The Hon John Rau MP
Minister for Planning
GPO Box 464
ADELAIDE SA 5001

Dear Minister Rau,

LOCAL HERITAGE DISCUSSION PAPER

Further to my correspondence of 24 August 2016, I write to convey Council’s formal submission in response to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) Local Heritage Discussion Paper.

Council unequivocally views built heritage as supporting multiple strategic goals around liveability, culture, tourism, growth and sustainability.

The State Government’s invitation to engage in discussions on heritage reform before proceeding to introduce draft legislation into the Parliament of South Australia is welcomed.

The Discussion Paper provides a starting point for discussion, but lacks key information on a strategic framework, and clarity of detail on the various ideas and questions canvassed.

The limited scope of the Discussion Paper to ‘local heritage’ matters is at odds with the Expert Panel’s recommendations (and the State Government’s response) for an integrated State and local heritage system, statutory body and register.

Recent Forums have underscored the importance communities and stakeholders hold for built heritage as an integral part of their futures, this importance being held equally for State and Local heritage places. This underscores the importance, as sought in this submission, of further opportunity for broad community participation on this matter before a Bill is introduced into Parliament.

Broad community participation could form an exemplary model of participatory engagement, and demonstrate delivery of the principles for the community engagement charter that is in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.
Council has an expectation that further engagement will be the next step in the reform process, with the preparation of an Issues and Options Paper by an Independent Reference Group.

I trust that your consideration of this submission will enable the various stakeholders to participate meaningfully with the intent of progressing reform on a holistic basis.

I would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with you and DPTI on progressing this important matter. Please contact my office to facilitate this.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Martin Haese
LORD MAYOR

4 October 2016

Enclosure: City of Adelaide Submission to Local Heritage Discussion Paper
Council has a firm and well established position on the real and intrinsic value of built heritage to our City's liveability, prosperity and character. This submission is made to support and enable further discussion on reforms to the management of heritage in South Australia's planning system.

The Local Heritage Discussion Paper was released by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) in early August. Submissions are due to DPTI by 7 October 2016.

This submission contains discussion on:

1. Context of the Local Heritage Discussion Paper
2. Comments on the Local Heritage Discussion Paper
3. Suggested Approach to Engagement
4. Built Heritage has an Economic Value
5. Built Heritage contributes to a Liveable City
6. Built Heritage is Sustainable
7. Built Heritage enabling Population Growth

The Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum hosted by Adelaide City Council was held on 21 September 2016. The Notes of this Forum and expert presentations made are contained within Attachment 1.

The Heritage Community Forum hosted by Adelaide City Council was held on 26 September 2016. The Notes of this Forum (which also contain the written feedback provided at the Forum) and presentation made is contained within Attachment 2.

This submission was adopted by Adelaide City Council on 27 September 2016.
1. **CONTEXT OF THE LOCAL HERITAGE DISCUSSION PAPER**

In its final report (December 2014), the Expert Panel for Planning Reform made eight recommendations on heritage reform. These recommendations were supported in-principle by the State Government (March 2015).

The following table identifies how DPTI's August 2016 Local Heritage Discussion Paper responds to the Expert Panel's final report recommendations on heritage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation of the Expert Panel</th>
<th>Response in Discussion Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8.1) Heritage laws should be consolidated into one integrated statute</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.2) Terminology for heritage should be reviewed and updated as part of new statute</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.3) Integrated statutory body, replacing existing multiple heritage bodies, with links to state's cultural institutions</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.4) New body to administer a single integrated heritage register, including state and local, and have power to add special landscapes and historic markers to register</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.5) Heritage code of practice to outline how listed properties should be described, maintained and adapted</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.6) Allow accredited heritage professionals to provide advice and sign-off on changes to listed properties consistent with the code of practice</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.7) Existing heritage listings should be audited to accurately describe their heritage attributes</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.8) Financing placed on stable, long-term footing, with discounts on property-related taxes and a heritage lottery</td>
<td>Not covered in paper. Some commentary made that these matters are outside of the planning system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By being confined to local heritage matters only, the Paper progresses only some of the Expert Panel's recommendations. Limited information is provided in the Paper in support of this approach, however Council seeks further information and discussion on the decision for not progressing with the balance of recommendations.
2. COMMENT ON THE LOCAL HERITAGE DISCUSSION PAPER

Notwithstanding the scope of the Discussion Paper, the following provides Council's comments under the subject headings as they appear in the Discussion Paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic in Discussion Paper</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Why focus on Local Heritage? | • The basis put forward for the exclusive focus on local heritage is unclear, given the recommendations of the Expert Panel to consider State and local heritage on a holistic basis.  
  • The Expert Panel's recommendations for an integrated heritage system, statutory body and register and the State Government's flagged intent for closer integration between the current Heritage Places Act 1993 and the Development Act 1993 is not canvassed in the Discussion Paper. There may be sound reasons for this and it would be appropriate for a process with further steps to facilitate a conversation on this topic.  
  • As this Paper has commenced a discussion on legislative reform options for heritage, further information should be provided and discussion enabled to consider the full range of options around the scope of reform to heritage legislation and practice. |
| Updating current local heritage listing criteria | • Council's adopted position (September 2014) is that a review of criteria should not raise the threshold for statutory recognition. Raising the threshold for recognition would erode the statutory basis of current properties that are listed. |
| Question in paper: "Should our local heritage criteria be replaced to better match national best practice?" | September 2014 – Council resolution on Heritage Places and Character  

Council's minimum position in relation to heritage is that any changes in relation to arrangements for the listing of State or local heritage places and areas should:  
• not involve any changes to the existing listing criteria for State or local items which would make it more difficult to obtain listing and protection of the State's valued heritage whether of State or local significance;  
• permit the listing of local character items and areas to reflect the importance which local character items and areas have to local communities, the broader community and tourists;  
• not result in the delisting of any existing item of State or local heritage; and  
• not change or diminish the central role which Council's and their elected members have in relation to the listing of local heritage items or areas or local character items or areas.  
• The Paper identifies the listing of local heritage places will also need to be considered in balance with the broad strategic objectives of the State. This consideration occurs in the State heritage listing process, but its applicability is questioned for local heritage listings. The impact of extending this approach |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updating current local heritage listing criteria (continued)</th>
<th>to local heritage listing considerations is not explained in the Paper. Assessment of local heritage values should occur independently of other influences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Paper raises many questions that require further discussion around how new criteria reflect community values of heritage and the role of local government (as the level of government closest to the community) in the listing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition to current statutory heritage designation underway, Council has sought particular statutory heritage recognition that has not been able to be progressed regarding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Adelaide Park Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various Adelaide buildings supported in the City Heritage Survey 2008 by Donovan and Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various Park Lands structures supported in the Adelaide Park Lands and Squares Cultural Landscape Assessment Study 2007 by Dr David Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On local heritage criteria (a) and (d) that use the word ‘has’, substitute the word ‘displays’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a framework document and practice direction</td>
<td>• Uniform and clear guidance for consistent decision making is supported, the detail of which would require further analysis and resolution including ensuring local values are incorporated in the development of broader themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in paper:</td>
<td>• The current system is lacking in guidance material to promote consistent practice and evidence based decision making. Changes in administrative practice, separate to changes to local heritage criteria, could address many of the issues identified as problematic with the current arrangements. The Paper has not identified or explored this as a potential option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Should local heritage criteria be supported by the more sophisticated forms of guidance found interstate?&quot;</td>
<td>Streamlining our listing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater transparency, consistency, timeliness, and quality of information as inputs into decision making and interpretation of criteria would be positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions in paper:</td>
<td>• The proposed approach outlined in the Paper raises many questions around the effectiveness of proposals to protect heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The listing process can give rise to conflict within communities, and between landowners and technical experts. Are there ways this can be improved?&quot;</td>
<td>Engagement Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Should the recognition of heritage value be undertaken by accredited professionals? If so, who should have the final decision?&quot;</td>
<td>• The basis of commentary in the Paper that improved early engagement with owners on proposed heritage listings will reduce the number of objections to as low as 1% is lacking any evidentiary proof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "Is a traditional local heritage register required?"        | • The City of Adelaide has provided a high level of customer service to owners around proposed heritage listing of their building. This has occurred on a one on one basis, and integrated within well considered and executed informal and formal consultation processes. The processes used have assisted owners increase clarity around why the property is proposed for listing and what it means, as well as how they
can participate in the process. Whilst not formally evaluated, this practice has probably reduced the concerns expressed via submissions.

- The proposition that there is 'serious doubt of the need for interim operation' based on successful interim engagement is questioned. It would be imprudent for a guideline to 'rule out' the use of interim operation for heritage listing. The legal basis and purpose for effecting interim control is to prevent unwarranted development (demolition) whilst consultation occurs on a policy proposal. A successful early engagement process is a separate discussion point that should not be confused with the conversation about not using interim control to protect heritage assets whilst consultation on a policy change occurs. Not doing so risks demolition that is the opposite outcome of the proposal to list heritage assets. In any event, the legal basis for use of interim control mechanisms is one that is well established in environmental law as a fair and reasonable statutory lever to prevent damage or loss.

New Listing processes

- The idea of accredited professionals to survey and identify possible buildings of heritage value underscores sound practice if accompanied by the requisite opportunities for review and comment.

- Regarding the 'existence' of an expert heritage committee of the Planning Commission, further information is sought, such as its Terms of Reference, governance structure and the like, in order to understand how such a committee will support progression of the Expert Panel's Recommendations, including its relationship to authorities established under the Heritage Places Act.

