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Abstract

Rural heritage in South Australia is represented by more than 3000 heritage listed properties located beyond municipal areas. It encompasses tangible aspects of South Australian history including buildings, places, sites and objects. Created by past generations of South Australians this heritage reflects pastoral, agricultural, commercial, industrial and social landscapes of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The survival of these heritage places relies heavily on effective heritage legislation and its associated administrative and financial support frameworks. The aim of the thesis has been to investigate the practical outcomes of current heritage legislation and frameworks. The study has aimed to determine the condition of selected state and locally listed rural heritage places in South Australia. It has explored how the protection afforded and the grants and incentives offered to heritage owners differs between local and state listings. It has examined the conservation and condition monitoring approaches utilised by state and local government, and considered the extent to which responsibility for listed built heritage is placed on the private property owner. Interviews were carried out with owners and an archaeological survey was completed to record the interior and exterior condition of nine properties which included homestead complexes, hotels and mining engine houses.

The research has revealed that it is the substantial time and/or financial commitment made by private owners and organisations, rather than heritage legislation and frameworks implemented by government, which leads to successful conservation. Furthermore, the study demonstrates the pressures faced by rural heritage including neglect and isolation. The thesis argues that, when these pressures are combined with ineffective heritage legislation and frameworks, heritage listing does not guarantee that the heritage values of a place will be protected.
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Introduction

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Australia was driven by a rural based economy. The definitive image that reflects this ambition, especially in rural South Australia, is the abandoned stone cottage sitting isolated in a bright yellow canola field. Fighting isolation and inconsistent rainfall, through agriculture, pastoralism, mining and industry the pioneers that built these heritage structures did much to establish the economic base of a fledging and experimental colony.

As Lennon states (2007:1), post-1960 Australia ‘fell off the sheep’s back’, turning to a mechanical and industrial lifestyle which, for many, is now played out in the municipal urban landscape. As a result, the rural economy declined and rural areas were depopulated. Today, the rural built landscape, including homestead complexes, cottages, outbuildings, mining sites and town buildings, in its neglected state, is a reminder of the economic and social changes of the 19th and 20th centuries. This thesis explores how South Australia works to conserve aspects of this built heritage.

Rural heritage is generally not as considered or understood compared with its urban counterpart. Though facing many problems itself, urban heritage remains in the sight and minds of those who pass it daily and is valued by a community which actively engages with it. Rural heritage by comparison is rarely valued in the same way.

For a minority of these rural heritage structures, individual, community, professional or government awareness of their heritage value has led them to be nominated as part of the state’s ‘official’ heritage list (the South Australian Heritage Register) or, through local government heritage registers. These processes of nomination (at least for state heritage), began with the Heritage Places Act 1978 and is administered currently through the South Australian Heritage Places Act 1993 (state heritage listings) and the South Australian Development Act 1993 (local heritage listings). Entering places into state or local registers is community and government acknowledgment that they are significant and tangible parts of our history which must be protected by appropriate conservation and management practices. For this reason, a proactive approach to identifying and recording rural heritage places, monitoring their condition and uses, implementing conservation strategies that support their values but also cater to their condition and function are key to their conservation.
How Australia’s official state and local built heritage should be conserved is a question asked nationwide. In 2001, and again in 2006, the Australian State of the Environment (SoE) Report highlighted the plight of Australia’s natural, Indigenous and historical heritage. Both reports acknowledged that Australia has no ongoing recording system in place to monitor the condition of the nation’s heritage. They found that states were implementing inadequate heritage policy frameworks and, as a result, the nation’s heritage faced significant threat (see Lennon 2001, 2006a; Pearson and Marshall 2006). The 2006 report stressed that it was in Australia’s best interests to implement an intensive and accurate monitoring system for heritage (Pearson and Marshall 2006:21).

Concern was directed specifically towards readdressing the ‘paucity’ of information existing for the nation’s remote area or rural heritage (Lennon 2006b:15). The 2006 report noted that:

… evolving pastoral and agricultural practices have made the functions of many rural buildings redundant … Because these buildings are not in the public domain their deterioration often goes unobserved except by the owners, and usually no pressure is brought to bear and no assistance offered for their conservation … while the impression is that the deterioration of rural buildings is accelerating, the true scale and extent of this problem is not reflected in heritage registers (Pearson and Marshall 2006:18).

In 2003 the South Australian Government acknowledged the value of its built environment with the release of the discussion paper Heritage Directions: A Future for Built Heritage. The paper influenced the expansion of the Heritage Advisory Service and provided for additional heritage funding over two financial years (Department of Environment and Heritage 2003:n.p). The legislation remained unchanged in regard to identifying and listing. However, amendment was made in relation to state heritage owners’ responsibility for managing heritage places. Under the new terms of the Act owners are required to take ‘reasonable care’ of their property. In those cases where reasonable care is not taken the Minister is given authority to issue an injunction to that owner. Serious breaches of the Act can incur financial penalty.

As a response to the amendments of South Australia’s Heritage Framework, and to conservation issues facing Australia’s rural heritage, this thesis aims to test the efficacy of South Australia’s conservation management processes and, by extension, the efficiency of listings in general.
1.1 Research Questions

By employing case studies from the rural built environment this thesis will investigate how the state's current heritage legislation and frameworks actively influence the effective conservation and management of rural heritage and, if not, why not? This thesis will explore the degree to which responsibility is placed on private property owners to maintain heritage properties, and the extent to which they do this with or without local or state government support. The following subsidiary questions were considered:

1. What is the condition of the selected local and state built heritage structures in Local Government Areas in rural South Australia? Is there a notable difference in the condition of places between these areas and, if so, why may this be?
2. If there are differences, what variation in heritage approaches may influence this?
3. To what extent is responsibility placed on private owners, and, are they aware of the services and incentives offered to them? Furthermore, do they utilise them?
4. Does the use and location of the selected built structures in rural South Australia influence their conservation and management outcomes? If so, in what ways? In addition, does government heritage legislation and frameworks cater to these variables?

1.2 Outline of the Thesis

Chapter 2, 3 and 4 investigate the background themes of the study, including rural heritage, cultural heritage, cultural heritage management, and the current heritage legislation and heritage frameworks in South Australia. Chapter 5 focuses on the methods, including the process of archival research, the rationale for site location and the process of recognising the variables needed for designing a condition recording form. Chapter 6 presents the results of the fieldwork. Chapter 7 discusses the condition of South Australia’s rural built heritage and the effectiveness of the current heritage legislation and frameworks. Lastly, Chapter 8 draws conclusion to the study, outlining the key findings and key recommendations.
2

The Rural Landscape

2.1 Defining Rural Landscapes

Conventional wisdom separates concepts of urban and rural landscapes through social construct, demographic, political, economic and socio-economic ideas (see Brown and Schafft 2011; Bunce 1982; Dewey 1960; Jones 1955; Lennon 2007; United Nations 2011). These varying definitions have meant that the only clear separation of the two landscapes is that, ‘in some vague way the terms rural and urban are related to city and country, to community variations in size and density of population’ (Dewey 1960:80).

Traditionally, rural areas are those places that are ‘culturally the most remote: in the sticks, in the middle of nowhere, in the backwaters of this country and many others, in a word, the countryside’ (Bunce 1982:15). Notions of rural areas are often utopian, informed by those who do not live there but who are influenced by the traditional, idealistic viewpoints of rural life that sharply contrast with that of the city (Williams 1977:40). In Australia, romantic concepts of rural life were impacted by the rapid onset of urbanisation, which created a fanciful idea of the countryside as opposed to the commotion of city life (Winchester and Rofe 2005:269).

Bunce (1982:2), explores the assumption that, in using the adjective ‘rural’, something distinctive is implied in relation to other types of settlement. Likewise, he believes that the sheer amount of interest in the area, which has over the years been expressed through literature, art, poetry and academic research, indicates that, for many communities, the concept holds great importance. Lennon (2007:1) agrees, arguing that aspects of ‘Australianness’ are tied up in those whimsical and idealistic conceptions of the ‘bush’ influenced by images invoked by artists such as Banjo Patterson, or through the invention of the archetypal Australian (see also McManus and Pritchard 2000:17).

