



WESTERN AUSTRALIAN  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

**Western Australian Local Government Association  
Interim Response**

**Conservation of Historic Heritage Places**

**Draft Report  
Productivity Commission**

**February 2006**

*Western Australian Local Government Association  
15 Altona Street WEST PERTH WA 6005  
PO Box 1544 WEST PERTH WA 6872  
Tel: +61-8-9321 5055  
Fax: +61-8-9322 2611  
[info@walga.asn.au](mailto:info@walga.asn.au)*

## **The Western Australian Local Government Association**

The West Australian Local Government Association is the united voice of Local Government in Western Australia. The Association is an independent, membership-based group representing and supporting the work and the interests of 144 Local Governments.

The Association provides an essential voice for almost 1,400 elected members and over 12,000 employees of the 142 Local Governments in Western Australia and Christmas Island and Cocos (Keeling) Island Councils. The Association also provides professional advice and offers services that provide financial benefits to the Local Governments and the communities they serve.

This submission will address the recommendations of the Draft Report.

## **Preamble**

The Association agrees with the Inquiry findings that historic heritage places provide important cultural benefits to the wider community in addition to the use value that they provide to their owners.

The Association agrees that government involvement increases private conservation above that which would have been taken anyway and needs to be targeted with the benefits to the community outweighing the costs.

We acknowledge the Inquiry findings that the bulk of properties are listed at the local level, are privately owned and display public good characteristics. We agree that there is a need for a rationale to determine who receives the benefits and to whom the costs should be apportioned.

We support the three tier framework whereby the Australian Government takes responsibility for nationally and internationally significant places, the States and Territories for State significant places and Local Governments for locally significant heritage places. However we believe that there is a need for support by State and Commonwealth to assist Local Government undertake this task.

The Association presented an initial submission to the Productivity Commission's Inquiry into the Conservation of Australia's Historic Heritage Places in July 2005. We are disappointed that a number of issues and recommendations made by the Association have not been addressed by the Draft Report of the Commission. The Association disagrees with a number of the policy tools recommended by the Inquiry to achieve better heritage protection in Western Australia. These will be addressed in relation to a number of the recommendations outlined in the Draft Report.

## **Response to the Draft Recommendations**

### **Draft Recommendation 8.1**

**Privately owned properties should be included on a national, State, Territory or local government statutory heritage list only after a negotiated conservation agreement has been entered into and should remain listed only while an agreement is in force.**

Disagree

## **Individual property rights vs. public interest**

The Association is disappointed that the Report does not provide equal weight to the environmental, social and economic benefits of heritage. Rather it focuses on the adverse impacts heritage identification is seen to impose on individual property owners.

The Association agrees with the Report that heritage properties have public good characteristics and that there are community considerations beyond that of the individual property owner. There is an implicit assumption in the Report that all externalities are negative and that property owners do not receive any positive benefits of heritage conservation. There is also an implicit assumption that the community are free riders when often property owners are provided with Local Government concessions for heritage conservation. The Productivity Commission's survey found that half of local Councils provide some form of assistance to property owners for historic conservation heritage. Inevitably this advice is free.

The Association acknowledges the findings that the extent of the additional costs that owners incur by listing is not a factor as the focus of listing is on the intrinsic heritage value of the property. However there is an underlying assumption in the Draft Report that owners suffer an erosion of property rights and potential loss of value which does not encourage them to actively conserve heritage values and in some cases encourages degradation and destruction of these values. This assumption is not proven by the Report.

All property owners are constrained by development through a number of Acts including those relating to building, town planning, environment and environmental health. Heritage is a valid development consideration given its public good characteristics.

The recommendation that Heritage management through listing is only undertaken by agreement with the owner shifts the balance of power for heritage conservation to the property owner. It removes a level of integrity and rigor in heritage management. The abolition of mandatory listing will lead to heritage conservation being driven by the wishes of the property owner, not the intrinsic heritage characteristics of a property.

