

**REVIEW OF THE SUBMISSIONS  
MADE TO THE PRODUCTIVITY  
COMMISSION INQUIRY INTO  
AUSTRALIA'S HISTORIC  
HERITAGE**

**SECTION III: DATA ORGANISED BY ISSUE**

**February 2007**

**The Heritage Chairs and Officials of the  
States and Territories of Australia**

## **SECTION III: DATA ORGANISED BY ISSUE**

This data has been taken from Section II (data organised by stakeholder category) and re-arranged by issue to provide a convenient summary of the ways submissions addressed key issues, and the suggestions and recommendations they made to improve the heritage system.

The issues have been organised in four parts to correspond with the organisation of Part Three of the Analysis (Section I), but the internal sections of each part of this table do not correspond directly with those of the Analysis.

Please note also that the % have been retained from Section II, but should be interpreted with caution, as generally, the higher the % the lower the number of stakeholders in each category, and therefore the higher the value accorded each submission's views.

### **Part One          Structure, Regulation & Governance of the National Heritage System**

- 1a      Need for implementation of agreed national heritage policy/strategy*
- 1b      Implementation of National Heritage System*
- 1c      National Leadership Issues*
- 1d      Government Stewardship of Public Assets*
- 1e      Holistic Heritage Management*
- 1f      Integral Management of Collections & Place*

### **Part Two          Heritage at the Local Level**

- 2a      Interface of Heritage & Planning*
- 2b      Private property Issues*
- 2c      Local Government*
- 2d      Pressures on Heritage*

### **Part Three          Supporting the System – Policy Guidance & Education**

- 3a      Need for National Policies and Guidelines*
- 3b      Heritage Research & need for better access to heritage data*
- 3c      Improving Professional Integration in the Heritage System*
- 3d      Community Education*
- 3e      Heritage in the school curriculum*
- 3f      Trades Skills Training and Professional Education*

### **Part Four          Financial, Taxation & Cost Issues**

- 4a      Heritage Economics*
- 4b      NGO and community heritage management*
- 4c      Heritage Tourism*
- 4d      Tax Incentives*

## **Part One      Structure, Regulation & Governance of the National Heritage System**

### **1a      *Need for implementation of agreed national heritage policy/strategy***

#### **100% HCANZ have identified two issues as most critical to improving historic heritage conservation in Australia:**

- the need to improve the policy framework for historic heritage; and
- the need for enhanced and new incentives (economic instruments) to support historic heritage conservation

#### **100% Problems caused by reliance on heritage listing without sufficient support from complementary policy instruments:**

- lists not comprehensive
- uncertainty for property owners and potential purchasers
- public confusion re numerous lists, what listing entails or means
- encourages negative public perceptions of impact of listing
- Failure to ensure comprehensive audit of heritage places
- Lack of effective public education programs

#### **75% Lack of consistent national heritage framework**

- Inconsistent legislation & heritage principles & practice
- Lack of comprehensive listing, identification and assessment programs
- Federal changes not accompanied by complementary state legislative reforms
- Unnecessary duplication, conflicting, contradictory approaches, and bureaucracy
- Many gaps allowing important heritage places to be overlooked, neglected or lost

#### **70% Lack of comprehensive national heritage policy, and need for:**

- national inventory of heritage places;
- consistent national standards in regulation of heritage conservation;
- integration of heritage in planning, economic and environmental policy;
- agreement to consider heritage holistically.

#### **40% Lack of overarching policy framework limiting efficiency**

- Commonwealth withdrawal from national leadership
- Gaps in existing protection framework
- Duplication, disconnection across tiers of government
- Separate management of cultural and natural heritage artificial, distorting

#### **40% Failure to achieve agreed Integrated National Heritage Policy**

- No inter/intra-governmental agreements
- Lack of seamless, inclusive protection nationwide
- Inconsistency impedes holistic management of places of multiple values
- Plethora of poorly integrated and inconsistent heritage 'lists'

**33% Need to agree a national strategic policy framework in collaboration with S/T governments through the EPHC**

- Development, implementation of a balanced suite of policy tools

**33% Need to improve national policy framework to ensure consistency and ‘best practice’ in all jurisdictions**

- Need to close legislative gaps in protection of historic environment
- Need to lift standards for conservation work
- Need to develop common standards for assessment
- Need to address duplication and gaps in heritage lists

**Actions Recommended re need for implementation of agreed national heritage policy/strategy**

**Heritage Chairs recognise need to reinvigorate the 1997 COAG agreement for an integrated National Heritage Framework**

Including specific policy agreements encompassing issues such as (but not excluded to):

- need for nationally agreed listing criteria and thresholds for all three levels of government jurisdictions to ensure national consistency;
- nationally agreed development guidelines to increase consistency of decision making on the management of heritage places;
- nationally agreed measurable for state of environment reporting on historic heritage that can be used by all levels of government.

**Listing needs to be complemented by a suite of policy instruments**

- Tailored to the particular market failures that exist.
- Improved town planning practices that promote historic heritage conservation by:
  - reducing disincentives to conservation in form of incompatible zonings; and
  - making imaginative use of planning incentives
- Heritage integral part of comprehensive planning process, rather than adjunct.
- Inclusion of historic heritage conservation as integral element of sustainability policies or strategies
- Provision of effective network of specialist heritage advisory services
- Priority to information, promotion and awareness activities
- Research programs targeted at gaps to increase comprehensiveness of listings

**Strengthening the COAG agreed national strategic framework through inter-governmental collaboration to:**

- better integrate ‘heritage’ responsibilities in policy & legislation
- close legislative gaps in protection of the historic environment
- ensure adoption of common standards for conservation practice
- report consistently in nationally coordinated SoE reporting system
- complete AHPI incorporating RNE data providing database inventory of Australia’s heritage places accessible to all through its web links
- improve access to expert advice and assistance, through provision of heritage advisers at local government level
- address shortage of skills in heritage conservation

- improve consistency in assessment and CMPs
- develop manuals that explain heritage criteria and thresholds
- coordinate public engagement programs nationally
- develop education curricula incorporating appreciation & understanding of heritage, and conservation training programs
- promote heritage tourism more effectively
- disseminate guidelines and ideas re adaptive re-use more effectively

**Implementation of integrated national heritage strategy for cooperative action on funding for historic heritage:**

- balanced suite of incentives to support heritage conservation
- improved economic sustainability of heritage places
- funding similar to NHT for communities, local governments
- shared programs to assist disadvantaged regional places

**Integrated national heritage policy as recommended by COAG to:**

- identify clear national heritage criteria standards and guidelines;
- provide predictable, systematic and transparent system;
- define roles of owners, governments, commercial interests and community;
- agree ways to ensure governments commit to being exemplary stewards of their own properties;
- foster skills development, especially through the TAFE system;
- acknowledge and support need for conservation of collections associated with heritage places;
- more closely align heritage management with sustainability principles

**Implementation of Integrated National Heritage Policy:**

- providing seamless protection to heritage places nationwide;
- incorporating best-practice elements from all jurisdictions;
- finalising all necessary intergovernmental agreements;
- establishing clear criteria for assessment of values;
- ensuring holistic protection of all heritage places.

**Implementation of Integrated National Heritage Policy:**

- 3 tier system with Commonwealth leadership and funding;
- incorporating best practice elements from all jurisdictions;
- referenced in local government planning schemes and policies;
- providing consistent statutory protection across all jurisdictions;
- methodical standardised identification and conservation program;
- single comprehensive listing process for all levels of significance;
- appropriate mechanisms for delegating management responsibilities;
- holistic heritage framework.

**Development of national heritage policy framework establishing partnerships across governments to:**

- initiate review of Commonwealth, S/T legislation to minimise duplication, maximise consistency;

- recognise importance of local government assessment and management of heritage;
- delineate, streamline roles, responsibilities of each level of government;
- formalise agreed national heritage assessment procedures;
- create 'common standards' and guidance documents;
- establish common policy frameworks for heritage conservation;
- ensure professional heritage advice availability at local level;
- provide consistency, uniformity of policies, thresholds and significance assessments;
- ensure Aboriginal heritage incorporated into mainstream;
- incorporate sustainability principles into heritage legislation;
- ensure RNE places are assessed for statutory protection.