Davison (2005:ix) writes ‘long after Australia has ceased to ride, economically, on the sheep’s back, it still seems to ride, spiritually, with the stockmen and drovers, squatters and farmers of the rural frontier’. This suggests that, though most individuals now live in urban areas, Australians generally still identify with images that are stereotypically linked to rural areas. Brown and Schafft (2011:5) also explore rurality through its public creation, explaining that it can be defined as a ‘socially constructed state of mind’ influenced by the symbols and signs individuals imagine and
create. Though academics such as Winchester and Rofe (2005:269) view the rural social construct as mistaken, erroneous or artificial (see also Creed and Ching 1997; Goodall 1999) for many, this stereotype is a surviving idyll, continuing as a perceived and necessary counterpoint to ‘the urban’ (Smailes 1997:19).

In geography and the study of settlement, land use, landscape and scale determine ideas of rurality (Brown and Schafft 2011:5). This can be defined simply by urban areas being measured by the density of buildings and structures in contrast to rural areas, which are sparse and dominated by open spaces. Whilst rural areas are commonly seen as natural, urban areas are constructed or artificial. Bunce (1960:17) also views the landscape of ‘open space’ as being ‘an important distinguishing feature of the settlement of rural areas’. The landscape, he argues, has been dependant on the types of uses that have been applied to it. This is evident, for example, in Australia, where agriculture and pastoralism have been the conventional forms of land use in rural areas. Consequently, the rural landscape has become distinctive because of these associated practices and physical distinctions (i.e. large areas of land dedicated to paddocks).

2.1.1 Defining the Physical Boundaries of South Australia’s Urban and Rural Areas

Both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the South Australian Local Government Association (LGA) define the physical boundaries of urban and rural spaces. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (2000:n.p) separates ‘rural’ through population density, with the categories of rural localities (a population of 200-999 people), other urban areas (populations between 1,000 and 99,999) and rural balance areas (the rural remainder and therefore below 200 people). According to the South Australian LGA (2011:n.p), at present, regional areas begin past the City of Onkaparinga, Adelaide Hills Council, the City of Playford and the Town of Gawler. For this study, all regional areas past these boundaries (excluding the cities of Mt Gambier, Port Lincoln and the Aboriginal community LGA of Gerard) have been considered as ‘rural’ (see Figure 1).

Considering the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ definition of urban and rural through the variable of ‘population’, it is acknowledged that in some of South Australia’s rural towns, as per the LGAs approach, populations fall under the category of ‘urban area’. However, if the area lies beyond the rural/urban divide defined by the LGA (see Figure 1) it is considered as ‘rural’ in this study.
Settlement expansion, population growth and density have also changed the boundaries of the rural landscape. Due to this, areas that would once have been classified as ‘rural’ (such as Mount Barker in the south east of Adelaide) under the LGA classification are now part of the urban landscape. This study recognises that built heritage exists in these urban areas that once contributed to the rural landscape. However, as they are now combined as part of the urban landscape, their context and pressures (such as remoteness) have changed and so, they have not been considered in this study.

2.2 Creating the South Australian Rural Landscape

Initially, the majority of colonists in South Australia used land in and around what is today the Adelaide Plains and the Adelaide Hills (east of the city of Adelaide), for both settlement and cultivation (Kelly 1962; Pike 1957). Divided according to the hundreds system, farming land (Figure 2) was sold by the government in 80 acre sections for £1 per acre. As the demand for wheat became stronger and farmers became frustrated by the difficulty of clearing the mallee scrub that inhabited Adelaide and its surrounding areas, the potential of lands to the north, began
to be realised. Land toward Gawler saw the first expansion of farmers, especially when the train line was pushed to meet mines that opened in Kapunda and Burra in the 1840s (Kelly 1962). Throughout the 1850s, many farmers settled in the fertile areas of the Gilbert Valley and further on towards Auburn and the Clare Valley (Kelly 1962; Meinig 1962; Pike 1957). Expansion of the railway in 1857, 1860 and 1868 saw occupation of areas to the west of the Yorke Peninsula which was also largely influenced by the opening of copper mines (Kelly 1962).

Figure 2 South Australian Land Settlement Intensification 1836 – 1980s (modified by author from Heathcote 1986:16).

One of the most significant pieces of legislation to affect rural communities was the Wastelands Amendment Act 1869 (Cockburn 1925). Under the Act, individuals could purchase land under a credit system, with the owner paying 20% of the asking price outright and the remaining balance within a four year period. This scheme pushed settlement north to Port Pirie and Jamestown, west to the Yorke Peninsula and to the south east (Buxton 1966).
Land to the south east is infamous for poor natural drainage and an above average rainfall. Consequently, settlement of this area was slow and marred by numerous issues. However, in 1872 the new towns of Millicent, Rendlesham and Hatherleigh were opened for selection as a result of drainage schemes which allowed access and created suitable land for agriculture (See Kelly 1962:130).

Vast areas of South Australia were, and still are, pastoral land. Pre 1844 pastoralists built runs on blocks bought from the crown or leased from adjacent free holders (Pike 1957:325). When the following years witnessed the expansion of flock numbers due to ‘natural progression’ and shipments of sheep from Tasmania and the east (Kelly 1962:63), demand for pastoral space grew. Many leaseholds were subsequently granted in this period to pastoralists on the condition that they could be resumed if found to be suitable for agricultural pursuits. Though pastoralism often had the finance and backing of the upper echelons of society, many of the men and families lived isolated lives affected by heat, drought, fire, water and distance (see Cockburn 1925).

Before 1865 almost all rural towns were private ventures established on farmland (Williams 1977:44). As pastoral districts and mining ventures grew in the 1860s the need arose for additional trade centres and ports. Realising this, the government laid out land for the towns of Moonta, Kadina, Wallaroo and Port Hughes. Financial gain heavily influenced the further involvement of government and, by 1865, they were significantly involved in the planning of towns (Heathcote 1980, 1986; Williams 1977). By the 1900s South Australia’s distinct patterns of settlement had become apparent in the landscape (see Heathcote 1986:27). At the height of rural occupation more than 500 towns of varying sizes (Williams 1977:44) existed in rural South Australia (Figure 3).

These towns were often self-sufficient and, as a result, became the social hubs which created the backbone of rural communities (Creed and Ching 1997). Each town was generally home to a hotel, blacksmith, postal service, police station, churches, school, institute, flour mill, butcher and various occupied houses (McDougall and Vines 2009:6). Donovan (1986:45) explores the dominance of commercial buildings (Figure 4) of the 19th century within urban and rural landscapes. He states that in rural areas particularly, many of these buildings survive as physical reminders of the state’s bust and boom days.
Figure 3 Government and private owned towns in South Australia 1836 – 1970s (Williams 1977:43).

Figure 4 Example of a town’s typical main street. Clare c.1870 (State Library of South Australia Image: B19311).
2.2.1 Settlement Beyond the Townships

Rural heritage beyond the township is expressed through architectural and landscape features made up of dwellings or, as Sangiorgi (2008:4) views them ‘production units’. In Australia, a farm or property is generally a consolidated land unit in which the most obvious settlement feature is the farmstead or homestead (Blok 1969; Bunce 1982; Gelt 1991). Other features include shearing sheds, stables, fencing and outbuildings which have been altered and changed with the development of technology, and a shift in the relationship between people and their land (Heathcote 1986; Sangiorgi 2008). Complexes in Australia range from grand homesteads to small-scale farmsteads (see Williams 1969:64). The grand homestead, which often was originally designed in the local vernacular style, was often transformed into what Cox and Stacey describe (1972:20) as a ‘high style’ design which turned a homestead into a ‘work of art’. The larger complexes had numerous outbuildings, employed large workforces and were reflective of a wealthy, affluent lifestyle. Small scale complexes had minor production units attached, were often run by those who owned the property, and the farmstead itself often remained functional and vernacular in style (see Cox and Lucas 1978; Cox and Stacey 1972; Pikusa 1986). From a social perspective, the small scale complexes can reflect anything from middle to a lower class standard of living.