## **Local Government resourcing of negotiated conservation agreements**

The Report finds that Local Government officials currently involved in administering development applications (with or without heritage considerations) which involve negotiation with owners should take on the task of implementing agreements. There is an assumption that Local Government has the capacity to negotiate conservation agreements and can draw on the advice of heritage advisors. The Productivity Commission's survey indicates that of the Western Australian respondents only 31.4% employ a heritage advisor, that 92.9% of these advisors work part time and the average days per month is 3.2. This recommendation will require substantial additional resource requirements for Local Government.

### ***Alternative Recommendation***

- ***That research is undertaken by the Commonwealth into the impact of listing on property values***
- ***That research is undertaken by the Commonwealth into the positive benefits of heritage conservation in relation to cultural tourism***
- ***That negotiated conservation agreements are utilised only as one of a number of policy instruments to manage heritage conservation***

## **Local Government Town Planning System**

The Association acknowledges the findings that Local Government planning and land use systems are the primary mechanisms through which locally significant historic heritage places are conserved. We acknowledge that there are a number of inadequacies in the planning system as highlighted in the Report. However the Association disagrees with the philosophy underpinning the Report's recommendations that the current system is so fundamentally flawed ineffective and unnecessary that there is a need for the deregulation of heritage management at the Commonwealth, State and Local level.

The development of Local Government town planning schemes requires extensive community consultation. The development of heritage lists (statutory) follows consultation requirements for town planning schemes. In Western Australia the development of Municipal Heritage Inventories (non statutory) requires extensive consultation with property owners. All properties listed on the Municipal Heritage inventory have to have a statement of significance. In Western Australia there is a degree of rigour in the listing of properties – the current system at the local level provides the opportunity to distinguish between the level of significance between properties

The Productivity Commission survey found that Western Australia had the highest proportion of Councils providing heritage information on listed places with over 96% of listed places having some information on their heritage places and over 94% of Councils in Western Australia indicating that all their places had heritage information (and no Councils indicated that none of its places had such information). This evidence does not support the finding that all properties tend to be treated the same irrespective of the degree of significance of the cultural values that they provide to the wider community.

We agree that there is a need for Local Government to have a transparent, open dialogue with property owners and developers. If there is a lack of clarity at the Local Government level for requirements imposed by owners on heritage lists, or by property owners on the implications of heritage listing, the solution is greater education.

We disagree that there is a fundamental difference in the approach to heritage and non heritage development. Both are undertaken as part of the development control process. The Association acknowledges the finding that the assessment of development proposals differs between heritage places and non heritage places and that Local Government discretion is higher for controls over heritage properties rather than non heritage properties. We acknowledge that this does result in a burden on the owners of heritage properties, the reason for which is to protect heritage values.

Current inefficiencies with the town planning system in Western Australia have been identified by a State / Local Government Heritage Working Party. This Working Party found that is an opportunity to address inefficiencies within the current parameters of heritage protection utilising the Local Government town planning system. The Association, in our initial submission to this Inquiry put forward a number of solutions to address town planning and development issues in Western Australia. These include:

- Criteria for the assessment of Local Heritage Places and Areas;
- Statement of Planning Policy for Cultural Heritage Conservation;
- Template Local Planning Policy for Heritage – a tool for Local Government for implementing the Local town planning scheme and local planning strategy;
- Basic Principles for Municipal Heritage Inventories; and
- Changes to the heritage related provision in the model scheme text.

The Association disagrees with the finding that there is no requirement for Local Government to identify and conserve its own historic heritage. Local Governments list all significant properties regardless of owner on heritage lists. This includes Council properties.

Within a regulatory environment Commonwealth, State and Local Government can take an educative, proactive approach with property owners. The degree to which this occurs is dependent upon policy direction and the resources available.

