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Abstract: Cultural heritage management is, in essence, a facet of social engineering, whereby physical remains of the past (and present) are selectively preserved based on values currently held by the population at large. Indeed, mid- and long-term protection of heritage sites can only occur if such places are “embraced” or “owned” by the community. However, public opinion, often colored by nostalgia, omits, consciously or unconsciously, places that do not fit the present value system. Thus, inevitably, there are places that need to be preserved that are identified by expert opinion, even if a community is apathetic or even antagonistic. Such differences of opinion allow conflicts to occur. Local planning and the implementation of planning priorities are inevitably caught up in it. The political dimension at the Local Government Authority (LGA) level further complicates matters, particularly as we move from one heritage to a multitude of “heritages.”

Over the past decade, the management of cultural heritage sites at the local government level has seen the decline of top-down, expert-driven studies, while bottom-up, community-driven, or at least community influenced, studies have increased. Both approaches have their failings and lead to gaps in the record. Furthermore, all too often heritage plans are limited. Great effort is expended focusing on the historic trends and themes of an area and on inventorying, evaluating and listing places deemed worth protecting. Yet, next to no effort is spent on implementation strategies, ranging from capacity building within the administering local government to education of property owners, wider stakeholders, public residents in the LGA and outside visitors.

This paper discusses the pitfalls inherent in the various planning approaches and outlines strategies for LGA-level planning and management to maximize returns from heritage planning projects.

Introduction

What is cultural heritage? Paraphrasing the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1999), cultural heritage is a collective set of places valued by a community, which enrich people’s lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and personal experiences. Therefore, cultural heritage management is, in essence, a facet of social management, whereby physical remains of the past (and present) are selectively preserved, thereby reflecting the values currently held by the community at large. In theory, these remains are identified and assessed by a range of practitioners in collaboration and consultation with the affected community.

Community involvement in the process has long been recognized as crucial because mid- and long-term protection of heritage places can only occur if such places are “embraced” or “owned” by the community. It is the level and nature of community involvement in that process, however, that causes problems for heritage planners. As always, there are two diametrically opposed solutions: top-down, expert-driven approaches, and bottom-up, community-driven studies. An expert-driven approach tends to underestimate places important to the community, favoring (types of) places the expert(s) are comfortable working with, while a community-driven approach tends to favor “popular” places and overlooks or even actively ignores places that do not fit the community mould. As the title suggests, both cause problems for the other side and the Local Government Authority (LGA) is forced to deal with it in day-to-day management.

In the following, we will discuss some aspects of expert versus community approaches and will outline the inherent pitfalls. We will then address issues of evaluation, in particular, the mutability of heritage values ascribed to places, and look at processes of how to deal with places that are not yet, but could be identified as significant. In the final part of the paper, we will look at some key aspects that are lacking in lo-
cal heritage management plans and outline how future plans could be shaped.

**Traditional Expert-Driven Approaches**

The historic foundation of the heritage movement in Australia was rooted in the interests of archaeologists, architects and historians, who sought to preserve parts of Australia’s heritage for future generations, for archival and demonstration purposes, or for reasons of future scientific investigations (Davison 1991; Smith 1996). Not surprisingly, then, heritage studies were traditionally carried out by a team of experts drawn from these disciplines. A study of 72 heritage studies completed between 1992 and 1999 by NSW LGAs showed that 33.9% of all authors and co-authors of heritage plans were architects, 19.7% were historians and 18.5% were archaeologists (Canning, Spennemann 2001). The standard heritage study of the 1970s and 1980s would see a small team of specialists descend upon a community and study its history as reflected in its architectural presence. Places were selected for protection based on historic relevance, architectural importance and aesthetic appeal. Consultation tended to be limited to people seen as knowledgeable in the history of the area and vociferous stakeholder groups, such as the historical societies.