- The Paper is silent on the role of local government in the process for identification of new local heritage places. As the level of government closest to the community, Council's expectation is that local government is central to the process for identification of new local heritage places.

Review of existing listings

- The Paper suggests that 'separate from a new process for listing, there could also be the opportunity to review existing statements of heritage value and descriptions of the listed elements of the place within a future set timeframe.

- Any such work would require careful consideration as to scope, purpose, benefit and cost. Some of the factors that should be considered include:
  - Work done over time that has led to existing listings.
  - That existing listed properties have been bought and sold based on those listings.
  - Within the City, listed properties over 25 years have received public funds through the Heritage Incentive
| Streamlining our listing processes (continued) | Scheme and adjusting a listing to not include conserved fabric through part public funding would not be supported.  
- A new, audited register, with better heritage identification and designation' is a sound idea, but a complete audit is probably beyond the resources of any one body.  
- Revisiting the status of existing local heritage lists has the potential to destabilise property values and lead to economic uncertainty for owners and occupiers of these assets.  

| Local Heritage Register | The new portal with an integrated heritage register is welcomed, and Council would be comfortable in working towards its establishment and successful operation to improve customer service, and business and administrative efficiency.  
- By way of an improved register, Council recommends that listings that apply to particular land parcels (be they State or Local heritage places or other forms of site specific policy), should reference plan and allotment numbers rather than Certificate of Title references numbers which can be subject to change, resulting in listing property details being out of date. Plan and allotment numbers always remain the same.  

| Clarifying the difference between 'character' and 'heritage' | Council supports the need for improved clarity in the use of these terms; however the Paper does not aid improving this clarity and much more discussion on this topic is necessary.  
(Note: the draft update to the 30 Year Plan on consultation does not assist to clarify this.)  
- Where a heritage character or preservation zone or sub zone is proposed, Section 67 (4) and (5) of the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act requires 51% of property owners to agree.  
- In February 2016 associated with SA Parliament's consideration of the draft PDI Bill, Council conveyed to the Minister and all SA Parliamentarians it was unconvinced of the merit or application of the 51% proposal by Dennis Hood MP.  
- The intent of affected parties being involved and supportive of the proposal through a robust engagement process is appropriate. However a viable area or sub-area of historic character may be compromised by requiring a prescriptive engagement standard. Noting the PDI Act establishes a community engagement charter to guide engagement around area based proposals, Council seeks that this 51% aspect of the PDI Act should be removed.  
- Character properties should be formally acknowledged as an additional tier of heritage to meet community expectation and be referred to as "Historic Character" for clarity of intent and to afford demolition protection to historic properties in Historic Conservation Zones that do not meet Local Heritage criteria.  

"Do you agree that there is confusion between heritage and character? If so, how can this be addressed?"

---
Streamlining our development assessment processes

Questions in paper:

"Do you agree that descriptions of heritage value and physical description of listed elements for each place should be kept up-to-date?"

"Subject to specified criteria, what types of minor works could be become exempt, accepted or even 'deemed-to-satisfy'?"

"Should a demolition proposal be able to be more robustly argued for consideration on its merits?"

"Using accredited professionals to assist statutory functions is envisaged by provisions of the PDA Act. But to what extent could they provide advice or even heritage approvals?"

- The scaling of complexity of a development assessment pathways to the impact of a development on a heritage place is a reasonable approach.

- A planning application for the full demolition of a heritage place should continue to be subject to rigorous assessment and detailed checks and balances (at the same level as the current non-complying process). This rigorous assessment provides assurance about the protection of the heritage value and like other planning controls, provides certainty for the economy and investment. This rigorous assessment also provides assurance that the cultural value from the past represented by the built fabric is maintained for the future, this being a key observation from recent Forums.

- The suggestion that some alterations to a Local heritage place could be classed as not being development is questioned and is open to significant interpretation.

- Council has strong reservations about the use of private certification in heritage development assessment decisions and expects it will lead to inconsistent, convenient or inconclusive advice on applications involving heritage. The well-regarded heritage advisor system is recognised as independent best practice.

- The methods used to accredit and review accreditation of professionals is open to question and without any clear framework in place, has the potential to be open to abuse.
3. SUGGESTED APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT

The process by which comments have been invited on the Discussion Paper and the time provided to make submissions has been subject to much discussion since its initial release.

It is understood the State Government’s intended next step is to introduce a Bill into Parliament on heritage matters.

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 includes a set of principles to guide the development of a new community engagement charter. The intent is to raise the level of community involvement ‘early on’ in planning decisions with an emphasis on the ‘front end’ planning decisions.

The engagement process to date around ‘front end’ heritage reforms does not adhere to these principles to enable reasonable, timely and meaningful opportunities to gain access to information about reform ideas and to enable full participation in the process.

The Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum and the Council Heritage Community Forum have underscored the importance communities, industry and peak bodies attach to heritage that tells the story of the past and how it is managed now for the future.

The Forums have affirmed the need for an ongoing conversation to consider the nature of reform and that people with different perspectives need to be able to interact around identifying the ‘issue’ to be fixed as well as ‘options’ to address those ‘issues’.

The presentations and outcomes of both Forums are within Attachments 1 and 2.

Whilst there is no particular issue with DTPI officers advising the Minister after 7 October, it is suggested that such advice encapsulate engagement methodologies, frameworks and specialist engagement advice that enables ordered, multisector discussion. We do not support the next engagement step being commenting on a Bill by itself.

It is suggested that a more detailed issues and options paper be prepared which can build on the issues and options canvassed through various submissions.
It is suggested that additional steps are undertaken to enable further discussion and agreement on a future system in advance of a new Bill being tabled in Parliament.

The approach detailed below is suggested as a more appropriate and robust engagement framework and process that has the potential to facilitate further discussion to work towards agreement and greater trust in future system arrangements.

These additional steps will assist people from a variety of perspectives to understand how they can participate, how their input may shape a future Bill; and reduce uncertainty which has the potential to lead to speculation and distrust about the future of valued heritage and character.

Council has an expectation that further engagement will be the next step in the reform process, with the preparation of an Issues and Options Paper overseen by an Independent Reference Group.

It has also been observed that some matters in the Paper are technical and specialised, which non-specialists don’t readily understand. This underscores the need for easy to understand information to be prepared to help interested non-specialists understand what changes are and what they would mean in a future system.
4. BUILT HERITAGE HAS AN ECONOMIC VALUE

The study ‘Economic Value of Heritage Tourism – Adelaide 2016’ by Dr Jack Carlsten for the City of Adelaide addressed an information gap in relation to the tourism benefits of cultural heritage in the City of Adelaide.

Dr Carlsten’s study identified the potential for cultural heritage to attract tourists to the City of Adelaide. The study measured the value of expenditure by visitors to the City of Adelaide where the city’s significant cultural heritage is a factor. The study identified that:

- Based on the results of a visitor survey in the City of Adelaide, the upper bound of annual direct tourist expenditure attributable to cultural heritage places is estimated to be in the order of $375 million.

- The amount of annual direct tourist expenditure that would be lost if the heritage tourism places in the City of Adelaide did not exist is estimated to be in the order of $111 million. This represents a lower bound of heritage places for tourism in the City of Adelaide.

The United Kingdom publication ‘Power of Place’ found that for a renovation, 60-70% of the dollar spend in construction was employment compared to only 30-40% for a new build.

Dr Carlsten presented at the Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum on 21 September. Dr Carlsten outlined:

- That an average of 32% of all visitors to Adelaide undertakes cultural heritage activities.

- Various methods are used to measure the economic value of built heritage.

- Built heritage has a range of ‘use and non-use’ values.

**USE AND NON-USE VALUES OF BUILT HERITAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE/utility/monetary VALUES</th>
<th>NON-USE/intrinsic/non-monetary VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage values</td>
<td>Cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research values</td>
<td>Aesthetic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarity values</td>
<td>Option values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism values</td>
<td>Bequest values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic values</td>
<td>Existence values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial values</td>
<td>Hierarchical values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values</td>
<td>Environmental values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Carlsten’s 2015 study is available via [www.adelaidecitycouncil.com/planning-development/city-heritage/resources/](http://www.adelaidecitycouncil.com/planning-development/city-heritage/resources/)

A video and copy of Dr Carlsten’s presentation is available at:
In the 2010 study "Heritage Australia: A review of Australian Material regarding the economic and social benefits of heritage property" - P Willis and C Eves for the NSW Heritage Office, March 2010, concluded:

- Although some participants in the market may tend to shy away from heritage listed property, they wrongly perceive that such properties have inherent economic and restrictive problems, whereas there is a distinct and lucrative value added market that can be accessed.

- That conservation can and does create employment. There are costs associated with conservation but these are more than offset by the economic, social and psychological benefits. Precinct and area conservation helps people maintain their socio-cultural identity which would more than likely be lost through large scale demolition and redevelopment. Conservation does sometimes appear in the short term to come at a cost, but the long term benefits to the owner of the property and the community as a whole outweigh this cost. When carried out properly the heritage listing of a stand-alone or isolated properties can benefit the owner as well as those in the immediate vicinity.

The 2005 "Valuing the priceless: The value of Historic Heritage in Australia (research report 2)" report by the Allen Consulting Group for the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand, assessed several Australian studies which collectively demonstrated that property values are either neutrally or positively impacted by a heritage listing.