The Association acknowledge the finding that problems at the local level are exacerbated by a lack of resources for heritage conservation, especially in rural areas. We acknowledge the finding that there are widely variable heritage policies across Local Government areas and that some Councils are proactive others less so. This may be due to the resource level of Councils and their capacity to focus on heritage issues and community interest and pressures in preserving heritage. If, as found, there is inconsistency within a Council in relation to heritage decisions, there is a need for education and support of the Council. To address heritage consistency across Local Government there is a need for greater Commonwealth and State Government frameworks, resourcing and support of Local Government heritage endeavours.

A key assumption is that there is an over listing of properties at the Local Government level. The Report has provided a quantum sum of the number of listed properties in comparison to State and Commonwealth lists. Data is not provided on the percentage of properties that are listed in relation to all properties within a municipality Therefore difficult to know the relative listing and whether there is an over listing of properties at the Local Government level.

### **Conservation Management Plans**

The significance of properties as outlined in Municipal Heritage Inventories and Heritage Lists is obtained at no cost to the owner. Councils do not require owners of listed properties to develop conservation management plans as a condition of current listing. A more interventionist approach which expects the development of a Conservation Management Plan by the owner in advance of a listing and in advance of any consideration of heritage conservation works occurring is inefficient.

### **Heritage Funding – Weakness of Current Model**

The Association acknowledges the findings that Local Governments provide a suite of incentives to assist property owners with heritage conservation. The increasing pressures on Local Government resources limits the amount of resources that Councils have available for heritage conservation. Councils have different financial capacities to support heritage conservation. Not all Councils have the capacity to offer advisory services to residents, offer grants, rate concessions or density bonuses.

There is a lack of clear, accessible model for Local Government of costs and benefits of heritage values and how benefits in heritage values across time are considered. Councils face different transaction costs for heritage based on their size and scale. There is an assumption that the cost for heritage significance should be stratified and that national heritage should be nationally funded, state heritage state funded and local heritage locally funded. At a national and State level there is a need to acknowledge the wider social benefits of heritage and the disparate cost borne by Local Government.

### **Financial Assistance Grants to Local Government**

Australia's federal system has led to vertical fiscal imbalance due to the legal and constitutional context so that Local Government does not have the revenue resources to fund its expenditure responsibilities. In this context intergovernmental grants between the Commonwealth and the

State are an important element of Local Government funding. Financial Assistance Grants do not provide all Local Governments with an appropriate source of revenue that meets existing demand, nor does it reflect historical growth in demand for Local Government services. The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics, Finance and Public Administration Report, *Rates and Taxes: A Fair Share for Responsible Local Government* (Hawker Report) found that escalating costs and constrained funding along with a growing community expectations/funding gap threatens the future of efficient and responsive Local Government.<sup>1</sup> Local Government's functions have increased due to:

- (i) *Devolution* – where another sphere of government gives local government responsibility for new functions
- (ii) *Raising the bar* – where another sphere of government through legislative or other changes, increases the complexity of or standard at which a local government service must be provided and hence increases its cost;
- (iii) *Cost Shifting* – where there were two types of behaviour. The first is where local government agrees to provide a service on behalf of another sphere of government but funding is subsequently reduced or stopped, and local government is unable to withdraw because of community demand for the service. The second is where, for whatever reason, another sphere of government ceases to provide a service and local government steps in;
- (iv) *Increased community expectations* – where the community demands improvements in existing local government services; and
- (v) *Policy choice* – where individual Local Governments choose to expand their service provision

The Hawker Report found that the level of States' grants to Local Government has failed to keep pace with changing responsibilities and cost increases.<sup>2</sup> Growth in Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) and other forms of federal funding has been accompanied a decline in State support. Although the amount has increased in relative terms its rate of increase is about one-tenth of the rate of increase of local government own-source revenue.