2.2.2 Mining Endeavours

South Australia’s mining history is influenced by a range of short-lived and successful ventures (see Cumming 1986; Drew 2011). The 1840s in South Australia saw one of the state’s largest mining booms as a result of large copper deposits located at Burra and Kapunda (Figure 6). The discovery of these deposits, and the consequential settlement of these two towns, led to the largest decentralisation of the state’s population from Adelaide (Drew 2011:42). In 1850 mining exports had surpassed the wool industry, with mining supplying 67% of the state’s exports (Drew 2011:42).

The mining industry represents many phases and periods in South Australia’s rural history. The ruined and intact structures of chimneys, engine houses, tanks, sheds, miners’ quarters, extensive underground workings and archaeological surface deposits, are dotted throughout the landscape, and are physical evidence of the role this industry played in different rural regions (Figure 5). What remains of these places in the present varies from site to site (see Cumming
Much of the evidence of the smaller ventures is now either rubble or buried under farmland, while many of the larger ventures are open to the public as museums and tourist locations.

Figure 5 Example of a typical mine layout at the Moonta Mine c.1900 (State Library of South Australia Image: B58894).

Figure 6 Mines and smelters in South Australia 1844 to 1877 (Drew 2011:42).
2.2.3 A Changing Landscape

The landscape of rural South Australia today, compared to that encountered by colonists 150 years ago, is vastly different. Since the 1960s rural areas have become ‘increasingly overlooked and forgotten by a society of overwhelmingly city dwellers’ (Williams 1977:17). Australia’s population density in urban areas is now more than triple that of rural areas, despite 52% of land use (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011:n.p) being dedicated to agricultural pursuits (Figure 7).

Technological change significantly altered traditional farming practices (Davison 2005; Pike 1957). In rural areas in the 20th century, this change mainly centred on the mechanisation of farming and the introduction of motor vehicles. Statistics from 1925 onwards illuminate this circumstance through a surge in tractor use and a decline in permanent and temporary rural employment (see Williams 1977:56). Human labour was gradually replaced by machinery and, as a result, individuals steadily gravitated to urban employment (Davison 2005; Goodall 1999; Williams 1977).

Figure 7 Land use in Australia in 2001 (Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 2006:n.p).
The mechanisation of farming also influenced the decline in the number of farm holdings, and particularly small farm holdings. In order to optimise the financial investment of a tractor and other machinery, farmers began to enlarge their land holdings by purchasing small scale farms and, at times, larger properties which were often not connected to their main property (Williams 1977:58). In combination with the decline of holdings, the fragmentation of farms often led to farmers changing the location of their home (Goodall 1999; Williams 1977). In these situations, the original farmstead or homestead complex was often partially or completely abandoned.

As the population of rural areas began to decline (see McManus and Pritchard 2000), townships felt the impact through what has been termed ‘dying town syndrome’ (McCann 2005:n.p). School and church attendance numbers would drop and, in turn, local stores and services would no longer be profitable. Williams (1977:62) explains this decline: ‘as business volume declines, trade centres are less able to offer services that will attract farmers … This lessened demand for one service will depress the demand for another, and so on’. This spiral has led to the isolation of many individuals and farming communities in rural South Australia.

Those once rural areas located on the fringe of municipal areas have also changed with time. In South Australia, towns such as Gawler, Reynella, Noarlunga, Stirling, Crafers and Aldgate, which sit within an 80km radius of the city of Adelaide, have all felt the impact of urban growth and are commonly no longer thought of as rural. Growth of urban areas occurred due to suburbanisation and expansion of the metropolitan area, a rise in urban population, increased mobility through motor vehicle ownership, increased availability of land and the continual romanticisation of rural life by urban populations (Williams 1974, 1977).

2.2.4 Isolation and Invisibility: South Australia’s Rural Built Heritage

As explored in 2.1, Australians still strongly identify with the archetypal and intangible image of what it means to be Australian in a rural setting. Yet, the physical elements of the built landscape that create this story appear largely omitted. Since the 1960s (Williams 1977) rural areas have not only become increasingly isolated and forgotten by the urban population, but also by a state government whose primary heritage concerns lay within the corners of large cities (see Department of Environment and Heritage 2003), and by local governments that face a magnitude of socio-economic, demographic, economic and climatic issues. As Davison (2005:ix) observes ‘in an age of economic rationalism, when everything has its price, it is hard to know how much value Australians attach to the fate of their countryside’.
The Productivity Commission (2006:154) investigation into the state of Australia’s historic heritage found that: whilst ‘pressures on heritage places in growing urban areas may be demolition and redevelopment, … in declining rural areas, neglect or lack of identification are more likely to pose a threat to preservation’. For the majority of rural sites, their abandonment as redundant structures or as a result of population decline often goes unrecorded and their condition becomes ‘subject to vagaries of natural decay, vandalism or theft’ (Lennon 2006b:21). Likewise, the Productivity Commission (2006:18) investigation found that:

Australia’s rural population has declined steadily over the last century, which while simultaneously reducing the capacity to pay for historic heritage conservation within those regions, has led variously to the abandonment of redundant rural buildings and to changes in rural landscapes.

For many of these structures, issues of government funding, which has seen radical change in the past thirty years, has influenced the use and abandonment of rural buildings, both within and outside of towns (see McIntosh et al. 2008). Funding issues have ranged from budget cuts to government-run town services to the ineffective implementation of heritage funding frameworks:

… there are many historic heritage places, particularly in areas with declining populations which, despite their significance for local communities, are either surplus to requirements, redundant, no longer fit for purpose, or too expensive to maintain … the task of conserving all these seems huge, when compared with the financial and human resources available (Productivity Commission 2006:19).

Lennon (2007:6) believes that issues of isolation and invisibility segregate rural heritage from any other. The lack of monitoring and consistent condition reporting on rural heritage places, the lack of services, funding and incentives offered to owners to conserve these structures, elevated heritage trade shortages and the lack of ongoing interest and attention afforded the issue by government and other interested parties, she argues, all affect the conservation of Australia’s rural heritage.

Consequently, rural heritage has become marred by issues which governments and heritage professionals are unsure of how to approach (see Lennon 2007; Pearson and Marshall 2006). The 2006 State of the Environment Report (Lennon 2007) found that there ‘remains a strong
perception’ amongst the heritage profession that rural heritage is continually at risk and in poor condition (see also National Trusts of Australia 2010). In reality, the scope of the situation is not understood and continues to be unaddressed.
Understanding Cultural Heritage

3.1 Cultural Heritage: Value, Identity and a Sense of Place

The power communities and individuals hold in order to recognise, forget, ignore, be unconscious of, or disown their heritage will ultimately influence what heritage, if any at all, is acknowledged and conserved within a community: ‘there will be many things that could be conserved but about which no one will care enough to ensure that they are’ (Howard 2006:6). The concept of cultural heritage therefore, is socially constructed and highly manipulated (Cameron 1997:67). Henry and William (2008:12) believe heritage value is manufactured by individuals who become threatened by change. Individuals will seek to engage and understand moments and places in the past and present, in order not only to define themselves, but also to find a sense of belonging and comfort. Read (1996:2) states that: ‘all really inhabited space bears the essence of the nature of home, that the human imagination begins to create a recognisable place wherever people find the slightest shelter, walls of impalpable shadows or the illusion of protection’.