A national survey undertaken in the 2005 Allan Report revealed that 93% of the community see heritage as forming part of Australia's identity and that heritage places are important to protect. The survey also found that 80% strongly agreed or agreed that the historic houses in my area are an important part of the area's character and identity.

This importance mirrors the high level of care communities place on the historic environment as found in the United Kingdom "Power of Place: The future of the historic environment" report by English Heritage.
Donovan Rypkema presented at the Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum on 21 September. Donovan outlined:

- The positive job creation role of built heritage conservation in comparison to new construction.
- The less infrastructure costs for built heritage conservation in comparison to new suburban development.
- The operational carbon efficiency of older buildings when compared to newer construction.
- The role of heritage conservation in fostering city competitiveness, culture and entrepreneurship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Salary &amp; Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Manufacturing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transportation</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Processing</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>$426,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>$616,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Georgia, $1,000,000 in output from various industries means.....

Between 2003 and 2013 Heritage Cities typically attracted 41 more instances of Direct Foreign Investment than the non-heritage Cities

Heritage cities attract more investments than non-heritage cities

Courtesy of Donovan Rypkema

5. BUILT HERITAGE CONTRIBUTES TO A LIVEABLE CITY

The City of Adelaide is active in supporting the successful contemporary use and reuse of its post 1836 settlement cultural and architectural legacy.

The City of Adelaide has over 2000 buildings designated as ‘heritage places’ and a number of residential areas that are designated ‘conservation’ areas.

Since the early 1980’s, Council has adopted an integrated approach comprising:

- statutory mechanisms
- planning controls
- promotion
- expert advice
- financial incentives to support owners with conservation works to their buildings.

This integrated approach has assisted create the City that is ranked amongst the most liveable in the world.

Many landowners – both residential and business – are proud of the story, history and intrigue represented by the building they own.

HOW BUILT HERITAGE CONTRIBUTES TO 5TH MOST LIVEABLE CITY

Landowners are mostly not experts in buildings and Council’s built heritage management program (with its flagship heritage incentives scheme now in its 25th year and the largest local government support scheme in Australia) has both contributed to the City as it is today and supported innumerable owners in the practical ‘conservation’ of the heritage fabric on their buildings.

Buildings designated as heritage places in the City of Adelaide comprise 536 State Heritage Places, 1846 local Heritage places and two Historic (Conservation) Zones.
Council's Heritage Incentives Scheme and Heritage Advisory Service has an annual (2016/17) expenditure of $1.369M. Council is also trialling a Mainstreet Historic Buildings Facade Improvement Scheme for "non-listed" historic buildings.

The examples following are of recently completed conservation projects to heritage fabric that illustrate the contribution of an integrated approach to built heritage management in the City.

**MAJOR FAÇADE CONSERVATION PROJECTS**

This long established integrated approach underscores the Expert Panel’s recommendations for an integrated approach to successfully supporting built heritage into the future.

![Garko House, 41 Rundle Mall](image1)
![Peel Chambers, 23 Peel Street](image2)
![Security House, 234 North Terrace](image3)

![Before](image4)
![After](image5)

214 & 216 Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide

Noting there are over 2000 buildings designated as heritage places in the City, arising from the integrated support:

- Around 200 development applications are undertaken on these sites per annum, this meaning 1 in every 10 heritage listed buildings has development approved to be undertaken on it every year.
- Since 2010, the total annual value of development applications on heritage sites has varied from between $50M to approximately $300M.
The vast majority of development undertaken is to alter or add to the building. Development on heritage sites represent around a quarter of all development applications undertaken in the City.

These statistics illustrate:

- The ability of owners to be able to adapt, modify and add to their buildings for modern day use.
- The flexibility of the system to support such changes.
- That owners of heritage listed buildings are doing work to their buildings.

6. BUILT HERITAGE IS SUSTAINABLE

The 2010 'Historic Dwelling Improvement Design and Resources Audit' by H Bennetts and S Pullen for the City of Unley identified the sustainability and carbon reduction benefits of retaining heritage fabric. The study identified that:

- Historic houses provide an important contribution to urban design and streetscapes and also represent significant resources in terms of materials and energy.

- When the addition to the renovated villa, and the new building have the same materials, retaining the villa results in savings of up to 43 tonnes CO2-e of greenhouse gases. These saving are increased to 58 CO2-e tonnes if the construction of the renovated villa is improved to 6 stars in line with the new dwelling and to comply with the forthcoming 8 star energy efficiency requirements in the Building Code of Australia.

- If the greenhouse gas savings are extrapolated Unley-wide the potential savings through renovating existing historic houses rather than demolishing and re-building, equate to over half a million Tonnes of greenhouse gases.

Donovan Rypkema outlined at the Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum on 21 September that older buildings are more operationally carbon efficient when compared to newer construction.

A multifamily structure built since 1980 uses 13% more energy per square foot than one built before 1920.

7. BUILT HERITAGE: AN ENABLER FOR POPULATION & ECONOMIC GROWTH

Built heritage is a critical part of Adelaide's lifestyle, economy, beauty and population growth into the future.

Ensuring the City's ability to accommodate envisaged population growth is important to Council and the State Government.

Ensuring the ability to accommodate population growth over a 30 year timeframe was investigated as part of the Minister's 2012 Capital City Development Plan Amendment. The investigations took into account the existence of heritage buildings and the zoning heights being proposed in the then Capital City Amendment.

These investigations identified that the City – with a Development Plan amended by the Capital City DPA – had ability well above (almost double) that needed to meet the 2010 30 Year Plan targets. More information is in 'Adelaide: One City, Many Places - A Spatial Vision for the Future of the City – 2014 – adopted by Council 11 June 2013.

Since these investigations, the City's residential and business population has continued to grow. Other amendments to the Development Plan have contributed in carefully considered ways to the ability to accommodate population growth.

Noting that the existence of heritage buildings are considered in changes to the Development Plan, the City is well placed to continue with its heritage fabric being part of a City with ongoing population growth.

This demonstrates growth and built heritage are complementary, not opposed.

The proposition that freeing up heritage listing processes will assist the community to prosper by releasing development potential lacks any research base. The City is concerned that the changes to listing processes and demolition controls has the potential to result in economic uncertainty, by allowing a greater degree of speculation in the development industry. The lack of clarity around demolition controls could result in listed properties being subject to speculative development where land price is driven up by development potential as a result of demolition being of a merit assessment process. Such speculation not only destabilises heritage lists, but also erodes the economic value of existing or planned projects on non-listed sites.

The fiscal consequences of a deregulated heritage framework has been insufficiently understood by the Discussion Paper.
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ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Local Government Association Local Heritage Forum – 21 September 2016 – Forum Notes and Presentations

Attachment 2 – City of Adelaide Heritage Community Forum – 26 September 2016 – Forum notes (including written submissions received) and presentation
Welcome & Acknowledgement of Country

Donna Ferretti introduced the meeting and outlined that the purpose of the event was to discuss the proposed heritage reform ideas and to allow people to be better informed in order to make a submission to the Department of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure (DPTI) on the Discussion Paper. Donna noted that DPTI staff were in attendance as observers.

Lord Mayor Martin Haese welcomed attendees and acknowledged Elected Members, Members of Parliament in attendance, as well as former Lord Mayor Wendy Chapman, and the forum panellists. There were around 300 people present.

The Lord Mayor reflected on the importance of built heritage:

- In a fast-moving society, heritage acts as an anchor to the community.
- Heritage has social, cultural, economic, educational and aesthetic value, and should be considered an economic asset that contributes to growth in tourism.
- Council supports heritage as part of a culturally rich city.
- Recent development plan amendments have enabled capacity for growth and development, but we cannot have growth at all costs.
- Council is open to genuine process reform, but will not look to compromise heritage listed places.

The Lord Mayor encouraged the community to provide a response to State Government by the 7 October deadline, stressing that a joint effort is required.
Overview of Local Heritage Discussion Paper

Rick Hutchins, Team Leader Spatial Planning & Heritage, Adelaide City Council

Rick outlined that input from the Community Forum would help inform Council's position.

Rick explained that there are different levels of heritage listing from international to local, and that the Discussion Paper only deals with local heritage. He noted that in South Australia, State and local heritage are dealt with under two different acts and two different ministers.

Rick outlined the planning reform process that has led to the DPTI Discussion Paper:

- An Expert Panel on Planning Reform was appointed in 2013 and led a review and produced a final report. The report's recommendations for change included the recommendation to integrate separate State and local heritage into a single process under a single body.

The State Government indicated support for the Panel's reports.

- New planning legislation was passed in April 2016. The Minister stated that there would be a separate bill to deal with heritage and indicated that every existing State and local heritage place would be transferred to protection under the new bill/act.

Rick provided an overview of the content of the DPTI Discussion Paper:

- The Paper identifies opportunity for reforms.

- There are a large number of items with local heritage listing compared to State listings.

- Some criteria are not considered consistent with best practice.

- The Paper is intended for discussion and looks for feedback in three areas:
  - Listing criteria – opportunity for new criteria and to provide guidelines for clarity.
  - Listing processes – current processes are cumbersome and could be streamlined.
    - DPTI clarified it is not proposing to remove the ability to use interim controls.
  - Assessment processes:
    - Potential to scale the process relative to the impact for applications for alterations to heritage places.
    - The Paper also looks at demolition on merit, better descriptions of heritage listings, and a role for accredited heritage professionals.
Rick observed that the planning reform bill set out a new engagement charter which could help to inform this process. This could see additional consultation steps led by an independent reference group to allow independent discussion before a bill enters parliament.

