



**STATE HEADQUARTERS**

State Office  
Franklin House  
413 Hobart Road  
LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

27 February 2015

Ms Natasha Exel  
Committee Secretary  
Legislative Council  
Parliament House  
Hobart TAS 7000

Dear Ms Exel

**Re: Legislative Council Inquiry into Built Heritage Tourism in Tasmania**

The National Trust Tasmania is pleased to provide this submission to the sub-committee's inquiry into the management, preservation, tourist marketing and promotion of built heritage assets in Tasmania.

The National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) was registered on 29th April 1960 under the *Companies Act 1959* as a non-profit making company limited by guarantee. Saving Franklin House (the Hollies) in 1960 was the driver for the foundation of the National Trust in Tasmania. More recently, the National Trust Tasmania was created as a statutory corporation created by the National Trust Act 2006 (TAS) (No. 30 of 2006). Please refer to Appendix B to this submission for further details on the Trust.

The National Trust in Tasmania currently owns and operates the following properties:

Franklin House, Launceston  
Clarendon Homestead, Nile  
Old Umbrella Shop, Launceston  
Oak Lodge, Richmond  
Runnymede, New Town  
Penitentiary Chapel Historic Site, Hobart  
Penghana and  
Mt. Lyell Mine Offices, Queenstown

The above largely operate as house museums with the exception of Penghana, which is leased as a bed and breakfast. The National Trust is responsible for all ongoing operations, conservation and property maintenance across its portfolio. In addition, the National Trust currently leases and operates the following from the relevant council: Mariner's Cottage, Hobart; Home Hill, Devonport and the Court House Museum, Latrobe.

Given this background and the Trust's annual turnover of approximately \$1 million, the National Trust believes it is well positioned to respond to the Legislative Council sub-committee's inquiry.

This submission comprises an Executive Summary and Recommendations addressing each of the terms of reference followed by Appendix A, which elaborates on each of those terms of reference. Details of the past and current history and operation of the National Trust Tasmania are contained in Appendix B.

The task of the sub-committee is not an enviable one. While the prime focus of the sub-committee's task is on the tourism aspects of built heritage, the issues of management and preservation of built heritage bring with them an array of matters that either directly or indirectly intersects with tourists' perceptions of our built heritage.

We would welcome the opportunity to address the sub-committee. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Matthew Smithies, telephone 6344 6293 or [matthew.smithies@nationaltrusttas.org.au](mailto:matthew.smithies@nationaltrusttas.org.au).

Yours sincerely,

Dario Tomat  
Chairman  
National Trust Tasmania

Matthew Smithies  
Managing Director  
National Trust Tasmania

Legislative Council Inquiry  
into Built Heritage Tourism in Tasmania

Submission prepared by



February 2015

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....   | 1  |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....   | 1  |
| 1. The current and future potential contribution that built heritage makes to tourism in Tasmania ..... | 1  |
| 2. The role of government .....   | 2  |
| 3. The role of tourism organisations .....  | 3  |
| 4. The role of heritage organisations .....   | 4  |
| 5. Any relevant considerations in other jurisdictions .....   | 5  |
| 6. Any other matters incidental thereto .....   | 6  |
| RECOMMENDATIONS .....   | 8  |
| APPENDIX A – ADDRESSING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE .....  | 1  |
| 1. The current and future potential contribution that built heritage makes to tourism in Tasmania ..... | 1  |
| What is heritage tourism? .....   | 1  |
| Contribution of heritage tourism to a region.....   | 2  |
| The National Trust contribution .....   | 3  |
| Sustaining heritage experiences .....   | 5  |
| Heritage issues associated with large-scale tourism .....   | 7  |
| 2. The role of government.....  | 10 |
| Ownership and heritage protections.....   | 10 |
| Statutory protection of heritage .....  | 11 |
| State Government as a heritage tourism operator .....   | 12 |
| Government support for heritage sites .....   | 14 |
| Innovative funding models .....   | 15 |
| 3. The role of tourism organisations.....   | 18 |
| 4. The role of heritage organisations.....  | 20 |
| The nature of heritage organisations in Tasmania.....   | 20 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Issues hampering heritage tourism development and growth..... | 21 |
| Challenges for heritage organisations .....                   | 22 |
| 5. Any relevant considerations in other jurisdictions.....    | 25 |
| International examples .....                                  | 25 |
| National examples .....                                       | 27 |
| Technology and tourism.....                                   | 28 |
| 6. Any other matters incidental thereto .....                 | 30 |
| Higher education.....   | 30 |
| APPENDIX B – ABOUT THE NATIONAL TRUST .....                   | 1  |
| History of the National Trust of Australia (Tasmania).....    | 1  |
| The National Trust Tasmania today .....                       | 1  |
| What is heritage? .....                                       | 3  |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*For full details please refer to Appendix A*

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a summary of the salient points from the more detailed submission included as Appendix A. The summary has been arranged under sub-headings reflecting the sub-committee's terms of reference.

#### **1. The current and future potential contribution that built heritage<sup>1</sup> makes to tourism in Tasmania**

Tourism numbers, after dropping for several years post the GFC, have started to rise again.

Tourism engagement with Tasmania's built heritage is demonstrated by the levels of visitations to historic homes and historic sites as captured by the Tasmanian Visitor Survey through specific questions on visits to historic homes and visits to historic sites.

The term 'visit a historic home' captures a plethora of interactions that can range from staying in a historic home that offers hotel services to visiting one of the many houses that are open for public access. Visits to historic sites (principally Port Arthur, but also several others around the state) indicates that about 40% of visitors undertake this activity. With a modest contribution from those who visited only a historic home open for public access, it is possible to deduce that nearly 50% of interstate visitors or some 500,000 people engage with built heritage pastimes.

At the National Trust, we received 50,000 visitors: 11,100 Tasmanian, 26,900 interstate and 12,000 international in 2014. Local tourist visitation has increased with an additional 9,000 people attending an event or festival at a National Trust property in 2014.

There are significant growth areas in tourism, particularly from non-English speaking cultures, that provide a major opportunity for sharing and disseminating the stories of our heritage. At the same time, there will be challenges in sharing these in a manner that is meaningful and respectful of their cultural backgrounds.

The appeal of our cities to tourists is the quaintness and large areas of quasi-intact colonial architecture within or close to the CBD. But the reality is that while the heritage attractions

---

<sup>1</sup> 'built heritage' for the National Trust, covers all that we, as a society, value today and wish to pass on to future generations. This is a very broad definition, and deliberately so. Its scope is much broader than 'place'. It includes intangible as well as tangible heritage—language and customs, as well as places and moveable collections.

underpin a significant level of tourist experience, the larger benefits of this activity accrue to non-heritage tourist services (accommodation, meals, transport) rather than the owners and operators of the heritage attraction.

For the owners and operators of publicly accessible heritage properties, be they government, private sector or community groups, the challenges – financial, staffing, maintenance of buildings, a plethora of statutory strictures and a crowded uncoordinated market for heritage attraction – are very real. (*See Trends and Pressures in Appendix A for further details.*)

There is a stark reality to the future potential of heritage tourism – while heritage attractions underpin a significant level of the tourism experience in the state, the financial benefits from heritage tourism largely accrue to non-heritage tourist services and operators (accommodation, meals, transport and the like).

If heritage tourism is to be sustainable, a different revenue stream has to be developed to help fund its operation, maintenance and upkeep. While such a revenue stream need not come directly from the State Budget, the State Government has a key role to facilitate the development of this revenue stream.

## **2. The role of government**

The State Government is the custodian of a large built heritage property portfolio, comprising many prominent public buildings and structures around the state as well as smaller, less known but important exemplars of aspects of our history or earlier way of life.

Local government also in many places has an extensive portfolio of built heritage. Within the overall planning constructs, local government has sought to preserve heritage precincts that help to ensure sympathetic development, but has also had to compromise, particularly in CBDs.

The Australian Government is also a custodian of some of Tasmania's important military heritage. However, it is looking for ways to reduce its military estate and has already disposed of properties that have important ties with the Tasmanian armed service community.

These matters highlight the important interplay between the needs of heritage tourism for surroundings that have the right look and feel with the issue for owners of such properties. In making heritage preservation a statutory requirement, the governments have imposed on themselves a major burden of compliance. However, a similar significant compliance burden falls on non-government owners of heritage properties.

State Government is the dominant player in the heritage tourism market place with, as a conservative estimate, 80% market share of the direct expenditure on visitation to heritage sites and historic homes open to the public; this is largely driven by the dominant position of Port Arthur in the market. This market dominance would suggest that government would provide a significant level of leadership and coordination within the heritage tourism sector. However, at least externally, there are few signs that this is occurring. One of the main factors is the disparate nature of the State Government market participants (Tourism Tasmania, Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Tasmania Museum & Art Gallery, Tasmanian Archive & Heritage Office, Department of Primary Industry, Parks, Water & Environment, and Tasmanian Heritage Council).

The National Trust believes that the heritage tourism sector would benefit if a lead agency were assigned the role and resources to coordinate the sector. The National Trust sees that this function would sit well with a properly resourced Tasmanian Heritage Council in consultation with Tourism Tasmania.

In addition, it is clear that the sector requires some innovative funding models to be able to achieve the appropriate levels of investment in enhancing the heritage tourism experiences. Some ideas are discussed in Appendix A section 2.

A key opportunity for the government to better support the marketing of heritage tourism opportunities is illustrated by the recent establishment of the PAHSMA ticket office at the new Hobart Ferry Terminal building. The National Trust Tasmania supports this initiative, but believes that where substantial taxpayer funding has been provided (either directly or indirectly) to allow such a venture, there should also be an obligation to provide a collaborative marketing approach with other participants, including providing ticket sales and advice at the venue for all heritage attractions in Tasmania.

### **3. The role of tourism organisations**

The current structure and networks within the tourism sphere represent the State Government; Regional Tourism Organisations (supported by State Government); Local Tourism Associations; the Tourism Industry Council; the Tasmanian Visitor Information Network; and a range of industry associations (at least nine bodies) representing various tourism interests (destinations, products, services or demographics). Nevertheless amongst all of these bodies there is no organisation solely focussing on heritage tourism. The initiative of Regional Tourism Organisations provides a good basis for development of such an organisation, though financial capacity poses a significant barrier.



