

2006-2008 Heritage Incentives Program

Program 4 – Conservation Management Plan

Program Objective

This program provides funding for the preparation of a conservation management plan or a conservation management strategy for items listed on the State Heritage Register or of state significance

Overall program summary

90% of applications received were funded, of these 75% have been successfully completed to date. Overall \$354,620 was spent on conservation plans through this program made up of \$86,185 grant funding and \$268,435 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$3.2

Evaluation

What do the KPIs tell you about these outcomes?

Overall, the program was a great success and achieved the stated program purpose.

What were the key results or achievements for the year?

- 100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful
- 92% of funded projects reported significant improvement in the management
- 75% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism.
- 75% of projects created paid employment,

Were there any challenges or disappointments that had a major effect on your results?

No.

What will you do next year?

Continue to work closely with customers and projects, look to provide more information and forms on-line. The program has been withdrawn in 2008-09 due to limited funding and recommended for inclusion in the 2009-11 NSW Heritage Grants program.

Outcome 1 - Improvement in the management of heritage items

92% of funded projects reported significant improvement in the management of the heritage item

Outcome 2 - HIP funded projects are successfully completed

100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful in achieving the project aims

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Advice provided by consultants, council
- Commitment of consultants
- Good research and background materials from previous studies

Outcome 3 - HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

75% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Outcome 4 - HIP funded projects created paid employment

75% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 0.25 tradespeople and 1 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 5 - HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

57% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 3 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Involvement of historical society and National Trust regional committee
- Community feedback on CMP and provided understanding on the social and cultural connections of the places to the community

Outcome 6 - Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

Overall, more than 60% applicant expectations were met in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- Providing funding for future projects
- Getting places on the SHR
- Funding capital works projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Advertising in local media
- Increasing amount of funding

Program 4 – Conservation Management Plan Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

Outcomes for overall program

90% of applications funded 60% successfully completed		20 applications received 18 projects funded, 12 projects completed
HIP funding multiplier effect \$1:\$3.2	\$268,435 Applicant contribution to project \$86,185 HIP contribution to project	HIP funding on average contributes 24% of project cost

Evaluation

90% of applications received were funded, of these 75% were successfully completed.

Overall \$354,620 was spent on conservation plans through this program made up of \$86,185 grant funding and \$268,435 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$3.2

Outcome 1

Improvement in the management of heritage items

*This outcome measures the **improvement in the management** of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through use of Conservation Management Plans.*

Key Performance Indicator 1 – Conservation Management Plans improved the management of heritage item

Use of a CMP helped to <u>improve the management</u> of my heritage item	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	8%
	4 (mostly)	50%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	42%

Evaluation

92% of funded projects reported significant improvement or exceeded expectations in the management of the heritage item

Outcome 2

HIP funded projects are successfully completed

This outcome measures the successfully completed projects and their contribution to the conservation and management of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through HIP funded works projects, as assessed by the applicant.

Key Performance Indicator 2 – Successfully completed HIP funded projects

Yes , the project was <u>very successful</u> - we achieved everything we set out to	100% of projects completed
Yes , the project was <u>mostly successful</u> - we achieved most of what we set out to do	0% of projects completed
No , the project was <u>not successful</u> - we did not achieve what we set out to do	0% of projects completed

Evaluation

100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful in achieving the project aims

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Advice provided by consultants, council
- Commitment of consultants
- Good research and background materials from previous studies

Outcome 3

HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

This outcome measures the contribution to heritage tourism. Contribution to heritage tourism is defined as (open days, part of a heritage trail, part of a main street or heritage precinct or commercial heritage tourism venture).

(This is a NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority - Result indicator - At least 70% of funded projects assist heritage tourism)

Key Performance Indicator 3 – HIP funded projects contributed to heritage tourism

Yes , my project <u>contributed</u> to heritage tourism	75% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item, was <u>open for public inspection</u> (eg Open Days for Heritage Festival, etc)	25% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>local heritage trail</u> or interpretation walk around your area.	50% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>main street or town centre heritage precinct</u> .	25% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is a <u>commercial heritage tourism venture</u> – (eg Bed and Breakfast accommodation, or heritage tourism venture such as a gold mining site, etc)	25% of projects completed
No , my project <u>didn't contribute</u> to heritage tourism	25% of projects completed

Evaluation

75% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Outcome 4

HIP funded projects created paid employment

This outcome measures the contribution to employment creation and increased trade and professional skills in heritage conservation.

(A NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority outcome.)

Key Performance Indicator 4 – Paid employment created by HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created paid employment</u>	75% of projects completed
Number and type of <u>paid tradespeople</u> employed on my project (eg roofer, plumber, carpenter and joiner, etc)	3 tradespeople 0.25 tradespeople per project
Number and type of <u>paid professionals</u> employed on my project (eg engineers, architects, etc)	14 professionals 1 professional per project
No , my project <u>did not create any employment</u>	25% of projects completed

Evaluation

75% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 0.25 tradespeople and 1 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 5

HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

This outcome measures active community support for HIP funded projects through volunteer hours and media coverage.

Key Performance Indicator 5 - Volunteer hours contributed to HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created an opportunity for volunteers</u>	42% of projects completed
Number of <u>volunteer hours</u> contributed to my project	20+ volunteer hours Average 3 hours per project
No , my project <u>did not create an opportunity for volunteers</u>	58% of projects completed

Evaluation

57% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 3 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Involvement of historical society and National Trust regional committee
- Community feedback on CMP and provided understanding on the social and cultural connections of the places to the community

Key Performance Indicator 6 – Media coverage for HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created media interest and coverage</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	42% of projects completed
Number of <u>media inquiries and media releases</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	1 item of media interest or media coverage
No , there was no <u>media interest or coverage</u> of my project	58% of projects completed

Evaluation

42% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of less than 1 media item per project.

Outcome 6

Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

This outcome measures HIP funded project customer service satisfaction levels

Key Performance Indicator 7 - Customer service satisfaction

<u>Helpful assistance and advice</u> was provided to me for my HIP funding and project	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	17%
	4 (mostly)	58%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	25%
The <u>Application Form</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	8%
	3 (some)	16.5%
	4 (mostly)	67.5%
	5 (very easy to complete)	8%
The project <u>payment claims</u> were easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	42%
	4 (mostly)	58%
	5 (very easy to complete)	8%
The project <u>final report</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	8%
	3 (some)	25%
	4 (mostly)	67%
	5 (very easy to complete)	0%

Evaluation

Overall, more than 60% applicants expectations were met in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- Providing funding for future projects
- Getting places on the SHR
- Funding capital works projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Advertising in local media
 - Increasing amount of funding
-