During the 1970s and 1980s, there was little doubt that experts were afforded the authority to pontificate on matters within their purview. After all, they had studied the subject matter and were thus qualified to comment, while the average citizen as layperson was not. Increased levels of tertiary education, coupled with an increasing environmental consciousness and an increased level of community involvement in other land management issues (e.g., LandCare), saw the wider community assert its authority to speak on matters of cultural heritage. After all, it was their past and their identity that was being decided upon. In that regard, the empowerment of Indigenous Australians to increasingly influence the destiny of their own heritage cannot be underrated as a stimulus.

**Community Studies**

During the 1990s, attempts were made to widen the involvement of the community in decision-making processes. The role of the heritage planner has increasingly been reduced to that of a facilitator, conducting community workshops and juggling the various outcomes with the opinions of specialists in the fields of archaeology and history.

Even though such approaches are community-focused and, on occasion, community-driven, the authority commissioning the plan influences the plan’s outcome through the phrasing of the terms of reference (including stipulating who should be regarded as a stakeholder) and through the level of funding allocated to conduct the study, which directly translates into the amount of time consultants can spend on the matter. Such time constraints tend to confine any detailed analysis of values that can be carried out, given competing requirements of survey, historical analysis and developing management prescriptions. As a direct result, much assessment is still based on consultations with individual community members who are deemed knowledgeable (Pockock 2002) and, from the perspective of the “veracity” of information, reliable as well.

Modern heritage management plan development, still controlled by an expert as facilitator, draws on a small group of stakeholders through formal responses to draft documents, through direct one-to-one consultations with individuals or groups, through selected focus groups or through more openly structured community workshops. Large-scale community meetings can also be held.

Community-driven or community-controlled heritage studies, such as those developed in NSW (NSW Heritage 2001c), place community members in control, who select heritage places deemed worthy of preservation, assisted by a project manager and historic theme studies compiled by a professional historian. In the NSW scenario, sites outside the predefined historic thematic framework are prone to being overlooked, either consciously or unconsciously (assumed to be outside the parameters) unless the lay committee is prepared to argue the case.

Unless the commissioning authority specifically requests the inclusion (or exclusion) of specific stakeholders, the stakeholder selection will be driven by individual responses to public advertisements and calls for expression of interest. This means that self-nomination is encouraged, which will cause the process to be dominated by self-interest groups, who may not be representative of the population at large. Historical societies are usually included as key stakeholders in any heritage identification process, but considering both the age structure and ethnicity of most historical societies, these are
Heritage and cultural values are inherently a personal matter – with values varying in nature and level of conviction from one individual to another (see below). Even though the composition of focus groups, community reference panels and the like is meant to be representative of the views of the stakeholders as a whole, they ultimately reflect only the values of the participating individuals. While these values may be largely or even overwhelmingly congruent with the values of the stakeholder segment these people are meant to present, there will inevitably be divergence of values at the margins. It is this divergence that will affect the inclusion or exclusion of sites that do not have widespread and universally acknowledged community significance.

All such approaches have their own problems derived from the group dynamics. Vociferous individuals may hold sway, while at the same time the group may defer to real or imagined experts in their midst. The facilitators of the planning process need to be well able to control this, without imposing their own ideology on the outcome.

**Problems with Site Identification**

Despite a plethora of current approaches, places worthy of heritage protection are slipping through the net. This is, in part, due to the mesh size used, i.e., the criteria applied for the eligibility test as well as the interpretation of these criteria. But, to stay with the analogy of fishing, often an entirely different method is needed to catch other kinds of fish: while the nets of focus groups and guided survey questions allow us to query in-depth views about heritage, they can, in fact, limit the range of places mentioned, simply by restricting the view of participants as to what does and what does not constitute a heritage item.

An alternative approach is to have the general public nominate heritage sites of importance. This can be carried out by sending open-ended anonymous questionnaires to all households (cf. Harris 1995; Spennemann, Harris 1996; Spennemann et al. 2001), or by drawing a representative random sample from the electoral rolls (Savage 2001). The differences between “normal” community studies and such general approaches are striking.