Several initiatives have been undertaken that have strong heritage tourism themes by many organisations, but by and large these efforts are not funded in a coherent state strategic context and are not marketed in a coordinated manner.

In the absence of a coordinating mechanism, heritage organisations – other than government-based operators – rarely have the skills, knowledge or resource capacity to become engaged in coordination of tourism activities through Regional Tourism Organisations. In the case of the National Trust, this is despite the best efforts of the current National Trust Board and Managing Director to establish links and networks with government and non-government-based operators.

As a consequence, without the participation of heritage organisations, many of the regional tourism destination management plans have references to the value of heritage in their regions, but few of the plans have had the depth of analysis by this sector to be able to define clearly what heritage features are likely to attract tourists. Too often, the aspirational goals are to develop more experiences, rather than to work on assessing those existing but hidden “jewels in the crown” of heritage and how to enhance those offerings.

There needs to be a realisation that there are already many opportunities for heritage tourism in most regions but that many of the operators are struggling to achieve the quality of offering expected by tourists. Poor experiences tend to reduce the likely participation rate.

#### **4. The role of heritage organisations**

Heritage organisations range in scope, with arguably the National Trust being the most prominent community-based organisation providing public access to heritage spaces. The National Trust is a respected international brand that National Trust Tasmania volunteers value and international National Trust members recognise. However, until recently the National Trust Tasmania has provided heritage tourism experiences based on a house museum model unchanged for decades. Guided tours provided variable outcomes for tourists based on the interests and capabilities of house guides who basically were trained through a buddy system.<sup>2</sup>

The Board of the National Trust recognised that the Trust is as much a heritage tourism participant as it is a heritage property and collections conservator. This recent realisation, brought about by a combination of rejuvenation of the Board and appreciation of the financial sustainability task for the National Trust, has seen innovative offerings being developed. For

---

<sup>2</sup> Many of the achievements of the National Trust hinge on the contributions of over 400 volunteers who devote an estimated 50,000 hours annually to helping maintain and open Trust properties to the public. This huge contribution (equivalent to 25 FTE positions) is clearly beyond the capacity of the Trust's budget to fund through paid employment.

example, the Trust has recently engaged Roar Films to develop a master plan for the development of the Penitentiary Chapel Historic Site to engage more tourists with one of the most important historic sites associated with law and justice in Tasmania, if not the country. There are many more stages of development that will be needed to realise the full potential of the master plan, but as these will require a major funding input of at least \$2 million, the implementation will take a very long time with the current financial limitations.

In the north of the state, through the philanthropy of Ros Palmer and a great volunteer effort, a major improvement in the presentation of Clarendon has occurred that has had recent visitors praise the authenticity of what some described as "...the best visit to a historic house in Australia...".

There are many other bodies that provide public access to heritage properties on a range of scales. However, these bodies (like the Trust) are largely operated by volunteers, and the majority of these volunteers are retirees.

Issues hampering tourism development and growth across the sector include: lack of financial resources; a need for significant government investment; limited opening of rural properties from lack of support and volunteers; lack of government recognition for protecting assets and, in many heritage properties, lower than satisfactory conservation and protection of assets.

Heritage tourism needs to be sustained by professional service and quality experiences amongst all heritage properties.

Professionalism includes the presentation of properties and collections; quality interpretation; quality interactions and knowledgeable guiding.

Most community-based and private heritage organisations need a range of support to be able to provide a consistent product that enhances tourism experience. This support includes access to affordable training for guides, interpretation training, business planning skills as well as conservation and curation skills.

## **5. Any relevant considerations in other jurisdictions**

Throughout Australia and internationally there are numerous exemplars of heritage tourism becoming a key driver and contributor to economies. These attractions clearly show that for the development of 'heritage tourism' there needs to be a shift in ideology within both the heritage and tourism sectors. Nevertheless, international experience shows that this is inherently challenging, as heritage practitioners are reluctant to participate and operate within a commercial framework, and tourism bodies often view heritage as 'untouchable' and in most part irrelevant due to substandard experiences.

Examples of where heritage tourism has been highly successful are outlined in Appendix A, Section 5 and include: New Zealand, Chile, United States, Colonia Uruguay, and United Kingdom.

The UK Lottery Heritage Fund each year provides over £375,000,000, (3/4 billion AUD) investment for UK heritage support funding.

Closer to home the Western Australian National Trust receives over \$4 million each year in funding through government and Westlotto grants.

A case study of the Victorian National Trust illustrates what a better-resourced strategy can achieve. The National Trust in Victoria has a significant level of human resources and capacity to attract grants and other funding support. As a consequence, it has been able to employ specialist heritage staff (conservators, etc.) and more recently invest in modern communication mediums including the introduction of “apps”.

Innovative interactive apps that integrate with social media have a double benefit for heritage tourism. First they make the sector more interesting to younger demographics, although many older people are now becoming quite tech-savvy, but secondly the use of social media provides free marketing for both the state and the sector with an increased reach particularly for international and national markets.

The National Trust in Tasmania and most other community-based heritage organisations do not have resources to effectively access modern communications mediums as in the Victorian experience. However, the use of this media should be one of the many crucial aspects for inclusion in a consolidated marketing strategy for all heritage tourism for state-owned and other community heritage operated properties (as proposed above).

The experience of Tourism Tasmania and the Port Arthur Historic Site in their planning and/or development of social media along these lines would be beneficial to share and include in such a strategy.

## **6. Any other matters incidental thereto**

An effective heritage tourism model for Tasmania must take into consideration the many currently overlooked “incidental” heritage assets and their contribution to the visitor experience and tourism offering.

The potential contributions of higher education and research organisations to the enhancement of capability within the heritage tourism sector is another area that needs to be better understood and used by heritage organisations. There is an opportunity for the

## Legislative Council Inquiry Into Built Heritage Tourism in Tasmania

Tasmanian Government and the University of Tasmania partnership agreement to be extended to include heritage tourism as a priority area.

The National Trust's collaboration with the University of Tasmania is detailed in Appendix A, Section 6.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Trust Tasmania commends to the sub-committee the following recommendations on matters it believes are important to the sub-committee's deliberations and subsequent report. The numbering of the recommendations follows the numbering of the terms of reference as set out in this submission. More detailed discussion underpinning the recommendations is found in Appendix A to this submission.

### ***1. The current and future potential contribution that built heritage<sup>3</sup> makes to tourism in Tasmania***

**Recommendation 1.1:** That the sub-committee notes that heritage and culture are one of the primary motivators for visitors to Tasmania and that at least 50% of visitors engage in a visit to a publicly accessible heritage property.

**Recommendation 1.2:** That the sub-committee notes the significant contribution that heritage attractions in regional areas make to visitors engaging is an aspect of heritage tourism, and the major contribution that volunteers make in providing access and interpretation to those visitors. But, there is no single report that quantifies the economic benefits of heritage-based tourism, although various studies give an indication of its importance.

**Recommendation 1.3:** That the sub-committee considers the implications for longer-term accessibility to heritage properties due to the current operating models not being sustainable without significant State and Federal government funding. While publicly accessible heritage sites are important to tourists, the principal economic beneficiaries of these attractions are non-heritage tourist services such as accommodation, meals, transport and the like.

**Recommendation 1.4:** That the sub-committee acknowledges that built heritage:

- makes a major contribution to current tourism experiences and has the potential to be improved further to attract greater future tourism numbers;
- has a number of unique aspects associated with its public benefit and intangible (cultural and intellectual) capital characteristics, and it provides significant market benefits such as heritage tourism and non-market community benefits.

**Recommendation 1.5:** That the sub-committee recommends to State Government the establishment of a heritage tourism operator network to co-ordinate all activities in the sector

---

<sup>3</sup> 'built heritage' for the National Trust, covers all that we, as a society, value today and wish to pass on to future generations. This is a very broad definition, and deliberately so. Its scope is much broader than 'place'. It includes intangible as well as tangible heritage – language and customs, as well as places and moveable collections.

including packaging of all heritage tourism experiences into a consolidated offering that tourists can comprehend.

## **2. *The role of government***

**Recommendation 2.1:** That the sub-committee notes the additional responsibilities that have fallen on State and Local government following devolution by the Commonwealth and cessation of the national estate program, and that the sub-committee considers whether adequate resourcing has been provided for these additional functions.

**Recommendation 2.2:** That the sub-committee considers, and, if thought appropriate, recommends that State Government appoints a well-resourced lead agency, supported by a sector advisory group, to the coordination role for the heritage tourism sector. The tasking for such an agency to include consolidating the development of a marketing strategy for heritage tourism and assisting in coordinating events and experiences for properties amongst sector participants.

**Recommendation 2.3:** That the sub-committee acknowledges the financial barriers faced by most property managers of publicly accessible heritage properties arising from market failure, and the desirability for such a failure to be addressed through suitable funding.

**Recommendation 2.4:** That the sub-committee considers, and, if thought appropriate, recommends that the State Government consult on strategic decisions on future operation of state-owned and other community heritage operated properties, rather than relying on ad-hoc management processes for deciding on funding for built heritage preservation and enhancement.

**Recommendation 2.5:** That the sub-committee considers, and, if thought appropriate, recommends that the State Government facilitates development of a suitable heritage fund, with an inbuilt growth component, for sustaining such contributions to support the State's heritage tourism infrastructure and heritage education.

## **3. *The role of tourism organisations***

**Recommendation 3.1:** That the sub-committee considers the disadvantage that most heritage-based organisations suffer in participating in the broader fora for the tourism industry due to lack of resources and, if thought fit, recommends to the State Government a support mechanism to facilitate participation of these organisations particularly with Regional Tourism Organisations to help strengthen those organisations' focus on heritage tourism.

**Recommendation 3.2:** Regional Tourism Organisations working with heritage tourism operators should participate in the process of consolidating the development of a marketing

strategy for heritage tourism for State-owned and other community heritage operated properties.

