

**Submission  
No 14**

## **INQUIRY INTO REVIEW OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977**

**Organisation:** Canterbury Bankstown Council

**Date Received:** 22 June 2021

---



22 June 2021

Standing Committee on Social Issues  
Parliament House  
6 Macquarie Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

**NSW Heritage Act Review–  
Canterbury Bankstown Council Submission**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NSW Heritage Act Review.

In-principle, Council supports the need to review and reform the Heritage Act 1977. However this should not occur at the expense of proper identification and development outcomes for State heritage items.

In considering the Discussion Paper, Council raises the following issues:

**Issue 1: Guiding themes to underpin the review**

The Discussion Paper discusses three themes:

- Making heritage easy
- Putting heritage to work
- Making heritage relevant.

Council proposes that the first theme would more meaningfully read 'Making heritage easier'. It is not always easy to achieve desirable heritage outcomes, and changes to make the system more straightforward should not be at the expense of this. However, the system can be made easier and Council is supportive of appropriate reforms.

In regard to 'Putting heritage to work', the Discussion Paper assumes that State heritage listings may stifle the adaptive use of buildings. It would be instructive to know the percentage of State heritage items that are in disuse or underused due to the heritage listings to know the extent of this issue.

In relation to the third theme, heritage is currently relevant to many people. This theme would be in the view of Council better worded to read 'Making heritage more relevant'.



## **Issue 2: Objectives of the Heritage Act**

Council supports the proposal to expand the objectives of the Heritage Act to include community participation in all aspects of the State heritage system, including strategic issues.

## **Issue 3: Heritage Incentives**

Council supports the need to increase financial incentives, and this should include supporting organisations that promote heritage such as the National Trust. Where incentives such as grant funding are available, greater awareness of these incentives should occur including notifying owners (such as Council does for its local heritage grants).

However, transferrable floor space schemes are of limited effectiveness in an area like Canterbury Bankstown where most State heritage items are infrastructure related or in residential areas.

## **Issue 4: Proposed NSW Heritage Listing Categories**

Council supports the proposal to create four NSW heritage listing categories as it is appropriate to individually recognise the importance of items of exceptional/iconic value, and heritage landscapes.

## **Issue 5: Simplification of the approvals process**

The Discussion Paper identifies the need to simplify the approvals process for State heritage items, however it does not provide details as to how this may occur. While a less complex process may be required, this should not result in watering down the assessment and listing process for State heritage items.

## **Issue 6: Interim Heritage Orders**

Development exemptions for properties covered by an Interim Heritage Order are currently covered by the NSW Heritage Office exemptions.

It is considered that properties that are of local significance should instead be covered by the minor works provision under clause 5.10 of the Standard Instrument Local Environmental Plan, which currently applies to locally listed heritage items. This change will result in greater consistency and ease of assessment for Council and property owners.



If you have any enquiries, please contact Council officer Allan Shooter

Yours sincerely,

**Mitchell Noble**  
**Manager Spatial Planning**