Financial Assistance Grants are intended to equalise the capacity to provide services. The quantum of funds is below what is needed to apply full horizontalism equalisation principles. Local Government has limited options to increase their own revenue. The Report highlighted is the need for certainty of funding, the need for a growth base for FAGs, the need to leave FAGs untied, the direct payment of FAGs to local government and the need for a new approach to funding local government. The Committee recognized the need for discretionary funding in order for Local Governments to maintain the capacity and flexibility to be able to plan for and deal with local needs as they arise. Over the past 30 years, local government has maintained its revenue-raising effort and has worked to expand own-source revenue. During the 1970s, fees and user charges comprised 13% of total revenue. This revenue source now represents 32% of the total. Local Government has also continued to increase municipal rates. However, compared to growth in Commonwealth taxation revenue (39% over the period 1998-99 to 2002-03), rates are a slow-growth tax (25% over the same period).

At present, the Australian Government annually adjusts the quantum of FAGs using an escalation factor based on inflation and population growth. Over the past 20 years, the application of this escalation factor has resulted in a decline of FAGs as a percentage of total Commonwealth taxation revenue. The 2004-05 Federal Budget papers indicate that this trend is set to continue. The value of FAGs, as a proportion of total Commonwealth taxation revenue, will have fallen from 1.18% in 1993-94 to 0.97% in 1996-97 and to just 0.77% by 2007-08.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Australia. House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics, Finance and Public Administration Report 2003 Rates and Taxes: A Fair Share for Responsible Local Government, p 11

<sup>2</sup> Op cit p 36

<sup>3</sup> Information sourced from the Australian Local Government Association

### Implication for heritage funding

The Hawker Report makes it clear that under existing financial arrangements Local Government is struggling to meet increasing demands for its services. Consequently, local government faces the choice of either increasing revenue or cutting services. Cutting local government services is not usually a viable option and is counter to the objective of delivering equitable local services across Australia. If local government is to continue to satisfy legitimate community expectations about heritage, while coping with legislated responsibility transfers from other spheres of government, it is essential that the financial relationship between the Australian Government and local government be significantly reformed.

### Proposed Solution

Local Government seeks to resolve this problem by linking the quantum of financial assistance for Local Government to an agreed proportion of total Commonwealth taxation revenue (excluding GST). In advocating this reform, ALGA proposes a graduated two-step approach. Initially, by amending the escalation factor to more closely align growth in FAGs with that of the Australian economy; and subsequently, setting the quantum of FAGs at an amount equivalent to 1% of total Commonwealth taxation revenue (excluding GST).

### **New Funding Model required to support Local Government's Heritage Conservation**

As highlighted in the Hawker Report, there is increasing pressure on Local Government budgets. Local Governments have different capacities to support and protect heritage. In order to achieve nationally consistent heritage policy outcomes there is a need for financial support to Local Government. The protection of heritage assets should not be subject to Local Government's ability to access limited grant applications. In particular consideration should be given to:

- New method of calculating financial assistance grants;
- The financing of heritage through an additional special purpose payment; and
- Additional funding to Local Government outside the Financial Assistance Grants model.

The nature of economic development policies in Australia is changing and increasingly they have a regional scale and focus. The driving changes are two key issues: globalisation and sustainable development.<sup>4</sup> While Australia does not have formalised structures of government at a regional scale, it has become clear that many tasks need to occur at this level. Local Government is increasingly having a pivotal role in the delivery of national strategies such as National Resource Management, Road Infrastructure at a regional level.<sup>5</sup>

A national survey on the role of Local Government in economic development found that In order for Local Government to move beyond its traditional range of (primarily local) economic development functions to more aggressive activities like targeted investment attraction or to regionally focused projects a greater resource allocation is necessary. This provides scope for the State and Commonwealth to revisit the means by which they allocate programme funding to the regions and to explore ways that funding allocations could be more responsible to local requirements. Such an action would require a flexible financial resource pool.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Bellamy, J., Meppem, T., Goddard, R., Dawson, S., 'The Changing Face of Regional Governance for Economic Development: Implications for Local Government', in *Sustaining Regions* Vol 2, No 3, Winter 2003, Flinders Press, Adelaide, p 7

<sup>5</sup> Bellamy et al (2003)