#### **4. *The role of heritage organisations***

**Recommendation 4.1:** That the sub-committee notes the contribution of community-based heritage organisations to tourism heritage and the sterling work and dedication of their volunteers.

**Recommendation 4.2:** That the sub-committee considers tourists' expectations with respect to particular levels of engagement, quality and professionalism in interpretation and presentation of built heritage. Consequently, the sub-committee report provides consideration of the support needs of community-based organisations to meet heritage tourism expectations.

**Recommendation 4.3:** That the sub-committee considers mechanisms to provide support services to the sector and, if thought appropriate, recommends to State Government how those support services may be best delivered.

**Recommendation 4.4:** That the sub-committee notes the opportunities for heritage organisations in expanding their market to tourists from non-Anglo backgrounds (both Australian residents from overseas and international tourists), and the significant task that most heritage organisations face to offer a product in keeping with the tourists' cultural background and expectations.

#### **5. *Any relevant considerations in other jurisdictions***

**Recommendation 5.1:** That the sub-committee notes the extensive examples of international best practice that are available and, if thought appropriate, recommends to the State Government that more effort be placed on adopting suitable international best practices uniformly in the heritage tourism sector, and that support for heritage organisations to achieve these standards be implemented.

**Recommendation 5.2:** That the sub-committee notes the role that modern technology plays in the presentation of built heritage nationally and internationally, and acknowledges the limitations that non-government heritage sites have in recasting existing content to the new medium.

#### **6. *Any other matters incidental thereto***

**Recommendation 6.1:** That the sub-committee notes and, if thought appropriate, recommends the critical success factors developed by the CRC for Sustainable Tourism be

used by the State Government as a basis for enhancing the performance of the heritage tourism sector.

**Recommendation 6.2:** That the sub-committee notes the benefits of the long-standing partnership agreement between the State Government and the University of Tasmania and, if thought appropriate, recommends extending the partnership to include heritage tourism as a priority area in the Partnership Agreement.



## APPENDIX A – ADDRESSING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

### 1. The current and future potential contribution that built heritage makes to tourism in Tasmania

Tourism numbers, after dropping for several years post the GFC, have started to rise again. The Tasmanian Visitor Survey (TVS) provides details of interstate visitations, while the Australian Visitor Survey covers international visitors.

The TVS estimates that there were some 0.91 million interstate visitors to Tasmania last financial year, and the Australian Visitor Survey estimates 168,000 international visitors in the same period. It should be taken into consideration that these statistics include people visiting the state on business or visiting family and friends who are less likely to have participated in tourism activities.

The importance of heritage to the state as a key appeal and driver of Tasmania's tourism industry is clearly demonstrated by data captured by TVS showing consistently high level of visitation to historic homes, sites and places. In addition to this important body of research, substantial data on visitor activity in Tasmania and key market perception studies have been undertaken over the past ten years by Tourism Tasmania. The outcomes have repeatedly identified and documented the significance of heritage to the state's tourism industry.

#### Recommendation 1.1

That the sub-committee notes that heritage and culture are one of the primary motivators for visitors to Tasmania and that at least 50% of visitors engage in a visit to a publicly accessible heritage property.

#### What is heritage tourism?

Tourism Tasmania developed the *Historic Heritage Tourism Strategy 2012-15*<sup>4</sup>.

It defines heritage tourism in the following terms:

*Historic heritage tourism relates to experiences that engage with the past, either as a primary tourism experience or incidental to other experiences.*

<sup>4</sup> Tourism Tasmania *Historic Heritage Tourism Strategy 2012-2015*

*Although some of the most visited historic heritage destinations are historic sites and museums, historic heritage tourism also includes intangible experiences that engage visitors with historic heritage places and landscapes, stories, traditions and the way of life of a place and its people. Visitors are increasingly motivated to engage with and understand the people and places and to relate this to their own life...*

*...Heritage tourists come from a variety of backgrounds and although often thought to be dominated by older visitors, participation of younger age groups in heritage tourism is increasing. The trend to heritage tourism is part of the evolution of experience-based tourism – with more tourists looking for new and authentic experiences and wanting to learn about and connect with their own and other cultures. There is an increased interest in tangible historic heritage such as sites, buildings and cultural landscapes, and in the intangible aspects of heritage such as stories and a realistic appreciation of life in the past.*

‘Heritage tourism’ for the National Trust covers visitation to places that have historic, Indigenous and natural values, their associated collections (including documentary collections), and the settings in which places are located.

The genesis of the National Trust in Tasmania, decades prior to heritage laws, was precisely the concern of communities that development was destroying too much of what were familiar built landmarks.

### **Contribution of heritage tourism to a region**

In 2012, the National Trust was commissioned by Tourism Tasmania to conduct a detailed audit of heritage tourism assets in the north of the state<sup>5</sup>. While this body of work is specific to a region, it does provide an insight to the magnitude, richness and diversity of heritage attributes in Tasmania rarely matched elsewhere in Australia

The audit identified the importance of heritage to Tasmania’s tourism industry and highlighted the lack of a statewide knowledge of the diversity of the state’s heritage assets, their management and contribution to the economy. A detailed audit of 24 heritage assets was undertaken revealing annual attendance of more than 246,700 visitors, the employment of more than 60 full- and part-time staff, and a gross turnover of more than \$2.5 million. These 24 heritage assets were supported by more than 1,400 members and volunteers and received less than \$200,000 in annual financial support from the State Government. A comparison with Port Arthur historic site, undeniably a key state heritage and tourism asset, shows that for the same period the number of visitors was comparable (247,000) but the

---

<sup>5</sup> National Trust Tasmania *Realising the Potential* 2012

revenue at the PAHS from retail activities was over \$9 million and additionally it was supported with state grants of over \$3 million.

The term 'visit a historic site' captures a broad range of experiences from staying in a historic home that offers hotel services to visiting one of the many houses open to the public or visiting a museum where objects are presented in a controlled environment and context. Visits to historic sites (principally Port Arthur, but including several others around the state) indicate that about 40% of visitors undertake this activity. With a modest contribution from those who visited only a historic home open for public access, it is reasonable to deduce that nearly 50% of interstate visitors or some 500,000 people engage in a built heritage experience.

International tourists are significant contributors to built heritage attraction visitation as shown from anecdotal evidence and known participation in organised coach tours.

The balance of tourists that visit without actively engaging in a heritage-based experience have made specific comment on the important contribution the state's heritage streetscapes and settings have made to their Tasmanian visitor experience.

### **Recommendation 1.2**

That the sub-committee notes the significant contribution that heritage attractions in regional areas make to visitors engaging in an aspect of heritage tourism, and the major contribution that volunteers make in providing access and interpretation to those visitors. But, there is no single report that quantifies the economic benefits of heritage-based tourism, although various studies give an indication of its importance.

### **The National Trust contribution**

The National Trust in Tasmania currently owns and operates the following properties:

- Franklin House, Launceston
- Clarendon Homestead & Australian Fly Fishing Museum, Nile
- Old Umbrella Shop, Launceston
- Oak Lodge, Richmond
- Runnymede, New Town
- Penitentiary Chapel Historic Site, Hobart
- Penghana, Queenstown
- Mt. Lyell Mine Offices, Queenstown

## Legislative Council Inquiry Into Built Heritage Tourism in Tasmania

The above largely operate as house museums with the exception of Penghana, which is leased as a bed and breakfast. The National Trust is responsible for all ongoing operations, conservation and property maintenance across its portfolio.

The National Trust currently leases and operates the following:

- Mariner's Cottage, Hobart
- Home Hill, Devonport
- Court House Museum, Latrobe

The National Trust Tasmania is custodian of one of the state's largest collections with in excess of 30,000 objects entered onto our collection management database, and a further 22,000 objects requiring significance assessment prior to being entered on to the collection database. Within the collection there is a considerable number of objects having national significance.

Current tourism products on offer across the Trust portfolio have been specifically designed and developed for visitors to engage actively with our unique heritage, in order to gain a greater understanding of Tasmania's cultural past, present and future. These include:

- viewing the attractions as part of a guided or self-guided tour
- real-life performances recently introduced at the Penitentiary Chapel Historic Site and Runnymede in conjunction with Chris and Judith Cornish
- children's 'hands on' events and storytelling
- demonstrations and talks on our history, properties and collections
- events and festivals that use the ambience of our heritage places to add value

### Visitation

- Over 50,000 Tasmanian, interstate and international people visit a National Trust property in Tasmania each year.
- An average 24% of visitation is from international tourists either in an organised travel group or self-guided basis.
- Local tourist visitation has increased with an additional 9,000 people attending an event or festival at a National Trust property.

In the majority of cases, heritage tourism places open to the public do not receive sufficient income from users to cover costs, and this results in an under-provision of the service relative to market expectations. This is especially relevant to the National Trust movement due to international branding. The National Trust in countries such as England and Wales is comparatively well funded, allowing presentation and engagement programs to reach very

high standards and, in most cases, the international visitor has an expectation that all our National Trust properties will be presented at this high standard.

### **Sustaining heritage experiences**

In Australia, there are very few examples of public, private and not for-profit heritage places open to the public where the use value (demonstrated by commercial returns on the property after ongoing maintenance and operating costs) is positive. In Tasmania, to achieve a self-sustaining heritage model is particularly challenging due to the demographics of a small population, comparatively low visitor numbers and the highest density of heritage attributes in Australia. Commercial activity from functions and events is required to subsidise tourism operations with such activities then reducing facilities available for tourism activities.

The appeal of our cities to tourists is the quaintness and large areas of intact colonial architecture within or close to the CBD. Tourists appreciate the largely unaltered streetscapes no longer present in other Australian cities. Due to a lack of funding available to preserve these significant heritage attributes, a majority of them are in a state of deterioration with conservation plans either not developed or not executed. Disturbingly, the long term conservation and sustainability of heritage under present operating models is not possible. The stark reality is that while heritage attractions underpin a significant level of the tourism experience, the financial benefits of this activity largely accrue to non-heritage tourist services and operators (accommodation, meals, transport and the like).

For heritage tourism to become a key driver, a statewide approach is required to develop and implement a sustainable financial model. For this model to be effective it will need to take into consideration the requirement for a contribution towards heritage management on costs such as interpretation, conservation, maintenance and operations.