Group and community heritage exists beyond the more personal and individual heritages most identify with. Read (1996:2) believes that ‘anything that individuals recognise as ‘a place’ has been in part constructed to suit them and in part has been created by wider issues of power, group dynamics, conflicting ideologies and institutions’. Group heritages are intricate and intertwined with notions of power. When a community or group suppresses one group’s heritage in order to push their heritage as majority, heritage becomes an avenue of exploitation (Aplin 2002; Gilmour 2007; Pearson and Sullivan 1995). As easily as heritage can unite a community, it also has the power to divide: the designation, conservation and interpretation of the heritage of one group can simultaneously isolate and devalue another’s.

Many individuals and groups within Australia dedicate their time to caring for a heritage place, site or object. For them, the motivation to do so frequently results from a perceived benefit for themselves or others (see Table 1). Individuals, groups and communities create a collective memory, identity and heritage which they mark with the various symbols which incite ‘remembering’. Enthusiasm for this remembrance arises from nostalgia of what was in the past and in order to claim ownership over what exists of that past in the present. Pearson and Sullivan (1995:18) view this enthusiasm as ‘feelings of reverence for the age of the place, its place in the
community’s heart as a symbol or shrine for some past event or period, or its value as a landmark or familiar visual element creating for people a sense of place’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value type</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>‘Strongly agree’ and ‘Agree’</th>
<th>‘Strongly disagree’ and ‘Disagree’</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct use value</td>
<td>Looking after heritage is important in creating jobs and boosting the economy</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect use value</td>
<td>My life is richer for having the opportunity to visit or see heritage</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option value</td>
<td>It is important to protect heritage places even though I may never visit them</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence value</td>
<td>Heritage is part of Australia’s identity</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The historic houses in my area are an important part of the area’s character and identity</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-use values</td>
<td>It is important to educate children about heritage</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Community perception of heritage related values summarised in the Allen Consulting Group study (2005:viii).

Dowell (2008:47) discusses heritage and memory in relation to territoriality and the idea that memory has become a ‘metaphor of a physical location’. Heritage, however, is not always linked to the ‘physical consistency’ of a structure (Wright and Falconer in Dowell 2008:47). The intangible, in comparison to the tangible record, is immaterial and holds as much potential to inform individuals about their heritage as do physical aspects. Henry and William state: ‘the fact that something might physically disappear … does not mean that it no longer exists in terms of heritage’ (2008:15). The contribution of intangible heritage is a key and valued component of many cultures. For example, residents of the former town of Yallourn, in Victoria, Australia, which was dismantled in the 1980s, and subsequently excavated as an open cut mine, still identify with the intangible aspects of their heritage, engaging with their favourite occupation of ‘talking Yallourn’ (Fletcher 2002:4). Together, they keep their memories active and in turn keep Yallourn alive.
In contrast to this however, after the town was physically removed, Yallourn ‘residents [also] felt that it was ‘lost’ to them and that their heritage had been dug up for coal’ (Fletcher 2002:222). This feeling of loss residents faced survives as they continue to feel disconnected from their past, their identities and the material culture which helped shape their lives. Read (1996:xii) writes: ‘let us not underestimate the effect which the loss of dead and dying places has on our own self-identity, mental well-being and sense of belonging’. As Relph explains (see Seamon and Sowers 2008:43), it is all too often that individuals take for granted the ‘nature of place and its significance as an inescapable dimension of human life and experience’. That is, the meaning and significance individuals can create or place on the physical aspects of a landscape become part of everyday life and create a ‘complex attachment to the physical world’ (Basso 1996:55). As Yallourn residents experienced, the built environment embodies meaning and concepts of identity that cannot be conjured in an alternative space. Torre and Mason (2002:3) found that: ‘value has always been the reason underlying heritage conservation. It is self-evident that no society makes an effort to conserve what it does not value’. The community of Yallourn learnt that a sense of place can transcend from the obvious (artefacts, buildings) to the mundane (gardens, street signs) (see also Clifford and King 2006:n.p). Relationships, experiences and attachments become part of the physical, built environment. Whilst it may be that heritage can hold an intangible presence in memory, continuity in identity and belonging can be severed and intense pain inflicted when the physical aspects of a person’s heritage are removed. As in Yallourn:

... their past was obliterated. The places that helped explain who they were, and that could impart knowledge on of their lives to children and grandchildren, were now in a deep black hole, an abyss. Many described themselves as lost souls, who have lost their place and the rootedness that defined their identity as individuals (Fletcher 2002:197).

Survey work undertaken by the Allen Consulting Group (2005), supports this finding from the literature introduced above as: ‘80% of survey respondents said that their local heritage was of great importance and contributed to their area’s identity, sense of place and amenity’ (MacDonald 2008:2).

3.2 The Management of Our Heritage

Cultural heritage management, in its simplest form, concerns the implementation of systems and strategies, including inventory, assessment and planning processes that provide for a constructive outcome (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:188). Conservation should involve ‘all those
processes’ (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:9) of continuous care that not only look after a place but also retain its cultural significance (see Australia ICOMOS 1987). Comprehensive and successful management can be complex and involved, with professionals and owners working to provide for the identification, documentation, conservation, interpretation, maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction or adaptive re-use of a site (Aplin 2002; Schofield 2008). The utilisation of these elements of cultural heritage management, however, is not always interconnected. Often it is the case that the parties involved (including owners, occupiers, neighbours, users, local councils, state and national governments and a range of interest groups and individuals) have differing views on what, if any, action is necessary and for this reason cultural heritage management frequently becomes a debate about the originality versus authenticity of a structure’s fabric (see Jameson 2008).

3.2.1 Maintenance and the Path to ‘Proactive’ Conservation

In carrying out conservation work, minimum standards of maintenance should be applied so as to avoid responsive conservation which, as Forster and Kayan state (2009:211), is sporadic, un-systematic and of low priority. Conservation, if monitored, instead has the ability to be proactive, providing assurance that large, expensive and unexpected conservation issues can be avoided due to regular attention to the condition of the fabric.

According to Kerr (1996:12), maintenance must be seen as ‘the single most important conservation process. Whether the place is architectural, mechanical or botanical, prevention is better than cure’. In Australia, achieving and documenting regular maintenance efforts, and therefore creating a ‘proactive’ management approach, is often not achieved (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:9). Though, in South Australia, a state heritage owner is required under legislation to take ‘reasonable care’ of their heritage property (see 4.1.2), after initial listing (as with local heritage) no formal process of conservation management is called for and no regular method of reporting on the fabric of a property is undertaken by either the owner or local government. This is despite the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) (2008:2) acknowledging that: ‘a building is a major asset. Its value, both in financial terms and in the satisfaction it brings to its users, is affected by its condition’.

In Europe, condition surveys are commonly carried out in order to collect information on the condition of a structure, record the progress of repairs carried out since the last inspection, document the need for further repair, and to understand the urgency and importance of further
works (Dann and Worthing 2005). Dann and Wood (2004:143) believe ‘the term “condition survey” implies a record of a building’s condition at a particular moment in time’, and state that it serves the purpose of mitigating vulnerability and avoiding the loss of fabric. Further to this, however, they suggest that condition surveys have the potential to ‘provide strategic monitoring information on the effects of policy decisions on the historic environment’ (Dann and Wood 2004:143). That is, regular condition monitoring of a heritage property can potentially provide an indication on the effectiveness of both heritage frameworks (i.e. professional consultation services, conservation management plans, and state and local heritage funds) and heritage legislation. Pearson and Sullivan (1995:239) believe that recording the condition of a site can help better understand and establish a place’s significance, but that it also creates a database of work against which a place can be monitored, if and when, future work is carried out: ‘it is a safeguard against mistakes, and an aid to later study and interpretation’.

Many heritage professionals (e.g. Dann and Cantell 2005; Dann and Worthing 2005:94; Forster and Kayan 2009) are concerned that conservation strategies carried out by heritage organisations, council and government are primarily centred around philosophical approaches toward, and the means to accomplish, specific conservation works. They are not, however, focused on how these principles can be applied to long term management processes, such as condition surveys and, as a consequence, conservation can easily be seen as efficient without necessarily being effective (Forster and Kayan 2009:210).