### **1b Implementation of National Heritage System**

#### **50% Pressures from regulatory, institutional requirements under EPBC Act**

- Impact of size, diversity of organisation's heritage portfolio

#### **50% Need for capacity building programs so National Heritage List places can exemplify best practice in planning, management and presentation to the public**

#### **50% Key challenge for management of public heritage sites is sustaining balance between access, use & conservation**

- Significant operational, environmental, and OH&S pressures
- Lack of financial assistance or cost recovery to offset heritage estate management
- Costly reporting requirements
- Requirement for specialist staff, external expertise to meet assessment, CMP development and management responsibilities
- Development of policy and supporting tools, including manuals

#### **40% Concerns re structure and effectiveness of national heritage system**

- Reduced community participation in EPBC through complexity of processes
- Protection not effective because reliant on assessment of potential impact of action
- Conservation management at landscape/precinct scale, extremely difficult

#### **35% Concerns re Complexity and Flaws of the National Heritage System:**

- capacity of NH system to identify and protect places of national significance (eg Recherche Bay);
- ignoring of 'best practice' such as Burra Charter principles;
- encouragement of discretionary decision-making;
- weak interim listing processes;
- guidelines for CMPs and HIS inadequate;
- weakened protection - impact of proposed action, rather than nature of action;
- dual management - costs increased, efficiency weakened;

- slow pace of establishment of NHL;
- failure to provide nominators with adequate guidance;
- absence of lists of heritage themes, yet nominators asked to specify a theme .

### **33% Challenges communicating and delivering on new national heritage system**

- Using public nominations process to build comprehensive credible NHL- quickly
- Community nomination to CHL or NHL distract from core heritage assessment
- Need for strategic thematic research program to underpin nominations

### **33% Specific administrative issues with DEH re *EPBC Act***

- Determination re possible adverse impact a new, significant agency responsibility
- Delays, costs with lack of specific timeframes during commenting process
- Role of Burra Charter needs clarification – not statutory, yet referenced

## **Actions Recommended re Implementation of National Heritage System**

### **Improved inter governmental coordination in building the NHL**

- Strategic program of thematic research
- Utilisation of skilled staff and expertise
- Program of community education and engagement

### **Improvement to EPBC administration**

- Statutory timeframes, supported by resources within DEH
- Development of necessary guidelines, explanatory memoranda

### **Ports should be exempt from heritage legislation**

## **1c *National Leadership Issues***

### **90% Absence of national leadership**

- No evidence that AHC or DEH will continue former AHC national leadership role
- Failure to develop national guidelines for assessment and CMP development
- Community confusion over duplicated Commonwealth and S/T lists, eg RNE
- Concern re Commonwealth management of *EPBC Act* administration
- National Heritage regime left gaps in identification and protection (eg, ACT)

### **70% Failure of Commonwealth leadership to support national heritage conservation through lack of commitment to and support for:**

- national framework for heritage research;
- practical heritage conservation initiatives;
- leadership in the public debate about heritage issues;

- national approach to archaeology and maritime heritage;
- independence of AHC, (constrained by inadequate resources);
- provision of resourcing for Historic Shipwrecks Program;
- national standards for 'best practice ' heritage management.

**20% National leadership in heritage conservation weak**

**40% New national heritage system is failing expectations**

- Diminished role for the AHC
- Lack of Commonwealth leadership, lowering of national standards and principles
- Myriad of heritage systems and guidelines confusing

**10% AHC failing to provide national leadership**

- Lacks independent resource or research base

**Actions Recommended re National Leadership Issues**

**Australian Heritage Council should be resourced to play broad leadership role envisaged**

- best available national experts appointed to the AHC

**Commonwealth should adopt leadership role, and through HCOANZ develop a comprehensive, national policy framework to:**

- clarify roles, better resource heritage agencies and local government;
- develop 'best practice' model approach to relationship between heritage and planning;
- conduct national review of opportunities for community access to heritage sites, interpretation and education resources;
- recognise Indigenous culture as integral to Australian culture;
- better support Australian international heritage activities.

**AHC should be enabled to be independent expert national heritage champion**

- DEH should review EPBC processes re referrals and actions

**The AHC should be funded to fulfil its functions under the Act**

**1d Government Stewardship of Public Assets**

**75% Poor management of redundancy of government assets**

- tension between service delivery, maintenance of heritage elements
- community critical of government's poor stewardship

**45% Failure of governments to be exemplary stewards of own properties**

- Insufficient funding for agencies to care for heritage property
- Complexity reconciling community expectations with commercial needs
- Multi government ownership and administration impedes best use options
- Governments increasingly seen:

- as retreating from community;
- of making laws and then not abiding by them;
- of setting up systems doomed to failure due to lack of financial support;
- of ‘selling off the public farm’ for profit.

### **35% Insufficient consideration of viable re-use options**

- System mitigates against good design, optimal site use
  - BCA compliance issues affecting viability of adaptive reuse

### **35% disposal of government assets generally poorly managed**

- Failure of government stewardship – poor community exemplars
- Contributes to loss of social capital, decline of communities

### **30% Difficulties striking balance between protection & reuse**

- Need for ways to encourage sympathetic renovation/restoration of heritage
- Heritage constraints sometimes too restrictive of commercial uses
- Need to regularly revise CMPs for adaptive reuse proposals
- Restrictions on demolitions and potential changes to building fabric

### **25% Lack of coordinated policy to encourage good adaptive re-use**

- Governments not supporting Good Urban Design Principles
- Rigid observance of uniformity, facadism, mimicry of heritage forms
- Prescriptive approach precludes innovation, creativity
- 20c heritage undervalued, under severe threat
- Need to ensure heritage management linked to sustainability principles

### **20% Public sector poor managers of heritage - poor role models for community**

- Funding of maintenance /operation of sites in regional areas major issue

### **16% Difficulties finding viable re-use within core business and operations**

- Heritage assets not ‘fit for contemporary purposes due to OH&S, BCA requirements

## **Actions Recommended re Government Stewardship of Public Assets**

### **Government commitment to best practice stewardship**

- Requirement to justify disposal subject to independent audit
- Ensuring heritage values considered in all relevant decisions
- Government model custodian of its own heritage

### **Governments should demonstrate exemplary stewardship through:**

- adopting strategies which avoid redundancy;
- facilitating reuse of heritage places;
- managing places holistically and sustainably;
- considering results of *Managing our Heritage* study (Vic);
- producing CMPs & publicly report on heritage-related costs.

### **Government should fully fund its stewardship responsibilities**

- full disclosure of government financial dealings regarding disposal
- exemplary management of heritage places in their care

### **1e *Holistic Heritage Management***

#### **33% Need to integrate all aspects of heritage at all levels of governments in legislation and policy**

- Heritage not regarded and managed holistically in all jurisdictions

#### **20% Holistic management difficult - disparate philosophies, separated administrative systems**

#### **20% Division between 'historic' and 'indigenous' divisive**

- Need to address limited comprehension of scarcity and value of aboriginal culture

### **Actions Recommended re Holistic Heritage Management**

#### **Heritage' should be regarded & managed holistically:**

- inclusive of place and setting;
- inclusive of associated collections.