Rick observed that the Discussion Paper only progresses some of the Expert Panel’s recommendations, and it is unclear why the other ideas were discarded.

Rick concluded by referring to additional information available on Council’s YourSay website: http://yoursay.adelaidecitycouncil.com/SA-planning-and-heritage-system-changes

What would an ideal local heritage system look like in the future?
Professor Norman Etherington AM, National Trust SA

Norm thanked the Lord Mayors and Elected Members of Adelaide City Councils for allowing the community to have their say.


Norm stressed that the main purpose of the Forum was for the community to have their say, and commented the process led by DPTI is a text book example of how not to engage with the public.

Norm put forward his views on the Discussion Paper and the process to date:

- Local heritage is not defined by experts but what the community says is heritage.
- There is a fallacy of hierarchy where local heritage is considered the least important.
- From a national and international perspective, Adelaide’s most unique and significant built heritage is the extensive groupings of 19th century and early 20th century stone buildings, most of which are protected under local heritage listing. They provide our local character and identity.
- Thematic representation is a dangerous theory. The Discussion Paper refers to the use of thematic frameworks to help us to decide what is over- and under-represented. Norm used the analogy of the Dewey Decimal System being used to classify books, but not to suggest there are too many of one type of book. Another example would be to say that pyramids are overrepresented in Egypt, or windmills are overrepresented in Holland.
- On the matter of demolition on merit – the merit will be assessed by distant experts rather than the local community or council.
- An ideal heritage system would look a lot like the current system:
  - Assessment and identification the responsibility of local councils to ensure accountability and community input.
  - It would acknowledge that heritage goes beyond lists, rules and experts.
  - Heritage places would remain protected.
  - Any proposals to change the system would begin in a public forum.
• There is the potential that this process will result in less protection and result in a culling of the list, similar to the experience of heritage reform in Tasmania.

• The National Trust members have a great deal of expertise and maintain a digital register of heritage places, recording evidence of any demolition.

Question & Answer

Panel:

• Deborah Lindsay, International Council on Monuments and Sites (Australia)
• Norman Etherington, National Trust SA
• Councillor Sandy Wilkinson, Adelaide City Council
• Rick Hutchins, Team Leader, Spatial Planning and Heritage at Adelaide City Council
• Simon Weidenhofer, Senior Heritage Architect at Adelaide City Council

The question and answer period saw 21 people speak, from the City of Adelaide, the metropolitan area and regional South Australia. The following themes were identified:

• The importance of an integrated system for all heritage places, rather than current system with two different sets of legislation and processes for State/local heritage.

• The need for more extensive community consultation and more time to respond to the Discussion Paper.

• The contribution of heritage to economic growth through local jobs and tourism

• The current lengthy, cumbersome process to list local heritage places through development plan amendments. Heritage listing should be separate from the planning system and be done administratively, under one central heritage act.

• Heritage protection should address development near heritage places.

• Concern that the 30 Year Plan identifies historic areas with the highest density for further growth.

• Concern around the loss of local decision making. Concern around State Government taking control of local heritage.

• Alternatively, concern around local government control of local heritage. Many councils have not undertaken heritage surveys, possibly due to a lack of resources or belief that the Minister would not support new listings.
The importance of preserving built heritage for future generations and concern around a loss of history.

Local heritage places and contributory items listings should be retained.

Concern around demolition “on merit” and the lack of certainty in this process.

The sustainability value of heritage buildings and the contribution to goals for a carbon neutral city.

Both public and private ownership can have positive or negative outcomes for heritage; public ownership does not guarantee protection.

Importance of adaptive reuse in keeping buildings alive, and the need to address the difficulty in ensuring compliance with building codes in heritage buildings.

The heritage value of the Adelaide Park Lands.

The importance of compliance and maintenance and supporting heritage building owners with financing – not covered in the Discussion Paper.

The importance of Heritage Conservation Zones.

The need for involvement from the community, including the groups and volunteers who dedicate time to work on preserving and promoting heritage.

During the Question and Answer period the themes of discussion were recorded on a whiteboard:
Lord Mayor Martin Haese closed the Forum and thanked the panelists. The Lord Mayor reiterated that the themes from the meeting would inform Council's response, but encouraged the community to write to the Minister for Planning and to engage with their local councils and Members of Parliament. Finally, the Lord Mayor urged everyone to educate their children and grandchildren on the value of heritage.

Donna Ferretti invited those who wished to provide comments on a form available. 21 submissions were received, and are included as Appendix A.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

- Demolition on merit is not fair!
- Modern buildings next to a heritage building detract from the innate quality of a heritage site.
- Heritage buildings alone as is (slowly) happening is the death of the heritage character of our beautiful city once called the City of Churches.
- I stop as a tourist in towns where there is a heritage character - spend days - spend money in accommodation etc.
- Our Australian 'built' heritage is young in comparison to Europe & Spain - it needs protection.
- Councils, historical societies, national trusts have more knowledge than 'expert planners'.

Name: **Ken Lawson**

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? **Yes □ No ☑**

*Member of Burnside Historical Soc. Formerly maintained old buildings in Adelaide (i.e. Builder)*

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum. **Retired.**
As a resident of Colonel Light Gardens, I consider the more heritage suburbs/districts/areas the better.

I have witnessed over the last 20 years very considerable development in C.L.G. Vast amounts have been spent restoring and improving many of these houses; there even have been a few sales of over $1M.

These improvements were paid for and hence stimulated our economy.

There are those who restore houses like those who restore cars.

Also please consider new houses of architectural merit which will outstanding examples of the early 2000's.

Name: JOHN FAIRNINGTON  Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
| Name: MARGARET | Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? | Yes [ ] No [ ] |

| What are your comments about heritage reform? |
| "Announce and defend is instep - Note Tony Weatherill - People need stability and constant insecurity about their homes. It's all about money, not human needs and values and culture. Developers use their dominance to coerce petitions - the public are powerless. It is a corruption of the political process. It takes much longer to tonify the public will you than a few weeks. Margaret Doolan. P.S. Gardens and trees are also heritage in some of our older suburbs." |

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

On behalf of the Walkerville Society Inc., we would like to table the following issues regarding the proposed heritage reforms:

- There has been a general lack of public consultation regarding the proposals as well as a short time to respond. A greater consultation period as well as more publicity of the proposals would be beneficial to allow all stakeholders an opportunity to respond given the significant changes proposed.

- We believe that local heritage decisions should remain within the domain of local councils and residents rather than those powers being taken away and centralised. This dilutes the role of local government.

Name: Stephen Furlan
(Assistant Secretary)

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

as well as takes away the rights and say of local residents who live and support their areas. Local communities are best placed to support and deal with heritage matters.

"The view is that these proposals reduce the value of local heritage and heritage sites overall, which in fact contribute economically to the State. There should be greater emphasis on expanding and supporting these heritage sites and regions.

"Scaling back heritage requirements for the sake of development is ultimately counterproductive and only achieves short term aims. Having a vibrant, well supported heritage system is not...

Name: Stephen Farman

(Acting Secretary)

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

only provides economic but social benefits

Strengthening the heritage process

is a preferred mechanism to retaining

our history and prosperity, rather

than diluting it.

Name: [Handwritten] Stephen Tucker

(Acting Secretary)

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes [ ] No [X]

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

Decision - making on local heritage needs to be the province of local governments.

Name: Helen Fraser

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? No

but I've worked here for 36 years.

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

1. Local heritage has to stay in the control of local councils.

2. Demolition on merit - "public service speak" - a dreadful expression. However, when an owner of a local heritage property insists on demolition & development, he or she should be on that person to provide a full heritage assessment (at their cost) by a consultant chosen by the council, so as to fulfill a fair unbiased report.

3. Interim listing must remain, in fact it is imperative.

4. If a building is to be listed, if an owner objects, tough luck, it shall still be listed.

Name: PATRICIA SUMERLING  Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes [ ] No [x]

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

Please place history above architecture in the assessment process. Damage to the physical fabric of a building or even changes for adaptive reuse purposes—such as in the case of Sturt Street Community School—can otherwise disqualify highly historically important buildings from listing. Sturt Street School's physical fabric remains almost entirely intact, but because of new sections added at the expense of its extensive facade, its renewed access for a school and repurposing of its facade approved by ACC, it was rejected from State Heritage listing. How do we find local heritage listing may be at risk?

Name: Kathleen Patitakas née Muirhead

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

The integrity of the streetscape of Hume St in the S.E. corner of the city has been spoiled by the erection of an 8 storey apartment building, flanked by 2 original cottages, in a street exclusively of 2 or 1 storey buildings. It is incongruous in the extreme.
A 5 storey development on this site was rejected several times by Council Planning Dept.
Minister Ramsay overrode these judgements partially by re-zoning the southern border of the Capital City Zone in this small residential street.
There is no parking or set back and the building makes no contribution to affordable building targets. There is overlooking and overshadowing of Carrington St.

Name: SUE ANN BLESSING

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

WHAT HAS BEEN THE IMPACT ON LOCAL HERITAGE DUE TO ZONING?

Name: SUSAN & JEFF COLLINS

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☑ No ☐

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

I come from a city of ghosts.

Ghost buildings in the wake of 2010 - 8,000 earthquakes later in Christchurch - once a great Victorian / Edwardian city.

I have come back to live in Adelaide because it is still intact - a few cancers and gaps in its streetscapes - but still alive with its history - built and otherwise.

