

## **RESPONSE TO PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSIONS DRAFT ON CONSERVATION OF AUSTRALIA'S HISTORIC HERITAGE PLACES - Cr Sandra Brown 24/2/06**

I have been an elected member of council for nine years. I am a member of the Local Heritage Advisory Committee of Council and a heritage and tourism group within the City of Onkaparinga district, South Australia.

I have lived in my district 33 yrs, familiar with localities since childhood and had ancestral ties in Coromandel Valley and Aldinga South Australia dating back to 1839 but have had family influences that bring in Mitcham Torrensvalley Thebarton Glenelg Peterborough Gladstone Hawker South Australia and Broken Hill New South Wales.

I am thankful for the opportunity of having a strong family influence in respecting and understanding the plights of our forefathers and visiting built form heritage to get a sense of the history.

I now find myself reflecting what was and the opportunities lost to new generations whom will never get a feel for what I have seen and experienced. My grandmothers and parents have shared some of the losses in loss built form heritage and subsequent loss of identity. These views have been discussed by a growing number of community spokespersons. As a consequence I believe it is my duty to put forth my case and see if we cannot seek sustainable solutions.

### **Hearing Summary**

I am thankful for the opportunity to attend the hearing Friday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2006 in Adelaide. It was interesting to hear views of proactive built form heritage advocates from bodies of all government tiers representing either themselves or a body and that of residents and commercial property owners expressing their fears and expectations.

I respectfully comment that every owner must paint their home and maintain it. Owning a heritage home requires maintenance as any other with a similar age background. Paint colours do not determine costs. In the past when a home/building has been selling 'cheap' it is usually because of its condition of which most people wanting to invest make informed decisions before purchasing.

Owning a heritage home is not distinguished by monetary capacity. I note two stonemasons whom have spent their lives maintaining their heritage homes and know of others whom decided to make a change in their lives and roll up their sleeves to sand paint and repair heritage homes themselves.

Insurance however is an issue that needs addressing. It is said owners are victims and exploited. Property insurance is hard to get and far in excess of realistic evaluation of repairs. A resident of a heritage home has explained he could only get one insurance company to cover his property (CGU Rural, AON Risk Insurance), he has to pay a farm

tax as the property is over one acre and classed as a farm although no farming practice has occurred in 30 years or is occurring. His insurance is \$1,750

Costs are fairly easy to obtain, it is a pity the government bodies as custodians have not accounted for associated costs in maintaining the heritage buildings they may have occupied. However I am sure there are a number of avenues to find associated costs in maintaining heritage buildings. The National Trust being one such contact as well as a number of owners whom have heritage properties.

When hearing of issues of a group of disgruntled owners that if their premises were new it would appreciate greater value for them to sell the building may not seem a justifiable argument measured with proactive groups that have painstakingly upgraded their facilities enlisting their members into proactive hands on community development.

Old Reynella changing station, Old Reynella, South Australia (*photos attached*) part of a shopping centre precinct, owned privately by an interstate group, was left to wreck and ruin for 30 years and had a demolition application lodged with the council by the owners in 2001. There was community outrage at the possible loss of 'their' icon. This evolved into local retired or employed trades and labourers working with the local business and tourism association whom auspice grants for materials for the project. All labour in the rebuilding was voluntary even local trade supply businesses donated or offered a discount for material and supplies such as sand, cement and specialist hire equipment. The local baker often supplied the workers with surplus pastries.

The state heritage minister 16th October 2005 opened the Reynell Horse Changing Station renovations for the general public to view. The Reynell Business and Tourism Association Inc. showcased the premises and organised the day's events. During the process the Reynell Business and Tourism Association have gained new members and the support mechanism has grown. The Reynell Horse Changing Station has a heritage committee, management committee, regular volunteer list and a list of local people whom have offered to assist infrequently.

I understand there are other examples of such fine outstanding community support such as Kow Plains Homestead at Cowangie in the far northwest of Victoria.

### **Other pressures in conservation of historic places**

Redevelopment of established urban areas is a large negative pressure placed on the conservation of historic heritage places. Shopping strips and residential precincts are gathering any available land to infill. Allotments that once housed a home with a backyard containing fruit trees and a 'veggie' garden are now facing pressures to subdivide into up to eight townhouse allotments. These new allotments often do not have front or backyards. The existing property often has the fence near the back door and a one-way driveway where there was once a side entrance. The new properties require services and often have more vehicles than the property can accommodate.