#### **Development of national program to address limited comprehension of scarcity and value of Aboriginal heritage**

### **1f *Integral Management of Collections & Place***

#### **40% collections of historic material under threat**

- Dependant on volunteers, gifts of conservation materials & rent-free accommodation
- Only modest project grants available
- Lack of volunteers, training and support
- Insurance costs high, and difficult to insure volunteers over 80

#### **25% Moveable heritage items under threat**

- Lack of resources for essential maintenance & restoration work
- Problems of location - neglect, fire, vandalism, storage
- Increasing costs of maintenance
- Compliance with increasing OH&S, safety and public insurance requirements

#### **16% Integral value of collections to place not incorporated into policy framework**

- Collections essential to assessment, interpretation, education

Difficulties re use of heritage buildings as collection repositories

16% Importance of collections to heritage places not supported through funding

### **Actions Recommended re Integral Management of Collections & Place**

**National program to support conservation of historic records**

- Historic collections fundamental element of Australia's social capital, especially in regional Australia
- Greater support needed for collections in historic buildings
- Proper storage facilities needed for displaced objects under threat
- Program funding for conservation, storage, security, interpretation of places and their associated collections

**20% Conceptual issues re 'heritage' create uncertainty,**

- Degree of significance always lies in continuum
- Assessment of significance does not imply or suggest actions required
- Difficulties establishing priorities for heritage assessment/management

## **PART TWO Heritage at the Local Level**

### **2a Interface of Heritage & Planning**

#### **75% Heritage agencies perceived as prescriptive, anti-developer**

- Under resourced and under funded
- Heritage decision making not transparent or timely
- Staff often inexperienced and quality of decisions poor

#### **65% uneven quality of heritage criteria and assessments at local level**

- Lack of agreement over what constitutes 'adverse' impact
- Lack of clear guidelines re development assessment/approval processes
- Lack of heritage expertise in local government planning departments
- Dealing with multiple agencies complicates process, causes delays
- Process response driven not proactive or strategic
- Assumption that key works (James Kerr's "*A Conservation Plan*" and *The Burra Charter*) provide benchmarks or standards confusing
- Absence of, poor quality of, Statements of Significance
- Perceived/actual conflict of interest between role of heritage advisers as adviser and assessor

#### **65% Planning/heritage intersection problematic for heritage**

- Optional and sometimes politicised listing process
- Lack of model heritage assessment guidelines and standards
- Need for community education programs to engender support for heritage
- Failure to provide clear information to owners about rights and responsibilities

#### **60% Issues arising as heritage conservation not integral to planning**

- planning schemes sometimes incompatible with conservation goals

#### **35% Lack of integrated planning, listing results in confusion, duplication**

- 'Heritage' merges with 'character', 'amenity', 'townscape'

#### **33% Need for improved interface between heritage & planning**

- Inconsistent compliance provisions and standards
- Uncertainty as to weight of heritage significance in planning decisions
- Imposition of burdensome application, reporting and conservation processes

### **Actions Recommended re Interface of Heritage & Planning**

#### **Key criteria for evaluating existing heritage/planning regimes**

- Clarity—How easy is it to understand?
- Consistency—Does it produce similar outcomes in equivalent circumstances?
- Credibility—Does it produce outcomes that are fair and credible?
- Timeliness—Does it give outcomes in time for critical decisions?
- Transparency—Is the process open and available to all, with efficient dispute resolution processes?

**Essential elements of best practice heritage/planning regime:**

- consistency in threshold definitions across jurisdictions;
- clear and mandated role for local government;
- separate heritage and development regimes;
- adequate enforcement powers and resources;
- clear, timely, thorough and transparent processes;
- provision of incentives and support/resources for owners;
- appeal rights (restricted for listing, more open for end use);
- Provision of Statements of Significance as matter of course;
- clear statement of property information, restrictions;
- guidelines for obligations and support for owners.

**Improve heritage outcomes within the planning system through:**

- better integration of heritage with planning;
- encouragement of innovative design;
- ensuring planning decisions based on explicit rules, governing how competing values are weighed up to deliver outcomes;
- better alignment with sustainability approaches;
- more active support, advice, education, information for owners;
- new provisions for minimum maintenance of heritage places;
- clarification re blurring local heritage with amenity, character issues;
- requiring risk management strategies to include disaster preparedness.

**Initiatives to improve heritage management at local level:**

- integration of heritage approval and planning processes – ‘one application – one permit’;
- criteria and assessment processes should be reviewed and standardised;
- provision of resources to owners at a local level - free professional advice, explicit design guides, grants, awards for heritage restoration
- development of Statement of Planning Policy for Cultural Heritage Conservation;
- template Local Planning for Heritage – tool for Local Government for implementing local planning strategy;
- integration of heritage in the planning approvals process;
- development of set of national guidelines for conservation management plans.

**More efficient reliable heritage regulation required**

- Streamlined & more cost effective approvals process
- Preparation of model conditions for development on heritage sites
- Statutory timeframes must be agreed and met
- Publication & compliance of procedural fairness guidelines
- Preparation of state wide criteria and assessment guidelines
- Development of comprehensive programs of community information

**Evaluation of role and resourcing of Heritage Councils is required**

- Heritage staff should be experienced and consider commercial factors in decisions

- Heritage Councils should include representatives with commercial experience
- Heritage agencies must have power to reject spurious applications for listing
- Developers should utilise heritage advice in preparation of development applications/

Use of voluntary conservation agreements should be considered

**Decisions should be transparent, based on clear process**

- Information should be provided to owners re reasons for listing
- Financial hurdles to prevent frivolous objections
- DA process should be transparent, clear
- Heritage Advisors should be accredited, qualified
- Staff, advisers should be accountable for advice provided
- Commitment to consultation prior to decisions

**Creative conservation ideas which should be tried**

- Heritage Stewardship program – rent free in return for agree conservation upkeep
- Creation of ‘Significant heritage provision’ so that rural historic sites can be sold with smaller land parcel
- Assignment of heritage ‘mentor’ to assist owner with advice, agreeing and recording small changes – cf, ‘medical’ file on property
- Incentive program providing ‘credit hours’ for use of unemployed for conservation work in return for community access to sites

**2b Private property Issues**

**100% Perception of private ‘property rights’ conflicting with public heritage benefits**

- UK development control legislation challenged by illegal demolition and claims of human rights violation through heritage listing

**100% Public confusion and uncertainty re differing roles in heritage management**

- Lack of consistency across local authorities
- Local listing subjective, reliant on consultants who often disagree
- Public use heritage as a means of preventing development
- Limited public understanding of listing and development assessment processes
- Limited understanding of impact of heritage listing on property

**100% Owner should not bear conservation costs**

- Rates and land tax are double taxation on listed property
- Incentives difficult to access
- Impact of listing negative over life cycle of property

**80% Owners bearing excessive burden of heritage conservation**

- Owners’ financial outlay adds little to capital value of property

**50% Loss of development rights without compensation**

- Difficulties valuing & realising value on heritage property

### **75% Heritage development unattractive to commercial interests**

- Heritage tourism not seen as sound investment
- Few economic benefits to retaining heritage in redevelopment projects

Delays in approvals cause massive cost over runs

### **75% Imposition of heritage controls is confiscation of private property without compensation**

- Heritage listing seen to have negative effect on property rights
- Public benefit must be identified prior to any heritage listing
- If community seeks to preserve heritage, community must be prepared to pay
- No provisions to compensate owners for loss of rights through listing
- Powers to list must be restricted to state or federal government

### **75% Limited incentives for owners major restriction to good conservation outcomes**

- Need for philosophic shift to supporting needs and expectations of owners
- Particular incentives needed to encourage adaptive reuse

### **70% Owners feel loss of control of heritage listed places**

- Owners lack skills and expertise
- Minor changes frustrated by restrictions of heritage listing
- Problem with lack of skilled trades and appropriate materials
- Lack of information re listed property, exacerbated by Council amalgamation
- Negative impact of listing 'orphan' heritage properties within development zone

### **65% Property rights ignored/violated**

- Heritage assessment invasive of privacy, violation of enjoyment of home
- Property listed without agreement, information, consultation
- Listing process violation of natural justice
- Imposition of requirement to care for derelict properties
- Retrospective listing
- Heritage listing unreasonably restricts development

### **60% Inadequate support for private owners bearing conservation costs**

- Inequitable that owners denied opportunity to fully capitalise on property
- Higher compliance, DA and maintenance costs
- Lack of support for conservation/maintenance of heritage places

### **60% Owners bear costs, community benefits**

- Owners asset rich and income poor
- Little financial assistance to help owners cover extra conservation costs
- Lack of creative incentives
- High cost of trades skills, rare materials, management & maintenance
- Economic, social benefits hard to quantify

### **50% High costs of heritage materials, maintenance, labour, compliance**

- Need for professional advice adds to costs
- Insurance, OH&S, disabled access, fire rating compliance

- Difficulties overlaying modern standards on heritage fabric – for IT, temperature control, customer service areas etc

