leases issued to shackies in several shires have expired, but extensions were granted in some cases and a few of the settlements remain in place. The state’s official policies still call for their total removal, despite several reports (e.g. Whelans Town Planning Consultants 1997; CALM 1999) appearing to favour a more gradual mainstreaming of the settlements, as has occurred on the south coast. Agreement and action on the heritage value of these sites would seem to be even more uncertain. Heritage was first raised as a planning issue in 1991 (Selwood 1991) and enthusiastically supported by the shackie community associations. In addressing this issue shortly afterwards, the government supported the production of a “photographic and descriptive record” of the west coast shack settlements (Suba and Grundy 1996), which stated in its Executive Summary that “the shacks have aesthetic value as a group which forms a unique cultural landscape, historic significance for their association with the opening up of the coastline and social value for their representation of a disappearing lifestyle”. This disappearing lifestyle was chronicled on a display board, or ‘interpretive centre’, at the site of former shackie settlements in the mid section of the Central Coast (May and Selwood 2001, 388). However, by 2008, even that display board had disappeared. Its replacement merely makes reference to the government having removed the shacks, while outlining a landscape rehabilitation program and the creation of a number of picnic sites and recreation facilities in their place (Figure 7). No casual camping is allowed along this section of the coast and holidaymakers and tourists are confined to established town sites and commercial caravan parks. Similar treatment has also been meted out to the former settlements in the northern portion of the Central Coast, which is now serviced by a new coastal highway. Only a few licensed ‘professional fishermen’ now have the privilege of being able to retain shacks along the coast.

The same policy is being extended to the remaining unserviced portion of the coast centred on the communities at Grey and Wedge which, until very recently, were still relatively inaccessible, except to 4WD vehicles. Despite energetic lobbying by their respective community associations, the most recent government report on the settlements still denies their appeals for a continued existence in anything resembling their current informal and unique form. The progress associations of the two communities did succeed in persuading the former State Labor government to revisit the issue. However, only one meeting was held. The new government has held no further meetings, a good indication of its lack of commitment to the squatter heritage.
Meanwhile, the coast road connection between Cervantes and Lancelin has recently been completed and sealed, so it now appears only a matter of time before Grey and Wedge suffer the fate of the other squatter settlements along the Central Coast. In a last ditch effort to save the communities from complete destruction; a petition calling for heritage recognition comparable to that accepted in several other Australian states is currently circulating in hopes of obtaining a stay of execution (Wedge Island Protection Association 2009). However, the future looks bleak indeed for the squatter settlements of the Central Coast. In very distinctive circumstances, however, one shackie settlement has not only survived, but has been deemed worthy of preservation as a heritage site.

**Naval Base - Saved by the Smokestacks?**

Many coastal/estuarine shack settlements were established within what is now the Perth metropolitan area and the adjoining Peel region, but during the late 20th Century virtually all of them were engulfed by the spreading tide of suburbanization as Perth’s population grew from less than 300,000 at the end of World War II to over 1.5 million in 2006. However, the Naval Base Caravan Park, which was established ca. 1933, has remained largely unchanged (City of Cockburn 2004). The main reason for this is its location immediately adjacent to the state’s main heavy industrial area at Kwinana. This industrial/port complex has been growing since the early 1950s and the caravan park is next to (and, indeed, was partially swallowed by) the heavy industrial site. As such, it is located in the buffer zone surrounding the industrial land at Kwinana and has ceased to be a desirable location for more conventional coastal development. Its survival is reminiscent of those heritage areas in inner cities that have persevered due to their being by-passed by more recent developments seeking localities perceived to have greater amenity or functionality than the older, obsolete districts (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000).

Somewhat atypically, Naval Base was a local government controlled recreation and camping reserve, rather than Crown land as such, so residents did not ‘squat’, but from the park’s inception paid a small council leasing fee. In virtually all other respects, however, it developed fairly rapidly into a shack-like Western Australian coastal holiday settlement. Almost from the start, the council allowed caravan owners – perhaps illegally – to build permanent extensions on to their caravans (Figures 8 and 9). The contemporary shacks are becoming progressively more uniform in style, or have been virtually replaced by new structures, partly due to the devastation caused by a near tornado in 1968 (City of Cockburn 2004, 8). However, the shacks are still not individually serviced by mains power, running water or sewers. The listing in the heritage inventory describes one shack (named “Gudday”) as having been built for $100 in a weekend with the nails being the only new materials used. The park is immediately adjacent to the beach, with swimming, snorkeling and fishing among the residents’ main activities.

In social terms, too, it remains a typical shackie settlement, with many extended families having used their shacks for generations; there is an active community association that aims “to protect the lifestyle we all love” (City of Cockburn 2004, 2) and, at Christmas and Easter, the residents all celebrate collectively. The Cockburn Council has facilitated the preservation of this settlement and community in several ways beyond its inclusion of the site on the municipal heritage inventory in 2004. Leasing rates remain low ($650 per annum in 2004). A maximum building size of 5.2 metres by 5.2 metres is enforced – a regulation complemented by an unwritten rule that any new extensions must not block other residents’ views of the ocean.