You will miss it too late.

Don't lose it.

Ruth Gilmore / Zanier

Once Christchurch now North Adelaide Resident

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

CONCERNED AT THE PROPOSAL FOR
DEMOLITION ON MERIT.

IMPORTANCE OF STREET NARS ZONE
AGAINST single out IMP.

INDIVIDUAL REPRESENTATIVES OF
ERA OR STYLE.

LG COUNCILS NEED TO BE
REQUIRED TO UNDERTAKE L.H.
SURVEYS; MORE THAN HALF
HAVE NOT.

Name: Roger Andre

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

We support ACC efforts to extend the time for close of submissions to change Heritage Protection.

We support local Councils assessing the heritage value of local Heritage Areas. Independent experts are not good enough.

David Monceaux - Mount Osmond

Anne Monceaux - Mount Osmond

Name: David Monceaux

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

The word Mayor of Adelaide opened.

The forum tonight made:

We must do right on these people.

Are the Karka peoples of Oyandit Plains, uninvited or engaged in the implication of this Heritage Act will have on their community?

There appeared to no representative at the hearing.

Name: ____________________________

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight’s Heritage Community Forum.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

1. Reform? What is the real intention behind this? Is it “reform” to do away with character homes & suburbs? Is it to encourage local councils to list more buildings as local heritage? I think not.

2. For too much power has been given to the State Court & DPTI over this matter. There should be more & better community consultants. Local councils throughout SA should each be given the ability to determine, but to make a register of local heritage buildings/spaces.

3. More control of local heritage listed properties too - if owners renovate or let their buildings deteriorate, special penalties should apply.

4. John, give us 4 months, not 4 weeks to debate, discuss & determine what should be done about local heritage.

---

Name: Mayor Don
Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes ☐ No ☑

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight’s Heritage Community Forum.
When a liquor licensing Application is made, a sign is required to be posted in a prominent position on the building. I would like to see similar signs posted on any building that is the subject of a major planning or development application. Having such signs would allow the local community to feel included and to have a say in the same way that a liquor licensing Application allows the community to have a say.
What are your comments about heritage reform?

IT IS ABOUT TIME TO MESS
RED TAPE

Name: Jimmy Philips
Trade: Stonemason

Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide? Yes □ No □

Please note: If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight’s Heritage Community Forum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your comments about heritage reform?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public notification and consultation on the heritage reform has been entirely inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It needs to be publicised further and the submission date extended to 30 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups, historical societies etc, need to be directly contacted for input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Rau needs to be present at DPTI organised public forums and answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage listing must stay with Local Councils and not be at the whim of the State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Heritage listing needs to be centralised under one authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim listing must be retained and enforceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of &quot;over representation&quot; is contrary to the concept of &quot;themes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can’t have a theme of one architectural style or period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The demolition of any heritage listed building should not be on &quot;Merit&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: Cr John Kemp, Adelaide Hills Council

I do not live or own property in the City of Adelaide.
Dear David,

Here is my comments for adding to the ACC Submission on the proposed Local Heritage law changes. I own property in the City of Adelaide.

Dear Mr Rau,

Why do you want to hurt SA tourism, our reputation, lifestyle and liveability ranking so much?

Maybe you have good memories of your teens in the “good ol’ days” 40 years back when there were few rules and almost anything historic and beautiful could be demolished in SA without question – maybe the sound of bulldozers and dust from collapsing historic buildings bring a tear of joy to your eyes?

However, for the rest of us, we love our Adelaide, Burra, Stirling and tens of other street communities across the state today - having found a good balance of the old and new, and the grand and the quaint: from our series of impressive grand buildings along North Terrace through to tiny and once little known lanes with their old historic warehouses and shops – so many of which now have been sensitively restored by our small army of architects and craftsmen to become homes, shops, boutique hotels, cafes and bars loved by locals and tourists alike.

I am sure some developer in the 80s might have loved to demolish say all of our historic one-to-two storey buildings along Rundle Street to build yet another massive shopping centre with big windswept car parks all around, but your predecessors in state government and councils across SA came up with rules and lists of loved local historic buildings needing approvals from the community before they could be demolished.

I am also sure both us locals and tourists now filling Rundle Street or Hahndorf main street each day appreciate us having found the wisdom in time to stop unbridled destruction of our quaint historic buildings there.

I am also sure our world’s 5th most liveable ranking is won in part for having preserved these lively street communities versus what many US cities like Dallas did demolishing the old and creating empty blocks of massive car parks and a few tall office towers bereft of life beyond 9 to 5. One doesn’t see a Dallas rank anywhere near the top for liveability, do we? I know my friends from Dallas, Sydney, Hong Kong, Shanghai and other big money-addicted cities envy us, lamenting that they learned the value and fun of their history too late and have lost so much of the soul of their city, replaced by unloved steel towers.

You say “We are not talking about buildings like the Edmund Wright House or St Peter’s Cathedral or Mintaro,” implying that anything smaller is of no real value. In fact, buildings most loved and appreciated are often those smaller ones - of the human scale - we can use day in day out, whether the converted buildings on Leigh, the old German shopfronts in the Barossa, or quaint workers cottages that once served the Lion brewery in North Adelaide. They often mean more to us and tourists than the big and grand.

Besides tourism and hospitality jobs, preserving our history has created many other ongoing jobs for the state: we have built up a strong community of skilled architects and craftsmen restoring our listed local heritage buildings across the state with statistics showing 3 times as many (skilled) people are employed renovating and maintaining an existing historic structure versus demolishing a site and just putting up a simple concrete box instead.

Please listen to the many of us across SA now protesting loudly about your threatened elimination of protections of our built culture. Please maintain the current system of rules and community-wide consultation. Please allow us locals to keep our say in what buildings we keep and which we let go. A state bureaucrat far away in Victoria Square can not know as well as local residents and local Council members in say a Hahndorf about which small old shopfront deserves protection the most and what is the best way to renovate it for today’s world.

In short, please trust us citizens to continue to decide what is best for our needs.

Thank you.

Regards,
David Bailey

From: George Hobbs
Sent: Tuesday, 27 September 2016 7:51 AM
To: David Bailey
Subject: Comments on last night's public meeting on Heritage Protection for your submission

Dear David,

thank you and the council organising yesterday evening's meeting.

Sorry I did not have time to fill out your comments form and in fact most of the items were captured by public questions.

One issue that was not addressed in the patronising Government discussion paper was regarding adaptive-reuse of heritage buildings of which we have a large number in the city alone of good examples currently empty (e.g. Edmund Wright House). This is a special case that needs to have some help in getting more happening.

One public questioner did raise it. I think more should have been said about this as it is the most effective way to enliven the city and maximise carbon-neutrality - knocking down teh chimneys on the coal fired power station at Port Augusta was a huge waste of resources and loss of an opportunity ofr adaptive re-use but I guess an expensive pottn was being made by the government!

Despite the best recent example of adaptive reuse being directly opposite the town Hall: Electra House absolutely no mention was made of it. Very disappointing for the investor who made the large sacrifice to do that development and I had invited along to the meeting.

Overall I think it was a good meeting but a shame that there were not more young peopel like the guy from St Georges in attendance as really this issue is going to affect them much more than most of us.

Well done in keeping this in the public arena. Hoepfully we will get a longer cinsulation period

Best regards
George Hobbs
Australasian Representative of The Georgian Group Councillor of National Trust of South Australia

27.9.16
RESOLUTION FROM THE COMMUNITY MEETING
ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2016

That this Community Meeting rejects the State Government’s Heritage Discussion Paper as a flawed document that fails to recognise:

- The unique social value of South Australia’s Heritage
- The contribution of Heritage to the Economic and Cultural Life of present and future South Australians.
- The valuable contribution made on Heritage by our Local Councils

What we want:

- We want the people of SA to make decisions about South Australia’s Heritage and NOT a faceless, remote and unaccountable board of so called experts appointed by Minister Rau.
- The present system for nominating for Heritage buildings to continue
- We want our Local Councils to make Heritage decisions
- We want the retention of Contributory Items
- We want our Heritage preserved and not bulldozed

Heritage belongs to all the people of South Australia. It is ours Minister and not just yours.
## What are your comments about heritage reform?

Control of Heritage should remain local and in Council hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: ___________________________</th>
<th>Do you live or own property in the City of Adelaide?</th>
<th>Yes □ No □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please note:** If you submit this form it will be made public in a report to Adelaide City Council and will form part of the public record of tonight's Heritage Community Forum.
Overview of Local Heritage Discussion Paper

Rick Hutchins
Team Leader, Spatial Planning & Heritage
Heritage Community Forum

DPTI Local Heritage Discussion Paper
Released August 2016

Open for submissions to DPTI until 7 October 2016

RENEWING OUR PLANNING SYSTEM
Placing Local Heritage on Renewed Foundations

Heritage reform – an exploration of the opportunities
Local Heritage Discussion Paper

The State Government is committed to improving the ways we recognize and manage local heritage places in South Australia.