**50% Nomination, listing imposed without consultation**

**45% Incentive programs inadequate, inconsistent, unreliable**

- Owners often cash poor – elderly, rural

**42% Conflict between business imperatives and heritage conservation**

- Limited understanding of commercial reality for heritage businesses

**42% Burdensome heritage & planning administrative processes**

- Difficulties working within heritage office guidelines
- Poor agency, council staff knowledge, management skills
- Staff discourteous, lacking concern for owners limited means
- Extreme delays in decisions

**40% Public confusion re government, agency responsibilities**

- Concept and process for listing whole town inadequate (Braidwood)
- Queries re validity of criteria and thresholds for listing
- Queries re council's integrity and capacity for judgement
- Anomalies of heritage adviser role - architect in private practice – conflict of interest

**35% Heritage agencies appear to cast owner as 'enemy'**

- Agencies' role to protect property, not support owner
- Councillors/advisers not accountable, often not professionally qualified
- Effectively no appeal rights against council decisions – abrogation of natural justice

**35% National heritage system fails to provide incentives for conservation**

- Commonwealth conservation funding now only directed at national heritage places

**30% Lack of effective framework to ensure maintenance of heritage properties**

- Lack of resources for essential maintenance

**25% Public confusion about roles, responsibilities of levels of government**

- Duplication of legislation, planning, heritage lists, administrative systems unwieldy and unworkable

**20% failure of commitment to ensure long term public interest supported over short term private development interests**

- Increasing problem of perceived inalienable private property rights versus heritage conservation and community held values

**33% Land value distorted by unrealistic development opportunities/**

**25% Public confusion about roles, responsibilities of levels of government**

- Duplication of legislation, planning, heritage lists, administrative systems unwieldy and unworkable

**25% Poor communication, consultation, provision of information to owners**

- Confusion re implications of listing
- Confusion re roles of governments, agencies re heritage
- Heritage assessment lacking rigour, transparency
- Lack of certainty re redevelopment options

**20% failure of commitment to ensure long term public interest supported over short term private development interests**

- Increasing problem of perceived inalienable private property rights versus heritage conservation and community held values

**20% Fear that listing will impact future economic well being**

- Listing process imposed on owners

**15% Impacts of heritage listing on property values poorly researched**

**8% Heritage listing, management, intrusion on owner's privacy**

Owners technically ill-equipped, dependant on experts

**Actions Recommended re Private Property Issues**

**Partnership between owners & regulators to develop guidelines to ensure listing has positive impact on heritage significance and commercial value of property**

**Cost based compensation must be paid to owners**

- Funded incentive and compensation package should be integral to heritage legislation
- Package to include grants, loans, tax breaks, plot ratio and density bonuses
- Imposition of 'compensation options'– tradeable, transferable development rights
- Conservation covenants could provide flexibility to owners re conservation

Taxes on listed properties should be reduced

**Compensation for loss of development rights must be considered**

**Program of incentives, advice and support essential to offset costs necessary to offset costs**

- Reintroduction of Commonwealth tax incentive scheme
- Improved valuations for land tax and rate assessment for heritage buildings
- Expenditure on heritage fabric should be fully deductible
- Accelerated depreciation rates for fire, safety and other such requirements

**Governments should assess the adverse impacts subsidisation of new facilities has on heritage businesses**

**Improvements necessary to streamline heritage management**

- Clarification needed of roles of governments, agencies
- Commitment to transparent decision making processes
- Consultation and provision of information to owners prior to listing

## **2c Local Government**

### **75% Inconsistency in heritage management across local governments**

- need for standardised sets of guidelines and terminology
- deficiencies in conservation knowledge & practical conservation

### **70% Heritage not core business but consumes significance resources**

- 'heritage' subjective, labour intensive
- Assessment, conservation, management require professional expertise

### **35% Local governments lack heritage expertise**

- Expense, confusion created by time taken to develop/revise Control Plan
- Difficulties providing/revising statements of significance & CMPs
- Lack of national network of heritage advisory support

### **35% Local government insufficiently resourced to ensure owner, community support for heritage conservation**

### **30% Local government has limited capacity to support conservation, to:**

- manage municipal surveys
- secure and provide professional expertise and advice
- fund community heritage projects and programs
- provide speedy protection in emergency

## **Actions Recommended re Local Government**

### **Local Government assistance program to support community heritage conservation through:**

- employment of more heritage advisors;

assistance with heritage promotion, restoration, adaptive reuse advice.

### **EPHC & ALGA to review Australian heritage system to:**

- analyse extent system based on appropriate combination of regulation, incentives and provision of information and services;
- identify and evaluate best-practice elements of existing regimes;
- review role of local government in planning and heritage protection, focusing particularly on human and financial resourcing issues.

### **Regional initiatives to increase local capacity, efficiency:**

- establish regional networks, eg, Hunter Heritage Network;
- locate Commonwealth officers in regional areas;
- prepare regional heritage management plans, cf Coastcare program
- stronger regional networks could support joint research programs, eg, Flanders Project;
- shared heritage officers program, eg, Qld Museum network of Museum Development Officers;

- Regional Heritage Councils could be established (funded at state/federal level) to:
  - manage and administer local lists – arbitrate on complex issues
  - provide independent professional advice
  - oversee local nominations, removals, demolition of places

**Alternative approaches:**

- Expansion of heritage typology beyond traditional categories of precinct, place, conservation area & heritage precinct to provide for townscape, landscape, streetscape, elements
- Development of more sophisticated 3-tier system of listing
  - Interim protection
  - Assessment & acknowledgement of significance
  - Then, negotiated conservation agreement
- Alternative to LEP listing would be to rely on definition of relic, and to presume all buildings 50 years and older are listed, then assess
- Enabling of smaller sub divisions where heritage property exists would facilitate sale of heritage assets

**Local Government assistance program to support community heritage conservation through:**

- employment of more heritage advisors;
- assistance with heritage promotion, restoration, adaptive reuse advice.

**Local Government Regulatory Reform Necessary**

- Development of standard criteria and thresholds
- Provision of more flexible adaptive reuse provisions
- Streamlining and rationalisation of local planning controls
- Widening of concessional planning and zoning arrangements for heritage places to actively encourage adaptive use
- Adjustments of control on locally significant buildings to level of significance
- Ensuring demolition does not occur without expert assessment
- Dispensation/reduced premiums for insurance coverage
- Documentation and publicly reporting on heritage related costs
- Establishment of measures for collecting, maintaining and disseminating relevant heritage information

**Consistent professional heritage framework at local level**

- Burra Charter central to conservation practice
- Standardisation of common terms, phrases and definitions
- Agreed quality standards and benchmarks
- Rigorous assessment criteria with inclusion/exclusion guidelines
- Guidelines for conservation of cultural landscapes
- Establishment of clear & agreed thresholds
- Best practice Statements of Significance models
- All heritage listings accompanied by Statement of Significance
- National program to support heritage advisers

- Assistance to address administrative impediments to ready compliance with BCA

## **2d Pressures on Heritage**

### **80% Adverse impact of development pressures**

- Demographic changes, growth of cities
- Demolition of homes and gardens
- Reduction in original lot sizes, removal of trees
- Depopulation of rural areas
- Abandoned places (residential, industrial, religious)

### **80% Contemporary pressures adversely affecting heritage conservation**

- urban redevelopment pressures affecting heritage character of older suburbs
- population shifts, losses or gains
- abandonment of rural structures, public building redundancy
- loss of cultural landscapes through changing rural land use patterns
- declining public sector budgets

### **80% Adverse impact of development pressures**

- Demographic changes, growth of cities
- Demolition of homes and gardens
- Reduction in original lot sizes, removal of trees
- Depopulation of rural areas
- Abandoned places (residential, industrial, religious)

### **65% Demographic, social pressures on retaining, sustaining heritage places**

- Adaptive reuse costly, over regulated
- Information asymmetry - unsubstantiated myths re heritage listing
- Changing government priorities – environmental issues, market pressures

### **55% Urban Heritage under pressure**

- Maximisation of returns from property investment
- Changes of use demanding extensive change to fabric and setting
- Population growth - demolition, land consolidation, in-fill development
- Failure to consider heritage implications in urban planning schemes
- Subdivision of curtilage and loss of setting through development