According to Forster and Kayan (2009:216), proactive heritage maintenance is often looked upon as the ‘Cinderella sector’: unglamorous and inferior and creating a significant ‘burden’ for those parties involved. Though heritage maintenance is considered of the utmost importance and a priority for heritage professionals, it is rarely the focus of government heritage decisions (Dann and Worthing 2005; Forster and Kayan 2009; Wood 2005). The regular maintenance of historic buildings, therefore, is continually understated (Dann and Cantell 2008) and ‘considered as a “low-status professional” operation which “does not gain the attention” that it deserves’ (Forster and Kayan 2009:216).

In South Australia, though some attempt is made at the time of listing to assess and record the condition of a place (see Appendix 1), in-depth initial study and follow up is not routinely required and is infrequent if not non-existent. The 2006 State of the Environment Report (SoE) (Pearson and Marshall 2006:24) recommended that this situation be addressed by further encouraging, supporting and intensifying national, state and local survey and documentation practices beyond
initial recording processes. The 2001 and 2006 SoE reports acknowledged that ‘the assessment of the physical condition of heritage places … alerts managers to the pressures impacting on heritage values of these places and objects and the need for conservation-based responses’ (Lennon 2006b:13). To date, however, this situation has not been rectified. Maintenance continues to be ‘carried out on a crisis basis – that is, when something falls off, cracks or collapses’ (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:245).

### 3.2.2 The Cost of Heritage

The priorities of heritage management and the provision of funding to preserve heritage are exceedingly controversial and political (Aplin 2002; Davison 2008; Gilmour 2007). In Australia, government funding is available to those places or sites officially listed as national or state heritage places in the form of grants and various incentives (see Chapter 4 for further information).

The 2006 SoE report found that government funded conservation programs across Australia are not accomplishing any long-term conservation outcomes. In fact, ‘many places which have received conservation funding over the last two decades are not being maintained and are now in a deteriorating condition’ (Pearson and Marshall 2006:21). Though long-term maintenance methods have been found to decrease the cost of management and repair (see Dann et al. 1999), proactive methods are yet to be acknowledged by the South Australian government (Figure 8). Issues of inadequate maintenance systems and funding continue to affect heritage in South Australia. This is despite the Department of Environment and Heritage (now DENR) stating in 2008 (3) that continual ‘vigilance and prompt action will save money, limit the extent of damage and protect the historic value of the place’.

In 2004, the National Incentives Task Force (32) found that ‘budget appropriations for historic heritage in Australia have generally stagnated or declined over the last decade’. This decline continued and in 2008, 37 senior heritage officials including former chairs of the Australian Heritage Council claimed:

…the overall situation with Australia’s historic heritage is at its lowest point since before the time of the Whitlam government in the 1970s … there are major problems with funding for conservation, education and training, promotion, awareness, organisational capacity and research (Australian Greens Party 2010:n.p).
This situation is reflected in South Australia, where the annual budget for the State Heritage Fund of $250,000 dollars has not changed in the past five years (see 4.2.2). When compared against other states’ heritage funding (Figure 9), South Australia’s allocation is considerably lower. In New South Wales, $5.458M of funding for the period 2011 to 2013 has been allocated by government, adding up to a total of $1.819M per year (Office of Environment and Heritage 2011:n.p). In Western Australia, grants of up to $100,000 are offered through a competitive process, with approximately $1M allocated to heritage conservation works between 2010 and 2011 (Heritage Council of Western Australia 2011:n.p). On top of this grant scheme (i.e. the Heritage Grants Program), owners of heritage in Western Australia are also eligible to apply for the Heritage Loan Subsidy Scheme, local government grant programs, Lotterywest grants, and Federal Government grants (see Appendix 7).
In 2005, the Allen Consulting Group (34) found that, the majority of survey participants supported additional financial assistance for heritage programs. It is a common argument that, since heritage ‘belong to the people’ (Boer and Wiffen 2006:217), the people, through their government, should be responsible for its conservation, preservation and care and that part of this responsibility should be assisting with the financial cost of maintenance (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:314). In 2002, the Heritage Council Victoria (2004:n.p) found that owners of heritage properties had come to expect ‘at least some’ funding opportunities to help maintain their property. Over the years, various Australian governments, including in South Australia, have attempted to respond to these issues through various grants and tax incentives (see Chapter 4). New South Wales’ Heritage Incentive Program has been one of the most targeted and successful programs (MacDonald 2008:3). Through this initiative, state government provides financial assistance to local council, including regional and rural councils, in order to support the administration of heritage.

The success and effectiveness of financial assistance for heritage is a perennial issue nationally (see National Incentives Task Force 2004). The ICOMOS Burra Charter (basic heritage guidelines followed by most professional heritage practitioners) lists the management of a place and the monitoring of a place as the two final steps in protecting and conserving heritage (Smith 2005:103). Current financial support in South Australia for heritage does not supply sufficient funding to equally implement these two steps for either local or state heritage listed places. There
are over 2215 state heritage places in South Australia and a total of $250,000 in funds available. If the system distributed funds uniformly over a one year period each heritage site would receive approximately $112.00. Hence, the program is rigorous and selective with just 74 applicants applying in 2009/2010 and only 8 grants offered (see 4.2.2).

3.2.3 An International Perspective

Internationally, heritage conservation agencies have been developing ‘special scheduling procedures to ensure a simple and regular maintenance inspection of buildings to identify problems at an early stage, and thus save the money that the ‘crisis’ approach involves’ (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:245).

In 1973 the Dutch non-government organisation Monumentenwacht recognised the need to utilise preventative maintenance in the care of its countries more than 22,000 heritage places and objects. Through a yearly cycle of systematic inspection and maintenance, the organisation has managed for more than thirty years to ‘prevent the deterioration of historic buildings by advising the owners on how to keep their property in good condition’ (Monumentenwacht Nederland n.d-a:1). It believes that through annual inspection, reporting and providing advice on appropriate maintenance, the process of owning a heritage building can be simplified:

If wooden window frames and doors are painted every four to five years they will remain in perfect condition. If the painting is put off, however, the paint will crack, flake off and any damp will be able to penetrate the wood and cause it to rot. The resulting damage demands massive, and thus expensive, repairs. (Monumentenwacht Nederland n.d-a:1).

Monumentenwacht is structured so that, at the request of an owner, inspection of condition and repair is carried out by one of the eleven independent provincial organisations that employ staff with technical training in heritage, maintenance and construction (Luijendijk 2000). Depending on the size and condition of the structure, follow-up inspections occur annually or every two years.

Under Dutch law, it is a requirement of each heritage property owner to subscribe to this service in order to receive a heritage subsidy (Monumentenwacht Nederland n.d-b). Monumentenwacht (n.d-a:1) has found that, as a result of the program, owners have become aware of the condition of their property and have ‘become more committed and increasingly follow the maintenance advice we provide’.
On average the organisation incurs an annual cost of €112,000 (Approximately AUD $150,000) per team (Luijendijk 2000:10). Funding to cover costs is made up of contributions from owners as part of their subscription, as well as inspection fees and a subsidy from the provincial government (approximately 75 – 90%). In recent years, other countries, including England, France, Italy and Germany, have realised the potential for a program like Monumentenwacht in improving the condition of their country’s heritage properties. Organisations such as Maintain Our Heritage (England), the Raadvad Centre (Denmark) and Historic Scotland have integrated aspects of the Monumentenwacht framework into their heritage programs.