Often the new families have dual incomes and commute in all directions. The teenage children often have vehicles to access school and sport while parents are at work. In the district I live in the transport facilities are ineffective or non-existent. Most households require cars however as most properties do not accommodate the volume of vehicles that the household have this impacts other residents and the local amenity. When heritage homes are apart of the local amenity their sustainability is limited. Valuing our past has not been noted or promoted as part of our ethos. It is sad to view lovely old homes once owned or built by renowned families or persons, surrounded by two or three story units shadowing it from life and sunlight.

The pressures of sending our children off to school and teaching them that more is more and less is less further adds a 'nail in the coffin;' to creating greater demands for urbanization and pressuring sustainability. We promote our children to leave home and find work that meets the demands of the excesses we have taught or indulged them in. This compounded with the harsh living environment of rural living and a lack of structure of all government tiers to value rural production or understand consequences. There is a constant demand to subdivide rural properties which evolves into unsustainable primary production, into costly unproductive 'hobby farms', compounded by domestic economics which often results in demolished or run down old homesteads.

### **Value adding renovating**

The value in saving older buildings should not simply be the cost of replacing a strongly built, well-insulated smaller building for a tall glass or concrete panelled fast built option. Such issues as energy values in conserving and wasted energies in new constructions need to be evaluated. Total energy output that includes total resources such as emissions to make and deliver materials including the human elements, needs to be taken into account if we are serious about sustaining our planet. It is interesting to note that it is said to take 30 years before an energy savings can be realized in building "new" rather than renovate.

Maintenance factors should be incorporated, as it is understood that well maintained properties have a lower demand in demolition applications and the subsequent new constructions that result from demolition.

- **Social Cohesion.** The ongoing use of publicly known buildings adds to community cohesion and social capital, by keeping people informed and bringing people together. In the past the constant demolitions, restructuring and merging of government departments has added to the confusion of people not knowing where to go, whom to see or feel in anyway shape or form connected to being in control of their lives and purposely able to assert themselves. The loss of identity of a building threatens and lessens assertion of many people particularly the disadvantaged. This careless action puts all people in the fast lane, if they cannot cope they are dropped or fall-off.

## **FINDINGS**

### 3.1 Overview of historic heritage conservation finding

There may be little information on the conservation of Australia's historical heritage but the nature source and types of expenditure is well noted by past and current owners. Governments have consolidated merged and re-emerged into unrecognisable forms to such a degree that people do not know whom to contact any more. It is little doubt that records have been lost or destroyed however the forward thinking is to find a solution and part of the solution is:

- Change the current demands for government departments to consolidate into tall city buildings to other places to obtain services and cease to identify themselves as a community service – a quote from a submission lodged by a former government heritage architect Susan Balderstone involved in conservation of heritage buildings reinforces this issue
  - a. *“Anecdotal evidence has supported a widely held view that the forced redundancy of government buildings and their abandonment to other (possibly hard to find) uses, which follows falling town/suburb populations is a major factor in the decline of communities. Once the school, courthouse, post office and town hall are abandoned the town or suburb has lost its core community facilities. The churches may hang on with tiny congregations but without the other services the local residents are forced to travel”* Susan Balderstone
- Educate and build desire for preservation
- Build the patriotic path that celebrates the buildings their civic stately federal democratic or individual values locally and broadly
- It is accepted by all those whom preserve old structures that cost was not the prime reason or energy that inspired the maintenance, it was the satisfaction and pride in rebuilding the beauty and stature

## 4 Australian State and Territory governments heritage systems

4.1 I do not believe that properties listed onto State or Territory Heritage Registers results in that body becoming a de facto planning authority. I believe they are the official and legitimate planning authority in South Australia that is expected to show an interest and duty to conserve for future generations. Councils generally are the perceived planning authorities as they have a grass roots understanding of the locality. Councils that have independent development assessment panel members mixed with officers and Councillors are appropriate bodies to assess developments unless of course the land in question is a State or Federal Government owned asset.

If there is a desire to reduce bureaucracy:

- Ask the bodies assessing the developments how this can be streamline assessed
- Ask the applicants how they believe this could be done with fewer complications (private enterprise often comes up with solutions bureaucracy cannot – however long term financial gain of developers must be an equation that is measured.