### **30% Capital city development pressures extreme**

- Difficulties balancing community expectations – anger from both sides of heritage spectrum

### **25% Redevelopment pressures adversely affecting conservation of heritage**

- Maximised value of property through increased unit occupancy of the land
- Loss of setting for heritage buildings

### **20% Community confusion re differences - heritage, amenity, character**

## **15% Landscapes, settings, curtilages not respected and protected**

### **OTHER ISSUES**

#### **In the UK, steps are in hand to:**

- refute connection between heritage regulation and human rights (private property) violation;
  - persuade the Government to exempt places of worship from VAT;
  - consider benefits of incentives, similar to US tax incentive scheme including:
    - new investors being brought into heritage property development
    - increased urban regeneration taking place
  - provide increased support to encourage traditional crafts and trades skills training
  - establish peer review mechanisms for conservation work to raise standards
- increase emphasis on sustainability contribution of heritage buildings – with emphasis on value of embodied energy

**3a Need for National Policies and Guidelines**

**50% Need for common and transparent policy frameworks and thresholds**

- Inconsistent compliance provisions and standards
- Uncertainty as to weight of heritage significance in planning decisions
- Lack of clear criteria for determining what constitutes 'heritage'
- Lack of clarification around Municipal Heritage Inventories and their purpose

**Development of agreed guidelines and standards to support best practice implementation of national heritage system**

- Potential conservation costs should not be included in listing criteria
- EPBC regulations should be brought into line with *Burra Charter*
- DEH should simplify guidance for management plans
- All values should be considered in management of place
- RNE not dismantled until all S/T places assessed , and data secured
- Strategy to guide NHL listing of national heritage sites to complement community-based nominations
- Publication of community information resources to 'translate' NHL criteria into sub-sets of tangible themes, including DEH themed studies and Australian Natural Heritage Assessment Database

**Actions recommended re Need for National Policies and Guidelines**

**Governments & partners to initiate *New Vision - Focus on heritage of the future - RAlA proposal:***

- adaptive re-use placed at forefront of national heritage policy
- encouragement of innovative design through consideration of holistic urban context
- conservation response appropriate to level of significance
- program of case-studies research
- National Development Guidelines for Heritage Properties
- a 'how to' guide for best practice design in heritage adaptation
- showcase models for innovation & successful adaptive re-use
- encourage reliance on performance based guidelines rather than prescriptive measures
- establish heritage gateway with access to publications and tools including specialist consultant and trade listings
- mandatory assessment of environmental sustainability
- whole area conservation controls rather than single sites

**All governments should share heritage responsibilities**

- Retention of RNE essential
- Consolidated national heritage list should be compiled
- Heritage promotion programs essential, eg, heritage awards

**Community heritage management to be strengthened through:**

- establishment of 'Heritage Care' Program;
- specialist volunteer training packages;
- public education programs;
- expansion of Heritage Advisor role to include community capacity building and public awareness-raising;
- assistance to participate in heritage consultation processes;

**Consistency of legislation, administration, professional practice**

- RNE places assessed for inclusion on other statutory lists
- Government commitment to best-practice stewardship

**All governments commit to better ways to share information and pool resources to establish:**

- *National Heritage Research Program (cf, City of Perth program) including coordinated program to assess:*
    - sustainability of heritage vs conventional places;
    - impact of capital expenditure on price of heritage properties;
    - financial implication of heritage listing, sustainability ;
    - real cost/benefits of heritage listing;
    - environmental benefits and costs of heritage;
    - ways to increase energy efficiency of heritage places;
    - the national story, assisting nominations to the NHL.
  - *National heritage community education program:*
    - to improve provision of community information about heritage;
    - to prevent insurance agencies raising premiums for heritage;
    - to promote appreciation of wider cultural heritage values;
    - to assess benefits of heritage in relation to cultural tourism;
    - to develop historic themes to complement local studies;
    - to communicate savings from adaptive reuse and recycling of heritage buildings to promote attractiveness of reuse.
  - *National strategy to assess and list places of heritage value*
    - Nationally coordinated comprehensive survey
    - Agreed consistent criteria re condition, conservation needs
    - Mandatory heritage reporting in all SoE
  - *National heritage website: a 'one-stop' heritage shop*
    - providing access to national studies and images;
    - electronic recording of places and collections;
    - register of historic heritage places with rating of significance & level of assistance to be provided by all governments;
    - consolidation of heritage lists to single database (AHPI);
    - website/database development assistance for councils;
- cf, NSW Heritage Office online heritage inventory software

### **3b Need for Heritage Research Program/better access to heritage data**

#### **80% Dearth of consistent accessible data re heritage places**

- Lack of contextual, thematic studies impedes effective assessment
- Lack of agreed data collection standards
- Inconsistency re SoE reporting systems nationwide
- APHI incomplete – must incorporate RNE data
- Need for heritage research program
- Need to ensure NEGP & other studies publicly accessible
- Lack of data re status & condition of engineering heritage

#### **60% Lack of research program to underpin heritage assessment and management**

- Need for case based research studies

#### **50% Limited availability of data and analytic tools to assist decision-makers to determine priorities for assistance**

- Need for heritage research program providing comparative studies
- Need for framework for consistent annual reporting on historic heritage assets

#### **45% gaps in registers, including:**

- Typological - eg, cultural landscapes
- Thematic – eg, multi-cultural heritage, post-war architecture, industrial places
- Geographic gaps evident in rural areas
- Future challenges in identification of potential heritage places

#### **40% Dearth of heritage data impedes effective assessment, management**

- Failure to coordinate heritage reporting at all levels of government
- No agreed consistent data collection standards
- APHI still very incomplete
- Access to existing knowledge difficult, poorly organized
- Inadequate comparison due to lack of comprehensive inventory
- Need for comprehensive survey of historic heritage places
- Many areas poorly researched, industrial/social heritage, cultural landscape

#### **30% lack of consistent data about state of Australia's heritage places**

- Dearth of hard data, metrics on value impact of historic heritage regulatory regimes
- No consistent and consolidated national data sets on heritage places
- Lack of heritage research programs like NEGP

#### **30% Lack of contextual, comparative studies to support high quality assessment**

#### **20% Comprehensive heritage survey present difficulties**

- Aboriginal places not always visible above ground
- Values of historic places will continue to be recognised over time
- comparative assessment is required but data limited
- no research funding under new national heritage system

### **Actions Recommended re need for better access to heritage data**

**Program of national heritage research required providing ready access to comparative data, to specialised studies related to emerging fields of evaluation of social, cultural capital**

#### **Research program to assess community heritage contribution**

- Evaluation of regional Australian income derived from tourism
- Assessment of value of work of volunteers in historical societies
- Development of tools for incorporating social capital considerations into policy analysis

#### **Governments should construct a supportive intellectual framework for national heritage conservation**

- Continued development of Australian Heritage Bibliography
- Australian Heritage Places Inventory to include all reputable heritage lists, including those from NGOs
- Sample heritage surveys for SoE based on standardised data

#### **Establishment of National Heritage Research program:**

- to facilitate cultural economics research
  - to establish costs/benefits of heritage conservation
  - to assess value of environmental techniques to heritage conservation
    - Measurement of environmental benefits of heritage conservation
- 1 Provision of wider definition of 'productivity' and 'value' when assessing contribution of heritage value
- Assessment of waste generated in new build
  - Validation of value of adaptive reuse
  - Recording of marketability of adaptively reused buildings

#### **National heritage research program established to:**

- underpin academic and community education programs;
- audit existing heritage data and bibliographic information;
- ensure public availability of consolidated national data;
- consolidate existing research
- commission new studies, eg,
  - define community value of 'heritage'
  - broad ranging studies like EH *Power of Place* study
  - consumer's 'willingness to pay' survey.
    - review contentious issues
  - property rights and heritage conservation,
  - planning and to land use regulation
    - solicit, record and make material available from community archives

#### **Establishment of single centralised register of heritage data**

- Systematic surveys, typological & thematic studies

- Inventory of data re demolished or degraded buildings
- Coordination of SoE reporting at all levels of government
- Better resourcing for development of AHPI, incorporating RNE data
- Delivery of consolidated data & heritage information over web
- Systematised arrangements to locate, access and conserve records associated with heritage places

### **Recording of heritage places electronically, and establishment of public repository for these records**

#### **3c Improving Professional Integration in the Heritage System**

#### **55% Value of historic significance in heritage assessment, conservation and interpretation not recognized**

- Greater emphasis needed on intangible (including social values) assessment

#### **33% Conservation and adaptive re-use of engineering heritage impeded by:**

- failure to utilise engineering expertise in assessment & management;
- lack of ongoing use resulting in cessation of maintenance and rapid deterioration;
- extra costs of safety regulations, insurance premiums impede volunteer support;
- under representation of engineering heritage on registers;
- poor government stewardship of assets (frequently engineering heritage).