In 1991, English Heritage, a non-department public body of the British Government, implemented its Buildings at Risk program and the Buildings at Risk Register. One thousand, four hundred and twenty eight of England’s most important heritage buildings were included on the register as places that ‘were at risk of damage or loss if urgent steps were not taken to stabilise their condition’ (English Heritage 2008:10). The program’s ultimate goal is to accomplish a ‘dynamic picture of the health’ (English Heritage n.y) for the country’s heritage and to create a resource that can be used by everyone. Sponsored largely through government funding the program has steadily received financial assistance since 1998 when £5.1M (AUD $7M) was invested. Since its inception, £69.8M (AUD $96.05M) has been allocated to the program (English Heritage 2011a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Register year</th>
<th>Amount offered</th>
<th>Number of buildings at risk</th>
<th>Cumulative total offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>£5.1m</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>£5.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>£6.6m</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>£11.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>£5.7m</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>£17.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>£5.3m</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>£27.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£4.8m</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>£32.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>£4.7m</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£36.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>£4.3m</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>£41.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>£4.9m</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£45.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>£4.4m</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£51.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>£4.1m</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£49.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>£8.5m</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>£58.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>£6.2m</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>£64.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>£5.2m</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£69.8m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Total English Heritage grants offered to listed buildings ‘at risk’ from 1998/99 to 2010/11 (English Heritage 2011a:n.p)

The methodology for the program uses local planning authorities, local community and English Heritage staff. During the year staff assess those places already placed on the Register and
those places that have been nominated. Every year, existing entries on the Register are inspected and re-recorded to update information. Only when a place is seen as fully repaired and secure is it removed from the Register. The success of the program is highlighted through conservation of the Shildon Cornish Engine House in Northumberland (English Heritage 2011c:n.p). Listed as being in poor condition on the register from 2005, it was repaired in 2009 as part of the 'Living North Pennines Project'. Prior to listing and the resulting conservation, the building was in a state of disrepair, it had no roof, leaving the engine house exposed to weather (English Heritage 2011c:n.p). Work in 2009 stabilised the structure which ‘over time … would have crumbled and disappeared completely’ (J. Charlton in BBC News 2010:n.p). It was officially removed from the Heritage at Risk register in 2011.

![Figure 10 Shildon Cornish Engine House and chimney](English Heritage 2011c:n.p)

The approach of organisations in the Netherlands and England demonstrates that, when a program has a clear course of action in relation to conservation and maintenance, an appropriate annual inspection cycle can be implemented (Dann et al. 1999). Additionally, the programs mentioned reveal that maintenance systems supported by government reinforce the initial legislative commitment made to the significance of a site and reflect and confirm the value that communities and governments place on their heritage properties.
The Legislative Framework

4.1 Heritage Legislation

Legislation is central to effective heritage management. Much like the definition of ‘heritage’ itself, heritage legislation, is a fluid concept which relates to both the listing and protection of heritage, as well as to the development of control mechanisms (Local Government Association 2011:n.p). For every country, the utilisation of agreed upon guidelines, frameworks and standards is essential (see Pickard 2001; Pollock-Ellwand 1992; Techera in press; Vecco 2010) in order to move from ‘questions of principle to issues of practical application’ (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:36). Many organisations, not solely governments, participate in heritage projects. Yet, because of governments’ ability to provide funding and attempt a level of control through legislation, they tend to be the dominant party (Ballester 2001:xiii). Without a legislative process, no authoritative basis would exist to push for co-operation in the management and conservation of Australia’s cultural heritage.

The legislative framework for heritage in Australia provides three tiers of heritage control and management: national, state and local. Consequently, management is fragmented as it moves from national, which is often seen as exclusive (see Boer and Wiffen 2006; Parrott 1990), to state and then local heritage, which are generally the two categories that suffer from what Pearson and Sullivan (1995:34) describe as a lack of ‘effectiveness’:

Australia has a great range of heritage legislation, of varying degrees of effectiveness. This effectiveness depends on the quality and comprehensiveness of the legislation, the zeal and wisdom with which it is implemented, and the adequacy of the administrative and technical systems and financial resources supporting it.

At a state level, each state and territory is responsible for the legislative processes enacted to protect their heritage. Powers given to State Government under the Heritage Places Act 1993 (see 4.1.1) allow for heritage to be assessed as significant at both the state and local levels. Responsibility for the care of local heritage is then passed on through legislation to local councils, which compile heritage lists. In South Australia, local heritage lists are included within a council’s Development Plan whilst State Heritage Places are entered onto the State Heritage Register,
which is developed under a regulation of the South Australian *Heritage Places Act 1993* (see 4.1.1).

### 4.1.1 A Brief History of Heritage Protection in Australia

In South Australia, the movement to protect built heritage gained momentum throughout the 1960s and 1970s (Cosgrove and Marsden 2005). Initially, heritage protection (see Davison 2000), was an interest of upper socio-economic income groups and was seen ‘as a means of preserving particularly grand buildings and monuments for future posterity’ (Petrie 2005:177). Broader public interest in South Australia’s heritage throughout the 1970s encouraged interest beyond the aesthetic, and forced the discipline to acknowledge that the significance of a stone cottage can be equivalent to a grand estate.

In 1972, the Australian Commonwealth began its commitment to heritage conservation when the National Estate Grants Program was established, along with a commission of enquiry in 1974 (National Trusts of Australia 2008). The enquiry (see Crow 1993) aimed to determine the breadth of Australia’s heritage and suggested that up until then Australia had shown no ongoing interest in either the natural or historical heritage of its country. As a result, the *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975* was passed, followed by the establishment of the Register of the National Estate. In the succeeding decades, the Australian Heritage Commission entered over 13,000 heritage places and sites into the Register (Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 2007:n.p).

In 1999 *The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* was established. This Act protects heritage of ‘nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, [and] ecological communities and heritage places’ (Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 2007:n.p). In January 2004 under this Act, a new national heritage system was created and the Register of the National Estate was abolished. This change was determined by the Council of Australian Government’s decision in 1997 to rationalise ‘existing Commonwealth/State arrangements for the protection of places of heritage significance through the development of a co-operative national heritage places strategy’ (Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 1997:n.p). At this time, agreement was made that each tier of government, within each state and territory, should be responsible for protecting heritage at the appropriate level (see Productivity Commission 2006).
4.1.2 Heritage Places Act 1993 and Development Act 1993

Until the 1990s and as per the South Australian State Historic Guidelines, regional surveys of South Australia’s heritage were completed in order to assess places of state and occasionally local heritage. At this time both categories were the state’s responsibility. In 1993 the South Australian Heritage Places Act 1993 (see Appendix 2) was enacted to protect places of state significance only. This legislation (see Part 2(4)) is designed to provide ‘for the identification, recording and conservation of places and objects of non-Aboriginal heritage significance; to establish the South Australian Heritage Council; and for other purposes’.

The Act gives authority to the Minister of Environment and Conservation and the South Australian Heritage Council, which is an independent body that provides strategic advice to both the Minister for Environment and Conservation and the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. The Council also administers aspects of the Heritage Places Act 1993 including the State Heritage Fund, and as per the Development Regulations 2005, establishes the Register Committee which considers nominations for heritage listings (see South Australian Heritage Council 2010).

In order to be considered as having heritage value, a place must satisfy one of the criteria listed in the South Australian Heritage Places Act 1993 (see Appendix 2). Once nominated, considered and officially recognised, the heritage place is then entered into the South Australian Heritage Register, which acts as an inventory of South Australian heritage places (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 2011a:n.p).

The Act, whilst providing much of the administrative regulations for the nomination and listing of heritage, also specifies penalties for individuals who may have breached it. As a result of amendments to the Act in 2005, it is now a requirement that owners take reasonable care of their property or face a penalty of up to $75,000 (H. Angas pers.com., 28 September 2011). Though the Act is designed to provide means for the conservation of the state’s heritage and specifies that owners take ‘reasonable care’, there are no specific regulations set out within the document as to how this can and should be accomplished. This situation supports Pearson and Sullivan’s (1995) observation that heritage legislation exists at varying levels of effectiveness. Though South Australia’s legislation addresses the need for conservation and management, it does not deal with the practicalities of implementing those processes.
As part of one of the first legislative heritage cases in the state, the with ‘reasonable care’ clause of the Act is currently being tested. The government has issued the owner of state heritage listed property Bell’s Plumber Shop on Payneham Road, with a Heritage Place Protection Order, formally acknowledging that the owner may have breached terms of the Act. Constructed in 1883, ownership of the property passed to Hamilton Hill Pty Ltd in 1997 (Whitford 2010a:n.p). Since this time the building has suffered fire damage and has been vacant for more than 4 years. In 2009, the Australian National Trust recognised the building on its Our Heritage at Risk Register, with architect David Beaumont (Beaumont in Whitford 2010b:n.p) stating: ‘the place is disgraceful’ … It’s damaged and vandalised and there’s been no attempt made to clean it up …It is in extremely poor condition, due to a combination of factors including age, vandalism and neglect’. This situation has culminated despite McDougall and Vines finding in 2010 that the building and its heritage elements were repairable (Moore 2010:22). This case opens the door for a precedent to be made for the definition of ‘reasonable care’ and for government to re-explore its conservation guidelines.