4.2 The commitment of Governments and individuals to conserve and manage varies between State because of the funding options, awareness and community pressures. To form consistency throughout the country is by leadership of the commonwealth to:

- Build in a strategy from federal to local government on principals and objectives to conserving built heritage form
- Build better opportunities
- Educate and build better respect for built form heritage in Australia as there is overseas
- Promote the built form heritage in tourism – as Australia is aging the interest in heritage buildings increase. International travellers overseas view the heritage of cities and states in other countries through an established tourist industry
- Our British and European colonial buildings tell us about our history ourselves our people. The importance of such buildings in the context of Australia's democratic nationhood justifies Federal government funding support for their conservation to the same extent as provided for Australia's other great national distinguishable features – its Aboriginal heritage and its natural heritage
- There is ample environmental, social and economic benefit justification for Federal Government funding support

4.3 The level of assistance provided to private owners varies from States as does the grants and rebate incentives that assists some owners to carryout maintenance to their valued premises. Governments may not have measured expenses on heritage premises as that may not have been an equation in their pie chart costs, however it may need to be implemented if there needs to be checks and measures in built form heritage costs. It is well noted 'maintenance forgotten - all lost and forgotten'. Hopefully this would not be an exercise that creates more bureaucracy and less on ground maintenance. Measurements of accountable on-ground implementation must be in the pie chart of cost.

## **5 Planning controls and heritage conservation at the local level**

5.1 I am not aware of high levels of discretion in decision making on heritage matters at local government levels. I do have considerable contact with the local Council, as a Councillor, however if there is a shortfall it may be an option to improve upon this rather than up-end the whole process and almost start from scratch again.

5.2 Statements of significance have not been an issue from my personal opinion. Most items listed on the local heritage list by members of the community are quite significant to local or heritage groups in districts. It may seem unfair to the community to prioritise from other sections of the Council or imbalance listings of priority as may be inferred. Local listings may not seem as significant to architects and why there is a State Heritage. This list to incorporate a different process, which often includes City buildings, wealthy suburban mansions that are quite different to the Roundhouse of Moana, Holly House and Pennys Hill church in Hackham or the horse changing station at Old Reynella South Australia.

- 5.3 It is interesting to note conservation areas impose fewer restrictions for redevelopment than individual heritage properties. As a member of a heritage committee I will take that onboard
- 5.4 Heritage controls on properties are an issue that has some people supporting but certainly not developers or people not interested in conserving the building. Plan Amendment Reports on local government listed heritage properties are open for public and owner response. Owners have been known to contest listings. Some have had the premises delisted some of the buildings have been demolished as a result of a request to have the premises delisted. The Fernleigh Lodge issue in Burnside South Australia is an example where a stately home was demolished outraging the community and a number of the local councillors at the time. It was a loss for the state and future generations. A process of consultation with the community may have produced a different outcome. The premises were large, property prices in the locality high and rising compounded by urban infill pressures, which assisted the process.
- 5.5 If owners are unaware of heritage listing and their effects, they need only contact the authority that the building is listed under to clarify the circumstances. Making significant lists may not necessarily be supported by members of the community at one location and could be seen to favour another section. There are Federal State and Local lists, to accommodate the differing levels of significance to local and broader communities.
- 5.6 If there are requirements to improve the scope of managing heritage conservation by local government it will significantly increase the costs. Council has processes for land use and planning and meet with the state requirements. If the anti is upped, it will increase the costs. I am uncertain if the objectives of the productivity commission is to cost shift.

## **6 Analytical framework**

- 6.1 Heritage can have a positive effect to amenity, tourists, economics, community well being and preservation and recognition of history. Purchasers are aware of that a number of old buildings may have a historic significance and/or have the potential to be heritage listed. Owners can use it as a complaint if they wish not to preserve/maintain the building along heritage guidelines or that they may wish to cash in on the value of the property to developers. Urban infill demands put pressure on the later.
- Our world is made up of many different people; some like history and historical old buildings while some prefer modern sterile type homes. It needs to be accepted some people simply do not like older homes and those people cannot be convinced any different, however there may need to be strategies in place to conserve some places, that the views of the current owners will not be shared. The processes may be long to seek equity; transparency, accountability and community consultations, care and civil rights must be considerations.
- 6.2 Costs to maintain old premises are commonly known, to use a heritage listing as an impost to the cost could be seen as blame lying. Old premises could have considerable

maintenance. The premises are usually sold according to the condition and in purchasing premises regardless of why type it is the obligation of the purchaser to go in with eyes wide open and cost repairs before purchasing the premises. Of the many people I know who have renovated old premises, they have all said it was for the achievement and obligation to future generations, costs were secondary. The passion to preserve for posterity over ruled their pocket.