#### **33% Lack of Commonwealth support for historic archaeology**

#### **33% Lack of Commonwealth support for marine archaeology**

#### **Actions Recommended re improving professional integration into the heritage system**

##### **Greater Commonwealth support for marine archaeology**

- Ratify *Convention for the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage*

Amend *Commonwealth Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976* to incorporate all forms of physical cultural heritage located in Australian waters

##### **Commonwealth support for historic archaeology including:**

- establishment central management system for archaeological relics
- blanket protection for historical archaeological places with 50-year rolling date
- adoption of Victorian *archaeological artefact conservation agreement system*

##### **Program supportive of conservation of historic gardens to:**

- develop and implement best practice conservation planning;
- require developers to fund public open spaces, heritage gardens.

##### **Broadening of heritage professional practice to include historians:**

- government program for collecting, maintaining and disseminating relevant data series on Australia's historic heritage places;

- strategy to guide listing of National Heritage sites to complement community nominations.

### **3d Community Education**

#### **90% Informational Asymmetry**

Persistent myths adversely effect community's understanding of heritage listing:

- curtailment of owners' ability to alter or renovate
- adverse impact on private property values

#### **45% Need for comprehensive community education regarding value of heritage**

- Fragmented support for research priorities and policy innovations
- Insufficient resourcing to record and document changes over time
- Lack of resources to support local archival and history projects

#### **45% Need to address public concern over possible implications of listing**

- Imposition of burdensome application, reporting and conservation processes
- Perception that once place listed, it cannot be renovated or modified.
- Concerns re property rights, and lowering of property values
- Difficulties ensuring owners acknowledge and accept responsibilities
- Demolition by dereliction threat to the long term retention of the built heritage

#### **Actions Recommended re Community Education**

##### **Commitment to creating an 'informed community' through:**

- provision of education on built environment and its conservation
- facilitation of community involvement in heritage conservation
- public education programs on heritage values and management
- readily accessible advisory services and technical assistance
- support for network of regional/local heritage committees
- support for 'heritage champions' at each level of government

##### **The profile of 'heritage' in the community should be raised**

##### ***Heritage to be better represented in school curriculum***

##### **Need for Heritage to be incorporated into School Curriculum and programs**

##### **National heritage education program**

- Incorporation of heritage/history into school curriculum
- National conservation award program

##### **Development of *Australian Story* national education program**

- to enable annual visitation of historic sites by all students (as in UK)
- to develop heritage related education programs & teacher training

### ***3f Trades Skills Training and Professional Education***

#### **90% Heritage expertise and conservation skills shortage**

- Lack of heritage expertise in DEH, heritage agencies,, Local Government
- Lack of advisers, archaeologists, engineering expertise at local government level
- Insufficient and poorly targeted skills development and training
- Heritage advisers spread unevenly, too thinly across local government areas

#### **55% Shortage of Conservation & Heritage Trade Skills**

- Fewer opportunities and incentives to undertake traditional skills training
- Lack of professional training for conservation architects, no system of accreditation

#### **50% Lack of skills, availability of professional expertise**

- Majority of advisers of architectural background – limiting
- Only remaining conservation courses at masters level, not trades skills level
- Major challenges with conservation of new materials, construction techniques
- Approaching retirement of generation of conservators

#### **50% Practical conservation issues impeding best practice heritage**

- Scarcity of original materials, trades skills shortage
- Difficulties accessing professional expertise
- Significant liability issues along with BCA and disability access requirements
- Additional consent requirements eg professional advice, research

#### **50% Labour and skills shortages impacting on quality of conservation**

- Great damage to historic fabric through inept repair work

#### **25% Trades skills shortage threatens nation's cultural heritage**

- Inadequate training programs

#### **25% Lack of national strategy to support trades skill development**

- Expertise thinly spread, lags well behind many other countries
- Breadth and depth of technical advisory material is poor
- Increasing concerns about availability of traditional materials

### **Actions Recommended re Trades Skills Training & Professional Education**

#### **Initiatives to support trades training and provision of expertise**

- Establishment of National Heritage Advisory Scheme:- on-line information clearinghouse
- National review of heritage education and traditional skills training
- Establishment of National Heritage Trades Skill Centre
- Establishment of 'hands-on heritage' program, like Green Corp, linked to Heritage Trades Skills program

- Access to specialist tertiary training for practitioners online
- Inclusion of traditional construction in basic trades training
- Specialist post-trade courses and programs should be developed
- Tertiary courses - architecture, building and engineering - should include components on traditional construction and heritage

#### **National review of professional and trades training**

- Commitment to inclusion of engineering expertise in heritage assessment & management teams

#### **National Heritage Trade Skills Development Program**

- Professional Heritage Accreditation programs
- Enhanced apprenticeship schemes
- Small business startup allowances and award schemes
- Development of register of skilled tradespersons
- Inclusion of qualified engineers in heritage conservation teams
- Mandatory use of accredited practitioners for publicly funded work

#### **Trades skills development program needed**

- Re-training program for specialist trade skills
- Subsidise employment of specialist trade persons
- Establish trade specialist register, national referral service

#### **Establishment of national conservation skills training program**

HCOANZ should establish task force to review heritage courses for range, effectiveness and viability, and develop programs to:

- improve standard and availability of technical materials, manuals;
- improve provision of high level technical advice;
- ensure availability of traditional materials;
- ensure building courses have traditional component;
- usage of skilled trades mandatory in government conservation ;
- establish trade mentor scheme, allowing employment of trainees;
- fund specialist training facility.

#### **Establishment of National Skills Training Program**

- Incentives to encourage trades people to upskill
- Regional clearing-houses to connect clients with rarer trades
- Promotion of groups of accredited 'traditional trades'-trained persons
- Legislation to prevent false marketing of 'heritage' expertise
- Inclusion of cultural heritage in tertiary education/ training

**4a Heritage Economics**

**100% Costs of historic preservation are vastly easier to calculate than benefits.**

**100% Market Failure present in historic heritage conservation**

**33% Need to address market failure occurring in provision of heritage services**

**100% Disparity in natural vis a vis cultural funding**

- Little capacity for long term investment in cultural heritage conservation
- inadequate funding to support comprehensive, equitable heritage system

**100% Over reliance on regulation, creates dysfunctional system**

- State-based heritage grant schemes oversubscribed by ratios 7:1 to 12:1
- Local Government grants/subsidies inadequate
- governments have not invested in incentives, see *Making Heritage Happen*

**85% Key issue impacting on heritage conservation is lack of funding at all levels**

- Failure of governments to consistently resource heritage conservation, education and promotion programs impacts particularly at local level
- Huge in-balance between monies for natural and cultural environments
- Heritage conservation relies too heavily on the 'stick' (regulation), and too little on the 'carrot', (incentives)

**85% Inadequate resources & incentives to support heritage conservation**

- Funding lacking for research, public education, publication programs

**85% Main pressure on historic heritage places is limited funding, resources & incentives**

- more applications for funding than funding available
- higher insurance premiums for owners & builders
- Inadequate funding for infrastructure and servicing of local heritage places
- Unreliable nature of grant funding makes effective long term planning impossible
- significant cost of subterranean heritage and archaeological investigations
- Councils face different transaction costs for heritage based on their size and scale

**80% Dramatically low levels of funding and technical support for cultural as compared to natural heritage**

- Grants for natural heritage research cannot be accessed for historic heritage
- Cultural NGOs ineligible for gift tax deductibility (except for National Trusts)- differs from environment and arts NGOs
- Inadequate support for NGOs, volunteer training

