

Submission
No 238

INQUIRY INTO REVIEW OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 28 June 2021

Partially
Confidential

Submission to NSW Heritage Act review

Review of NSW heritage legislation - discussion paper

Much of the terminology used in this document is a worry

A few thoughts as bullet points

- Reference to keeping exteriors and modifying interiors - used to be known as 'facade-ism' and can neuter a building. A fine example of where this has not been allowed to happen is Quarantine Station at North Head which has maintained the original 1930s toilets and wash basins- an example of past technology and washing in the past.
- The proposed new 'nuanced' categories of state heritage significance already seem to suggest bias toward heritage being an impediment.
- The use of terms such as 'Making heritage easier' For whom? Those who prize heritage in its unaltered context, or those who would like to tidy it up or surround it?

Category 1 refers to 'iconic' national and world heritage significance tourist attractions, but simple unspoiled rural cottages may make an area as attractive for tourism, as seeing the Sydney Harbour Bridge.

Category 2 refers to complex sites like farms which would have 'tailored conditions so as not to be impacted by heritage listing'.

a working farm would be treated differently from a 'standard item such as a railway station'.

Category 3 It is unclear why a railway station and the whole of category 3 are considered 'standard'. Assessment is not comparing apples with apples. What does this really mean – less careful planning/ easier demolition?

Category 4 for local heritage is maintaining the existing classifications. As I historian I have used these in several projects to assess the significance of library collections, buildings, museum collections and house museums. I find coupled with national significance categories they provide a wide range of descriptive terms. We need these to better understand each object, place, or site, or building that is being reviewed.

All examples in this document tend to focus on tangible significance and buildings, which ignores the two important existing categories *spiritual* and *social significance*.. Ask someone about the significance of a national park or waterway much of the reply will focus on these two areas. eg what is Willow Grove without its original setting, when it is set down somewhere else - a heritage toy, really

In reference to **Aboriginal heritage** the aftermath of the destruction of Juukan Gorge has unearthed the need for better practice and understanding. Guidelines can be drawn from the review of this pillage.

Involve Aboriginal people, ask them how they view their heritage and how they wish to see it managed. This is rarely done.