

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION
RE PETTIT & SEVITT EXHIBITION CENTRE NO. 1
(INCLUDING 400 MONA VALE ROAD), ST. IVES, NSW**

NSW HERITAGE OFFICE

BACKGROUND

The group of homes in Richmond Avenue (numbers 17 to 29) and 400 Mona Vale Road, St Ives was built during 1964-65 by merchant builders Pettit & Sevitt as the firm's first Exhibition Home Centre (as distinct from the several individual display homes) in NSW. The group is known as the Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No. 1. A second display village, Exhibition Centre No. 2, was subsequently constructed by Pettit & Sevitt in St Ives. The location of Exhibition Centre No. 1 is at the northern end of a 'peninsula' of suburban development and thus close to the bushland of Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park and Davidson Park State Recreation Area.

Pettit & Sevitt were regarded as market leaders in project house design and in the use of well-known architects to design and furnish their exhibition houses. The village was widely visited by architects and builders as well as prospective owners, and was the most influential exhibition centre of its type in the 1960s, inspiring merchant builders in Melbourne and similar operations in Brisbane and Perth. All houses in the group were designed in the 'Sydney Regional' style and are early examples of the domestic work of architect Ken Woolley. As a group of 1960s project homes they can be considered to be a significant group-example of the Sydney School of domestic architecture.

The Pettit & Sevitt Display Village is also noteworthy as an example of the then innovative ideas of the prominent landscape-architect Bruce Mackenzie of preserving and using the site's natural landscape and flora in association with development and setting of the display village. The group demonstrates the close collaboration between architect Woolley and landscape-architect Mackenzie to maximise the orientation of the houses to retain the existing native landscape and in particular the scribbly-gum trees.

The Exhibition Centre offered suburban home buyers the opportunity to own an architect-designed home in a landscape-architect designed setting that emphasised the bushland setting of northern St Ives.

The Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No. 1 group of homes and grounds remains today as a largely intact group although altered over time by minor alterations and additions to buildings, replacement of much of the native landscaping by exotic garden plantings, and the erection of fences between the houses.

Exhibition Centre No. 1 was first identified as a potential heritage item in a 1987 heritage study prepared for Ku-ring-gai Council. In 1989 most of the Exhibition Centre No.1 was listed as of local heritage significance on Ku-ring-gai Council's Local Environment Plan (LEP), in accordance with the provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (EP&A Act). Exceptions to the group LEP listing were 400 Mona Vale Road (eastern end) and 23 Richmond Ave (in the middle). It is understood that 400 Mona Vale Road was exempted because the owner believed it was considered to have been altered and thus it no longer 'presented' as part of the Pettit & Sevitt group not a Pettit & Sevitt house, although council records are not clear on councils reasons for not listing. No.23 Richmond Avenue was apparently exempted because it was argued at the time that it was not a Pettit & Sevitt house, although Council records are not clear on this point.

In 1991 No 27 Richmond Avenue was de-listed from the Ku-ring-gai LEP, apparently because it was argued that this also was not a Pettit & Sevitt house, although again Council records are not clear on the reason for de-listing. Following the de-listing, Council approved additions to No 27 that added a new kitchen and renovated the bathroom.

In 2001 Ku-ring-gai Council nominated Exhibition Centre No.1 for consideration for listing on the State Heritage Register (SHR) along with other items on Council's LEP which Council had ranked as being of state heritage significance.

The Heritage Office has funded a project officer position with the Royal Australian Institute of Architects (RAIA) to assist with identifying key examples of twentieth century architecture in NSW for possible listing on the SHR. Part of this project has focussed on the 'Sydney Regional' or 'Sydney School' style of architecture.

In 2004, arising out of this research, the RAIA nominated the Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No. 1, including 400 Mona Vale Road St Ives, for the Heritage Council of NSW consideration for State Heritage Register listing. A nomination was also received from one homeowner in the group.

The owners of most of the properties in the group made submissions to the Heritage Council to advise of their opposition to the listing proposal, each citing that they did not believe that their property was of heritage significance and that alterations had been made to the properties since construction.

The owner of 400 Mona Vale Road also stated their view that listing would prevent any change to the house; cause financial hardship by restricting future development; be unreasonable to undergo the listing process again given that that as Ku-ring-gai Council considered the house for listing in 1988 and rejected it; criteria for local and state listing are the same and testing against local criteria in 1989 did not establish heritage significance; and the group is not unique.

At its June 2004 meeting, the Heritage Council considered the nomination of the Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No. 1. At this meeting the Heritage Council resolved that, although the group is of heritage significance, due to the lack of *available* comparative data, it could not be resolved as to whether the group met the threshold for State heritage significance. In those circumstances the Heritage Council had determined in its resolution to recommend to the Minister that the proposal for State heritage listing of Exhibition Centre No. 1 not proceed.

ISSUES

Role of expert groups

The Heritage Council is a statutory body, and its membership is based upon statutory appointments, some of which are representative of certain interests in the community, including historical, architectural, Aboriginal, development industries, property rights and rural interests.