This discussion paper has been prepared to encourage high-level ideas and feedback from experts and practitioners involved in local heritage and/or in this field. Responses will inform planning debates in this specialist area, including the creation of a new EPF.
Activities to inform Council’s response

➢ Previous research papers and submissions to the planning reform process

➢ 21 September 2016 - Local Government Heritage Planning Forum

➢ Heritage Community Forum

Discussion Points

1) The Reform Process

2) Overview of Local Heritage Discussion Paper

3) Observations
Heritage Places in South Australia

- State Heritage Places
- Local Heritage Places

Planning Reform History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Listening, Ideas, Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Planning Development &amp; Infrastructure Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Implement: Commission, Engagement Charter, Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning Reform History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### DPTI Local Heritage Discussion Paper

**Purpose:**

- Focus on Local Heritage
- Review practice that has become ‘fragmented, inconsistent and out-dated
- Prepared to encourage high level ideas and feedback to inform the preparation of a future Local Heritage Bill
DPTI Local Heritage Discussion Paper

Content covers:

- Listing Criteria
- Listing Processes
- Assessment Processes

Heritage reform – an exploration of the opportunities
Local Heritage Discussion Paper

The State Government is committed to improving the ways we recognise and manage local heritage places in South Australia.

This discussion paper has been prepared to encourage high level stakeholders, local authorities and practitioners involved in local heritage practice in the state. Responses will inform planning policies in this specialised area, including the creation of a new list.

Adelaide City Council

Listing Criteria

➢ New set of local heritage criteria
➢ Framework document and practice directions
Listing Processes

- Streamlining listing processes
- Clarifying the difference between 'character' and 'heritage'

Assessment Processes

- Scaling of assessment processes to complexity of application
- Demolition of local heritage places 'on merit'
- Providing a role for accredited heritage professionals
Observations

Local Heritage Discussion Paper
(released August 2018)

Independent Reference Group to guide:
- Community Reference Groups
- Expert Working Groups
- Public Forums
- Cost Analysis

Position Paper, with Consultation

Heritage Bill

Steps identified in the Local Heritage Discussion Paper

Additional process steps in line with the engagement charter

Observations

Comparison to the Expert Panel's Final Report

- The Local Heritage Discussion Paper only progresses some of the Expert Panel's recommendations

- The basis for not proceeding with other recommendations is unclear
Once in a generation opportunity to be involved in shaping a future system

Next Steps

- Council will consider on Tuesday, 27 September 2016 (Decision will be made available the following day)

- Submissions close: Friday, 7 October 2016
Available Resources

Adelaide City Council 'yoursay' website
  • http://yoursay.adelaidecitycouncil.com/SA-planning-and-heritage-system-changes

DPTI 'planning reform' website
  • http://www.dpti.sa.gov.au/planning/planning_reform

Local Government Association website
  • Search 'local heritage'
Welcome & Acknowledgement of Country

Natalie Fuller introduced the forum being presented by the Local Government Association of SA, and thanked Adelaide City Council for hosting.

Lord Mayor Martin Haese welcomed attendees and acknowledged the Minister for Planning John Rau and Shadow Minister Steven Griffiths, as well as those Mayors and Elected Members in attendance. The Lord Mayor opened the forum by introducing the main theme of the value of built heritage to communities, and affirmed that councils are open to process improvement.

LGA President Mayor Dave Burgess thanked the Lord Mayor and Adelaide City Council for hosting, and stressed the need for robust engagement before reform and the need to work together.

Approach to Heritage Reforms – Hon John Rau MP, Minister for Planning

The Minister outlined the thinking behind the Discussion Paper:

- A deliberate decision was made not to tackle the breadth of heritage reform proposed in the Expert Panel’s report so as to enable the new planning legislation to pass.

- Heritage is now being dealt with separately, and the current topic is local heritage only – not State or national. The Minister is not an advocate of getting rid of local heritage and is not looking to take anything away from local government.

- The Minister believes local heritage matters should be decided by an independent body, such as the Planning Commission, rather than political figures. However, this is open to change if feedback through public consultation seeks a significant political decision making role.

- There are problems that need to be considered and resolved:
  - Consistency across local councils: there should be a consistent definition for and approach to local heritage.
Heritage and character: heritage essentially is about individual structures, whereas character is a broader concept related to streetscapes or areas. These may, but do not necessarily, crossover or coexist.

- There is no settled position. The Discussion Paper is inviting conversation and the Minister looks forward to working with local government.

- The aspiration for the planning system is for areas of character to be protected from demolition of character buildings and their replacement with inappropriate development.

- In contrast to the significant interest to the Discussion Paper (which only seeks to propose potential areas for reform and is aimed to encourage discussion), the Minister noted the little to no public response to the addition of a plebiscite test to any proposed character zones under the new planning laws introduced by a Cross-Bench MP. The government sought to oppose this addition twice but was unsuccessful in doing so.

**Question:** How can you say it's not about taking away control from local government when the Discussion Paper has no role for local government?

Minister: It's a Discussion Paper only. Prefers independent body to make decisions – not of the view that local government should be taken out of the picture, but others such as property owners could be involved as well.

**Question:** If heritage/character were defined with clarity in the Discussion Paper, this would enable comment. Concerned that if clarity is not given, it could go straight to legislation.

Minister: The Discussion Paper is necessarily open ended and vague – it is intended to have lack of specificity to allow contributions to shape a future Bill. There will then be opportunity for further consultation on a future Bill.

**Question:** The Minister has said that this Paper has nothing to do with State heritage places but these are interrelated. The withdrawal of funding for heritage advisory services has had direct impact on local councils; and the impact of the State heritage grant funding, putting pressure on local councils to provide funds.

Minister: There is a relationship between the two – why should we have two different processes? Maybe there should be more harmonization. However, a conversation about State and local heritage at the same time would risk confusion.

**Question:** Why was this Discussion Paper formed? There is a huge disparity between the panel's expert planning advice and the Discussion Paper.

Minister: Welcomes any submissions with thoughts on the Discussion Paper. If people feel strongly about any particular aspect of the Expert Panel advice that they believe should be reflected in a future Bill, then please put forward those views in any submissions in response to the Discussion Paper.
The Value of Heritage to Tourism for Adelaide – Dr Jack Carlsen, Adjunct Professor, Curtin University

Dr Carlsen commended the consultative approach being taken for complex questions and presented on his work around the value of built heritage:

- Two categories of value: Use (monetary/utility) and Non-Use (intrinsic/non-monetary)
  - Use includes: heritage, research, rarity, tourism, economic, financial, and property values
  - Non-Use includes: cultural, aesthetic, option, bequest, existence, hierarchical, and environmental values

- Estimating the economic value of heritage:
  - Property value does not reflect full value of heritage, so non-market techniques are required to determine the value people place on heritage places.
  - Attribution and substitution methods assign a proportion of tourist expenditure to heritage.

- 2015 study for Adelaide City Council estimated an attribution value of $375m to $569m and a substitution value of $111m to $166m per annum.
  - Attribution value was calculated by estimating total visitor expenditure and using survey questions to explain visitors’ motivations, importance and activities related to heritage. 27% of tourism expenditure in Adelaide is attributable to heritage.
  - Substitution value was calculated using a scenario question: if these places didn’t exist, would you have stayed home? 8% of respondents would not have visited Adelaide.
  - These findings were cross-checked with existing tourism data, which found that 32% of visitors undertake cultural heritage activities.

- In order to sustain heritage we need to capture use and non-use values, and need to address the plurality of meanings of the terms cultural, heritage and value in relation to built heritage.

The Economic Value of Heritage to Cities – Donovan Rypkema, Principal of Place Economics

Donovan presented on the findings from studies over the last decade identifying the wide range of economic impacts of heritage conservation:

- Jobs: Heritage restoration is a labour-intensive and generates considerably more jobs and income per dollar output than other activities, including local jobs and high-end artisans.

- Savings: Restoring historic buildings sees significant savings in infrastructure investment (50-80%) and in waste going to landfill.

- City Centre Revitalisation almost always uses heritage resources. One study found a range of financial benefits including more private investment, tax generation, lower vacancy rates, etc.

- Economic growth: rather than people following jobs, young people are now going where there is lifestyle quality, and the jobs follow people. Heritage is an important component of quality of life.
  - One study showed 41 more instances of foreign direct investment in 29 “heritage cities” in Europe than in 29 comparable cities.

- Density: historic districts in Manhattan have approximately 30% higher density than modern residential skyscrapers being built as high-density to accommodate growth.
- Competitiveness: cities are now competing internationally and heritage contributes to civic identity
  - Historic cities attract creative classes, with evidence that historic districts in the US have proportionally higher percentage of creative jobs.
- Arts & Culture: There is a natural connection between arts/culture and historic buildings which are often used as venues for fine arts, contributing to the experience of museums, theatre, etc.
- Heritage buildings are often used for small, local businesses, food and wine businesses, and lend authenticity to local crafts and local products.
- Environment: Older buildings have lower energy usage even compared to energy efficient new buildings. It takes almost 80 years to make up for cost of a new build.
- Heritage tourism: Heritage visitors outspend visitors not visiting heritage.
- More information in the World Bank’s publication: The Economics of Uniqueness

Social and Cultural Value of Built Heritage – Duncan Marshall, ACT-based Heritage Consultant

Duncan presented on the social and cultural value of built heritage and the community’s attachment to heritage:

- A 2006 Productivity Commission Inquiry Report into conservation of historic places identified a range of “community benefits” including: the role of heritage places in identity, the contribution to streetscapes and neighbourhoods, and educational and tourism benefits. The study found people value having the option to visit heritage places, knowing heritage assets can be endowed to future generations, and value knowing that heritage places are conserved, whether or not they will visit.
- A 2005 survey found most people agree that heritage enriches their life, is part of Australia’s identity, and that it is important to protect heritage places. 80% of respondents agreed that “historic houses in my area are an important part of the area’s character and identity”.
- Communities do care for heritage, but this is not always obvious due to the wide range of issues that communities care about.
- The Burra Charter was adopted in 1979. It is a world-class guideline used as the basis for principles adopted elsewhere, such as in China.
- Heritage conservation tools include heritage criteria, thresholds, and thematic frameworks.
- Heritage and character require definition and this should be addressed by experts in the community to assist the reform process.
Panel Q&A – Duncan Marshall, Dr Jack Carlsen & Mayor David O’Loughlin

**Question:** Concern around potential loss of contributory items and their association with themes important to a historic zone. What is the panel’s view on this and the importance of establishing a theme?

