

1. Mr Sean Macken, in your submission, you state that we should not remove the heritage protections afforded by the Act but at the same time allow it to be flexible. Can you elaborate on how you see this happy medium being achieved?

The Committee's view is that, while we need to have robust protections for our states' heritage items, these protections should not preclude these items playing an ongoing role in the life of our city. That our protections should not prevent our heritage items, places and buildings reflecting or adapting to societal change. For example, we see no issue in allowing the heritage listed State Library of NSW to also be used as a film set or to house a café or bar. Likewise, the repurposing the St Patrick's Seminary at Manly as a private college was successful in ensuring that precinct's heritage is maintained for future generations even though this was not its historic purpose.

The Committee is worried that, in some cases, heritage protections have sterilised places and buildings from having any economic, cultural, or social function. That many items listed on the State Heritage register have been vacant or unused for many years.

This concern is covered by the first policy principle for the reform of the Heritage Act in our submission:

*1. The State's significant heritage should be conserved and protected. However, Heritage listing should not sterilise a place, thing, or building from life and activity nor deprive it of an economic, social, or cultural purpose. It is not a museum piece. A thing to be preserved in aspic or behind a glass pane, but something to be celebrated, respectfully acknowledged, cherished, and enjoyed.*

- *Heritage buildings are better with people in them. They are better when they can be easily accessed by all.*
- *Heritage landscapes are better with people in them and are loved and enjoyed by all.*
- *Heritage and community values change over time and our conservation practice should reflect and support these changes.*