Port Arthur can be considered as a working example of this model. Activities of the Authority across its sites attracted approximately 290,000 tourists in 2013-14. The gross revenue from these visitors amounted to approximately \$42.70 per head. The cost of servicing these visitors is estimated at \$37.50 per head leaving a contribution margin of only \$5 per head (approximately \$1.5 million) The annual conservation effort on the Authority's sites is estimated at \$4 million. Clearly even an operation with such large operating revenues can't sustain the cost of conservation without other funding sources.

Contributing to the difficulties of sustaining development of experiences for heritage tourism is the significant difference in investment levels that private organisations are able to make compared to the investment made in attractions owned and managed by government.

### Recommendation 1.3

That the sub-committee considers the implications for longer term accessibility to heritage properties due to the current operating models not being sustainable without significant State and Federal government funding. While publicly accessible heritage sites are important to tourists, the principal economic beneficiaries of these attractions are non-heritage tourist services such as accommodation, meals, transport and the like.

Further, intrastate and international marketing initiatives developed by government agencies, designed to attract visitors to the state, predominantly feature state-owned heritage attractions. It could be argued that the net result of this over an extended period is detrimental to the state's heritage tourism sector, as it presents the state as having limited heritage experiences.

Within the global heritage sector, it is well acknowledged that selecting 'hero' attractions is detrimental to the sector, with countries such as England, United States, Canada, South Africa, France and New Zealand taking a more sophisticated approach at least ten years ago, based on detailed market research and visitors' growing appetite for new products.

The State Government's *Historic Heritage Tourism Strategy*<sup>6</sup> was an attempt to develop a future vision; it failed to achieve this, largely due to the philosophical underpinning of the strategy. An emphasis was placed on pre-1850s heritage attributes, resulting in a large number of heritage tourism contributors being alienated and their contribution not understood. While the convict era is a very valid subset of heritage tourism, use of such a time-based definition of heritage experiences in the strategy limited and misrepresented the total contribution of heritage tourism.

Due to the density of heritage experiences available in Tasmania, a key challenge is for each site to offer unique and complementary experiences rather than similar offerings. A prime example of this is the early colonial cluster of properties open to the public within the Launceston area: Entally House; Woolmers; Brickendon; Clarendon and Franklin House which, with coordination amongst operators, could provide different but complementing experience.

Regrettably, in Tasmania the tendency is for properties to try to maximise tourism visitation share through a "me too" style of approach to product development. The consequence is that the incentive and reward for taking the risk associated with innovation in presentation of an experience can only be achieved for very short timeframes until a competitor copies. The

---

<sup>6</sup> Tasmanian Tourism ibid

visitor, therefore, isn't encouraged to explore more than one site, as often it's a case of 'experience one experience all'.

### Case Study

In Gerards Cross, Buckinghamshire, England the National Trust was faced with a similar situation. Eighteen years ago they addressed this by developing unique experiences at each of the cluster properties and introducing strong cross-promotional activities and a multiple experience booking system. The high density of heritage experiences is now heavily promoted and used as a key marketing and business development attribute.

### Heritage issues associated with large-scale tourism

#### Trends and Pressures

The list below is indicative of trends that are affecting the heritage tourism market and that need to be considered in developing any policy response. The list is not considered to be exhaustive.

| TRENDS  | PRESSURES / OPPORTUNITIES   |
|---|---|
| <b>Demographic</b><br>Ageing population<br>Growth of cities<br>Declining population in rural areas          | Heritage traditionally appealed to older age group<br>New markets to capture younger audience requires innovative interpretation methods<br>Development encroaching up to rural properties with subsequent rural zoning changed to residential planning zones |
| <b>Workforce changes</b><br>Casualisation, part-time, multi-jobs<br>Female participation<br>Service economy | Fewer volunteers<br>Reduced leisure hours<br>Facility opening hours (24/7)<br>Skill shortages in trades<br>Paying double time on weekends where staff are employed<br>Greater compliance functions  |
| <b>Health, education and policing community demands</b>   | Greater expenditure on basic services<br>Reduced funding available for heritage, which is lower on the list of priorities   |
| <b>Demand for greater levels of comfort</b> (cooling, lighting, heating)                                    | Heritage buildings do not have modern conveniences and do not have funds to upgrade.  |

## Legislative Council Inquiry Into Built Heritage Tourism in Tasmania

| TRENDS  | PRESSURES / OPPORTUNITIES   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Cannot operate year round</p> <p>Heritage structures often need to be compromised to build in modern conveniences</p>  |
| <b>Growth of wealth and affluence</b>   | <p>Café society</p> <p>Expectation of high standard of experience</p> <p>Value-added experiences and retail expenditure opportunities</p>   |
| <b>Technology</b><br><br><p>Growth in use of computers, home entertainment, the web, Internet</p>                       | <p>Standards and competing leisure options</p> <p>Education opportunities</p> <p>Access to information</p> <p>Innovative methods of interpretation delivery but lack of available funds for implementation</p>  |
| <b>Role of government</b><br><br><p>Changed relationship to NGOs</p> <p>Expansion of government cultural facilities</p> | <p>Higher standards of museum/gallery interpretation and experiences that NFP organisations do not have sufficient access to investment to match</p> <p>Competition for private funding from the public sector</p> <p>Payment for services</p> <p>Transfer responsibility to others</p> |
| <b>Tourism and leisure</b><br><br><p>Growth in travel market and alternative opportunities</p>                          | <p>Greater competition for visitation</p> <p>Higher standards</p> <p>Different cultural backgrounds*</p>  |
| <b>Reconciliation</b>   | <p>Recognition of Indigenous cultures</p> <p>Need to incorporate wider range of places</p> <p>Lack of appropriate skills/knowledge</p>  |
| <b>Occupational Health and Safety</b><br><br><p>Greater focus on total risk reduction and access requirements</p>       | <p>Cost implications of complying with all OH&amp;S requirements</p> <p>Increasing Insurance costs</p> <p>Heritage buildings unable to be adapted to comply with new codes so impose re-use limitations</p>   |

\*There are significant growth areas in tourism, particularly from non-English speaking cultures, that provides a major opportunity for sharing and disseminating the stories of our



heritage. At the same time there will be challenges to undertake this sharing in a manner that is meaningful and respectful of their cultural backgrounds.

#### **Recommendation 1.4**

That the sub-committee acknowledges that built heritage:

- makes a major contribution to current tourism experiences and has the potential to be improved further to attract greater future tourism numbers;
- has a number of unique aspects associated with its public benefit and intangible (cultural and intellectual) capital characteristics, and it provides significant market benefits such as heritage tourism and non-market community benefits.

#### **Recommendation 1.5**

That the sub-committee recommends to State Government that it facilitates a heritage tourism operator network to coordinate all activities in the sector including packaging of all heritage tourism experiences into a consolidated offering that tourists can comprehend.

## **2. The role of government**

### **Ownership and heritage protections**

The State Government is the custodian of a substantial heritage portfolio including significant collections and built attributes. This publicly owned portfolio includes numerous prominent buildings and structures around the state as well as smaller, less known but important exemplars of aspects of our heritage. Within the Parks portfolio alone there is a wide representative range of the state's rich heritage attributes. These range from mountain huts in national parks that preserve the heritage and traditions of early trappers, explorers and bushwalkers through to significant agricultural and commercial estates such as Entally House and Highfield.

Local government throughout Tasmania also plays a significant role in the preservation and presentation of the state's heritage, contributing to the visitor experience and tourism sector. The list is vast and in many instances overlooked: from major buildings such as Town Halls, entire precincts such as Low Head Pilot Station through to the numerous local museums, and from maintenance of hedgerows and bridges through to supporting heritage attractions and events. This important contribution provides diverse heritage backdrops displaying the richness and complexity of our heritage to visitors.

Within the overall planning constructs, local government for the most part has sought to preserve heritage precincts and encourage sympathetic development. However, compromises have been necessary particularly in CBDs in order to address the demands of contemporary life and to compete financially within the wider market. A prime example is the competing need for city buildings to meet contemporary retail expectations; this has resulted in unsympathetic development over many decades leaving a chaotic jumble of colonial and Victorian architecture dominated by contemporary constructions. Fortunately, there are also examples of heritage attributes being successfully incorporated into modern applications through sensitive adaptive reuse; one notable example is the development of the ANZ Centre in Elizabeth Street, Hobart, where existing architecture has been adapted to house modern office and shopping facilities.

The Australian Government is custodian of some of Tasmania's important military heritage. However, the Federal Government is considering avenues to reduce its military estate and has already disposed of properties that have significant cultural heritage ties with the Tasmanian armed service community. Examples of this reduction in estate ownership include the closure and sale of the Brighton Military Camp, the HMAS Huon Naval Depot on the Domain, and there is continuing speculation about the closure of Anglesea Barracks and the camp at Fort Direction.

The changes in ownership noted above have led to, in the case of Brighton, a dismantling of the site with no apparent significant redevelopment of the site under consideration. In the case of the former HMAS Huon site, there has been a gradual deterioration of the heritage values of the site through dereliction by neglect.

The above highlights the important balance required between the needs of the heritage tourism sector to preserve heritage attributes with those needs of property owners whose priorities may not include heritage consideration.

### **Statutory protection of heritage**

In making heritage preservation a statutory requirement, government at all levels has imposed a major compliance burden on themselves as well as on listed heritage property owners. This burden also falls on owners of properties in heritage precincts that local government planning schemes define. The statutory requirements are based on meeting the demands of communities for preservation of places, but there is no compensatory mechanism to assist the owner to pass the imposts of such statutory requirements back to those communities that demanded them in the first place.