The practise of people forming associations to pursue mutual interests is long established, and there would seem to be no reason to deny such groups a role in heritage matters just because they can articulate a specific or expert point of view, even if a property owner perceives those views to be detrimental to the financial values of their property.

The processes for listing an item on the SHR clearly require owners and occupiers to be notified of an intention to consider listing, of the recommendations about listing made by the Heritage Council, and of the Minister's decisions about listing. The *Heritage Act 1977* specifically identifies owners and occupiers for such notification (and its consequent consultation).

Post-war and late twentieth century heritage: the need for community education

Objections on the potential listing of 1960s/40 year old/project houses indicates the need for much greater effort to be invested in community education about the potential heritage values of twentieth century items, especially of the post-war and late twentieth century periods. The Sydney Opera House (1957–1973) has recently been listed on the State Heritage Register, Australia Square (1961–1967) has been nominated, and the potential significance of Centrepoint Tower (1967–1981) is currently a subject of community debate. All of the structures post-date the “Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No 1 Precinct” in their completion dates, but clearly have an iconic value based upon aesthetic and dimensional values that the nominated group does not. The values evident in the “Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No 1 Precinct” are related to a desire to provide better quality, more liveable, more affordable housing for ordinary Australians in the suburbs and country towns with the private sector taking a leading role. Such everyday qualities, revolutionary though they were at the time, do not yet have the broadly recognised stature of the more monumental buildings.

It appears that the greatest concern about SHR listing is a loss of control of the properties, particularly for investment and financial purposes. The owners have been advised during the notification of intention process of SHR listing benefits, such as rate and land tax reductions, eligibility for financial assistance, some control over surrounding development, that adaptations, additions and other changes are not prevented, that public access is not required, and of free access to heritage advisory services.

Owners or buyers of colonial and early federation houses or buildings may have a reasonable expectation that some level of heritage value may be evident in their properties. It may be that the same cannot yet be said for post-war and late twentieth century places. These matters can only be addressed by ongoing community education, not just of householders, but also approval bodies and other parties.

The experience of the Heritage Council of Western Australia (HCWA) is useful to note. HCWA was considering a nomination for the 1962 Empire Games Village in the Perth suburb of Floreat, which demonstrates some similar values to the nominated group, although on a much larger scale. The response to the nomination was a campaign of owner objections, supported by several community leaders, based upon arguments about loss of property values. There is very little on the WA register from this period, and the village was already suffering from demolitions and modification, which was exacerbated by an increase in demolitions once owners were advised of the heritage consideration. Due to the extensive opposition, the HCWA decided not to proceed with the nomination, despite the significance of the village.

SHR listing of the “Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No 1 Precinct” on the SHR may have the effect of enforcing fears of heritage rather assuaging them among some owners of post-war and late twentieth century buildings. It is therefore essential that

community education on this matter is actively pursued before any SHR listing of a comparable item is considered.

In recent months the Heritage Office has received from the RAI A a nomination to the SHR for Pettit & Sevitt Exhibition Centre No. 2.

CONCLUSIONS

Financial assistance is available to owners of privately-owned heritage items, although a greater amount or diversity of financial assistance would be appreciated by owners.

'Freezing' heritage items in time is not and never has been an objective or practise of the heritage system. Continuing claims by some advocates that this is the case indicates a failure in the educational and promotional aspects of heritage systems rather than their actual operation.

Once-only consideration of listing is neither feasible nor fair. It would privilege the views and assessments of the present generation over all others, and eventually lead to an ossified and dysfunctional system. It would also be contrary to the functioning of other areas of public policy.

Arguing for compensation for claimed losses in property values as a result of heritage listing assumes that such losses can be verified. This has not been shown to be the case, and in fact independent studies have tended to show otherwise: that heritage listing can increase property value.

Experts and interest groups have a right to participate in the heritage system. The Heritage Act allows any person or group to nominate an item for listing, and does not provide any grounds for discriminating against experts or interest groups in the nomination and consideration processes.

It is accepted that some property owners will object to heritage listing, usually on the basis of a strongly held belief that this will lower their property values. The heritage conservation framework in NSW established by the *Heritage Act 1977* seeks to strike a balance between the long-term inter-generational view and the immediate financial concerns of current property owners.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION RE NORTH HEAD QUARANTINE STATION, MANLY, NSW

NSW HERITAGE OFFICE

BACKGROUND

Site

The Quarantine Station is located on the western side of North Head, facing Sydney Harbour, on the natural amphitheatre of land centred on Quarantine Beach.

Site significance

The site contains evidence of many layers of human history, beginning with Aboriginal occupation consistent with other sites in the Sydney region dating from 3000 years ago. The range of recorded Aboriginal sites includes middens, engravings, rock art and at least one burial site. The Quarantine Station is the oldest, largest and most intact of the Australian quarantine stations. The station's function illustrates the changing social and scientific demands of quarantine and modes of travel during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. On a broader scale, the Quarantine Station also demonstrates the social patterns of different periods, including, most dramatically, the separation of people by class and race.