- Duncan: Places either have heritage value or they don’t. Is another category of heritage protection needed, or can they captured by normal planning controls?

- Comment from the audience: Contributory items are a strange anomaly from the SA planning system. In 1993 councils were allowed to designate historic conservation zones but were not allowed to have too many local heritage places; so, within these areas there were local heritage places and contributory items.

- Mayor O’Loughlin: Local heritage is complex compared to State heritage listings. We need to get the process to be very clear – do we need four categories, or could we have just two?

- Dr Carlsen – Complexity is easy while simplicity and clarity can be hard to achieve. We need to draw upon world’s best practice in these areas.

**Question:** How can more recent heritage places be included, such as Basket Range style housing?

- Mayor O’Loughlin: If something has particular value importance, there is no reason it can’t be protected at very early stage. For example the SAHMRI building should maybe one day be listed. How do you audit that you have collected enough heritage to tell your story? If local government is the only driver of what will be listed – who is making sure we’re doing our job? Many councils haven’t reviewed their heritage registers in a long time.

**Question:** Gawler has many listings and many contributory items, and heritage and character are intertwined. What is the panel’s view on heritage v character?

- Duncan Marshall: The Minister was right in the sense that you can have heritage without character/ and vice versa. For example West Lakes has character and that may be valued by the people of that community, and the normal planning system should respond and protect that. It gets murky where character meets heritage. If you’re talking about character where related to local heritage, then it is related to heritage. Conservation areas are standard in jurisdictions across Australia. We don’t talk about just character – it’s about heritage character.

- Dr Carlsen: Heritage can only be inherited whereas character can be created. Perhaps character can be defined from considering what has no character.
• Mayor O'Loughlin: Using character as euphemism for heritage is problematic. Definitions are very important, and character should be defined in heritage terms.

Comment: Heritage is seen as a handbrake on economic prosperity, but heritage restoration sees more money spent on labour as compared to materials. There is inconsistency in heritage opinion and listings in a street. There’s a need for “4th tier demolition protection”.

• Dr Carl森: There's an argument in favour of job creation, but don't overlook the benefits of operating places (such as for tourism) once renovation complete. The Minister commented that private owners could initiate adjustments to heritage listing, but the value of block of land is often more than the market value of the building, it has a wide range of values to the community. It is important that community value is well recognized.

• Duncan Marshall: An independent alternative to Ministerial decisions is a good thing, but the question is, what expertise will be on the planning commission? If there is not a strong voice you can still get a poor outcome. There is a very broad range of views among heritage experts/consultants. Therefore need a layered process incorporating a range of views rather than coming back to a single expert without checks and balances.

• Mayor O’Loughlin: Maybe local government is not always the best arbiter. But where do we go to get a hearing? The State heritage system allows anyone to apply for listing, which is less cumbersome than the Development Plan Amendment process required for local heritage listing. This current process may help to free this up and allow other groups to initiate changes.

Question: The Discussion Paper mentions “over-representation”. What does this mean – only one representative of a class of building is needed and the rest are irrelevant?

• Duncan Marshall: The idea of representation arises in criteria for State listing. The use of criteria suggests you are being highly selective, but doesn’t suggest you’re trying to be comprehensive. The practical issue is the lack of resources heritage authorities have to make decisions, which leads to the need to prioritise. So, when there are a range of nominations, they may decide to put energy into places most under threat or not well-represented.

• Dr Carl森: Longer term thinking is required to achieve the outcomes desired, so any system has to be able to stand the test of time, beyond political terms.

Comment: Lives in a contributory dwelling in a historic conservation zone in Burnside. Residents value historic dwellings and the heritage character of the suburb. Listings and zoning prove no impediment to property value, and the heritage/character of the whole suburb is valued.

Comment: We do not know what will happen to contributory items. These are the building blocks in heritage conservation zones – what people value are collections of old buildings and not just individual buildings here and there. Contributory Items will not become local heritage places – if heritage conservation zones lose their status, the contributory items will lose demolition protection.

Question: My son is doing a trades-based course in heritage conservation – but while tradespeople are highly skilled, they are not asked about their knowledge. Concerned about Discussion Paper referring to demolition on merit – if something has been listed, there is no merit to demolition.

• Duncan Marshall: This needed more clarification. From discussions, understands that this is intended to deal with non-heritage aspects of heritage places (i.e. a 1960s extension).
Comment: Contributory item proposals are difficult to assess and perplexing to DA staff. If working without contributory items you have to be very specific in crafting the zoning policy, and there are ways of doing this without contributory items.

- Duncan Marshall: You can design the best system, but it will fall over without the right people, expertise, and sufficient resourcing.

- Mayor O'Loughlin: Do not to assume government is pro-heritage or that the Minister for Heritage sympathises. It's upon all of us to get the best system we can get and legislate safeguards. We have a rare opportunity and need to get involved in the current reform opportunity to help this happen.

Lord Mayor Martin Haese closed the forum with reflections on the economic value of heritage in Adelaide as well as its contribution to our identity, and once again highlighted the need to work together on heritage reform. The Lord Mayor invited people from communities throughout South Australia to the Heritage Community Forum on Monday 26 September.
THE VALUES OF BUILT HERITAGE

DR JACk CARlsen, ADJUNCT PROFESSOR CURTIN UNIVERSITY
DIRECTOR, TOURISM RESEARCH SERVICES
LGA HERITAGE PLANNING FORUM 21 SEPTEMBER 2016
ADELAIDE TOWN HALL

OVERVIEW

• Overview of values attributed to Built Heritage

• Estimating economic value

• Value of Cultural Heritage Tourism to Adelaide and Perth

• Sustaining the Values of Built Heritage
USE AND NON-USE VALUES OF BUILT HERITAGE

- USE/utility/monetary VALUES
  - Heritage values
  - Research values
  - Rarity values
  - Tourism values
  - Economic values
  - Financial values
  - Property values

- NON-USE/intrinsic/non-monetary VALUES
  - Cultural values
  - Aesthetic values
  - Option values
  - Bequest values
  - Existence values
  - Hierarchical values
  - Environmental values
  - Conservation values

ESTIMATING ECONOMIC VALUES

- Range of market and non-market techniques
- No actual 'market' for built heritage, apart from the property market
- Property value ≠ market value
- Need to use surrogate market methods to estimate value
- Contingent Valuation is based on 'what if' scenarios and Willingness to Pay (WTP)
- Travel Cost Method uses travel cost and time as a surrogate for the value of places
- Attribution and Substitution method attributes a proportion of tourist expenditure to a place or asset
ESTIMATING DIRECT ECONOMIC VALUE

- First applied to National Parks in 2004 then widely used across Australia.
- Used in valuing cultural heritage tourism in Albany and Fremantle in 2005 at $82.7mn and $27.5mn p.a. respectively.
- Used in 2008 to estimate the direct economic value of cultural tourism attributable to the City of Perth at $490.7mn p.a. and a substitution value of $31.8mn.
- Attribution value estimated at $375mn to $569mn and substitution value of $111 to $166mn p.a.

USING TOURISM SURVEY DATA TO MEASURE VALUE OF BUILT HERITAGE

- Estimate average trip expenditure per visitor of $512.
- Estimate average number of visitors at 2.722mn p.a.
- Estimate total direct visitor expenditure at $1.394bn p.a.
- Cultural heritage attribution factor based on survey of motivations, importance and activities associated with cultural heritage. Rated at 12%, 28% and 41% respectively.
- Triangulate these to arrive at an attribution factor of 27%.
- Scenario question estimated the proportion of visitor expenditure that is ‘retained’ in Adelaide, rather than another ‘substitute’ destination or activity at 8%.
- Could be considered as a component of the conservation value of built heritage.
CULTURE AND HERITAGE TOURISM DATA

- Based on Tourism Research Australia National and International Visitor Surveys
- Visitor profiles include activities grouped into:
  - Culture and heritage
  - Food and wine
  - Nature based
- Culture and Heritage Visitors
- City of Adelaide 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Daytrip</th>
<th>Average/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Visitors</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Visitors (000s)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Spend ($mm)</td>
<td>533.8</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>942.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CULTURE AND HERITAGE TOURISM IN ADELAIDE 2015

- Based on grouped cultural and heritage tourism activities, including festivals and events
  - 69% of international visitors (253K), 21% of domestic overnight visitors (500K) and 6% of daytrip visitors (237K) in 2015.
  - An average of 32% of all visitors to Adelaide undertake cultural heritage activities.
  - Almost one million cultural heritage visitors spending almost one billion dollars in 2015.
- Indicates the value of conserving and presenting cultural heritage for tourism
- Built heritage is an important setting for cultural heritage tourism activities
- Similarly, 25% of all visitors (1.77mn) took part in cultural heritage activities in Perth, spending just over $1.5 billion in 2015.
SUSTAINING THE VALUES OF BUILT HERITAGE

- Draw on the concepts of environmental economics to estimate Total Economic Value (TEV)
  \[ \text{TEV} = \text{Use} + \text{Non-use value} \]
- Review of literature provides some guidance on how to estimate use and non-use values and TEV
- Armitage (2011) provides some perspectives on the value of built heritage
- Draws on the national Heritage and Environmental legislation to define built heritage as ... "having aesthetic, historic, scientific or social significance, or other significance, for current and future generations of Australians"
- Identifies nine definitions of 'values' in relation to built heritage including... "worth, desirability, utility, one's principles or standards, one's judgement of what is valuable or important in life".