In 1993, legislation was passed to specifically cater for, among other issues, the heritage nomination and conservation of local heritage by local government. As a result, local heritage is now managed and protected through the Development Act 1993 (see Appendix 2). English Heritage (2008:317) argues that the development and understanding of local heritage for, and by, the community leads to an effective and powerful increase in public involvement and awareness, as well as creating a link to the community’s past. In keeping with this, the Productivity Commission report (2006:77) found that in Australia ‘it is at the local level where the vast majority of historic heritage places are statutorily recognised’. This is reflected in South Australia, as statistics from DENR (2010b:n.p) show that, there are more than 6,474 local heritage places in South Australia compared to the state’s 2215 heritage places.

The Development Act 1993 provides for the preparation of Development Plans, which, if a local council wishes, can ‘describe the characteristics and other aspects of the natural or constructed environment that are desired within the community in order to provide clear directions with respect to development in the relevant area’ (South Australian Government 1993:3). Under Part 3, Division 2 Section 23(4) criteria to designate a place as being of local heritage value are explained. Part 3, Division 2 Section 23(6) also states that, among other things, the ‘Development Plan should seek to promote the provisions of the Planning Strategy and may set out or include … (iv) the management or conservation of land, buildings, heritage places and heritage areas’.
Local government is made responsible for the production and documentation of heritage surveys (a report which details current and possible future heritage places) within their areas. These surveys are contracted to heritage professionals and are often commissioned in order to submit a Heritage Plan Amendment report which, according to the Development Act 1993, has the power to change the council’s current Development Plan and therefore alter existing heritage provisions (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 2011b:n.p).

In many cases, this process can be facilitated by funding and guidance from state government (see Productivity Commission 2006:77). However, it is not compulsory in South Australia for a Local Government Area (LGA) to authorise a local heritage list, though it has strongly been encouraged in recent years.

Caring for local heritage in South Australia is often a problematic issue for local government (National Trusts of Australia 2010:6). As with state heritage conservation, local heritage protection legislation falls short of providing practices or explanation as to what ‘conservation’ should in fact entail. Though support is possibly offered to owners through a Heritage Advisory Service, funding is not offered equally across the board (see Sullivan 2006). Information about how and why these places should be cared for is often not accessible to owners unless they seek it out themselves. This echoes the situation in England, where the heritage organisation Maintain Our Heritage found that ‘current historic building enforcement powers and procedures require urgent review to encourage local authorities to be more proactive in halting deterioration before buildings fall into disrepair’ (Maintain our Heritage 2004:6); circumstance are similar in South Australia.

### 4.1.3 Heritage Directions: A Future for Built Heritage

In August 2003 the South Australian Government released the discussion paper Heritage Directions: A Future for Built Heritage for public consultation. The paper proposed changes to the framework for built heritage and, after consultation, was followed up with official amendments of the Heritage Act 1993 in 2005. The framework was developed with the understanding that it would unify state and local government and assist both in working together ‘effectively’ in recognising, maintaining and capitalising on the state’s heritage assets (Department of Environment and Heritage 2003:8).
Seven key issues and initiatives for the future of the state’s built heritage were outlined in the paper, all of which stemmed from the general concern that ‘heritage assets are receiving limited attention and resources and are therefore slipping in both profile and condition’ (Department of Environment and Heritage 2003:3). In short, the paper aimed to renew what had become an ineffective system.

Of relevance to this thesis is the statement that legislation would ‘provide for more effective incentives as well as for conservation orders and possible offences’ (Department of Environment and Heritage 2003:5), and that the proposed framework would aim to further support local government through the provision of heritage training, the expansion of the Heritage Advisory Service and through the continuation of financial assistance for the development of heritage plans and for grants and loans to private heritage owners.

The LGA responded to the proposal, stating (Local Government Association 2004:n.p):

> Whilst Councils are generally supportive of the strategic direction being taken by the State Government, there is concern that any new initiatives/processes/changes are adequately resourced in terms of financial and administrative assistance that is able to be provided to Local Government to facilitate improved management of heritage within the community.

In 2004, the government announced funding of $2.9M over four years to achieve the goals highlighted through the discussion paper with additional funding of approximately $1M per annum in the following years. In total, $580,000 was allocated to local government in South Australia over a period of four financial years. Specifically, it was assigned to assess the significance of local heritage places, to undertake Heritage Plan Amendment reports and to establish local heritage incentive schemes (Gailit 2004:1). Funding was allocated to those councils that applied for assistance and was offered twice within the four year period (Local Government Association 2008). Funding for the initiative, however, has not been renewed beyond four years and so the incentive has ceased.

### 4.2 Heritage Frameworks

Pearson and Sullivan argue (1995:80) that ‘the well-managed site is like the tip of an iceberg: it floats because it is supported by nine times the resources apparent on site’. These resources can
involve adequate funding, support from government for private owner(s), public support, teamwork, planning mechanisms and effective legislation. Without this framework it is impossible to actively care for a heritage site. In Australia, the implementation of systems designed to assist and facilitate heritage legislation and therefore ensure heritage protection are enacted and monitored by government, community organisations and not-for-profit organisations. Between each state, these systems exist at varying levels of success (see Productivity Commission 2006). The following sections explore the programs and mechanisms established by the South Australian government.

4.2.1 The Heritage Advisory Service

For local government, the Heritage Advisory Service is the only genuine avenue of support and consultation provided through the State Government: ‘the provision of free heritage advice has facilitated revitalisation of once depressed towns with historic character, giving the area new focus and direction’ (McDougall and Vines 2008:n.p). This service (which is available in the majority of Australian states), employs a conservation specialist with an architectural background and offers professional heritage advice not only to local council but also to private owners and organisations (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 2010a:n.p). Within local government, both a state and local Heritage Advisor is employed on a consultancy contract, with visits to the council weekly to once or twice a month. Salary for the position is jointly raised through DENR (for the state heritage position only) and by the appropriate council (Table 3). The key role of a Heritage Advisor is to assist government through advice on planning, development plan improvement and local awareness and promotion, and to assist private owners through advice on maintenance repairs, and alterations while maintaining the overall heritage significance and value of a place (see Productivity Commission 2006:234).

The Productivity Commission’s report (2006:335) found that in South Australia, 44% of councils employed a Heritage Advisor, 93% of whom were employed part-time and worked, on average, 1.9 days per month.
Table 3 Proportion of LGAs which received financial assistance by state (Productivity Commission 2006:336)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Proportion of responding councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Financial assistance provided by State Heritage Office or equivalent. In some cases, other sources (such as rural development funds) have also been identified. Normally, the council is also required to contribute to the cost of the heritage advisor.
Source: Productivity Commission Survey.

An unnamed local government which provided in-depth response to the issue (Productivity Commission 2006:349), stated in regard to the Heritage Advisory Service that its council has made a ‘significant effort to maintain and enhance built and cultural heritage. However funding assistance from State and Federal levels has been extremely limited’. Since commencement of the Heritage Advisory Service, more than $6.1M in funding has been dispersed by all state governments (see McDougall and Vines 2008). Yet, funding cuts, especially in South Australia, have made the delivery of the program complex (McDougall and Vines 2008). For rural areas especially, it has been found that ‘the heritage advisor may be the only professionally trained planner or architect that a council has to do any of their development assessment or planning work’ (Wood 2003, 2005), thereby making the service pivotal to the conservation of heritage in rural areas. Yet, despite the program being found to be one of the most cost effective management tools for Australia’s heritage (see McDougall and Vines 2008), when an owner purchases a heritage property, they are not made aware of this service (S. Hosking pers.com., 4 October 2011) and often, no other conservation information is provided to them either by council or the State Government.