The site's cultural heritage value is evident in:

- Aboriginal archaeological sites;
- Historical archaeological sites;
- Over sixty standing buildings;
- Industrial heritage, siteworks and services;
- The range of artefacts and movable objects;
- Over 1000 historic inscriptions;
- Archives and records; and
- Cultural landscape elements.

The geology of the area and the flora and fauna present on North Head and parts of the Quarantine Station are of outstanding significance. The biological diversity remaining within the natural areas is considerable, including:

- five species of terrestrial mammal, including the locally endangered long nosed bandicoot and seven terrestrial reptile species;
- 90 native bird species, including the little penguin; and
- The site records some 460 species of flora, including five species identified as rare.

Heritage listings

The site's statutory listings include the State Heritage Register (SHR), Item No. 01003 (2 April, 1999), Manly LEP 1988, (16 September, 1988). The site is within the Sydney Harbour National Park managed under the provisions of the NPW Act and is included on the Register of the National Estate (29 August, 1982).

Non statutory listings include the National Trust Register.

North Head is currently being considered by the Australian Heritage Council for listing on the National Heritage List. In January 2005, the Federal Minister for Environment and Heritage rejected an application for the emergency listing of North Head on the National Heritage. The emergency nomination by the North Head Sanctuary Foundation was in response to the leasing of the Quarantine Station.

Current management of the site

The Quarantine Station is currently managed by DEC for use as conference facilities and interpretative tours. There are over 60 buildings on the site and currently about one third are used.

The broader context and management of North Head

Integrated management of North Head was initiated by NPWS and has been occurring effectively for some years. This is formalised through a stakeholder group who meet regularly to discuss issues that are common across the landscape or events that impact on stakeholders such as the Sydney to Hobart Yacht Race on Boxing Day. Membership of the group is made up of representatives from each of the land manager agencies on the headland including DEC, Sydney Harbour Federation Trust, Dept of Defence, North Fort, Sydney Water, Manly Hospital, St Patricks and the International Hotel School and Lend Lease as well as St Pauls school and Manly Council. This group discusses and organises operational activities across North Head concerning feral animals and weeds, fire planning, cultural heritage management, public access and tours, site interpretation, infrastructure management and management of particular plant and animal species. Some species are threatened or endangered populations on North Head and recovery plans are being implemented across the landscape in a cooperative manner. Many of the conditions of consent for the Quarantine Station are aimed at the management and monitoring of the natural as well as the cultural heritage of the site in the context of North Head more broadly.

The NSW Government has recognised the value of North Head. This is illustrated by virtue of its gazettal of those parts of the headland in state government ownership as a National Park in 1975. Since this time the government has made significant achievements in the management of the natural and cultural heritage of the area. NPWS and the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust established in 2001 are working cooperatively to build on the achievements of the NPWS through management programs that complement the National Park programs. This is being achieved through collaboration by both agencies on the implementation of the programs mentioned earlier. A scientific committee has been established by the Trust on which NPWS is represented. This committee will guide the scientific research across the headland and assist with planning.

The approved proposal

The NSW Minister for the Environment and Mawland Hotel Management Pty Ltd are co-proponents for the proposal to conserve, adapt and re-use the Quarantine Station site for cultural tourism purposes and have sought a 21-year planning approval.

The proposed uses include: a visitor centre and museum; guided tours; a restaurant; accommodation; functions and conferences; and an environmental and cultural study centre. Specific to the management of the site's heritage assets, the proposal includes:

- conservation work to arrest deterioration of buildings and archaeological features;
- cyclical conservation and maintenance program;
- conservation and management of the Quarantine Station's cultural landscape, including plantings, views, setting, as well as repairs to infrastructure such as roads, paths and the wharf;
- curatorial work on inscriptions, archives, artefacts and moveable heritage;
- provision of a range of interpretation and educational services, tours and programs as well as provide public access such as open days; and
- environmental management programs, including erosion, weed and feral animal control.

Planning and community consultation

Assessment of the proposal has been rigorous. The determining authorities for the proposal were the Minister for the Environment, the NSW Heritage Council; and the NSW Waterways

Authority. The proposal also triggered concurrence and consultation concerning the *Threatened Species Conservation Act* and the *Fisheries Management Act*. In addition, the Minister for Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources had an approval role for the activity. In approving the proposal, the joint determining authorities concluded that the activity is consistent with the objectives of protecting the significance of the place and achieving improved access and interpretive outcomes.

Two Conservation Management Plans (CMP) have been prepared for the site and endorsed by the Heritage Council. The North Head Quarantine Station Conservation Management Plan 2000 which includes the Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) and the thorough Quarantine Station Detailed Area Conservation Management Plan 2001. These documents identified the constraints and opportunities on the site, which in turn informed the reuse proposal.

As part of the assessment of the proposal, a Commission of Inquiry (COI) into the environmental aspects of the proposal was held. During the COI, the proposal was amended to address concerns and reduce potential impacts. The proposal has been subject to a high level of scrutiny by the NSW Heritage Council. The Heritage Council (through the Heritage Office), also presented submissions to the COI and assisted to prepare the draft conditions of consent.