The dichotomy between natural heritage and cultural heritage, which is so deeply ingrained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>3 3 3 1 3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>21 1 9 2 1 4 29 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Culture</td>
<td>9 4 6 15 5 5 3 28 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>7 4 7 4 5 6 5 12 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td>2 5 1 1 6 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1 1 7 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Activities</td>
<td>2 2 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, Bridges &amp; Dams</td>
<td>1 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Life &amp; Culture</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Industry</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers &amp; Waterways</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43 17 19 36 15 16 19 91 155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: Expt = expert-driven study; Mail = anonymous questionnaire mailing; Wshp = community workshop-driven study.

in the institutional structures and staff of many non-indigenous conservation agencies, has little meaning to the general public when asked to nominate places of heritage value. Indeed, the most frequently mentioned places in open-ended anonymous community surveys were natural heritage items to which the community had a social attachment (cf. Harris 1995; Spennemann et al. 2000; Savage 2001). The key problem is to sort out whether these are true heritage sites with cultural and social values attributed to them or whether these are places with a high community amenity value. Savage (2001) conducted a heritage assessment in the Shire of Esk southwest of Brisbane, and compared the results of previous expert-driven as well as community workshop-based heritage studies with those using open-ended anonymous questionnaires (see Table 1). Both the range of site types and the overall number of sites proposed is much greater. The latter method provides a more accurate reflection of a community’s heritage as it also captures members of the “silent majority,” who for various reasons would not attend workshops or public meetings about heritage, but who too are taxpayers and who have a stake in the LGA’s heritage management strategy.

Risks Associated with Relying Solely on Community Viewpoints

However, granting every community the right to self-determine the future manifestation of its own heritage poses potential problems. In particular, the past is likely to be glorified—with nostalgia dominating (Bickford 1981; Lowenthal 1985), while dissonant heritage sites will simply disappear in a climate of political streamlining to a contemporary ideal (Spennemann 1992; Tunbridge, Ashworth 1996). It takes courage to preserve and manage sites whose presence may cause community anguish (Hollow, Spennemann 2001; Hollow 2002).

Thus, there remains a role for the expert who, with the benefit of helicopter-vision, can provide input into the planning process. However, the ethical conundrum remains as to what extent the expert should exert his or her expert status to provide an alternative (or amended view).

Example: Albury NSW

Albury, NSW, can serve as an example of the transition from an expert-driven type of study to a community-driven type. The local historical society conducted a brief listing of buildings in 1975, paying particular attention to architecturally and aesthetically significant buildings. This list was transitioned without much change into a National Trust Listing (Latona 1976), A Central Albury Heritage Study was developed, drawing on the extant data set as the basis (Collean, O’Dwyer 1990), which the 1993 Main Street Study continued (Freeman, Collette, Fransen 1993). The foci of all these studies of Albury’s heritage, particularly the subset of the central business district, was on architecturally or historical important buildings. Heritage more recent than the 1920s was largely ignored, as were more “mundane” places, such as transportation sites, apart from the obvious, such as the Albury Railway Station.

In 2003, Albury City commissioned a community heritage study that was developed drawing on the NSW Heritage Office’s “Guidelines for Community-Based Heritage Studies” (NSW Heritage 2001c). This study, which is still in draft form (Albury City 2003), drew on a series of local historical themes which had already been critically appraised (Durrant 1996), and which were a subset of the broad historical themes identified by the Australian Heritage Commission (2001) and of those identified by NSW Heritage (2001). This study brought out a wide range of places that had so far been overlooked, particularly with respect to the post-World War II immigrant experience. While new sites were added, no recommendations were made to critically appraise the sites that had been previously identified.