According to the Productivity Commission's 2006 report<sup>7</sup>, *Conservation of Australia's Historic Heritage Places*:

*"The rationale for government in heritage conservation rests on the view that owners, acting in their own interests, would conserve too little historic heritage.*

*Governments have intervened by introducing regulatory regimes based on the identification of places with heritage characteristics and the subsequent provision of statutory protection through their inclusion on lists of protected places. This protection places a range of obligations on owners, essentially requiring them to undertake no action which would threaten those characteristics unless approved by the relevant authority.*

*Typically cost considerations are irrelevant for the decision to list. As a consequence, the current heritage system,..., essentially requires property owners to provide, without payment, community-demanded heritage conservation services.*

*This approach entrenches divergences between the incentives faced by owners and the community, and introduces incentives to list and conserve historic heritage places where the benefits are less than the costs of conservation. It also provides an incentive for listing agencies to continue to press for further conservation effort until there are few more*

---

<sup>7</sup> Productivity Commission *Conservation of Australia's Historic Heritage Places* 2006

<http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/heritage/report/heritage.pdf> accessed 20 February 2015

*benefits to be had – irrespective of the costs involved. Without the discipline imposed by having to pay the costs of heritage conservation, there may be over-provision of the heritage public good, or of particular types of heritage places, resulting in a net cost to the community as a whole, rather than a net benefit.”* (pp. 219-220)

Fortunately, the current State Government is seeking to improve the listing situation in the state where there are thousands of listed properties with no clear significance. But, there still is a solid raft of statutory protections through Council Planning Schemes for identified properties that impose their own regulatory burdens.

States assumed additional responsibility for heritage identification and assessment following devolution by the Commonwealth and cessation of the national estate program. These additional obligations must be properly resourced to be effectively discharged by state and local governments.

#### **Recommendation 2.1**

That the sub-committee notes the additional responsibilities that have fallen on State and Local government following devolution by the Commonwealth and cessation of the national estate program, and that the sub-committee considers whether adequate resourcing has been provided for these additional functions.

#### **State Government as a heritage tourism operator**

State Government is by far the dominant player in the heritage tourism market place with, as a conservative estimate, 80% of total market share of the direct expenditure on visitation to heritage sites and historic homes open to the public, largely driven by the dominant position of Port Arthur in the market.

This market dominance would suggest that there would be a significant level of leadership and coordination within the heritage tourism sector. However, at least externally, there are few signs that this is occurring.

One of the main factors is the disparate nature of the State Government own market participants:

**Tourism Tasmania** – responsible for marketing Tasmania as a holiday destination and maximising tourism's contribution to the economy.

**Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority** – responsible for preserving and maintaining the Port Arthur Historic Site, the Coal Mines Historic Site at Saltwater River and the Cascades Female Factory Historic Site in South Hobart (2010).

**Tasmania Museum and Art Gallery** – responsible for managing the museum's collection as the cultural heart of Tasmania.

**West Coast Wilderness Railway** – operates the heritage railway between Queenstown and Strahan on the West Coast

**Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office** – provides archival material on aspects of Tasmania's Heritage.

**Department of Primary Industry Parks, Water and Environment** – responsible for Entally House and Highfield House; a range of Convict World Heritage sites; and several important national park facilities such as Waldheim, Heritage Tasmania, and Aboriginal Heritage. The Department also holds collections at the following historic sites: Entally House, Highfield House, The Richmond Gaol, The Steppes Sculptures, The Kangaroo Bluff Battery, Woodvine, Maria Island and Low Head Pilot Station.

**The Tasmanian Heritage Council** – in addition to its resource management and planning functions with respect to heritage conservation, its duties under the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995* are as follows:

- *to encourage and assist in the proper management of places of historic cultural heritage significance; and*
- *to encourage public interest in, and understanding of, issues relevant to the conservation of Tasmania's historic cultural heritage; and*
- *to encourage and provide public education in respect of Tasmania's historic cultural heritage; and*
- *to assist in the promotion of tourism in respect of places of historic cultural heritage significance*

This separation of functions into a variety of departments and statutory authorities makes leadership and coordination amongst agencies, and more broadly within the heritage tourism sector, no single agency's responsibility. As a consequence, there is a high degree of ad hoc investment, marketing and decision-making from diverse bodies.

The National Trust believes that the heritage tourism sector would benefit if a lead agency were assigned the role and resources to coordinate the sector. The National Trust sees that this function would sit well with a properly resourced Tasmanian Heritage Council supported by an advisory group from the sector.

**Recommendation 2.2**

That the sub-committee considers, and, if thought appropriate, recommends that State Government appoint a well-resourced lead agency supported by a sector advisory group to the coordination role for the heritage tourism sector. The task of such an agency is to include consolidating the development of a marketing strategy for heritage tourism and assisting in coordinating events and experiences for properties amongst sector participants.

**Government support for heritage sites**

Heritage has enjoyed support from all political parties and this often includes grants to various bodies for a range of purposes normally as infrastructure support. The current government's commitments to government and non-government heritage tourism organisations include:

|                                       |                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Franklin House                        | \$25,000           |
| Duck Reach Education Centre           | \$60,000           |
| St George's Church restoration        | \$150,000          |
| Tasmanian Historic Society Premaydena | \$70,000           |
| Mount Lyell Mine Disaster Park        | \$25,000           |
| Brickenden                            | \$50,000           |
| Woolmers Visitor Centre               | \$1,752,000        |
| Highfield                             | \$430,000          |
| Woolmers maintenance                  | \$150,000          |
| Queenstown Heritage and Arts Festival | \$50,000           |
|                                       | <b>\$2,762,000</b> |

Nevertheless, the provision of adequate funding to organisations to maintain heritage properties is a major issue, both in terms of defining what should be preserved and invested in, and who should fund it.

The heritage tourism market has a number of unique aspects associated with its public benefits and intangible (cultural and intellectual) capital characteristics, and provides significant non-market community benefits.

But, there is an obvious market failure to ensure sustainability of the providers. This market failure justifies a form of funding that reduces the financial impact on the market participants.

While there are a few properties open to the public that receive sufficient income from visitation and sales alone to cover most ongoing operating and maintenance costs, the overwhelming majority of community-operated heritage places that are open to the public do not receive sufficient income to cover basic operating and maintenance costs, let alone invest in new interpretation or comprehensive conservation of these places. The *Historic Heritage Tourism Strategy 2012-2015* failed to address the lack of capacity to invest by community-based market participants.

Given the large number of community-based organisations offering heritage experiences, it is essential to consider the way these community groups can be supported. Without the significant volunteer time devoted to the preservation and interpretation of local heritage that these groups provide, there would be a significantly diminished list of experiences for tourists to access. Government, from its own resources, may not be able to fund these groups, but the National Trust believes that the State Government should be more active in pursuing a mechanism to sustain these groups' efforts.

### **Recommendation 2.3**

That the sub-committee acknowledges the financial barriers faced by most property managers of publicly accessible heritage properties arising from market failure, and the desirability for such a failure to be addressed through suitable funding.

### **Recommendation 2.4**

That the sub-committee considers and, if thought appropriate, recommends that the State Government consult on strategic decisions on future operation of state-owned and other community heritage operated properties, rather than relying on ad-hoc management processes for deciding on funding for built heritage preservation and enhancement.

### **Innovative funding models**

It is clear that the sector requires some innovative funding models to be able to achieve the appropriate levels of investment in enhancing the heritage tourism experiences.

The government is under significant budget pressure that is likely only to increase as the demands for greater investments in education, health and public safety rise. There are clear signals that the Australian Government is looking to cost shift a range of expenditure back to State Governments. Therefore, to address the longer-term sustainability, another funding source has to be developed.

One option for a funding model that has often been held as an example is a lottery system modelled on the UK Lottery Fund. In the UK this fund that distributes the profits from the

National Lottery has been spectacularly successful. The proceeds are distributed in the following proportions:

- Health, Education, Environment, and charitable causes – 40%
- Sports – 20%
- Arts – 20%
- Heritage – 20%

The distribution from the Lottery to the heritage proportion amounts to £375 million (\$750 million) each year. On a per capita basis, that is about \$10 per person in the UK. A similar level of funding from such a source in Tasmania would equate to \$5.1 million per annum for heritage.

However, there would be limitations of a state-based lottery. A state lottery will lack scale, therefore the total value of prizes may not make the lottery a competent participant against established players. Further, the lack of scale is likely to mean that operating costs will absorb most of the proceeds, leaving little for investment in heritage purposes. A state lottery may also affect the level of activity in other forms of gambling, so State Government is likely to lose revenue from those sources. The lottery is also likely to have limited growth potential over time.

An alternative model is to use a levy approach to create a suitable heritage fund. There are two potential methods that can be used

- a) Imposing a heritage levy on forms of public accommodation charges, which means that tourists will help fund the heritage aspects that they value but don't pay for – a charge of \$1 per bed-night<sup>8</sup> would result in approximately \$9.5 million raised per annum, or
- b) Imposing a levy on all properties in a similar manner to the imposition of the Fire Service Levy.

Either of these levies would be modest in terms of the unit cost impost, but either will scale well as either growth of tourism or growth of property values automatically leads to rises in the total collected from the levy each year.

Suitable governance measures would need to be imposed including ensuring that a significant amount (say 80%) of the levy raised in a particular local government area is spent in that area.

---

<sup>8</sup> Tourism Tasmania *Tourism Snapshot September 2014*

[http://www.tourismtasmania.com.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/25927/snapshot-sep14.pdf](http://www.tourismtasmania.com.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/25927/snapshot-sep14.pdf) accessed 20 Feb 2015



**Recommendation 2.5**

That the sub-committee considers, and, if thought appropriate recommends, that the State Government facilitates development of a suitable heritage fund, with an inbuilt growth component, for sustaining such contributions to support the state's heritage tourism infrastructure and heritage education.

### 3. The role of tourism organisations

Tasmania has a richness and diversity to its cultural heritage that is rarely matched by any comparable region elsewhere in Australia. Features of the state's regional heritage are the number of assets of national significance and the number that are readily accessible to the public.

The general principle of the need for different solutions in different regions in Tasmania was a key observation of the 2010 KPMG *Regional Tourism Review*<sup>9</sup>.

The current structure and networks within the tourism area represent the State Government; Regional Tourism Organisations (supported by State Government); Local Tourism Associations; the Tourism Industry Council; the Tasmanian Visitor Information Network; and a range of industry associations (at least nine bodies) representing various tourism interests (destinations, products, services or demographics).