Specifically, in its submission to the COI, the Heritage Council advised that it was aware that the State and Commonwealth Governments' review of options for surplus lands within Sydney Harbour. The review was supported, as it provided a unique opportunity to consider the conservation and future use of the Quarantine Station in the broader context of the significant North Head landscape and sites. However, it was considered that, as the conservation of the Quarantine Station's features required extensive and urgent conservation works, the proposal should be allowed to proceed while awaiting the outcome of a wider review of the nearby sites.

The Commission concluded that, subject to approval conditions, safeguards and triggers, the proposal would not prejudice an integrated planning approach to the whole of North Head. Accordingly, the proponents are required by the Conditions of Approval to be responsive to future opportunities which might arise on adjoining sites and to consult with adjoining landholders with a view to integrated planning of North Head.

On 5 February 2003, the Heritage Council's Approvals Committee resolved to support the proposal for the conservation and adaptive reuse of the Quarantine Station. To make its decision, the Approvals Committee considered the issues identified in the COI and included in nearly 1100 public submissions. The Approvals Committee understood the substantial level of community interest (evident in organisations such as Friends of Quarantine Station) in future management and development of the site demonstrated by the volume of public submissions.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee supported the proposal on the basis that:

- the proposal will assist in increasing the community understanding and appreciation of this important site and secure its long term conservation;
- the proposal complies with previously endorsed and carefully developed conservation policies; and
- the proposal retains and best manages community access to this valued site.

ISSUES

On-going assessment and future management

The approved proposal is subject to over 230 rigorous conditions to secure the long term conservation of the site as well as enhancing community understanding, appreciation and access of its important resources. Important aspects of the Conditions of Approval include:

- requiring the operator Mawland and DEC to prepare over 12 site wide management plans which control, manage and monitor environmental management, conservation work, sampling, landscape, Aboriginal and historical archaeology, interpretation, moveable heritage, access and infrastructure. All the plans are reviewed by and subject to approval by the Joint Determining Authorities. The Plans will be vital tools to properly manage the operation and protect the site's resources;
- establishes the role of the site's Environment Manager (working within DEC) and Heritage Adviser (working within Heritage Office) who will not only review and approve the site wide plans and detailed designs but also retain a meaningful role in the on-going operation of the site. The Environment Manager is based permanently on site and is responsible for monitoring compliance with the conditions of consent;
- establishes the Quarantine Station Community Committee (QSCC) who are appointed to provide comment and recommendations on proposals or relevant matters including the development and implementation of site-wide plans and provide a communication channel to and from the broader community;
- assures public access to the site is provided and managed by the use of special events, functions and free open days;
- includes an agreed staging plan which requires the operator Mawland to prioritise the repair and conservation of the site's heritage features over works to adapt the buildings and sites for operational uses;
- requires that important features of the existing buildings are to be retained and sampled;
- requires a sample accommodation adaptation design to be endorsed by the Heritage Council and DEC prior to any adaptation works commencing;
- includes a comprehensive auditing and monitoring program with approved triggers to control the operation with safeguards and mitigation measures to protect the site's natural and cultural resources;
- requires that all information and documents referred to in the conditions of approval are made publicly available; and
- sets out schedules which provide controls for specific natural and cultural heritage outcomes and objectives.

On-going monitoring

The Heritage Council as one of the joint determining authorities agreed that adaptive management is a key feature of the operation which must be able to respond to new information and monitoring data as it becomes available. This may involve altering the way the activity is conducted, including placing further limits on site visitation.

The site will remain in public ownership as part of Sydney Harbour National Park with Mawland providing accommodation, hospitality and cultural tourism services in accordance with approved plans and operating strictly in accordance with the terms of the lease.

DEC will continue to provide an on-ground presence in the form of the Environment Manager, who is responsible for monitoring compliance with the conditions of planning approval; whole-of-North Head planning, including special events; and management of vertebrate pests, bushfire, threatened species and endangered ecological communities.

In 2004 and 2005 following approval of the overarching proposal, detailed designs for the conservation and adaptive reuse of the site's cultural heritage resources such as buildings, landscape and archaeology as well as relevant site wide management plans addressing cultural and environmental issues are being submitted for assessment by the Heritage Adviser and Environment Manager. These assessments ensure compliance with approved proposal as well as ensuring best practice heritage conservation and adaptive reuse.

The proposed conservation works program is an important and exacting tool to guide the repair and to retain in the future the physical evidence of the site's significance such as the buildings, landscape features and archaeology and to achieve a high level of workmanship. Its preparation by the heritage consultant who authored the Detailed Area Conservation Management Plan has drawn attention to the comprehensive work which the operator will be required to do up front to reverse the site's poor condition as a result of years of neglect and ad-hoc management.

On-going community consultation

Under the conditions of approval, the operators are required to formalise on-going community consultation both during the detailed approval stage and during the future operation.