**80% Too many regulatory “sticks” and not enough incentive “carrots”**

- Little obvious incentive for owners to conserve places

- financial incentives too small to provide adequate protection
- Anomalies between tax benefits applicable to commercial and private owners
- No clear, accessible model for assessing costs and benefits of conserva

**75% cost shifting from the highest tiers of government to the lowest**

- Increasing pressure on Local Government from devolving of responsibilities
- Limitations of Local Government to raise revenue
- role underplayed and under funded
- Local government least resourced, but with largest number of heritage places
- Heritage Council under resourced, limited grants to allocate across state
- Inadequate capacity to employ heritage advisers

**65% Commonwealth cost shifting without commensurate funding**

- Inadequacy of funding to maintain, restore, manage and protect historic heritage places

**60% inadequate support for Australian international heritage activities**

**60% Poor resourcing for implementation of national heritage system**

**50% Subsidiarity model not properly resourced – cost shifting occurring**

- Australian government providing less funding
- World Heritage places need greater Commonwealth support
- Massive disparity between natural and cultural funding

**35% Gross disparity between natural, cultural heritage funding**

- NHT funds not available for cultural heritage, even for gardens!
- No national support for community heritage programs
- Natural environment attracts increasing number of volunteers

**33% Need for clear definition of financial responsibilities between governments**

- No cost shifting between jurisdictions

**33% Funding for cultural heritage far less than for conservation of natural resources**

- *Natural Heritage Trust* Act excludes historic heritage from being considered – despite indivisible nature of heritage values expressed in one place
- Australian government heritage grant programs heavily oversubscribed

**Actions Recommended re Heritage Economics**

**National Heritage Strategy should include funding agreements:**

- to agree intervention required to address market failure;
- to provide adequate funding at local government level ;
- to ensure systematic approach to heritage funding;
- to recognize need for ongoing conservation support;
- to encourage transparent reporting of heritage expenditure;
- to investigate innovative funding programs.

**Commonwealth and State national framework agreement to:**

- ensure local agencies sufficiently resourced to implement and enforce their legislation;
- allocate funding for effective network of regionally based heritage advisory services;
- develop national funding model for Local Government heritage responsibilities;
- review national applicability of UK heritage lottery & WA Lottery Commission models;
- consider ways to utilise tax regime to encourage triple bottom reporting to encourage heritage conservation;
- examine private cost/public benefit issues;
- implement incentives discussed in *Making Heritage Happen*;
- ensure funding is provided for NHL places in local areas.

**Establishment of sustainable comprehensive historic heritage incentives program as identified in *Making Heritage Happen*:**

- Tax deductions for donations to approved funds
- Tax concessions for owners that enter into Heritage Agreements
- Tax rebates for qualifying private expenditure
- Land Tax remissions
- Local government rate rebates
- Grants & loan subsidies; and
- Revaluation provisions for listed places, based on NSW, Vic models

**Tailored suite of tools needed for optimal conservation outcomes**

- Adoption of tools used in natural heritage management
- Heritage conservation tax offset – TIHC revised, cf, US tax incentives
- Conservation covenant concessions – expanded to include cultural places
- Extension of DGR status to churches and other NFP organisations
- Establishment of heritage places foundation utilising DGR status
- Municipal rates rebate (eg, Mornington)
- Reduction in land tax liability (as in Vic)

‘Extension of Hands on Heritage’ programs

**Regulations (sticks) should be balanced with incentives (carrots),**

**Role of heritage rehabilitation as incubator of small business should be better measured and acknowledged in policy**

**Judgement of ‘economic hardship’ should be based on “reasonable’ not ‘maximum’ return**

**Heritage conservation costs should be shared between governments and community**

- Recognition that heritage responsibilities have funding implications
- funding support should be directed to NFP sector & private owners where market failure can most be observed

**The Australian Government should develop generous grants and incentives program to support heritage conservation nationwide to:**

- provide redress for issues affecting owners of heritage property;
- allow cultural heritage NGOs to attract tax deductible donations;
- restructure land rates, taxes to reflect conservation costs, use of heritage property;
- provide suite of conservation support measures for the historic environment similar to those for natural environment, including 'Heritage Care' Program;
- enable agencies to invest in and maintain 'in house' expertise;
- allow heritage property acquisition and conservation.

**Other National Measures should include**

- Establishment of special funding sources
  - to supplement consolidated revenue appropriations (eg, share of lotteries or gaming revenue); or
  - share of Land Tax (or another suitable tax).
- **Establishment of Revolving Funds** for acquisition, restoration, disposal-under covenant of heritage places
- *National Tourism and Heritage Taskforce* should investigate research findings of Allens Consulting work re lack of recognition of relationship between cultural heritage and tourism
- EPHC/HCOANZ should implement recommendations identified in *Going Places* without delay
- Mechanisms for measuring the effectiveness of financial incentive schemes should be researched

**Commonwealth/State partnership to improve range of concessions available to support heritage conservation**

- Increase range of organisations able to receive tax deductible donations
- Introduction of ability for approved heritage organisations to receive property on tax beneficial basis
- Re-introduction of tax rebate scheme for heritage conservation projects
- Amendment of tax laws providing consistency between environmental and cultural organizations
- Review allocation of tax revenue
- Reintroduction taxation incentives to stimulate private investment
- Land rates or taxes should be structured to reflect conservation use of a property

**New funding sources within better considered program structure**

- Consideration of use of gambling funds, UK heritage lottery
- Special grants (eg, Federation fund) used for on-going conservation
- USA type tax relief and Incentives
- Demolitions tax, to cover material disposal cost
- incentive tools used in natural environment to cultural environment
- Cost/benefit analysis of heritage conservation proposals, would lead to
  - More focussed approach to heritage conservation

- Items conserved being more highly valued
- Better quality outcomes in terms of urban design

**Commonwealth should establish a Cultural Heritage Trust, cf Natural Heritage Trust to:**

- mobilise existing community effort under a regional structure;
- enhance on-ground outcomes;
- identify research and listing priorities on a regional basis

**Cultural Heritage Trust should be established, cf, NHT, to create**

- **Heritage Stewardship Fund**, to assist jurisdictions support owners
- **Heritage Care Program**, to encourage community conservation
- **National Heritage Research Council** to fund heritage research, and ensure availability of consolidated data

**4b NGO and community heritage management**

**70% Lack of training, support for volunteers**

- Ageing and declining membership and volunteer bases
- Reliance on untrained volunteers for conservation, security, interpretation
- Volunteers weary, burn out, carrying too great a load

**60% Lack of incentives program to support owners**

- No strategic investment in heritage properties
- No systematic alignment between community benefit and conservation costs

**60% NFP places starved for funds, generally operate at loss**

- Insufficient income to cover operating, maintenance costs
- Inability to invest in interpretation, presentation, public programming
- Little ability to train, support volunteers

**50% Heritage buildings cost more to maintain, insure and operate**

- Excessive costs of mandatory expert reports, assessments

**50% Inadequate, erratic, rate and tax concessions**

- Commercial properties low priority for grants, funding

**45% Redundancy of historic heritage**

- Particular issue for churches, declining congregations, increasing costs
- Redundant industrial heritage difficult to re-use – contamination, retention of plant

**45% Inadequate financial support for community heritage conservation**

**40% NGO Difficulties with short term & specific purpose grants**

- Difficulties developing long-term strategic management programs
- Ratio of demand for heritage grants versus funding offered approx 30:1
- Lack of capacity of NGOs re application, accountability
- Applications generally for work, but CMP funding needed

### **33% Lack of funding and support for community museums**

#### **25% visitation to historic sites has reduced.**

- Visitor expectations of historic sites have risen considerably
- Poor quality of heritage experience compared to other attractions
- NFP heritage sites particularly disadvantaged

#### **30% Grants cumbersome and inadequate to meet needs**

#### **30% Tax system mitigates against NFP conservation needs**

- Systematic scaling down of Federal Government funding
- Land tax exemption ceases if commercial rental obtained to sustain place
- Non-receipt of tax concessions because often no income
- Congregations, volunteers lack funds to qualify for GST refunds