Nevertheless amongst all of these bodies there is no organisation solely focussing on heritage tourism. The initiative of Regional Tourism Organisations provides a good basis for development of such an organisation, though financial capacity poses a significant barrier.

In the absence of a coordinating mechanism, heritage tourism organisations – other than government-based operators – rarely have the skills, knowledge or resource capacity to become engaged in coordination of tourism activities through Regional Tourism Organisations. While the National Trust interacts with Regional Tourism North, it doesn't have the resources to interact with the other bodies in the regions where it has properties.

As a consequence of this lack of participation, many of the regional tourism destination management plans have references to the value of heritage in their regions, but few of the plans have had the depth of analysis of this sector to be able to define clearly what heritage features are likely to attract tourists. Too often the aspirational goals are to develop more experiences, rather than to work on assessing those hidden "jewels in the crown" of heritage and how to enhance those offerings.

#### Recommendation 3.1

That the sub-committee considers the disadvantage that most heritage-based organisations suffer in participating in the broader fora for the tourism industry due to lack of resources and, if thought fit, recommends to the State Government a support mechanism to facilitate

<sup>9</sup> Tourism Tasmania – Regional Tourism Review 2010

[http://www.tourismtasmania.com.au/research/reports/regional\\_tourism\\_review](http://www.tourismtasmania.com.au/research/reports/regional_tourism_review) accessed 20 Feb 2015

participation of these organisations particularly with Regional Tourism Organisations to help strengthen those organisations' focus on heritage tourism.

### **Recommendation 3.2**

Regional Tourism Organisations working with heritage tourism operators should participate in the process of consolidating the development of a marketing strategy for heritage tourism for State-owned and other community heritage operated properties.

There have been several initiatives undertaken that have strong heritage tourism themes by many organisations, but by and large these efforts are not funded in a coherent state strategic context and are not marketed in a coordinated manner.

A recent example is the sound work that the Circular Head Tourism Association undertook with funding through the Australian government TQual program entitled "Under the Nut Heritage Walk". <http://www.stanleyheritagewalk.com.au/en/about/>. While this innovation is applauded, the lack of coordinated marketing means that few tourists to other parts of Tasmania hear about the experience and so miss out on an iconic village and memorable heritage experience.

It is worthy here to note successful events by organisations such as MONA that have incorporated heritage sites into their programs. Such events include Dark MOFO, which received government funding and saw heritage sites such as the Narryna Heritage Museum, Rosny Barn, Prince of Wales Battery at Battery Point and the sandstone basements of the Hobart Town Hall used in successful thought-provoking interactive exhibitions. The Launceston-based Junction Arts Festival also saw buildings including the Launceston Gospel Hall used in a similar way.

The challenge is to sustain a level of such events so that there is better exposure of local communities as well as tourists to heritage sites.

## **4. The role of heritage organisations**

### **The nature of heritage organisations in Tasmania**

Heritage organisations range in scope with arguably the National Trust being the most prominent community-based organisation providing public access to heritage spaces.

The National Trust brand is a well-known and well-respected brand for heritage experiences internationally. Members of the National Trust movement internationally enjoy reciprocal visiting rights and other benefits that helps increase visitation locally. But, the standard of presentation and experiences provided nationally and internationally have changed significantly; in particular in the past decade there has been a huge change in National Trust property presentation internationally.

Traditionally, the National Trust Tasmania has provided heritage tourism experiences based on a house museum model that is now discarded by the international National Trust movement. Guided tours provided variable outcomes for tourists based on the interests and capabilities of house guides who basically were trained through a buddy system.

It is perhaps a tribute to the stoicism of heritage tourists that visitation numbers for National Trust properties remained static for many years rather than suffer a major decline due to the static nature of the presentation.

The Board of the National Trust recognised that the Trust is as much a heritage tourism participant as it is a heritage property and collections conservator. This recent realisation, brought about by a combination of rejuvenation of the Board and appreciation of the financial sustainability task for the National Trust, has seen innovative offerings being developed.

The National Trust has recently engaged Roar Films to develop a master plan for the development of the Penitentiary Chapel Historic Site to engage more tourists with one of the most important historic sites associated with law and justice in the state, if not the country. The work to date on that site has included adopting the marketing name of “The Trench”, investing in a part-time marketing development resource to better promote the site, partnering with Chris and Judith Cornish to provide a historic re-enactment titled “No Mercy” and introducing paranormal tours.

There are many more stages of development that will be needed to realise the full potential of the master plan, but as these will require a major funding input of at least \$2 million, the implementation will take a very long time with the current financial limitations.

In the north of the state, through the philanthropy of Ros Palmer, who donated knowledge, furniture, furnishings and financial support, together with a great fundraising and volunteer

effort, a major improvement in the presentation of Clarendon has occurred. It is pleasing that recent visitors praise the authenticity of experience and what some described as "...the best visit to a historic house in Australia...".

But, efforts such as these require constancy of purpose and courage from volunteer boards, characteristics that are no longer a given in most people's expectation of volunteer board participation.

There are many smaller bodies that provide public access to heritage properties and collections on a range of scales. From caring for significant collections at the Maritime Museum to providing public access to a small heritage cottage in the country, at least 150 community groups care for some aspect of Tasmania's heritage. Invariably, however, these bodies largely are operated by volunteers and generally these volunteers are retirees.

### **Issues hampering heritage tourism development and growth**

Issues hampering tourism development and growth across the sector include: lack of financial resources; a need for significant investment in deferred building maintenance; limited opening of rural properties from lack of support and volunteers; lack of government recognition for protecting assets and, in many heritage properties, lower than satisfactory conservation and protection of assets.

Heritage tourism needs to be sustained by professional service and quality experiences amongst all heritage properties. Professionalism includes the presentation of properties and collections; quality interpretation; quality interactions and knowledgeable guiding. Consequently, while heritage organisations provide a number of services of interest to the heritage tourism sector, the quality and level of engagement that a tourist feels when visiting such offerings will be highly variable. Without sustained (but modest) professional support for development of the products that heritage organisations provide for visitors, it is unlikely that a significant exploitation of the opportunities that are embedded in these organisations will materialise.

Most community-based and private heritage organisations need a range of support to be able to provide a consistent product that enhances tourism experience. This support includes access to affordable training for guides, interpretation training, business planning skills as well as conservation and curation skills.

#### **Recommendation 4.1**

That the sub-committee notes the contribution of community-based heritage organisations to tourism heritage and the sterling work and dedication of their volunteers.

#### **Recommendation 4.2**

That the sub-committee considers tourists' expectations with respect to particular levels of engagement, quality and professionalism in interpretation and presentation of built heritage. Consequently, the sub-committee report provides consideration of the support needs of community-based organisations to meet heritage tourism expectations.

While the National Trust has from time to time provided a range of inputs to help develop conservation skills within the sector, it hasn't ventured into developing concomitant business skills (largely because the National Trust itself has limited skill in this regard). The National Trust has been engaging with the work undertaken internationally by the National Trust movement in the UK and has been also researching the work of the American Association of State and Local History to examine best practice models for publicly accessible heritage properties (see below). A suitable level of financial support would allow the National Trust to provide the staff resources with the expertise to provide a similar support service within the sector.

#### **Recommendation 4.3**

That the sub-committee considers mechanisms to provide support services to the sector and, if thought appropriate, recommends to State Government how those support services may be best delivered.

Another challenge for introducing change within the sector is the difficulties of achieving change with many of the particularly longer standing and perhaps most active of the volunteers associated with a particular property. There is a combination of overcoming the inertia of "we tried that but it doesn't work", "we know what our customers want" and the like. Relying heavily on volunteers and goodwill makes the flexibility of the site much lower and therefore less responsive to change.

Upsetting a long standing volunteer or paid staff member over change can lead to a considerable loss of knowledge and skill at a property site if that person decides to withdraw from volunteering. Heritage organisations are therefore unable to move as quickly as other tourism organisations to capture market trends.

#### **Challenges for heritage organisations**

Heritage organisations face a range of challenges some of which are outlined below:

| ISSUE   | THE PROBLEM   | POSSIBLE SOLUTION  |
|---|---|--|
| Lack of funding                                   | The lack of funding is currently accommodated by reducing necessary expenditure on essential maintenance and conservation, and by failure to invest in improved interpretation and the identification of new heritage attractions.                                  | A mix of government and private investment is considered to provide the best opportunity for supporting the ongoing care of cultural heritage places promoted as tourism destinations. Policy options need to consider how to target funding support to those areas of the heritage conservation market that have significant externalities. This may best be handled by a system of grants or market auctions for funding in return for a demonstration of the contribution towards the creation of heritage tourism value. Competition in funding should ensure that the scarce resources are allocated efficiently. Consider a range of incentives and policy tools to allow increased corporate and philanthropic contributions to cultural heritage conservation. |
| Government investment / philanthropic investments | Heritage assets are deteriorating due to lack of funds to restore and maintain them. Local government in particular is struggling to be able to provide funding and strategic planning and other support to assist community groups care for local heritage places. | Ensure the State Government provides adequate resources to maintain heritage built assets that are falling into disrepair.   |
| Accessibility                                     | Limited opening of rural properties from lack of support and volunteers.  | Enhance appreciation of the value of heritage tourism to rural economies   |
| Government recognition for protecting assets      | There is a developing trend recently for government to minimise its responsibilities and to attempt to pass these on to other levels of government or to other bodies (NFPs or NGOs).   | It is necessary for all governments to accept responsibility, and to ensure that there are clear accountabilities amongst the different levels without creating overlaps or leaving gaps. Any evaluation of the role of government in heritage tourism needs to include consideration of its role as an active market participant, not just as a rule-maker or provider of information. Given the essentially external benefits that accrue, government involvement and financial support is justified. Increased recognition and support is needed for heritage properties and collections  |

| ISSUE   | THE PROBLEM   | POSSIBLE SOLUTION  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | currently cared for by community organisations that are struggling to conserve & interpret them.   |
| Conservation and protection of assets                     | The requirement to earn a commercial return to remain viable means heritage assets are exposed to inappropriate use. Due to lack of funds, properties and collections in urgent repairs compete for funds. This can be viewed by the public as the organisation not caring enough to look after their assets. | Direction of government resources at all levels to the conservation of our valuable state assets   |
| Increase in tourism visitation from non-Anglo backgrounds | The trend in international tourism has seen a much larger influx of tourists from other cultures. These tourists often seek a different interpretation of heritage than is currently offered.   | The government's "Get China Ready" effort has focussed on hospitality, but, an equal effort has to be made to understand and invest in how we present our heritage to those visitors. The mere translation of literature and interpretation into another language often misses the cultural divide that needs to be bridged for a satisfying experience for the tourist. |

**Recommendation 4.4**

That the sub-committee notes the opportunities for heritage organisations in expanding their market to tourists from non-Anglo backgrounds (both Australian residents from overseas and international tourists), and the significant task that most heritage organisations face to offer a product in keeping with the tourists' cultural background and expectations.