The Quarantine Station Community Committee (QSCC) was established in December 2004 and meets regularly to review the site wide management plans. The membership of the QSCC includes the local Member of the Legislative Assembly, Mayor of Manly, representatives from the local and wider community (including Friends of the Quarantine Station) as well as people with specific skills in cultural and natural heritage. The multi-disciplinary membership of the Community Committee, through review and commenting on site wide management plans, enhances the assessment and implementation of these documents to best manage the site's rare and significant assets.

Representative of community groups, such as the North Head Sanctuary Foundation, have been invited to speak at Community Committee meetings and this will continue to be the case.

The proponents are aware and have abided by the requirement that if a variation to the approved proposal (submitted as part of the detailed assessments) which will adversely affect the significance of the site, advertising and community consultation will be required.

Leasing arrangements

The NSW Government is committed to the conservation of the Quarantine Station and has determined that the adaptive re-use of the site, with private sector involvement, is the preferred option to provide the resources necessary for the conservation and presentation of its heritage values. To achieve this outcome DEC undertook a public tender process that resulted in Mawland being selected to lease the premises, subject to Mawland obtaining all necessary approvals to adaptively re-use the site. The approval process was extremely comprehensive and the result of the project approval will be the most comprehensive and exhaustive environmental management system that has been adopted at any heritage site in NSW.

The NSW Minister for the Environment and Mawland entered into a Conditional Agreement for Lease in 2000, which was refined to reflect the project approval conditions. The revised Conditional Agreement for Lease was signed in January 2005. The contents and format of the lease have been agreed and both parties to the lease are completing lease pre-conditions. It is anticipated that the lease will be signed in late 2005.

Positive benefits from the proposed lease arrangement include expenditure by Mawland of a minimum \$4M on defined conservation works; a substantial capital enhancement of the site;

ongoing maintenance to an agreed standard for the term of the lease and an ongoing revenue stream to DEC in the form of a base rental (with growth provisions) and a share of revenue growth from the operation of the site.

The use of leases and licences to enable the occupation and adaptive re-use of historic heritage buildings is not new. Some of Sydney's most prominent heritage buildings such as the Hyde Park Barracks, the Sydney Mint and many buildings in The Rocks area are managed through adaptive re-use. Leases are particularly useful when external expertise is required in delivering these types of adaptive reuse.

A range of funding alternatives for the conservation of the Quarantine Station were investigated which included an expansion of current National Parks and Wildlife tourism operations, non-profit funding, multiple leases and a head lease. A head lease arrangement was regarded as the most feasible alternative because it would attract a single business with the capital and expertise to take on full responsibility of the funding of conservation of the Quarantine Station and a single point of contact for the monitoring of the performance of the lessee.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION RE LIDCOMBE HOSPITAL, NSW

NSW HERITAGE OFFICE

BACKGROUND

Lidcombe Hospital is of outstanding significance in the history of NSW health care, advancement, institutions and architecture, operating for over a century from 1893-1995 as a major state asylum and a leading state teaching hospital for the aged and infirm. The former hospital site is associated with innovative medical practitioners, specialists in geriatric health care, nurses and the local community for over a century. It contains a rare and exceptional collection of architecture and landscapes, demonstrating outstanding examples of asylum and institutional planning from leading colonial, government and private architects over two centuries, including works from James Barnet, Walter Liberty Vernon and Ken Woolley.

The nine Vernon hospital wards are part of a rare group of nineteenth-century hospitals designed in the colonial tradition of tropical hospital pavilions for the French and British colonies, based on the West Indies hospitals designed by the Royal Engineers, which demonstrate the principles of Florence Nightingale. The Rum Hospital (now the Mint, Parliament House and Sydney Hospital), and the Military Hospital on Observatory Hill (now the National Trust NSW) are other surviving examples of this nineteenth-century tropical hospital pavilions for the colonies in Sydney.

ISSUES

The hospital was closed in the mid 1990s and the site and buildings were modified in 2000 for use as the Sydney Olympics Media Village. The NSW Government sold control of the former hospital site to Australand in 2002, with ownership progressively transferred from the Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA) to Australand over the next five years.

Community groups and individuals have actively advocated the conservation and state and national listing of the site from the early 1990s, demonstrating a high level of community value for the site.

In response to community requests during the major phase of transition of the Lidcombe Hospital site, the NSW Heritage Office worked closely with Australand Pty. Ltd., Auburn Council and NSW Government agencies to establish the extent of the area to be nominated for listing on the State Heritage Register. As part of this process, the NSW Heritage Office and the NSW Heritage Council also contributed to the resolution of development issues by providing heritage comments to Auburn Council on development proposals, changes to planning controls, and the Conservation Management Plan prepared for Australand. The Heritage Council considered the Master Plan proposal for adaptive reuse of the heritage core of the site and residential redevelopment of the remainder of the site for 750 dwellings and considered the heritage impact to be generally acceptable.

The significant core of the former hospital site was consequently nominated for listing on the State Heritage Register by Australand in 2004 based on these negotiations with the Heritage Office. The Australand Master Plan for residential redevelopment of part of the site, including demolition of some hospital buildings, was approved by the

NSW Land and Environment Court in 2003-2004. The land approved for residential redevelopment excluded the core heritage precinct nominated for State Heritage Register listing.