#### **25% Churches struggling to care for heritage property**

- Public expectations of retention of traditional churches
- Absence of maintenance, support programs
- Spiralling costs of maintenance
- Redundant churches prey to vandalism, fire, theft
- Changing demographics – loss of congregations
- Exhaustion of volunteer resources
- Churches difficult to alter, adapt or dispose of

#### **25% Difficulties for community organisations accessing grant funding**

- highly competitive, onerous process of application, compliance
- conservation grants dependant on CMP, expensive to undertake

#### **20% lack of tax deductibility disincentive to private philanthropy**

- impacts on churches, public institutions

#### **20% Sustainable management requires long term planning & funding**

- Most grant funding short term, not recurrent,
- not able to be utilised for routine maintenance

#### **20% Problem with NFP 'sustainability' funding model**

- Presumption of self sustainability is at odds with reality
- Few heritage sites open to the public are profitable, or cover operating costs
- All need on-going subsidy & support

#### **20% sustainable management of historic site increasingly demanding**

- More sophisticated interpretation of the past required
- Increased expectations regarding quality of presentation
- Higher standards of curatorial and conservation practice required
- OH&S, food safety, insurance, disabled access provisions all impacting

**15% National Trusts struggling to conserve, present properties well**

- Harder to attract members and volunteers in support of historic sites.
- Increased focus on properties detracts from community education, advocacy
- Lack of resources to review and renew property portfolios
- Vast geographic spread of Trust properties and collections

**15% Reliance on volunteer impeding best practice collections management**

- Much vital information rapidly being lost as volunteers age and retire.
- Large part remains not professionally documented or properly stored.
- Need professional resources to assess significance and provenance

**10% Community archival holdings not readily accessible**

- Need programs to assist organisations make archival holdings available
- Poor provision of training, skills development for staff, volunteers

**15% Insurance costs too high**

- difficult to insure volunteers over 80

**10% Lack of education and training programs for volunteers**

**10% Forced reliance on volunteers lacking time, skills & professional expertise**

- Small population base ,reliance on older citizens
- Threat of burn out and/or revolution
- Community heritage groups often fragmented, unguided, unrecognized

**8% Government subsidies to new venues disadvantage heritage facilities**

**5% Most problematic situation is private ownership and public uses, eg, churches of strong local significance affected by change of use**

**5% Model of sustainable historic site needs rethinking**

- Worldwide, few achieve true self sustainability/ yet funding generally predicated on that being achieved

**Actions Recommended re NGO and Community Heritage Management**

**New grants program to increase professionalism of small community museums to:**

- provide training for development of business skills;
- extend *Sharing Australian Stories* to encourage destination linkage through shared stories;
- extend GVEHO grants to allow smaller organisations to apply;
- provide funds for development of tourism infrastructure

**Commonwealth should review adequacy of support provided for historical societies and owners of cultural heritage places in regional Australia**

**Funding should be provided to the NFP sector so it can better provide education, advice and support to community and owners**

- Conservation and interpretation of community owned heritage places

Ongoing management of collections and their interpretation

### **Greater recognition of and support for work of NGOs**

- Provision of volunteer training and support programs
- Support for Australia ICOMOS publications and community education programs

Work of heritage conservation volunteers should be recognized and celebrated

### **Extension of tax deductibility to churches, other organizations**

- DGR status to include heritage funds and NFP organisations
- permit exemptions for works to heritage places should be developed

### **Program provision for long term maintenance of heritage places**

- investment of % of grant to provide interest for maintenance

provision of incentives in return for maintenance, such as land tax relief, rates rebates

### **Programs to enable NGOs to better maintain, interpret and present their properties**

**Commonwealth to increase funding to Historic Shipwrecks Program**

**Commonwealth should review adequacy of support provided for historical societies and owners of cultural heritage places in regional Australia**

## **4c Heritage Tourism**

### **40% Difficulties balancing appropriate conservation, meaningful interpretation, good visitor management to achieve successful tourism outcomes**

- Tourism market saturated with poorly presented sites (Tas Trust properties)
- Over regulation impedes meeting of contemporary hospitality standards
- Skill sets/focus of tourism & heritage managers divergent

### **35% Tourism operators operating at margins of profitability:**

- bearing disproportionate costs conserving heritage sites;
- small visitor numbers providing low income streams;
- World Heritage sites not maximising advantage of listing

### **20% Failure to capitalise on cultural tourism as economic driver**

### **15% Inadequate recognition of economic benefits of heritage tourism**

## **Actions Recommended re Heritage Tourism**

### **Sustainable Heritage Tourism Program developed to ensure:**

- conservation needs of significant tourism sites assessed;
- recognition of international standing of Australian heritage practice

**Strategic investment needed in the heritage assets that underpin heritage tourism**

- Commonwealth heritage loan scheme at a national level to attract economies of scale

#### **Development of policy framework to support successful tourism**

- Increased focus on end user – tourism operator
- Strategies to increase visitor numbers
- Programs to assist National Trust to better present properties
- Better balance required between infrastructure – transport, hospitality needs – and conservation requirements

#### **Tourism promotion strategies and funding initiatives:**

- to facilitate markets;
- attract people and investment;

aid in economic diversification in regional areas.

#### **National Cultural Heritage Tourism Development Program**

- Innovative tourism, eg, virtual tours & program of self guided tours
- National support program to upskill volunteers, tourist operators

#### **4d Tax Incentives**

##### ***100% Regulation insufficiently balanced with incentives***

##### ***50% UK Heritage inequitably supported through tax system***

- VAT levied at 17.5% on conservation, repair and maintenance (not on new construction)
- The UK does not have Tax Incentive scheme

#### **Actions Recommended re Tax Incentives**

##### **Program of financial incentives for owners of heritage buildings**

- Maintenance support for private and government properties
- Reinstatement of tax concessions with first priority given to NGOs
- Low interest loans and revolving fund mechanisms
- Support for meeting standards under building and access codes
- Specialised support – eg, Heritage Lottery (cf UK)

##### **Innovative Program Ideas**

- Leveraged tax deduction program, similar to that previously offered for expenditure on Research & Development (Jaycees suggestion)

##### **Incentives should be used to balance regulation:**

- Reconsideration of *Making Heritage Happen* recommendations
- tax exemptions and rebates. GST refunds
- use of market auctions and revolving funds
- exemptions on authorised conservation expenditures/ expenses
- Partnerships with banks to provide grants or low-interest loans
- Use of public good outcomes of nature conservation on private land

### **Program of financial incentives for owners of heritage buildings**

- Maintenance support for private and government properties
- Reinstatement of tax concessions with first priority given to NGOs
- Low interest loans and revolving fund mechanisms
- Support for meeting standards under building and access codes
- Specialised support – eg, Heritage Lottery (cf UK)

### **Reinstatement of tax incentives for owners**

- Alternative ways of treating depreciation charges for not-for-profit companies
- Research and experimentation via pilot projects needed to gauge effectiveness of possible incentives
- Tax deduction could be offered for maintenance cost differences

### **Incentives to encourage owners to care for property**

- Transferable FSR established in suburban areas as in CBDs
- Flexibility and bonuses in planning regulations eg:
  - a. heritage Floor Space awards,
  - b. reduction in on-site parking;
  - c. land tax reductions;
  - d. waivers on consent application fees;
  - e. planning and zoning incentives;
- Heritage rate: councils levy small heritage rate then re-distribute to pay rates of each heritage-listed property to compensate for additional administrative costs;
- direct grant or low interest loans, seed funding;
- amendments to insurance regulation;
- provision of free professional and technical advice.

### **Local Government funded to provide local incentive package:**

- transfer and bonus plot ratio;
- rebate system – similar to the Pensioner Rate Rebates scheme;

discretion to waive planning fees;

- establishment of revolving fund, heritage restorative funds;
- guarantee of equal insurance costs for insurance for heritage places;
- government partnerships for private provision of labour, materials, expertise, finance;
- financial or transferable development rights to sensitively adapt rather than demolish buildings;
- reduction in land value for tax purposes for private owners;
- accelerated depreciation should encourage continued investment;
- tax capture/rebate system enabling community wide support for private owners;
- loan schemes such as the WA Heritage Loan Scheme & WA Local Government Grants Commission – Heritage Allowance