While the community-based study was a welcome addition, it too had serious shortcomings as significant structures were overlooked, although they related to the theme of transportation and to Albury as a rural service centre. During heritage assessments in preparation for the development of a new museum and library complex, two structures were identified which, albeit modified over time, represented unique examples. One is the only known large stable and coach terminal of the regional coach company, Crawford & Co., which had interstate (the inter-colonial) importance and which should have state significance (Spennemann 2003d); the other is Albury’s first purpose-built motor garage (1913) where the first proprietors also built a monoplane, one of the extremely few Australian-built planes of that era known to have actually flown (Spennemann 2003c). As the structures were not included in the previous heritage studies, and had not been flagged in
the community study either, development approval for demolition was given by the council.

Why were these two items never identified until in-depth research was carried out immediately prior to development approval? There are four reasons, one of age, and three of unconscious attitudes. At the time the first heritage studies were carried out by the National Trust, these structures were in use as motor garages, with rendered facades and enlarged windows for showrooms that masked their architectural significance. Secondly, at the time of the community study, the structures, in their current state with modern metal siding, parapets and cantilevered verandas did look modern and were also visually decidedly unappealing. Thirdly, any nostalgic appeal by the widest stretch of imagination is further undermined by the previous function of the buildings, motor garages and service centres – such utility structures are generally not recognized by the general public, unless public education (or manipulation?) as to their value has occurred. And finally, the age composition of those present at the community consultation is such that the period of significance pre-dates their own life experience.

**Problems in Evaluation**

The heritage legislation of Australian states requires the evaluation of the cultural significance of identified properties based on four main values: aesthetic value, historical value, scientific value and social value – with individual states using variations of these four. These have been taken from the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, which was originally developed in 1979 and which has since been revised (in 1981, 1988 and 1999) (Marquis-Kyle & Walker 1992; Australia ICOMOS 1999). At the time the Burra Charter was conceptualized, the expert and, usually, his opinion held sway. What constituted aesthetic, historical, or scientific value was more or less universally understood, with some interpretation around the edges. Indeed, in 1990, it was asserted that the determination of cultural heritage significance was a simple process (Kerr 1990).

The inclusion of social value was a recognition that there might be places that are imbued with values relative to a community or held by the community outside the normal expert opinion. How to assess this kind of value was not fully investigated until Chris Johnson’s study of 1992 (Johnson 1992). This occurred about the same time as an increased empowerment of Indigenous Australians in the evaluation and management of their own heritage (Jonas 1991), which opened the door for other numerically small ethnic sections of the Australian community to have similar rights to self-determination of their cultural identity and its manifestation in the environment. As argued by Lockwood and Spennemann (2001), this raises the issue of the “Balkanization” or fractionation of heritage. In the ultimate reduction, this will create a plethora of spatially local, culturally ethnic and possibly even spiritually diverse heritages. In this regard, heritage management firmly enters the arena of the debate on the relative merits of assimilation and multiculturalism.

Several ethnic/migrant studies have been developed on a state level (cf. Turnbull, Valitis 2001; Pesman, Kevin 1999; Williams 1999), mainly drawing on specialist studies and community workshops (Anon. 1999). Similar attempts at the LGA level, if carried out by the council and outside consultants governed by short timeframes, are poised to be met with distrust by some ethnic communities, and by questions as to whether the elected representatives and spokespeople for these communities can in fact represent them on heritage matters (Canning, Spennemann 1999; Canning, Spennemann 2001). While ethnic-specific studies increase the risk of fractionation, avoiding such studies reinforces cultural domination. Policy decisions for affirmative action disfavoring competing Anglo-Celtic interests for a set timeframe, for example, have been publicly argued for in other contexts (Spennemann 1993). An LGA Heritage Plan in the true sense can, in fact, quite easily accommodate such temporary shifts in emphasis.