The core site nominated for listing was enlarged over the period of negotiations between Australand and the Heritage Office to include additional historic roadways, hospital buildings from all decades up to and including the 1960s and the most significant landscape features. These negotiations took into account issues raised by community groups, the National Trust and other expert heritage assessments throughout the negotiation and listing process.

In June 2005 the NSW Heritage Council commenced the formal notification and consultation period for listing Lidcombe Hospital Precinct as an item of State heritage significance on the State Heritage Register by giving public notice of its intention to consider listing the precinct. All interested parties were involved in this consultation, including the Lidcombe Heritage Group and Australand who made presentations to the NSW Heritage Council. The listing boundary was the main issue debated during this consultation period. No objections were received from any affected or interested party to listing the precinct on the State Heritage Register or which disputed the state heritage significance of the precinct.

After considering these presentations and public submissions on the listing, the Heritage Council resolved to recommend State Heritage Register listing of the Lidcombe Hospital Precinct to the Minister in August 2005. The boundary of the recommended listing was considered to enclose the surviving state significant elements of the former Lidcombe Hospital on the land owned by Australand and SOPA. The listing boundary did not include the remainder of the former hospital site that had been substantially altered and approved for residential redevelopment by the Land and Environment Court. The listing recommendation will be referred to the Minister for Planning for listing on the State Heritage Register.

Items or precincts on the State Heritage Register are listed for their state heritage significance to the people of New South Wales under the requirements of the NSW *Heritage Act 1977*. State Heritage Register listing recognises and celebrates the state heritage significance of these places, while also establishing a framework for the assessment and approval by the NSW Heritage Council of future development and adaptive reuse proposals to retain this significance. State Heritage Register listing thus provides for the conservation of the significance of state significant items in partnership with reasonable and sympathetic development or adaptation of the item.

Any other surviving hospital features of local heritage significance outside of the State Heritage Register listing boundary can be appropriately recognised and managed by Auburn Council under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* by listing on the Auburn Local Environmental Plan.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION RE BRAIDWOOD AND ITS SETTING

NSW HERITAGE OFFICE

BACKGROUND

The Heritage Council of NSW has proposed that Braidwood and Its Setting be listed on the State Heritage Register because of its significance to the state of New South Wales.

The State Heritage Register was introduced to acknowledge, celebrate and conserve places, objects and collections that sustain and enhance the quality of life in NSW for present and future generations.

The case for listing Braidwood and Its Setting on the State Heritage Register has been growing since the late 1960s, when the first heritage report was commissioned by the National Trust. The Trust listed Braidwood as an urban conservation area on its Register in 1976. It was added to the Register of the National Estate in 1980. Since then, there have been many reports which have confirmed the town's heritage significance.

What makes Braidwood so special is that it is one of the few towns in rural New South Wales that still retains clear evidence of an enduring relationship to the land and clear evidence of early colonial planning principles, as well as significant building forms and fabrics. Unlike other towns it has also escaped the intrusion of major roads and rail.

The town's nineteenth-century buildings are built on a simple grid that preserves Georgian and Victorian town planning and settlement patterns. North of Wilson Street there are many fine pre-1850s buildings, while south of Wilson Street and in Wallace Street there many mid to late Victorian buildings that reflect the town's growth after the discovery of gold in Araluen in 1851.

The buildings house a contemporary mix of shops, galleries, cafes and restaurants. This juxtaposition of old and new uses adds to the town's appeal. The adaptive use of these buildings not only retains the heritage significance of these structures for future generations. It also contributes to the continuing economic vitality of the town.

The landscape around Braidwood is integral to the town's heritage significance, both because it reflects the historical development of the area and also because it makes for a particularly fine setting for the town. Streetscapes in the town frame views of the surrounding rural land. Similarly, views of the town from its northern, eastern and southern approaches add to the appreciation of the town's distinctive and historic character.

For an item to be included on the State Heritage Register it must meet at least one of seven criteria. Braidwood and Its Setting meet all seven criteria for inclusion on the Register. To view the assessment of Braidwood and its Setting against these criteria, visit http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/09_subnav_03_050725.htm#ass

Proposal for Braidwood and its Setting to be listed on the State Heritage Register

In March 2005 the Heritage Council of NSW formally proposed listing Braidwood and its Setting on the State Heritage Register.

Calls for the listing had been made by members of the Braidwood community from early 2000 to the NSW Heritage Office and to the then Minister for Planning in 2002 and 2003, because of concern about the lack of an appropriate framework for managing the heritage significance of the town.

The State Government and the community have invested considerable funding over many years for both physical works and heritage studies in Braidwood. The studies were intended to establish a strategic framework for the then Tallaganda Council to manage the heritage significance of Braidwood. However, few of the study recommendations had been adopted or integrated into the planning framework by the Council.

Informal discussions about community's concerns related to inconsistency in decision making and policy were held in the late 1990s.

