

24/10/2005

To the Commissioners,
Productivity Commission Inquiry into Heritage

Dear Dr. Byron and Mr. Hinton

Mr Scott Austin recently sent me a copy of the National Trust's latest submission to the inquiry. I already had a copy of the Trust's earlier submission.

The Trust's latest submission

The Trust's latest submission contains a number of points that could certainly be debated. However it does at least acknowledge that there is a case for "incentives" for the unfortunate owner of a heritage listed property.

I have taken the liberty of enclosing copies of two recent articles in the Sydney Morning Herald which are relevant and which you may not have seen:

The first appeared on the 5th October. It details, inter alia, a case where the NSW Valuer General, following a ruling in the Land and Environment Court, was forced to accept that heritage listing reduced the value of a property in Hunters Hill from his initial estimate of \$950 000 to \$650 000. He had initially refused to allow for the fact that "it was heritage listed and could not be extended or extensively renovated".

The second article appeared on the 19th October. Written by a lawyer, Mr. Alan Anderson, it lists many of the problems associated with present methods of heritage listing. It also suggests a much more reasonable approach than that currently adopted by the National Trust and other bodies wanting to impose heritage listing on unwilling recipients.

The Trust's earlier submission

The Trust's earlier submission proudly states that "**Intergenerational responsibility** and **equity** are the principal concepts which unite all regulatory, community and professional heritage groups".

Equity was a subject completely ignored by Council staff, the three councilors hell-bent on the listing, the National Trust itself, and Docomomo Australia in their attempts to have our home listed in April and July this year.

In fact, those attempts were initiated and carried out without consultation, without consideration for our position, and without care of the likely effects on us or our assets.

They were carried out in a way which constituted an intrusion into our lives and a violation of our rights to the quiet enjoyment of our home.

There was certainly no suggestion by any of the proponents of any compensation.

So much for equity.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to present our case to the Inquiry

Yours faithfully

John Boyd