<sup>6</sup> Lennon, S., O'Neil, W., Spiller, M., 2003 'The Role of Local Government in Economic Development: Findings of a National Survey of Australian Local Government Authorities', in *Sustaining Regions* Vol 2, No 3, Flinders Press, Adelaide, p 42

The principle of subsidiary is that each function of government should be devolved (where possible) to the lowest level of government where such an action best serves the interests of the community. Local Government is representative of its communities, a major provider of infrastructure and services and well placed to understand local economic needs and solutions. Increasing the quantum of funding made available to local government would be the first step to solving many of the problems confronting regions.<sup>7</sup>

### **Current Commonwealth Models to support local level initiatives**

There are models of Commonwealth contributory funding through assistance programmes to Local Government which are rigorous and ensure that no perverse incentives are in place. They ensure a balance between local autonomy and consistent application of national objectives. These programmes include:

- Roads to Recovery;
- Natural Resource Management; and
- Emergency Management.

#### **Roads to Recovery<sup>8</sup>**

The distribution of the Roads to Recovery funds between States and Territories is based on historical precedents, length of local roads and population. Allocations between Councils within each State are in accordance with formulae adopted by State Grants Commissions for the distribution of Financial Assistance Grants identified for roads. The allocations to councils are fixed for the life of the programme. The Commonwealth, to ensure this injection of funding is not dissipated, has insisted that State and Local Governments must maintain their own roads spending. The programme has recently been reviewed, and the main finding was that the funds provided to councils under Roads to Recovery have been well spent. In January 2004, the Australian Government announced a further \$1.2 billion will be provided over a further four years from 2005. Funding through this programme assists State Local Government Associations to employ staff to support Local Government in their transport and road activities.

#### **Natural Resource Management<sup>9</sup>**

The Commonwealth has a National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and a Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) programmes at the regional level. The NAP and the NHT are cooperatively implemented by the Australian, State and Territory Governments in partnership with Local Government.

The NAP and NHT programs are driven by a single regional plan, developed by local communities and supported by Government and the best available science to improve natural resources on a regional scale. Fifty-six regions have been identified covering all of Australia, and a natural resource management plan will be developed for each. In addition, support will be provided to high priority national and state-wide activities.

The important role of Local Government is identified in both the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and the Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) through bilateral agreements between individual States and the Commonwealth. Local Government support is a key component in the delivery of the outcomes of both programs: As community leaders, people in local government are well positioned to promote the integration of natural resource management. Existing Local Government infrastructure and administration can be used to provide local

---

<sup>7</sup> Beer, A, Maude A, Pritchard, B 2003, *Developing Australia's Regions: Theory and Practice*, UNSW, Sydney, p 263

<sup>8</sup> Information from DOTARS Web Site, [http://www.auslink.gov.au/policy/programmes/r2r/roads\\_to\\_recovery.aspx](http://www.auslink.gov.au/policy/programmes/r2r/roads_to_recovery.aspx).

<sup>9</sup> Information from NRM Web Site, <http://www.nrm.gov.au>.



expertise, feedback and support as well as facilitate the delivery of on-ground actions, infrastructure support, regulation and incentive-based systems. Local Government planning laws are integral to sustainable natural resource management.

At its April 2002 meeting, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to support arrangements that include adequate: Local Government representation on regional bodies; Local Government involvement in the development of integrated natural resource management regional plans; and awareness of regional objectives in local planning.

### Programme Co-ordination

Working at the whole of State/Territory level are Natural Resource Management Facilitators fully funded and employed by the Australian Government. Regional Natural Resource Management Facilitators are jointly funded by the Australian Government and the States/Territories and employed by NRM regional bodies working in NRM regions. Indigenous Land Management Facilitators Funded by the Commonwealth.

### Local Government

There are eight Local Government NRM Facilitators, one based in each state and territory. State facilitators are based in the Local Government Association of each State. They are jointly funded by the Australian Government and the Local Government Association in each State and Territory and employed by the Local Government Associations. These facilitators working at state-wide scale with their primary purpose to:

- engage local government in NRM at the regional scale; and
- promote and disseminate information about Australian Government policies and programs while assisting local government with activities such as natural resource management policy development.