## 5. Any relevant considerations in other jurisdictions

### International examples

Throughout Australia and internationally there are numerous examples of where heritage tourism has successfully become a key driver and contributor to economies. These examples demonstrate clearly that for the development of 'heritage tourism' there needs to be a shift in ideology within both the heritage and tourism sectors. International experience shows that this is inherently challenging as heritage practitioners are reluctant to participate and operate within a commercial framework and tourism bodies often view heritage as 'untouchable' and in most part irrelevant due to disengaging interpretation.

Examples of where heritage tourism has been highly successful include:

**Chile** – With considerable financial input from the United States over the past twenty years, a vibrant and highly successful tourism industry now exists in Chile focused on 'heritage tourism' and 'agricultural tourism'. Fundamental to the success has been the development and application of a national online booking system providing a stream lined end user experience. Both state and private operated destinations are audited on a regular basis to ensure standards are being maintained. If an operator is providing a sub-standard experience, their tourism operator licence is immediately cancelled. To re-establish as an operator they have to re-apply for a licence and undergo a rigorous audit.

**New Zealand** – Very strong regional tourism bodies with common charters, objectives and operational models have created an overarching cohesive strategy while still addressing regional characteristics. This highly successful model provides a national and highly regarded approach to heritage tourism that is constantly evolving, adapting and presenting new product. Streamlined booking systems and shared management systems between operators result in a streamlined, well organised and easy experience for the end user.

**National Trust UK** – Arguably the founders of 'heritage tourism', the National Trust throughout the UK has developed a national booking system and operating model across its massive portfolio. Core to management decision-making is creating regional experiences where operators (both National Trust and non National Trust) provide visitor engagement activities which are not duplicated and tell multi-layered heritage stories of the region. An excellent example of this is in Ironbridge – the home of the industrial revolution. Stately homes (built on industrially based revenue), heavy industrial sites, retail precincts, museums, churches, residential areas, and structures built through public works programs present a specific aspect of local heritage. The result for the end user is that they have the

option of participating in selected areas of interest or participating in the complete suite of experiences without duplication of interpretation.

The National Trust in Somerset has developed a range of themed heritage trails where visitors can move throughout the county visiting a multitude of heritage sites on a pre-paid program over a three month period at their own pace. Themes include gardens, musical instruments, architecture, kitchens, paintings, furniture, and maintaining heritage sites as well as human stories such as ‘scandals’, ‘family history’, ‘tales from the war’, ‘writers and artists’ and ‘spooks and weird happenings’.

**Colonia World Heritage Site, Uruguay** – This is probably one of the finest examples of successful collaboration between heritage managers, tourism operators, residents and commercial operators. A government-appointed management organisation was formed with the sole purpose being to preserve heritage values in conjunction with maintaining commercial viability and a resident population. As you move through the streets of this incredible site there is a sense that it clearly is a ‘working’ town coupled with a deep respect for heritage values. It is not a place that has sanitised commercial activity and thus it has avoided a ‘Disneyland’ experience.

**American Association for State and Local History (AASLH)** is a national association that provides a range of services to history professionals in particular within the United States but also internationally. The AASLH offers a range of publications, training and advocacy on behalf of community organisations. Over the years it has developed a significant range of publications of value to the heritage sector including diagnostic and support tools for community organisations. For example:

**Standards and Excellence Program for History Organisations** StEPs helps small- and mid-sized history museums, historic sites and houses (including all-volunteer ones) assess policies and practices, manage daily operations and plan for the future. StEPs uses a workbook, an online community with hundreds of resources, and certificates to help organisations identify their strengths and opportunities for improvement. A three-tiered system of Basic, Good and Better recommendations allows for self-paced progress by even the smallest of organisations. Assessment is common in many professions. Museums find that assessment programs like StEPs are an efficient way to help everyone within their organisation learn more about operating a museum or site. StEPs helps create a roadmap that takes an organisation where it wants and needs to go in order to be a vibrant part of its community.

**VisitorsCount** is an innovative visitor survey instrument that AASLH has developed. It can be used to do three different styles of survey: Gate, Teacher and Spotlight surveys.

The Gate Visitor survey collects data and feedback from general visitors to museums, historic sites, historic houses, and related institutions. AASLH works with the organisation to customise a survey instrument which is a combination of Visitors Count! questions and custom questions that focus on issues specific to the property. The questionnaires are distributed to people who visit the facility with the goal of collecting up to 100 completed surveys in each season (200 total). Data entry, processing and analysis are undertaken by the Centre for Non-profit Management of Nashville, and a final report is delivered electronically. A one-day meeting is provided to help organisations understand the results, benchmarks, key drivers, and priorities for digging deeper. From start to finish, the process takes approximately 10 months.

Teacher surveys are aimed at the educational offerings of the facility while the Spotlight survey looks at a particular aspect of the organisation's marketing, exhibition or interpretation program.

#### **Recommendation 5.1**

That the sub-committee notes the extensive examples of international best practice that are available and, if thought appropriate, recommends to the State Government that more effort be placed on adopting suitable international best practices uniformly in the heritage tourism sector and that support for heritage organisations to achieve these standards be implemented.

#### **National examples**

Closer to home, The National Trust of Australia, Victoria made a submission to the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Heritage and Eco tourism (2013)<sup>10</sup> including the following:

*The 2011 VCEC enquiry, 'Unlocking Victorian Tourism' recognised that both government and industry value ecotourism as a growth sector for the industry. According to 'Victoria's Nature-Based Tourism Strategy 2008–2012', the projected growth in the ten-year period from 2006 to 2016 was a 45% increase in visitation, with China being the largest source market (Tourism Victoria 2008).*

*Some key obstacles identified in the 2008-2012 Strategy (Tourism Victoria 2008) of key concern to the National Trust of Australia (Victoria)'s nature-based destinations include the lack of an integrated policy and planning framework to enable private investment, and limited coordination and focus on sustainable destination planning. The National Trust*

---

<sup>10</sup> Parliament of Victoria *Inquiry into Heritage and Eco tourism* (2013) <http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/enrc/inquiry/349> accessed 20 February 2015

*concur with VCEC (2011) in their assessment that facilitation is a priority for progressing nature-based and regional tourism, particularly with regard to funding assistance programs to leverage new major tourism investment to Victoria.*

*The existence of heritage, its protection and its connection with the community does not guarantee that it will attract tourists. A sanitised heritage presenting a safe interpretation of history and culture holds little appeal and will not generate interest amongst tourists. To have successful heritage tourism, it is necessary to rethink heritage and constantly adapt to the changing needs of the current and emerging tourism market.*

### **Technology and tourism**

The National Trust in Victoria has a significant level of resources and capacity to attract grants and other funding support. As a consequence, it has been able to invest in modern communication mediums. The following serves as an example of what can be achieved with such capacity:

*Lost! Melbourne's Lost 100*, the Trust's third iPhone app was launched during Open House Melbourne 2012. More than 4,200 people, including from China and the US, have downloaded it.

*Lost! Melbourne's Lost 100* is a dynamic app that uses augmented reality to provide the user with a 3D understanding of the now lost city buildings of Melbourne. Markets, mansions, hotels, hospitals, pubs, warehouses and shops are all ready to be explored and help us understand how the city has developed.

Users can view 80 'unlocked' buildings from home but not until you are within metres of another 20 will you be able to access their 'locked' files! A history, photos and stories of these often long demolished buildings will be available, as well as information on buildings currently at risk in the city.

Augmenting their phone's camera function, the app superimposes images of buildings that were there over what is there now. The user can then save these pictures to their phone, email them or upload them to social media. The app has links to both Facebook and twitter so users can upload their images, stories or comments about the sites, through the app as they're using it.

This project was supported by the Lord Mayor's Charitable Foundation, City of Melbourne, Helen McPherson Smith Trust, Public Record Office of Victoria, and State Library of Victoria.

The Commonwealth Government supported the Trust's fourth iPhone app *Our City*, released in August 2013. The App is a social history walking tour of the Melbourne CBD incorporating filmed interviews, photos and textual information on sites of interest.

The App features interviews with Ron Barassi, Mirka Mora, Tim Costello, Shannon Bennett, Tony Wheeler, Nadia Tass, Lillian Frank, Dr Kia Pajouhesh, Rod Quantock, Anson Cameron, Barry Jones and Robyn Archer. It walks the user to 50 sites in the CBD, each with a very special and personal story. User stories of experiences in the city can be uploaded to appear as a permanent part of the app and as a recorded social history of all Melbournians' experiences.

Innovative interactive apps that integrate with social media will have a double benefit for heritage tourism. First they make the sector more interesting to younger demographics, although many older people are now becoming quite tech-savvy, but secondly the use of social media provides free marketing for both the state and the sector with an increased reach particularly for international and national markets.

The widespread acceptance and penetration of technology through smart phones and similar devices opens a new opportunity for guiding and interpretation. The successful implementation of this technology at sites such as MONA, Port Arthur and Highfield provides proof that a more extensive implementation should be undertaken in Tasmania. Community-based organisations often have the material required to create content-rich interpretation, but these organisations rarely have the skills for developing this content to suit the new medium or the resources to achieve it.

Given the level of investment that has been made, particularly in many State Government departments, in this field it appears feasible that a means of supporting community-based organisations could be developed based on the public service's own knowledge.