In political and planning terms, the 1990s was a period of uncertainty because the site was threatened by further industrial and port expansion, complicated by a number of other planning studies looking into broader issues of coastal development. During this period, no transfers of ownership of the shacks were allowed, leading to the residents forming a pressure group to protest the threat to their community. Although the public outcry from the local residents at Naval Base probably had little impact on the decision, proposals for the more immediate expansion of port facilities in Cockburn Sound were suspended, and in 2000 sales resumed with 35-36 of the total of 178 shacks changing hands for sums ranging from $5,000 to $18,000 in 2000-2001.
In 2004, the site was included on the City of Cockburn Municipal Heritage Inventory (City of Cockburn 2004). The “Statement of Significance” (p.3) reads as follows:

The Naval Base Caravan Park has aesthetic, historic, representative, social and rarity cultural heritage significance. . . . The Naval Base Caravan Park is now an anachronism in the Perth Metropolitan Area. There are no longer any other holiday camps of this type existing along the coast. This place therefore, is unique and has significant rarity heritage value.

Ironically, the recent changes in Cockburn’s regulations pertaining to the Caravan Park are making it less of an anachronism and reducing its unique qualities. Upgrading of the shacks is occurring at an accelerating pace as owners now enjoy greater security of tenure and work to meet more stringent building regulations. Shacks which once were required to be on wheels and transportable are being replaced by more permanent, frequently prefabricated, or ‘pattern book,’ structures (Figure 10). As a result, the settlement is rapidly losing its idiosyncratic appearance and being transformed into a more conventional-looking compact holiday chalet subdivision. These developments could well lead to the loss of any valid claim to heritage value based on the settlement’s distinctive vernacular architecture. Given that a significant component of the heritage designation is said to rest on the community’s ‘exceptional social historical value,’ whereas the shacks can now be marketed freely to the highest bidder (one shack overlooking the water was being advertised for $90,000 in the summer of 2009), their heritage value is also becoming a less compelling feature. In reality, it seems that the local authority has only limited commitment to the heritage listing. Of far greater significance from a heritage perspective is the recent recognition that Naval Base is located virtually on the site of the original townsite of Clarence, or Peel Town, the first, albeit ill-fated, European settlement of the Swan River Colony. Archaeological digs have already exposed thousands of specimens in the immediate vicinity (Amalfi 2006). As a result, much of the area is likely to be designated as a site of national historical importance for reasons totally unrelated to the shack settlement.

Discussion and Conclusions: Heritage from Below vs. Regulation from Above

In The Coast Dwellers, a volume which Philip Drew (1994) subtitled a radical reappraisal of Australian identity, the author contended that “the beach is the twentieth century’s rejoinder to the bush, a wet tradition of sun, surf and sand, a tradition based on freedom and pleasure” (Drew 1994, 114). Problems arise, however, when some people’s “freedom and pleasure” is perceived to be at the expense of other social values, such as environmental protection, public order or even public health. Drew’s (1994, 116) assertion that: “The beach is for everyone. That is why it is so free. Going to the beach we leave society and its constraints behind,” raises two questions that are central to the disputes between the shackies and unmanaged campers on the one hand and the public authorities on the other. When the numbers of shackies and campers were small and competing demands on the coastal land essentially non-existent, these beaches and campsites/home sites could indeed be for “everyone” – or at least for anyone who wished and was able to frequent them. Furthermore, while the early shackies and campers could and did “leave society and its constraints behind”, society and its constraints have gradually caught up with them as both the Western Australian population and the effective demand for coastal land have grown significantly in recent decades.

Shackie and camper groups’ attempts to maintain their recreational lifestyles in increasingly prized environments are seen as a threat to the social order (Figure 11) and their efforts to protect their shacks and their lifestyles thus becomes a “heritage from below” initiative and a battle identical to those of the English plotlanders where:

On the one side were people of modest means defending pathetic homes on land that none had previously wanted in any case; and on the other a bureaucratic machine without compassion, growing with every new bylaw and parliamentary clause (Hardy and Ward 1984, 33).

These settlements certainly evoke nostalgia in their users and a degree of fascination from wider society. But the greatest threat that they face is that they are no longer in out-of-the-way
geographical locations frequented only by those who cannot afford or who choose to live according to a more basic lifestyle and are prepared to ‘go the extra mile’ to achieve that objective.

The old times may disappear, but we can hope that the heritage of generations of West Australians can be preserved, both mentally and physically. But it is not just the imposition of regulations from above that is causing the death of the informal, unregulated coastal holiday settlements, it is their erosion from within by the shackie ‘gentrifiers’ that is undermining their heritage value.
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