### Funding

While regional bodies and plans are being established, and where a bilateral agreement is in place, Governments are working with communities to provide the support that enables them to tackle natural resource management problems. This funding is provided in one of two ways:

- Foundation funding: Regional organisations develop proposals to access funds to assist in developing regional plans; and
- Priority funding: Regional organisations and state agencies develop proposals to undertake high priority regional activities that need to start urgently.

### Regional, National/State Investments

The Australian and State and Territory Governments direct the majority of funds from the NAP and the NHT to regions for the implementation of Accredited Natural Resource Management Plans. These regional plans guide the development of actions to address regional issues and prioritise the most important issues for action and funding. The Australian and State and Territory Governments assess each plan and accredit it. Once a plan is in place, the regional community develops an investment strategy to help put parts of the plan into action, with funds from the Australian and State Government and other sources such as local government and industry. Community organisations play an important role in developing the plans and investment strategies and carrying them out.

National/State investments cover activities that have a national or state focus, as well as activities that cross over state and regional boundaries and are best dealt with at a broader scale.

## Monitoring and standards

The arrangements for monitoring and evaluation will be outlined in the NHT and NAP Bilateral Agreements developed between the Australian Government and each State/Territory, and will require each State/Territory to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation Plan. Effective monitoring and evaluation arrangements will also need to be in place at the regional level, as this is a requirement for the accreditation of regional NRM plans. National level documents to assist with setting targets, monitoring, evaluation and reporting on natural resource management.

## **Emergency Management**

The Commonwealth, in recognition of the need for a whole of government approach to emergency management provides national training and funding to support Local Government in their emergency management endeavours. Some Local Government activities are 100% funded by the Commonwealth. Other activities required a funding partnership between the Commonwealth, State and Local Government. Within these programmes Councils with low financial capacity can receive exemptions for a funding contribution and their activities are funded by the State and Commonwealth.

## **State and Commonwealth Incentives for Heritage Conservation**

The Association disagrees that the principle of subsidiarity exonerates the Commonwealth and State Government from assisting Local Government to fund and assist with heritage conservation at the local level. There are a range of financial incentives that can be offered which are not within the scope of Local Government including land tax, tax relief and stamp duty reductions. In order to provide a full account of policy options, the Report should have investigate and discussed alternative and additional financial incentives that could be utilised to assist in heritage conservation by State and Commonwealth Government

### ***Additional Recommendation***

- ***That the Productivity Commission investigate State and Commonwealth financial policy incentives that could be utilised to assist property owners in heritage conservation.***
- ***The Commonwealth develops a national funding model for Local Government that will balance local autonomy and consistent application of national objectives similar to the National Heritage Trust***

### **Draft Recommendation 3.1**

**All levels of government should put in place measures for collecting, maintaining and disseminating relevant data series on the conservation of Australia's heritage places.**

A finding of the report is the lack of uniformity regarding collecting, maintaining and dissemination information on heritage. The Association agrees with the recommendation subject to:

- ***Commonwealth takes a lead role in the development of a framework for the collection, maintenance and dissemination of relevant data series – including the purpose to be achieved through the collection and dissemination of this data***
- ***Training and funding is provided to Local Government in the collection, maintain and disseminated relevant data***

#### **Draft Recommendation 7.4**

**The Australian Government should implement reporting systems that require government agencies with responsibility for historic heritage places to document and publicly report on the heritage related costs associated with their conservation**

- Agree

#### **Draft Recommendation 7.5**

**State, Territory and local governments should:**

**Produce adequate conservation management plans for all government-owned statutory-listed properties; and**

**Implement reporting systems that require government agencies and local governments with responsibility for historic heritage places to document and publicly report on the heritage related costs associated with their conservation.**

Agree subject to:

*The Commonwealth must undertake this too*

*Funding is available to assist Local Government in the production of conservation management plans*