Discussions commenced with Tallaganda Council about a possible listing of the town in August 2004 but these were interrupted by council amalgamations, which resulted in the formation of a new council covering Braidwood—Palerang Council.

The Heritage Office also had lengthy discussions with Palerang Council in the lead up to the announcement of the proposal to list Braidwood and its Setting on the State Heritage Register in March 2005.

Listing process

The Heritage Council of NSW formally notified its intention to list Braidwood on 2 March 2005. The steps leading up to a decision on the proposed listing are as follows:

- Community consultation to be conducted (April to October 2005)
- Submissions invited on the proposal (April to October 2005)
- Rural Impact Study to be conducted by the Office of Rural Affairs – September 2005
- Closing date for submissions (21 October 2005)
- Preparation of report to the Heritage Council of NSW, including a summary of public submissions (October 2005)
- Presentation of report to the Heritage Council of NSW meeting (2 November 2005)
- Heritage council recommendation to the Minister for Planning (2 November 2005)
- Listing decision by the Minister for Planning (November 2005)

Community consultation

Since the announcement of the proposal to list the town the NSW Heritage Office has engaged with the community as follows:

- Conducted four meetings in April 2005 for residents of the town to explain the process and implications of listing, to discuss heritage planning issues, and to respond to questions or issues. These meetings were advertised with all requests for attendance met. Additional meetings were offered if demand required.
- Held meetings with Palerang Council, Save Braidwood Inc and the Braidwood Residents Association.

- Established a website which includes a map and plan of the proposed curtilage for the listing, a summary of activities to date and a list of frequently asked questions
- Produced two newsletters for the general community – one a supplement in the local newspaper, the Braidwood Times, and another direct mailed to all residents of Braidwood. Two further newsletters are planned for publication prior to the Heritage Council's November meeting.
- Conducted one meeting with Braidwood businesses (17 August 2005) to identify issues of concern and questions. A second meeting with rural landowners was held on the 6 September 2005. All businesses attending these meetings have been assured they will receive a response directly to the issues raised and as well, the responses will be included on the website and in upcoming newsletters.
- A Meeting with rural landowners was held on 12 September 2005
- A Meeting with elected representatives of Palerang Council was also held on 12 September 2005.
- Further newsletters and information on the website are also planned.

Rural impact study

In response to issues raised concerning the likely social and economic impacts on the town of the proposed listing, the Heritage Office and Palerang Council have commissioned a Rural Impact Study, by the NSW Office of Rural Affairs. A preliminary report has been completed and is due for completion shortly. The findings will be provided to Palerang Council for dissemination to the local community, and will form part of the Heritage Council's consideration of the proposed listing.

Proposed Development Control Plan (DCP)

As mutually agreed, to assist Palerang Council the Heritage Office commissioned Palerang Council's Heritage Advisor to prepare a draft DCP to update the existing document which has been recognized as needing augmentation to meet current needs. Council has further developed this document and circulated it within the community as a discussion paper with no statutory status. On 30 August 2005, a public meeting was held in Braidwood to discuss the draft DCP. Council accepted public comments until 9 September and anticipates having a final version to present to Council in early October.

The new DCP will update the current DCP and is intended to provide a framework for Palerang Council's future planning, day to day management and decision making in Braidwood.

ISSUES

Issues of concern

Several issues have been raised during the course of the community consultation as follows:

Another layer of bureaucracy?

- Ultimately, Palerang Council is responsible for development in Braidwood through its normal planning process.
- If the town is listed, then the Heritage Office is proposing that Palerang Council would only refer proposals for new developments, major renovations, subdivisions and demolitions to the Heritage Council of NSW for consideration.

- All other proposals would be determined by Palerang Council.
- Council is currently developing the DCP. Once an appropriate version is adopted - and if the town is listed - then the Heritage Council of NSW will consider this document as a basis for further exemptions from Heritage Council approval.

Will the listing inhibit development opportunities in the town and hence constrain population growth?

- During the consultation process for the proposed listing, two developments have already been approved in the town – one for an aged care facility and the other for a large residential development. The Heritage Office successfully negotiated with the proponents of these developments to take heritage issues into account in their applications. As a result of these negotiations there will now be improved buffer zones around both developments, with landscaping to reduce the impact of the developments on the heritage significance of the town and its setting.
- The listing area includes a curtilage around the town which incorporates land which is currently zoned rural 1A. (This is land on the north, south and east of Braidwood.) The current zoning of this land does not permit residential subdivision.

There is development pressure on some of this land—some owners have indicated they would like the land rezoned so they can proceed with residential subdivisions. Applications to rezone this land would have to be made to Palerang Council and ultimately to the NSW Department of Planning. The NSW Heritage Office would be a party to their consideration if the listing is made, as part of the normal rezoning consultation process.

