

**Submission
No 160**

INQUIRY INTO REVIEW OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977

Name: Mrs Christine Newton

Date Received: 26 June 2021

Heritage is “not a burden” but a vital part of our growth. Adaptive reuse is easy for an innovative mind, unfortunately this is not encouraged in NSW. Great world cities have achieved interesting and thought provoking buildings incorporating the heritage. British museum that built around their old façade!

Q6: Land Tax exemption

Q9: This is already accommodated but not policed so irrelevant.

Q10: Yes, greater community input would give you a robust register but that is not what this government wants. Refer to a trusted body like the National Trust.

Heritage is Respect

Heritage is warm and has a spirit.

Heritage Council

Council already does a good job, already has indigenous affairs in account, the objectives are very relevant.

Unfortunately this Government want to be able to demolish or ‘remove and store’ heritage, so rules should be stronger especially for state owned properties that are held in trust for the people of Australia.

Owner Incentives

Government should make it known that heritage items can not be demolished regardless of their state of disrepair. If they are demolished severe penalties would be placed on the owner eg. Ban on development of the block for 20 years.

Developing a heritage site does not mean leaving just the façade.

Taxation exemptions may be a better tool but mainly Federal responsibility.

Q8/9: If you categorize the heritage, you lose control and you will be in the courts continually with developers fighting for a lower class. This will destroy heritage.

Q11: **Streamlining** would kill the SHR.

It takes a lot of work and money to prove that a building deserves protection. If you had to review constantly you would kill the list and every heritage item would be on the developer’s radar.

Delete this idea!!!

Q12&13: Rules that are in place are appropriate.

Q14&15: Building rules change all the time and Heritage buildings should be treated differently with more of a ‘common sense’ attitude eg. Sometimes lifts can be outside and have ramps to relevant floors.

Q16: Demolition by neglect seem to be the new developer tool. Property becomes too costly to repair therefore losing its status with rotting beams or stolen fireplaces. This should be stamped out by a 20 years ban on development.

Q17: History at school and free tours of historical sites eg the 'Open Sydney' event, run by the Sydney Living Museums is a great way of seeing new , restored, repurposed buildings that provokes imagination and innovative design.

Q18: All towns in NSW already repurpose their buildings and manage the history well. Mainly because the local council and the community respects their heritage and therefore tourists love to stay in old hotels or converted shearing sheds!

It's our city that has the developer mentality and this is what is changing our city from interesting to wind swept uninteresting, dark spaces.

The Glebe Island Bridge should be restored by the NSW government and could be just as viable as the Pyrmont Bridge. The problem seems to be lack of interest on the government's part. The community have been asking for this for years but the NSW government chooses not to listen.

Now the NSW government want to change the restrictions to this Heritage Act to allow the destruction of more heritage.

Leave the Heritage Act alone.