Despite the fractionation of “the” Australian heritage into a series of “heritages” and despite the realization that, ultimately, aesthetic, historical and scientific value are not independent values but are contingent on the social value concepts held by contemporary society (Byrne et al 2001) or sections thereof, social value has remained a somewhat nebulous concept. A content analysis of all Heritage Management Plans written for NSW LGAs between 1992 and 1999 (n=72), for example, showed that social value considerations were negligible (Canning, Spennemann 2001). Less than one percent of the pages dedicated to the assessment of cultural values in these studies dealt with social values, compared to almost half dealing with historic value. The underlying problem appeared to be the background of the heritage planners, mainly architects, who lack anthropological training (Canning, Spennemann 2001; see also Pocock...
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determined culturally significant – and hence suf-
ficiently valuable to warrant protection. Clear-
decision as to what is, and what is not
demonstrated as being of heritage significance for pro-
tected sites exist throughout Australia and their
application has become a routine matter. How-
ever, there are cases where items are not (yet)
heritage listed, but might be eligible for inclu-
ding the listing of places where an inclusion is very
much valid.

Mutability of Values

Objects, places and resources have no instrin-
sic value per se. Individuals project value onto
an object, place or resource based on their own
needs and desires and shaped by their current
social, cultural and economic circumstances,
which in turn are informed, and to a degree pre-
disposed, by an individual’s personal history of
experiences, upbringing and ideological forma-
tion. In non-Indigenous as well as non-Funda-
mentalist social environments, values tend not
to be absolute, with individuals holding differ-
ent values with varying strengths of conviction.
Subjective valuation, revaluation and ultimate-
ly prioritisation occur consciously and uncon-
sciously on a continual basis. If a choice has
to be made, individuals tend to be prepared
to “trade-off” one value against another. These
decisions will change with individual circum-
stances and are subject to change over time
(Lockwood, Spennemann 2001).

This fluidity of projected values, both on an
individual and a collective level, with continu-
ously shifting ground rules, needs to be ac-
knowledged in planning documents. This does
not occur. LGA heritage plans seem to treat
evaluation and listing as a finite outcome, with
final decisions as to what is, and what is not
depended culturally significant – and hence suf-
ciently valuable to warrant protection. Clear-
ly, values are mutable and heritage sites that
can be evaluated as insignificant today may be
regarded as significant tomorrow. Much more
problematic is the concern that the vast majority of
properties were never evaluated as they were
never identified in the first place.

At the same time, the very fact of listing indi-
vidual places as significant, and affording them
protection through this action, solidifies, even
enshines, the values of those making the deci-
sion at that time. One aspect that has not been
given sufficient attention is the grandfathering
of existing heritage listings, without consider-

The assessment of cultural heritage is to be assessed, both in relation to the structure to be developed and in relation to adjacent or nearby structures. All too often, it is forgotten that an individual development of a structure, which may be deemed insignificant by itself, can adversely impact a streetscape and adjacent significant structures. The implementation of such policies can be done in-house by the approving officer based on a set of criteria, including critical indicators and threshold, which would automatically trigger a specialist assessment either in-house by the LGA’s heritage officer, or through outside expert advice. The State Acts provide mechanisms for the temporary protection of places until such an assessment has been carried out.

**A Disaster Waiting to Happen**

As outlined above, local heritage plans tend to conform to the minimum standards required. While the identification of properties allows for their legal protection, the earlier mentioned shortcomings notwithstanding, very few plans go beyond suggesting some sort of legal and administrative management regime. Strategic planning is only very rarely included.

Australia is a continent where, given time and “opportunity,” a natural disaster is likely to happen at any given location. Bush fires and floods are most prominent in people’s minds, but wind storms, localized cloud bursts, and hail storms, cyclones, and earthquakes can occur. Given that, in many instances, it is not a question of whether such an event will occur, but when, it is imperative that these matters be taken into consideration when planning the management of an LGA’s heritage. After all, much of the “normal” decay of heritage properties by way of termites, rot and rising damp, and even inappropriate actions by owners, is of such slow onset that it pales in significance before the potential sudden and widespread destruction of heritage properties following a natural disaster, either caused by the disaster itself or by the rash actions of disaster managers following the event (Spennemann 1999).