It could be seen, as off setting costs, by claiming renovation costs were too great. If a home were in disrepair the costs to repair would be greater than a home that has been well maintained.

## **7. Assessing governments involvement**

7.1 I support the three-tier framework as an appropriate model for government involvement.

7.2 I do not believe negotiated agreements will achieve the end result. A number of people whom object to heritage agreements do so as they do not wish to maintain the building Do not wish to maintain the building in its original form  
Or long term wish to make as much money as they can on the site, subdividing into as many allotments as possible, demolishing the heritage building having no emotional attachment to the premises or any sense of obligation to preserve for future generations.

7.3 As custodians of buildings Government Departments should be aware of the costs in maintaining the building as well as its operations and I support processes that may improve government agencies better conserving of heritage places that they are utilising.

7.4 All departments should have maintenance budgets and transparent reporting of expenditure on conservation.

7.5 This may be the view of the developer but may not be shared by residents local Government and the broader community

7.6 Most people and or builders are fully aware of costs in renovating premises if they are conversant with renovating old premises. I believe this finding may not necessarily reflect a general view. I believe it is productive to work with positives. Find what is working and sort out some of the 'nits'.

7.7 There is no legislation to force any resident to maintain or upgrade their property in general. Heritage listing manages development of heritage places. As indicated above the cost of paint is not reflective to the colour. A poorly maintained home will cost more to repair than a well maintained home. It is important when judging issues that apples are measured with apples.

7.8 I would say this system is working better than without, however if the Federal Government sees it in their wisdom to increase funding for heritage conservation planning schemes I am sure most Local Governments would gladly receive the funds.

## **8 Getting incentives right**

8.1 I do not believe voluntary listing will work. I believe there could be great loss of many icon buildings if the Productivity Commission pushes this process. The Changing Station at Old Reynella would not have worked if there were a voluntary listing scheme, as it seems the developer only wants a car park where the building sits.

William St Knox Church – when an act of parliament determined the owner, the church sold the premises to a developer. The church was handed down by mergers originally, put their with community funds, but left to ruin for years without any attempt to maintain or repair from vandalism. It was a useable church in the 1970's now only a ruin in 2005. There has been no attempt to repair the premises. It is said greed and profiteering may likely seal the fate of this location.

Moana Round house owner did not want his building listed; he applied to the Minister to have it delisted. The Council objected to it being delisted giving sound basis and local knowledge, in its objections. The planning minister without any community, local Government or local State member negotiation, removed the listing. As a result the owner applied for a consent demolition order of which the Council asked not to be the determining body, however the judgement was that the local Council, whose desire was to retain the premises had to be the determining body of the consent demolition.

The local community in and near Moana, South Australia, are currently meeting discussing, negotiating and fighting to retain their local heritage icon. It is a historic place of significance of which people from all walks of life in Australia have valued. It was the beginning of Moana and built for first use as a sales office to sell the allotments of the new “Manly of the south” naming the subdivision Moana in 1927 and it is quite likely that Sir Robert Helpman practised dancing there.

Quidhampton, Hackham South Australia is part of a valued local precinct of the old township of Hackham. The property has been purchased by an aged care group that offers budget priced housing. As facilities such as a local community centre with aged care incorporating a social club, card playing, cooking and craft activities or networking activities and places to interconnect are not within this aged facilities budget. The building is surplus to their needs. The home was upgraded and liveable 12 months ago, at the time of purchase of this property. However in the past 12 months the place was left open and vandals have damaged the property. The aged care group have no insurance on the property to cover repair costs. There are currently community members trying to negotiate with all tiers of government and the owners, trying to find a solution that retains these premises for the benefit of present and future generations. It is well noted that it is likely to be a valued place and run by the aged, once renovations make the premises usable. It is also noted that without these facilities the



aged that use the nursing home and self contained units may suffer from disconnection of social well being. Community cohesion and social capital, by keeping people informed and bringing people together should not be ignored for the aged. The value of this building for the future is incalculable but the funding to secure and upgrade is presently unavailable. It is well noted that these premises take the space of several units, which would be a great loss to current and future generations. Finding a community outcome is an upsetting and long process for residents that are not accustomed to working with bureaucracy. The value of buildings cannot always be measured in bricks and mortar. Can your outcomes help situations like this?

