

2006-2008 Heritage Incentives Program

Program 2 – Land Tax and Local Rates Rebate Program

Program Objective

This program is aimed at assisting private owners undertaking conservation and maintenance works to State Heritage Register listed items

Overall program summary

90% of applications received were funded, 100% of the funded projects were completed. Overall \$218,999 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$78,693 grant funding and \$141,532 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$2

Evaluation

What do the KPIs tell you about these outcomes?

Although 100% of projects funded through this program were successfully completed, the overall program has not attracted funding applications and therefore not achieved the stated program purpose.

What were the key results or achievements for the year?

- 100% of funded projects were very successful or successful in achieving their project aims.
- 78% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism.
- 100% of projects created paid employment

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

This program targeted to private owners has been undersubscribed and the program funding concept has been difficult to understand.

What will you do next year?

This program has been deleted in the 2008-9 NSW Heritage Grants program. Private residential SHR owners are eligible to apply for funding through the Works program.

Outcome 1 - Improvement in the condition of heritage items

78% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item due to the project funding

Outcome 2 - Improvement in the management of heritage items

67% of funded projects reported significant improvement in the management of the heritage item

Outcome 3 - HIP funded projects are successfully completed

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

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Use of good professionals and tradespeople,
- Heritage Branch funding received and assistance

Outcome 4 - HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

78% 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.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- “Guided walks of the garden and stables in May 2008 were part of the fund raising weekend for MS research”.

Outcome 5 - HIP funded projects created paid employment

100% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 4 tradespeople and 0.7 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 6 - HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

10% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 20 hours contributed by volunteers per project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Community awareness raising through an open day

Only 22% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of less than 1 media item per project.

Outcome 7 - Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

Overall, more than 50% applicants expectations were met or exceeded in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

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

- Greater input into funds for private residences
- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Greater funds available

Outcomes for overall program (from HIP application data)

90% of applications funded		10 applications received 9 projects funded 9 projects completed
HIP funding multiplier effect 1:3.5	\$141,532 Applicant contribution to project \$78,693 contribution to project	HIP funding as a average 35% of project cost

Evaluation

90% of applications received were funded, 100% of the funded projects were completed.

Overall \$218,999 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$78,693 grant funding and \$141,532 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$3.5

Outcome 1

Improvement in the condition of heritage items

*This outcomes measures the **improvement in the physical conservation** of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through HIP funded works projects.*

Key Performance Indicator 1 – Improved condition of heritage item with HIP funding

HIP funding helped to <u>improve the condition</u> of my heritage item	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	22%
	4 (mostly)	44.5%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	33.5%

Evaluation

78% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item due to the project funding

Outcome 2

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 2 – 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 or not applicable)	22% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	11%
	4 (mostly)	56%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	11%

Evaluation

67% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item due to the project funding

Outcome 3

HIP funded projects are successfully completed

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 3 – Successfully completed HIP funded projects

Yes , the project was <u>very successful</u> - we achieved everything we set out to	89% of projects completed
Yes , the project was <u>mostly successful</u> - we achieved most of what we set out to do	11% 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 or successful in achieving the project aims

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Use of good professionals and tradespeople,
- Heritage Branch funding received and assistance

Stated reasons why projects were not successfully completed:

- Unforeseen extra costs found during works
-

Outcome 4

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 4 – HIP funded projects contributed to heritage tourism

Yes , my project <u>contributed</u> to heritage tourism	78% of projects completed
No , my project <u>didn't contribute</u> to heritage tourism	12% of projects completed

If yes, it contributed in the following ways:

Yes , my heritage property/item, was <u>open for public inspection</u> (eg Open Days for Heritage Festival, etc)	11% of project completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>local heritage trail</u> or interpretation walk around your area.	11% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>main street or town centre heritage precinct</u> .	0% 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)	0% of projects completed

Evaluation

78% 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.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- “Guided walks of the garden and stables in May 2008 were part of the fund raising weekend for MS research”.

Outcome 5

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 5 – Paid employment created by HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created paid employment</u>	100% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create any employment</u>	0% of total projects undertaken

If answered yes:

<u>Number and type of paid tradespeople</u> employed on my project (eg roofer, plumber, carpenter and joiner, etc)	39 tradespeople, 4 jobs per project
<u>Number and type of paid professionals</u> employed on my project (eg engineers, architects, etc)	7 professionals, 0.7 jobs per project

Evaluation

100% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 4 tradespeople and 0.7 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 6

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 6 - Volunteer hours contributed to HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created an opportunity for volunteers</u>	10% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create an opportunity for volunteers</u>	90% of projects completed

If yes,

Number of <u>volunteer hours</u> contributed to my project	20 volunteer hours, 20 hours per project
--	---

Evaluation

10% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 20 hours contributed by volunteers for the completed project.

Other forms of community involvement were :

- Community awareness raising through an open day

Key Performance Indicator 7 – Media coverage for HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created media interest and coverage</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	22% of projects completed
No , there was no <u>media interest or coverage</u> of my project	78% of projects completed

If yes,

Number of <u>media inquiries and media releases</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	3 items of media coverage Less than 1 item per project
--	---

Evaluation

Only 22% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of less than 1 media item per project.

Outcome 7

Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

Measures HIP funded project customer service satisfaction levels

Key Performance Indicator 8 - Customer service satisfaction

<u>Helpful assistance and advice</u> was provided to me for my HIP funding and project	1 (none)	22% of responses
	2 (a little)	12%
	3 (some)	22%
	4 (mostly)	22%

	5 (exceeded my expectations)	22%
The <u>Application Form</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	0% of responses 0% 22% 66% 12%
The project <u>payment claims</u> were easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	0% of responses 12% 22% 66% 0%
The project <u>final report</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	0% of responses 0% 12% 76% 12%

Evaluation

Overall, more than 50% of applicants expectations were met or exceeded in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

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

- Greater input into funds for private residences
- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Greater funds available