Does appropriate planning occur? Unfortunately, it is the great exception. A survey of all Heritage Management Plans written for Victorian LGAs between 1985 and 2002 showed that not one of the 99 studies assessed made any high-level reference to natural hazards or their impact (Spennemann 2003b). The studies concentrated on the identification of the physical description of identified properties as well as the assessment of cultural significance. The only management-related issues addressed were planning controls and guidelines for property maintenance.

The same occurs when considering the management of individual properties. While reams of paper have been printed dealing with the conservation of structures, very little time, thought and effort has been expended considering the impact and management of natural hazards. A survey of Conservation Management Plans written for places on the Victorian Heritage Register between 1997 and 2002 showed that less than 10% made any reference to natural hazards or their impact (9.2%; n = 98; Spennemann 2003a). The same applies to the Conservation Management Plans written in New South Wales during the same time period (6.1%; n = 58; Spennemann 2003c). Where discussion occurred, it was often boiler-plate material and insufficient. No specialized disaster plans were considered.

Overall, this is not very surprising. A study of the attitudes of NSW heritage officers and disaster managers (Rural Fire Service, State Emergency Service) found that there are attitudinal barriers among heritage managers in recognizing that disasters pose a threat to heritage sites, as well as barriers among disaster managers in recognizing that cultural heritage items are valuable and require special attention (Graham 2002; Graham, Spennemann: in press). Heritage managers too occupied in thinking about day-to-day problems tended to view natural disasters as a threat that might never eventuate, while disaster managers, influenced by their own personal value concepts in relation to heritage, see heritage as less important than life (no argument there) and personal property. Yet at the same time, heritage places are important markers in community and individual lives (cf. Cuba & Hummon 1993; Manzo 2003), and it is the post-disaster presence of such familiar places and environments that allows communities to rebound from natural disaster events (Fried 2000; Katz et al. 2003). Ideally, heritage sites should be regarded as “critical infrastructure” in disaster management activities. If the nexus between heritage and natural disaster impact is not included in heritage plans, how can we expect to be included in disaster planning?

**Conflict of Interest**

While the LGA is the watchdog for heritage matters at the local level, heritage concerns about development applications, as expressed
by council staff, are frequently overridden at the final approval stage, when the ideological views of individual councillors come to the fore. Every single council has individuals who are leaning more toward the development side and those who lean more toward the conservation side of decisions. It is implicitly assumed that in such matters the councillors reflect the will of the citizens who voted for them during the last council elections, and that the composition of the councillors reflects public opinion. Local government rules require individual councillors to declare potential conflict of interest in the approval of development applications – a requirement which is being followed with a certain degree of interpretation.

A serious conflict of interest, however, occurs where the council itself is the applicant, developer and consenting authority. With the LGA as the approval authority for local heritage, decisions can and are being made that see the destruction of heritage places that are included on local heritage lists, and, in particular, places that are not on local lists, but are eligible for inclusion in such lists. It can be posited that the eligibility would have been tested if the development application had come from an outside source. Council as developers, however, have no incentive to investigate potentially adverse options. At present, there is no mechanism in place that defers such council self-interest decisions to a higher authority. Instead, frequently an outside consultant is sought to comment on the proposal. Yet again, the choice of consultant will predetermine the outcome to a large degree. In cases of unlisted items, for example, there is no requirement for a consultant to address heritage issues. Consequently, proactive protection will not occur.

**A Way Out**

Given all these issues and problems, where do we go from here? Councils need to accept the notion that any Local Heritage Management Plan is just that – a plan. Because it forms part of an overall planning process, it is not a final document of infinite validity, but a document with a finite life, which, moreover, will have to be reviewed over its duration. Local Heritage Management Plans need to take the word “management” seriously and need to take a much more proactive stance. This implies that the LGA should receive a document that does more than merely identify and list properties for inclusion in the protective regimes, with a few comments on management strategies for these sites “tacked” on.