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**3.1 Recommendation response: historic buildings should have plans and maintenance portfolios data kept within their premises safeguarded for their records as owners change hands. The various authorities no doubt would keep copies but as they change and merge it is expected as has happened, the copies may not be as easily accessible.**

### **7. Assessing governments involvement**

**7.1 Recommendation response: I do not support phasing out the National Register**

**7.2 Recommendation response: I do not support removing any reference to the Register from planning and heritage legislation and regulations**

**7.3 Recommendation response: No I do not support the State Governments repealing legislations that govern National Trust if they have specific legislation that does so, at this time.**

**7.4 Recommendation response: all departments should have transparent maintenance budgets**

### **8 Getting incentive right**

**Recommendation response: If properties are only on a negotiated conservation list it is hardly likely most listings will remain. The dollar generates the activities; old premises often have much sought after valuable metropolitan land, which attracts attention.**

### **9 Conservation agreements for privately owned heritage premises**

**9.1 Recommendation response: I do not believe that non-government listing with agreement will work. It may an option to keep the property on the listing if after forming an agreement, however I do not believe the first process will be an easy or viable option, of which the second stage cannot work without the first stage in operation. The third option of statutory requirement under the Environment**

**Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act is no doubt plausible, providing the first stage is achievable.**

- 9.2 Recommendation response: I am not convinced the system is broken, thereby am hesitant of any support of modification of heritage legislation for owner conservation agreements as I do not believe it will support conservation of Australia's heritage places. I believe we stand to lose a significant number of valued heritage buildings of all levels local State and Federally significant**
- 9.3 Recommendation comment: I do not believe this recommendation will be of community benefit and add to conservation of Australia's Heritage places. Local Government lists of are usually made up from suggestions of the local community and from local values. There is a process in South Australia where the owners have an opportunity to impact the decision making body. The issue is considered and measured upon justifiable criteria. There are options for levels of support for heritage owners in some local governments. The Federal Government has the option to offer greater opportunities with funding or rebates to assist. Only 4.3% of development applications for historic places are rejected in South Australia. It seems that the majority of applicants are not dissatisfied. Why fix something that "aint broke?" There may be room for improvement but it may seem a considerable amount of funding is being directed to an area that may be put to better use actually injecting some funding into on ground works of heritage maintenance**
- 9.4 Recommendation response: compulsory acquisition is a costly and non-viable option that can only be used infrequently as a last resort. It has been stated this may happen more than once for one property, which opens the local authorities to ridicule and considerable costs. Acquisition is neither a cost effective option nor a supported action amongst communities.**
- 9.5 Recommendation response: I do not believe it wise to redress past issues too deeply. A way to appease the minority of displeased owners of heritage homes is to offer a carrot unless of course the intent is to subdivide their properties or to modernise the house with an addition that is not sympathetic to the original structure. It may be a difficult process to revisit past listings and negotiate new agreements as the long-term family ties may not be present, the past or heritage values may not be shared or the owner's values may be at variance to heritage or the value of the heritage amenity.**
- 9.6 Recommendation response: Section one: I support the retention of agreements in force where listings occurred prior to the purchase of the property. Section Two: Any opportunity for a developer to seize an opportunity of requesting a listing change by creating a substantial development may seen as opening the flood gates, overloading particular Councils with development applications, putting valued built form heritage at risk, angering local and broader communities at the possible loss of their icon heritage built forms, loss of**

**identity for the community, loss of character and amenity for the community, local incomes from the tourist industry and associated chain of employment it results in, loss of onsite historic education opportunities for the schools in the area**