*The State of Commonwealth provide funding for heritage advisors to assist Councils in the development of these plans*

*That the commonwealth or state provides funding and support for the development of the reporting systems*

*That there is a clear purpose/outcome achieved by reporting*

#### **Draft Recommendations 9.1**

**The Australian Government should implement processes whereby any additions of non-government owned properties to the National List occurs only after a conservation agreement with the owner has been entered into, and that the property remain on the list only while an agreement is in force. Consistent with its stated preference of relying on agreement for the management of world and nationally significant historic heritage places, the Australian Government may wish to make this a statutory requirement under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act**

Disagree

#### **Draft Recommendation 9.2**

**State and Territory Governments should modify heritage legislation to ensure that any additions of non government properties to their statutory heritage conservation lists occurs only after a conservation agreement with the owner has been entered into, and that the property remain on the list only while an agreement is in force.**

Disagree

#### **Draft Recommendation 9.4**

**State Government should put in place systems for their local governments to request compulsory acquisition in cases where this becomes the only way to ensure cost-effective conservation of places of local significance.**

Disagree

The recommendation may result in heritage conservation linked with the capacity of Local Government to pay rather than the significance of the property. It may lead to an implicit bias not based on heritage worth. This will lead to perverse incentives for property owners not to become involved in heritage conservation and to look towards compulsory acquisition. There is an assumption that Councils will have the capacity to undertake compulsory acquisitions. As acknowledged by the Report, Councils have different financial capacities and resources which will mean that heritage management will be tied with the financial capacity of individual Councils. This recommendation does not address the functional use of the property nor does not address the ongoing maintenance costs for Local Government.

#### **Draft Recommendation 9.7**

**State and Territory Governments should modify their planning legislation and regulations to remove any requirement to take heritage consideration into account in relation to any individual property other than those requirements relating to zoned heritage areas**

Disagree

#### **Draft recommendation 9.8**

**State and Territory governments should remove the identification and management of heritage, zones, precincts or similar areas from their heritage conservation legislation and regulations, leaving these matters to local government planning schemes.**

Disagree.

There is a need to better align State and Local Government heritage management systems.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**In order to strengthen the policy framework and incentives for the conservation of Australia's historic built heritage places it is recommended that;**

- **A Commonwealth and State framework is developed for the provision of community information, promotion and awareness for heritage**
- **Commonwealth and State funding is allocated for provision of an effective network of regionally based specialist heritage advisory services across Australia**
- **A Framework is developed that ensures Aboriginal heritage places are incorporated into mainstream heritage consideration**
- **Commonwealth and State funding is allocated to the National State based Local Government Associations for a heritage officers to co-ordinate Local Government, State and Commonwealth initiatives**
- **The Commonwealth develops a national funding model for Local Government that will balance local autonomy and consistent application of national objectives similar to the National Heritage Trust**
- **The Western Australian State Government addresses the recommendations of the State Local Government Heritage Working Party in relation to:**
  - **Criteria for the assessment of Local Heritage Places and Areas**
  - **Statement of Planning Policy for Cultural Heritage Conservation**
  - **Template Local Planning Policy for Heritage – a tool for Local Government for implementing the Local town planning scheme and local planning strategy**
  - **Basic Principles for MHIs**
  - **Changes to the heritage related provision in the model scheme text**

- **The Western Australia State Government develop a new Heritage Bill**
- **Increased financial assistance is provided to Local Government to facilitate markets for heritage tourism enterprises in order to;**
  - **Attract people and investment**
  - **Stimulate tourism**
  - **Aid in economic diversification in regional areas**
- **Research is undertaken by the Commonwealth into the impact of listing on property values**
- **Research is undertaken by the Commonwealth into the positive benefits of heritage conservation in relation to cultural tourism**
- **Negotiated conservation agreements are utilised only as one of a number of policy instruments to manage heritage conservation**
- **The Productivity Commission investigate State and Commonwealth financial policy incentives that could be utilised to assist property owners in heritage conservation.**