The plan needs to consider the shortcomings in the knowledge base and identify remedial actions in the form of further studies, research and assessments. The plan needs to address the history of urban expansion and urban renewal and needs to provide predictive models on how these trends are likely to impact on heritage matters. This in turn allows the LGA to gather information required to develop strategies that can deal with impending developments before too much time, money and emotional energy have been invested.

A good heritage management plan will review the threats posed to the well-being of heritage places and will assess, inter alia, the risk posed by natural hazards and include mitigation options, including the prescription of special disaster management plans.

The authors of the plan, and their political masters, need to understand that there is no single methodology for identifying heritage sites. While protocols for the evaluation and assessment process have been developed, the survey methodology chosen for the primary identification of places will precondition the outcome (see above). Approached rationally, this implies that a plan should acknowledge that one of its shortcomings is the effect of different approaches and schedules over the duration of the plan’s life, and then recommend additional information gathering activities that will utilize different techniques.

The plan will need to acknowledge that heritage values are mutable and that places not identified and evaluated as significant may prove to be so in future. A precautionary principle needs to pervade the approval of development applications and a local heritage management plan should provide mechanisms for how the council can address this.

This leads to another serious aspect that is commonly overlooked in heritage plans. What is the LGA’s capacity in dealing with heritage matters in-house, and, can they adequately manage and evaluate the studies that have been outsourced? How many in the council staff are qualified, how many staff are adequately trained? Does it all rest on the shoulders of a single heritage advisor? What is the level of awareness, and what are the attitudes towards heritage held by the building surveyors and development approval personnel? What are the councillor’s attitudes? Ideally, all incoming councillors should undergo initial and refresher training some three months after each
council election. The same applies to council staff.

Finally, the plan should also make provisions and set out strategies for the effective management of the individual sites that have been identified. Standardized site management plans (SMP) should be developed for each individual property listed on the local heritage register and/or environmental plan. An SMP should include an overall site management policy informed by the assessment of cultural significance, and should address four components: conservation management, disaster management, visitor management and site interpretation. Such a site management plan may well be rudimentary to start with, but where appropriate, detailed specialized (sub-) plans, as well as a detailed history should be developed for each of the four components. Importantly, such site management plans should be structured in a way that plan components can be reviewed and updated at regular intervals. Figure 1 shows the structural model.

However, let us go back to the initial assertion that cultural heritage management is a facet of social management. Public education is an imperative if we wish to raise the public profile of heritage issues and the acceptance of regulatory mechanisms. A good local heritage management plan will identify needs in this area and will identify themes and strategies that can be used over the duration of a plan’s life. Beyond that, the plan authors need to be cognisant and upfront about the nature of fractionation in the past into a number of “heritages” and that these need to be addressed within the LGA in a balanced fashion. It will require structured multi-year strategies and may involve concepts akin to “affirmative action.” Any such activity will require that the community is fully supportive, which in turn requires public consultation and education.

Moreover, there needs to be an upfront acknowledgement of the ideological messages that any public education campaign would include. Because community values attached to heritage places are mutable variables, and because an individual’s values are shaped by life experiences and outside stimuli, we need to recognize that public education campaigns will influence such values. By undertaking such campaigns, we are actively shaping the perception of our past by the present and thus creating the foundations of the perception of our past in a future world. There is a conundrum in this. As long as it occurs unconsciously, as is most frequently the case, no one seems to worry. No one seems to question the ideology of why specific (types of) sites are included in heritage lists and others are not. Yet, if we spell out these issues in a section of the planning document, we may be accused of social engineering, of creating an artificial past. But isn’t all heritage management through its selective preservation of places an imposition of our ideas and ideals anyway? The best we can do is to be aware of all the issues discussed in this paper and attempt to find a workable balance.
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