## **Recommendation 5.2**

That the sub-committee notes the role that modern technology plays in presentation of built heritage nationally and internationally and acknowledges the limitations that non-government heritage sites have in recasting existing content to the new medium.

## 6. Any other matters incidental thereto

An effective heritage tourism model for Tasmania needs to take into consideration many currently overlooked heritage assets and their contribution to the visitor experience and tourism offering. Our built heritage in all its guises provides a multitude of opportunities to engage and delight tourists with its authenticity, diversity and uniqueness. As has been outlined throughout this submission, such opportunities can make major contributions if assisted with professional support for marketing and a suitable funding mechanism for development.

Many key areas often neglected are:

**agricultural heritage** – throughout Tasmania there are inordinate numbers of rural structures that contribute to the visitor experience, such as vertical board barns, post and rail fencing, hedgerows, machinery sheds, livestock yards and dwellings. Many of these heritage structures are abandoned and not maintained, as contemporary farm equipment can't fit into them or standard farming practices have made them impractical.

Many landowners are not aware that they are by default contributing to the tourism industry, as their focus is on maintaining a profitable agricultural enterprise. But the loss of these agricultural structures will over time considerably diminish the tourists' delight of stumbling on such heritage elements when touring.

**mining heritage** – mining has played an important part in the development of Tasmania. But all mines have a finite life. While in many instances there are no opportunities to develop the heritage aspects, some attempts have been made, for example the Beaconsfield Mine Museum and the Trail of the Tin Dragon to name but two. Nevertheless, there are several large mines that will sooner or later become defunct, so planning for another economic driver within those areas should be a priority. The example provided by the adaptation of the disused salt mine at Wieliczka in Poland<sup>11</sup> (the site claims 1,290,288 visitors last financial year) to tourism could be used for a model where safe underground mine workings will be abandoned.

### Higher education

The contribution of higher education/ research institutions to the enhancement of the heritage tourism experience is often overlooked. Sound research is an important underpinning of any venture, and in particular where coordination and collaboration is sought amongst disparate groups towards a common goal.

---

<sup>11</sup> Wieliczka Salt Mine, K <http://www.wieliczka-saltmine.com/>

The Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism, which ceased operations in June 2010, contributed a significant body of knowledge on heritage tourism. Its publications include a 2008 report on critical success factors for cultural heritage tourism,<sup>12</sup> which the National Trust Tasmania endorses. These success factors encompass:-

*Agreed objectives and clear concepts*

*Financial planning for budgeting, capital raising and price setting*

*Effective marketing strategies based on sound market research*

*Human resource management, including paid staff and volunteers*

*Planning for product differentiation, life cycles and value adding*

*Quality and authenticity of products and experiences*

*Engage cultural heritage and tourism expertise in conservation and promotion*

*Design interpretation as an integral part of the heritage tourism experience*

The National Trust Tasmania is pursuing these success factors in revitalising its experiences for tourists and commends them to the sub-committee for its consideration.

#### **Recommendation 6.1**

That the sub-committee notes and, if thought appropriate, recommends the critical success factors developed by the CRC for Sustainable Tourism be used by the State Government as a basis for enhancing the performance of the heritage tourism sector.

#### **Collaboration with University of Tasmania**

Educators and students of the University of Tasmania carry out exceptional bodies of work directly relating to the tourism and heritage sectors. Much of this work is underutilised, as there is no effective available platform to disseminate this knowledge and resource to the tourism and heritage sectors.

The National Trust has been well positioned to access the University of Tasmania thanks to a senior manager of the University sitting on the National Trust Board. The expertise of many individuals at the University has contributed to the National Trust, particularly over the past twelve months, through many practitioners with an extraordinary knowledge of heritage and tourism providing international expertise.

<sup>12</sup> CRC Sustainable Tourism 2008 *Success Factors In Cultural Heritage Tourism Enterprise Management* [www.crctourism.com.au/wms/upload/.../80084\\_Carlsen\\_SUM.pdf](http://www.crctourism.com.au/wms/upload/.../80084_Carlsen_SUM.pdf) accessed 19 February 2015.

The State Government's current partnership with the University of Tasmania could be further expanded to include heritage tourism as a priority area.

**Recommendation 6.2**

That the sub-committee notes the benefits of the long-standing partnership agreement between the State Government and the University of Tasmania and, if thought appropriate, recommends extending the partnership to include heritage tourism as a priority area in the Partnership Agreement.



## APPENDIX B – ABOUT THE NATIONAL TRUST

### History of the National Trust of Australia (Tasmania)

The National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) was registered on 29th April 1960 under the companies Act 1959 as a non-profit making company limited by guarantee. The body's aims and objectives, and the powers and authorities by which the Trust was to operate, were modelled on those of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria). One key difference lay in the composition of the Council. Unlike the Victorian Trust with its nominees, representatives of specific groups and elected members, the Tasmanian council comprised only elected members.

Saving Franklin House (the Hollies) was the driver for the foundation of the National Trust in Tasmania. The house was purchased through public fundraising and was opened to the public on 28<sup>th</sup> October 1961 as the first house museum for the organisation. A new Trust constitution the *National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) Act* was enacted in 1975 by the State Government under which the National Trust of Australia (Tasmania) was incorporated as a statutory corporation. The Trust suffered a significant breakdown in governance function and increasing debts that led to the appointment of an administrator and establishment of a new Act to reconstitute the Trust – National Trust Act 2006 (TAS) (No. 30 of 2006).

### The National Trust Tasmania today

The National Trust manages a portfolio of 13 properties, 10 of which are accessible to the public on a regular basis. The annual turnover is approximately \$1 million.

By opening these properties to the public, the long-term beneficiary is the community – local, interstate and international. The sites provide educative examples that help to demonstrate the original fabrics and sound conservation practices and methods as well as appropriate ways to manage and conserve heritage gardens.

Many of the achievements of the National Trust, and its ability to operate with few paid staff, hinges on the contributions of over 400 volunteers who devote an estimated 50,000 hours to helping to maintain and open Trust properties to the public. This huge contribution, equivalent to 25 FTE positions, is clearly beyond the capacity of the Trust income budget to fund.

The National Trust operates with a triennial funding grant from government that has been fixed at \$300,000 per annum since its inception in 2006. The key purposes of the grant are to "... help ensure the sound and contemporary governance, leadership and management of

the National Trust in Tasmania; the ongoing delivery and expansion of the reach of the Community Heritage Program and the annual Tasmanian Heritage Festival....”; and is not for operation or maintenance of properties.

The Trust’s Community Heritage Program includes:

**Heritage Conservation Appeals Program** – this program offers the opportunity for community groups to establish tax-deductible gift programs for heritage conservation projects in Tasmania.

**Heritage Auspicing Program** – this program enables the National Trust to sponsor non-incorporated bodies with an interest in cultural heritage applying for grants and other support.

**Heritage Assistance Program** – this program enables the National Trust to support local and specialist heritage activities through the provision of professional advice by the Trust’s staff and volunteers.

**Heritage Local Support Program** – this program enables the National Trust to support local heritage initiatives through access to and use of the Trust’s heritage property portfolio.

**Heritage Cooperative Promotional Program** – this program aims to encourage the development of joint marketing initiatives with community-managed heritage sites and collections.

**Heritage Publication Support Program** – this program encourages and supports high quality publications that document aspects of Tasmania’s heritage by marketing through the Trust’s retail outlets and website.

**Heritage Trusteeship Program** – this program enables the National Trust to support community-managed heritage sites by becoming a Trustee for the site.

**Heritage Emergency Documentation Program** – this program enables the National Trust to support heritage groups, community organisations and local government to document threatened cultural heritage.

**Community Heritage Projects Program** – this program was established to develop heritage conservation and interpretation projects that aim to demonstrate good practice.

**The Tasmanian Heritage Festival** held in May each year, and coordinated by the National Trust on behalf of the government, is an annual centrepiece for community engagement. The Tasmanian Heritage Festival brings together over 300 organisations in a range of statewide events celebrating Tasmania’s heritage.

To date, minor property maintenance has been funded from the operating budget. Any larger element of maintenance is either undertaken when grant funds from other bodies become available or bequests are made to properties, or such maintenance continues to be deferred; deferral is to the detriment of the property and substantially escalates subsequent repair costs.

### What is heritage?

The task of the sub-committee is not an enviable one. While the prime focus of the sub-committee's task is on the tourism aspects of built heritage, the issues of management and preservation of built heritage bring with them an array of matters that either directly or indirectly intersects with tourists' perceptions of our built heritage.

In order to define the potential contributions to tourism, a working definition of built heritage is needed so that there is a shared lexicon when this term is used.

For the purposes of this submission, the term 'heritage' for the National Trust, covers all that we, as a society, value today and wish to pass on to future generations. This is a very broad definition of 'heritage', and deliberately so. Its scope is much broader than 'place'. It includes intangible as well as tangible heritage – language and customs, as well as places and moveable collections.

However, are we now living in a 'heritage age'? An age where conservationist values are creating an inexorable burden on those we wish to bequeath our heritage to? Putting it simply, is what we are doing sustainable?

These are questions that exercise the collective intellect of the Board of the National Trust as it tries to grapple with the financial burdens of the properties it owns; and these questions will be of concern to the sub-committee as it considers the management and preservation of what heritage experiences tourists are seeking.

In defining built heritage, both an emotional and financial aspect have to be considered – built heritage has to be something we **care about** and simultaneously **care for**. In considering how built heritage makes a contribution to tourism, the challenge is whether we can make tourists **care about** that heritage – that is see, understand and engage with the meaning it has for our community – and hence inject the economic stimulus that allows us to **care for** that heritage.

It is within this context that the management and preservation tasks have to be considered.

It is clear from the experience of Port Arthur Management Authority – one of the most visited heritage places in Tasmania – that there still isn't sufficient direct economic stimulus to make

the heritage on that site economically sustainable. The Authority also receives a significant injection of funds from governments on a recurrent (approximately \$3.6 million p.a.) and one-off basis to allow it to sustain operations and conserve the site's built heritage.