- 9.7 Recommendation comment: I fear modification of legislation that removes any requirement to take heritage considerations into account to individual properties other than those requirements relative to zoned heritage as it has potential to leave built form heritage unprotected during or after any process. What ever change is aspired there are those ‘with property gain at all cost’ thoughts that may find loop holes to destroy vital local and broader community and future tourist locations. We do not live in a perfect world and must take into account any possible detrimental effect. As present day custodians it is a duty that we try to give our future generations visions of our past to assist their future growth and sustainability.**
- 9.8 Recommendation comment I fear any identification removal may impact negatively on decisions. I would hope that the State and Territory identification might assist the protection of precincts and vital heritage built form. This proposal also have cost shifting elements of which I do not support.**

## SUMMARY:

1. I do not believe it wise to re-invent the wheel. The system may have a few gaps that may need fixing but certainly not in need of a total restructuring
1. I do not believe it wise to “chuck the baby out with the bath water”. There are many processes that are working. It is a matter of getting them to work smarter and together networking for the ultimate achievement and work towards the opening terms of reference paragraph stated by the Treasurer “set a policy framework and incentives for the conservation of Australia’s historic built heritage places. I believe it unwise to spend \$52.6 million totally restructuring to work with the 4.3% (SA) of unhappy results. The level of successful achievements must be measured with options for appeal for those not happy.

It will be a difficult process to resolve lack of understanding, confusion, and financial impacts if they are used subjectively to avoid or deter listing. There are rules and laws in society, each day we comply with many or face consequences. It is human nature to try to avoid costs that can be attributed to others.

In the council ward I live in, 77% of the people did not vote at the council elections. A large portion of complaints from residents is that they object to a certain development near their home. Yet many residents are unaware of the process that enables them to shape and mould their future in saying what type of development they support or do not support. Empowering residents is a hard task as the majority of people do not want to be bothered with governance until it impacts them using their busy lives as justification in not finding the time impact decisions. There is also the situation where residents believe there is not genuine attempt for real consultations so that people are not part of the decision making process. With that in mind I do not believe it possible to alter the process to 100% satisfaction.

2. Owners of heritage homes claim insurance is one of the financial problems they face. The cost of insurance of a heritage home is far greater than a “newer” home of similar value. The Federal Government could exert some pressure by regulating and monitoring insurance company costs. This may stop/limit the reported exploitation from insurance companies handing down exorbitant costs to individuals and groups whom own or manage heritage properties. As mentioned above a tin of paint is not priced on colour or a sheet of iron is not priced according to the age of the home. There may be some “extra” charges from contractors evaluating prices according to their assumption of owner’s wealth.
3. I share the background considerations of the terms of reference and that it is timely and understandable to review current pressures and that there has been less work undertaken on historic heritage places and their social economic value in the context of Australia’s overall natural, indigenous and historic heritage. The built conservation of our built historic heritage is important etc., but I do not believe it

wise to totally up end the process when it appears some minor adjusting may resolve the issues of concern.

4. Cost shifting implications seem evident throughout it is important not to impost local government with decisions as has historically been done in recent times. Local Government is still awaiting response from the 'Hawker' enquiry, it would seem unfair if more imposts were passed-on prior to the Federal resolutions to offer support and try to stem the flow of past cost-shifting.
5. There is an opportunity to directly reimburse Councils for rate rebates or grants for heritage property owners and not impost the 'general' ratepayers. I would expect that the rate rebates would be tied to an obligation to maintain the property with a process that is accountable and transparent.
6. Any form of grant would need to incorporate equity so that the small isolated rural Council that has low demographics has opportunities rather than see the big cities and states seize greater opportunities, as has been the situation with the Federal Roads Grants System.

I write this without prejudice and thank you for the opportunity of being apart of the decision making process. The views of above may not necessarily that of Council  
Cr Sandra Brown  
PO Box 180 Happy Valley SA 5159  
[sbrown@onkapinga.sa.gov.au](mailto:sbrown@onkapinga.sa.gov.au)  
Fax 83811214 ph 83817887.

Ref: Susanne Balderstone submission to the commission  
L. Mc Inerney – private owner of family heritage homestead/farm

Attachments:

- 1 a. horse changing station, Old Reynella South Australia prior and during renovations
  - 1 b. horse changing station, Old Reynella South Australia during renovations roofing stage
  - 1 c. horse changing station, Old Reynella South Australia completed stage one
  - 1 d. horse changing station, Old Reynella South Australia completed stage one front view.
- 2 photo of Quidhampton Hackham South Australia – prior to start of nursing home buildings on grounds