- There is pressure from some rural landowners around Braidwood and indeed from the NSW Farmer's Association in a general context, to resist proposals to rezone prime agricultural land for residential subdivision, because of a decline in this type of land across the state. Some NSW councils are tightening rules about concessional lots for similar reasons.
- Agriculture is a significant contributor to the local economy of Braidwood. (For example, an estimated \$8 million in cattle sales took place at the Braidwood sale yards in 2005).
- The Heritage Office has not included the western edge of the town in the listing because it does not exemplify the same types of planning and building that distinguish the proposed listing area. This area is already host to several 1980s and '90s style subdivisions. There is potential for further development in this area.

Why list the whole town when individual items are already protected, why include the rural land in the curtilage, and why include items in the listing which are considered to have no value?

- There are 106 properties in Braidwood already listed as heritage items in Palerang Council's planning instruments.

- There are also four items on the State Heritage Register: Albion Hotel, Bedervale, former Royal Hotel and the Mill Centre.
- These listings have not interfered with their owners' use or business operations.
- The proposed listing of Braidwood and Its Setting recognises the significance of the township and its surroundings as an integral precinct, or 'item' of cultural landscape, of significance to the State. Listing of the town and its setting on the State Heritage Register provides the greatest protection for preserving the town in its entirety.

While individual structures may contribute to a greater or lesser extent to the significance of the town, Braidwood and Its Setting together exemplify the evolution of a working country town founded on early colonial planning principles. The various stages of that evolution are revealed both in the town's built forms and fabrics and in its enduring relationship to the land. The proposed listing does not seek to 'freeze' this evidence in time, but rather to encourage future changes that respect, reflect and preserve these now rare patterns and rhythms for the instruction and delight of residents, visitors and future generations.

Commitment to the conservation of Braidwood

- The NSW Heritage Office and its predecessors have had a long standing commitment to the conservation of Braidwood. Since 1980 the NSW Government and the community have invested \$596,995 through the Heritage Incentives Program in the conservation of Braidwood. This represents nearly \$600 per head of population. This is the largest per capita investment of funds in the heritage of any town in New South Wales. In Broken Hill for example, which has a substantial track record of investment in heritage conservation, the per capita expenditure by the Government has been only \$70.00 per head.
- In common with 87% of rural councils in NSW the Heritage Incentives Program and Palerang Council support a heritage advisory service on a \$ for \$ basis.
- The NSW Heritage Office will continue its support for the town through Heritage Incentives Program funding. It has already offered \$20,000 as the basis for a Braidwood local heritage fund to provide assistance to local property owners for approved conservation work. This is in addition to the \$8,000 \$ for \$ funding offered to all councils in NSW.

The growth industry of tourism

- The NSW Heritage Office foresees considerable benefits for the town from the listing, and particularly from a tourism perspective.
- The Heritage Office is proposing to fund a tourism marketing strategy to be undertaken by Palerang Council to promote the town's tourism appeal.
- Tourism is a key to Braidwood's growth and prosperity. Palerang Council's predecessor, Tallaganda Council, conducted a business survey in April 2001

which reported that tourism was regarded as the greatest opportunity for the town.¹

- The NSW Heritage Office believes that listing Braidwood gives the town a marketing edge over other historic towns in New South Wales. It would be the first complete town listed on the Register.
- According to Braidwood and Villages Tourism, 3 million visitors pass through Braidwood each year. With an investment in a tourism marketing strategy, using the listing as a key feature, the NSW Heritage Office believes that some of those tourists can be convinced to make Braidwood a destination or indeed a hub from which to explore the surrounding villages. Braidwood and Villages Tourism is committed to promoting the town's heritage as one of its most significant attractions.
- In one of its recent newsletters², the NSW Heritage Office quoted a resident who has retired to Braidwood after a long and respected career as a director of the Tourism Industry Association, the Tourism Council of Australia, a director and Chairman of one of the largest travel groups in Australia, Concorde International Travel, and until last year a Director of QANTAS. He says:

‘There is no doubt in my mind that Braidwood is marvelously located from a tourism perspective, being close to the ACT and the coast, and tourism is already a significant contributor to the regional economy and employment. Everywhere in Australia and indeed overseas there is growing interest in both eco and heritage tourism and there would be any number of communities that would envy the situation of Braidwood.’

- If the town was able to attract more tourists to it as a destination in its own right then there would be opportunities for more jobs to be created and for new businesses to be established.

CONCLUSION

It is not expected that the listing of Braidwood and its Setting on the State Heritage Register, will have any greater impact on the majority of those who live and work in and around the town, than they already experience by living in a town which is considered to have heritage significance.

Braidwood is already a focal point for tourists. The town's heritage has not impeded the establishment of a variety of popular venues e.g. cafes, galleries, shops, and bed and breakfasts, in the town's 19th century buildings to meet the needs of tourists, as well as residents.

When Palerang Council concludes its new development control plan (DCP) it will provide a guide for Palerang Council in the planning and development approval process in Braidwood

It is recognized that Braidwood should be able to evolve, grow and prosper. The formal recognition of its heritage value and incorporation of sound

¹ Tallaganda Council, *Tallaganda Business Survey*, April 2001

² NSW Heritage Office, *Braidwood Matters*, August 2005

strategic policies to manage change will ensure growth is managed in a way that is commensurate with the towns amenity, quality and character.