SUMMARY

- Need to address the plurality of meanings of the terms culture, heritage and value in relation to built heritage
- Need to work with property developers to assess the Total Economic Value of heritage properties
- We cannot measure the Total Economic Value of Built Heritage until we agree on a definition of built heritage and relevant and measurable values
- Environmental Economics and Sustainability literature provides a guide as to how to conceptualise the value of built heritage.
- Economic value realised through tourism is significant but the TEV is much more important to good decision-making in the future
- Use TEV to support policy and planning decisions informed by cost-benefit analysis that includes all costs as well as all benefits of conservation and/or renovation of built heritage
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Two Requirements to receive full economic benefit of heritage...

1. Thinking beyond the monument

2. Commitment to adaptive reuse
Heritage conservation contributes to the community

Directly

Indirectly

Functionally

By providing context

[Cultural Heritage] is being discovered by both governments and citizens as a means of improving economic performance, people's lives and living environments.

Getting cultural heritage to work for Europe


The economic benefits of cultural heritage have most commonly been seen in terms of tourism, but it is now also seen as an innovative stimulant for growth and employment in a wide range of traditional and new industries.
Labor Intensive Construction

In Georgia, $1,000,000 in output from Various Industries means......

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Salary &amp; Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Manufacturing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transportation</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Processing</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>$426,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>$616,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NORWAY

Historic Rehabilitation

16.5% more jobs than New Construction

The Riwaq Center – Palestine
Conservation Craftsmanship

In United Kingdom:

- Skills shortages
- New recruits not adequately prepared
- Insufficient numbers entering the field
- 80% of building professional consider shortage of architects and engineers severe
- Two-thirds of work on historic buildings carried out by those without right skills and materials
Work in the Decorative Arts

Suppliers and Producers
Infrastructure Savings

Preservation projects save 50 to 80 percent in infrastructure costs compared to new suburban development.
Landfill Savings

In US and Europe between 1/4 and 1/3 of material in landfills is construction debris
In China buildings are typically torn down after 30 years. China produced 2 Billion Tons of construction waste in 2011.

Center City Revitalization
The Sustainability of Urban Heritage Preservation

Valparaiso, Chile
Oaxaca, Mexico
Porto, Portugal
Syracuse, Italy
Medinas of Morocco
Alleppo, Syria
Edinburgh, UK
Verona, Italy
Quito, Ecuador
Salvador, Brazil
Veracruz, Mexico

Measures of Success

- Private investment
- New middle class residents
- Increasing property values
- More businesses
- Higher tax generation
- Better property maintenance
- Lower vacancy
Creation of Civic Identity/Competitiveness

Does Heritage Matter?
Research collaboration with Erasmus University in Rotterdam

1. If today jobs are following people, and
2. If people (especially young, knowledge workers) are choosing where to live based on Quality of Life factors, and
3. If heritage is a significant Quality of Life indicator, then
4. There ought to be more examples of Foreign Direct Investment in strong Heritage Cities
Research Approach

1. Identify European cities that are
   a) World Heritage Cities
   b) Belong to the Organization of World Heritage Cities (29)
2. Identify comparable cities accounting for other factors – size, human capital, density, etc. (190)
3. Compare instances of FDI with similar non-heritage cities

Between 2003 and 2013 Heritage Cities typically attracted 41 more instances of Direct Foreign Investment than the non-heritage Cities

Heritage cities attract more investments than non-heritage cities.
Density

104,750

9,718
Historic districts have the greatest density in every borough in Manhattan, with 144,835 people per square mile. Non-historic residential areas have 104,750 people per square mile, and skyscrapers have 80,739 people per square mile.

Population Density per Square Mile

- Bronx: Overall 20,000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 25,000, Historic Districts 17,000
- Brooklyn: Overall 25,000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 20,000, Historic Districts 22,000
- Manhattan: Overall 100,000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 60,000, Historic Districts 80,000
- Queens: Overall 15,000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 10,000, Historic Districts 12,000
- Staten Island: Overall 2000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 1500, Historic Districts 1000
- NYC: Overall 120,000, Non-HD Residential Permitted Areas 65,000, Historic Districts 70,000
Identity and Competitiveness require Differentiation

Venue for Exhibitions and Trade Shows
Venue for the Fine Arts

Venue for the Performing Arts
Arts Districts

Venue for Street Performers
Attraction for the Creative Class

% of Workforce in Arts/Entertainment/Recreation

- NORTH CAROLINA
- RALEIGH
- NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICTS
- RALEIGH LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

0.0%  1.0%  2.0%  3.0%  4.0%  5.0%
Jobs in Knowledge and Creative Industries
New York City

- Share of All Jobs: 8.0%
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services: 10.4%
- Information: 13.8%
- Educational Services: 14.0%
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation: 20.3%
Attraction for the Young

Heritage and Attachment to the City
Public Gathering Place for Families

Context for Active Street Life
Context for Passive Street Life

Context for Watching Street Life Go By
Counterpoint to Quality New Architecture

Strategy for Small Town Revitalization
Education venue for elementary school students

Education venue for high school students
Education Venue for University Education

Housing for the wealthy
Housing for Professional Class

Housing for Middle Class
Housing for the Working Class

Market Stabilization

HOUSE FOR SALE
open house
PRICE REDUCED
Will Sell for Food

LENDER FORECLOSURE
HOME AUCTION
OPEN HOUSE 10/13, 10/20, 10/21
1-888-575-REDC (7332)
www.USHomeAuction.com
Recent studies in 14 cities in the US

Foreclosure rate half in historic districts as compared to other neighborhoods

Venue for Local Markets
Location for small, neighborhood serving businesses

New York City Historic Districts as Job Attractors

- Young Firm Jobs: 10.9%
- Start-up Firm Jobs: 10.1%
- Small Firm Jobs: 9.9%
- Private Sector Jobs: 8.0%
- Lots: 3.4%
Location for specialty product businesses

Location for food and wine businesses
Location for Crafts Production

Context for the Informal Economy
Location for Luxury Goods Businesses

Context for 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Business and Transportation Center
Environmental Impact of Rehabilitating 50,000 s.f. Warehouse in Maryland

**The Environment**

- 20 – 40% reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs)
- Reduction of travel related CO₂ emissions by 92 – 123 Metric Tons
- CO₂ “saved” relative to suburban construction = 18,700 to 22,000 gallons of gasoline
- Embodied energy retained 55,000 MBTU
- Greenfield land preserved 5.2 acres
- Less construction debris in landfills 2500 Tons
- Infrastructure investment “saved” $500,000 to $800,000

---

**The Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median kBTU/sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1930</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1950</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1970</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1990</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1990</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking for the Greenest Building? Start with the one that already exists.

It takes 10 to 80 years of an energy efficient new building to make up for the negative climate change impacts of construction.

Building reuse almost always offers environmental savings over demolition and new construction.

A multifamily structure built since 1980 uses 13% more energy per square foot than one built before 1920.
Share of Heritage Visitors in San Antonio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overnight Visitors</th>
<th>Day Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Visitors</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Heritage Visitors</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Less than 7% of Heritage Tourism Dollars are spent at the Heritage Sites that attracted them.

And many, many more
Thank you very much

Donovan D. Rypkema
Heritage Strategies International
Drypkema@HS-Intl.com
www.HS-Intl.com

Social and Cultural value of Built Heritage to Communities

Duncan Marshall
2016
Productivity Commission 2006 – community benefits

- The role of the historic heritage place in defining the cultural identity of a community
- Contribution to the preservation of community heritage
- Contribution to historic streetscape, neighbourhoods etc
- Educational benefits
- Spillover benefits from tourism

Productivity Commission 2006 – community benefits

- Option values — the value to community members of having the option to visit the historic heritage place in the future
- Bequest values — the value associated with the knowledge that the heritage asset can be endowed to future generations
- Existence values — the benefits gained from knowing that the historic heritage place has been conserved, irrespective of whether the community member enjoying the benefit actually visits it
Allen Consulting Group – 2005 survey

- **Looking after heritage is important in creating jobs and boosting the economy** – 56% of people strongly agreed or agreed with the statement
- **My life is richer for having the opportunity to visit or see heritage** – 78% strongly agreed or agreed
- **It is important to protect heritage places even though I may never visit them** – 93% strongly agreed or agreed
Allen Consulting Group – 2005 survey

• Heritage is part of Australia’s identity – 92% strongly agreed or agreed
• The historic houses in my area are an important part of the area’s character and identity – 80% strongly agreed or agreed
• It is important to educate children about heritage – 96% strongly agreed or agreed
Heritage criteria

Examples for State heritage places in South Australia...

• demonstrate important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the state’s history

• have rare, uncommon or endangered qualities that are of cultural significance

• demonstrate a high degree of creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment or is an outstanding representative of particular construction techniques or design characteristics