4.2.2 The State Heritage Fund

The State Heritage Fund is provided in order to assist essential conservation works, including repair and restoration, for South Australia’s State Heritage Places. Any owner of a State Heritage Place can apply for a monetary grant. On average, 80 owners apply per year (Table 4) and half of
these applications (with the exception of 2009/2010) are funded (see South Australian Heritage Council 2010:12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Monetary Funding Availability</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Offers Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>74 applicants</td>
<td>8 offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>87 applicants</td>
<td>43 offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>$ 305,000 ($55,000 from previous year)</td>
<td>85 applicants</td>
<td>53 offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>$ 273,000 ($23,000 from previous year)</td>
<td>100 applicants</td>
<td>62 offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>130 applicants</td>
<td>71 offers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 State Heritage Fund budget statistics (modified from South Australian Heritage Council 2010:n.p).

Successful applicants must show that they either aim to complete essential conservation works to significant built places or that they are undertaking a project that demonstrates planning for the future. In South Australia, monetary grants are most often rewarded for large scale repairs to roofing and walls (see South Australian Heritage Council 2010). There is a perception amongst heritage owners who care regularly for and maintain their property that they often fall between the cracks of the system because they actively care for their heritage place. These owners are often disheartened and therefore decide to disengage from the incentive system (M. Birnie pers.comm., 24 September 2011).

Professional debate over the success of these programs in Australia and South Australia is lacking. Reflecting upon grant programs in England, the heritage sector found that the implementation of systems that only offer finance for repair does in fact ‘reward neglect, penalizing prudent owners who have maintained their property in good condition at their own expense’ (English Heritage in Maintain our Heritage 2004:22). English Heritage has since made a shift to a proactive, planned maintenance approach and hopes in turn to reduce the budget of repair grants. Though they still acknowledge that major repairs can’t always be avoided, it is hoped that the large amounts of money often dedicated to a repair budget can instead be offered more generally to a larger group of owners and for more basic maintenance issues (Maintain our Heritage 2004:23).
4.2.3 Local Government Heritage Funds

It is at the discretion of local government to implement a local heritage fund. In 2006, the Productivity Commission Report (2006:332) found that 30% of councils within their survey provided local grant programs. It also found (Productivity Commission 2006:335) that, of this 30%, the majority of property owners were required to:

\[ \text{... contribute to the conservation costs in order to receive a grant, although the contribution rate varied between 25 per cent, 30 per cent and 50 per cent. The maximum grant tended to be around$2000; although this varied between$10 000 and$250.} \]

The Barossa Council, which is considered in this study, is an example of a council offering such a fund. It provides a grant to a maximum of $300 for paint and a maximum of $1000 for maintenance and repairs with owners expected to match the council’s contribution. Funding is open to owners of state and local heritage places and the council regularly encourages owners to apply (see Barossa Council 2011:n.p). Though offering small grants, the proactive nature of the Barossa Council heritage grant is encouraging. As the program outcomes indicate, such an initiative can encourage owners to be proud of the heritage value of their property and to work towards implementing practical and positive maintenance systems. For the community, there is the opportunity to create synergistic effects toward unification of community and economy (Maintain our Heritage 2004:24).

4.2.4 Conservation Management Plans

Conservation Management Plans (CMP) are prepared often only for state heritage places and can be required as a result of a heritage agreement between two or more parties including the owner of a heritage place (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 2011c:n.p). DENR (2008:1) states that in South Australia, a CMP aims to guide ‘the care and development of a place of cultural significance’. CMPs educate owners and help to implement strategies (set out according to the ICOMOS Burra Charter guidelines) by which they are given responsibility to provide for the security and maintenance of a heritage place. As Smith (2005:101) explains, a CMP ‘based on historical, physical and comparative analyses, … provides policies for restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and new work for current needs and future development’. Implementing strategies that result from heritage plans in an ongoing and consistent manner is the ‘keystone of effective heritage place management’ (Pearson and Sullivan 1995:188).
accomplish this care and development, a plan should involve methods to retain and/or recover the cultural significance of a heritage place, provide information on all of the relevant aspects of a place that contribute to its significance and create a clear set of guidelines under which it will be managed, developed and conserved (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 2008:1).

In South Australia, developing a CMP can be difficult, mainly due to owners being afraid of the restrictions they may place on future development and cost concerns (see Productivity Commission 2006; Smith 2005). Approximately 440 CMPs exist in South Australia in relation to the more than 8000 state and local heritage places. Without such plans, the overall conservation status of the state’s heritage is unknown.

4.2.5 ‘Other’ Incentives

DENR (2011c:n.p) states that the benefits of owning a heritage place can include tax incentives for approved conservation work, access to seminars and workshops, access to possible reductions in council and water rates based on revised valuations and access to local council incentives schemes (which can include heritage grants, the waiving or reduction of Development Application fees, discount for heritage courses, subdivision concessions and certain awards such as the City of Port Adelaide Enfield Heritage Awards Program). However, relatively few councils in South Australia and rural South Australia employ any of these ‘other’ forms of incentives. According to the Productivity Commission (2006:284) however, this situation is not atypical as less than 20% of those councils investigated offered low interest rate loans, rate rebates and concessions (Figure 11).
4.3 Summary

Legislation traditionally creates an authoritative basis by which frameworks can be implemented and followed by a society, a specific community and by individuals. Yet, in South Australia the competing levels of heritage and insufficient guidance and information about practical approaches, appear to be hindering the transfer of heritage legislation into an effective reality. Conservation legislation and frameworks are marred by inconsistencies in funding, in incentives, in education and in policy objectives and approaches.
Methods

5.1 Identifying a Study Area and Case Study Areas

A number of factors were taken into account in order to define a study area suited to the thesis' focus on heritage conservation in rural South Australia. First, a definition of ‘rural’ was adopted to establish a basis on which to define the physical boundaries of the rural landscape (see Chapter 2). It was possible then to identify a number of Local Government Areas (LGA) within the boundaries in order to compare data and incentive effectiveness. It was essential that the chosen LGAs offered a range of heritage incentives, including the employment of a Heritage Advisor and the implementation of a local heritage register and local council heritage fund. This narrowed down the possible choice of LGAs to include the Mid Murray Council, Barossa Regional Council, Clare and Gilbert Valley Council and the Goyder Regional Council (see Figure 12). Although the Mid Murray Council is yet to implement any aspects of the heritage framework, its inclusion was essential to ensuring that comparative data on the Heritage Framework could be drawn. Three of the case study areas maintain a Heritage Advisory Service and a local heritage fund (Barossa Regional Council, Light Regional Council and the Goyder Regional Council), whilst the Clare and Gilbert Valley Council supports a Heritage Advisory Service only.

5.2 Identifying Sites

A targeted methodology for choosing sites within each LGA was implemented. Buildings were chosen which reflected local, social, commercial and industrial characteristics of life in rural South Australia. As a result, the categories of homestead, engine house and hotel were chosen.

Homesteads were selected as they bridge the gamut of family and working life, and their forms (from large to smaller complexes) reflect social status. Engine houses were chosen due to their industrial background and their common role in mining sites. The last category, of hotel, was chosen for its commercial role and because it represents a contrasting aspect of a community’s social life compared with the homestead.
Initial research into suitable case studies was carried out using material provided through the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the South Australian Heritage Places Database and the Australian Heritage Inventory. Final case study choices were based on conversations with senior South Australian heritage consultant Kate McDougall (McDougall and Vines), and were narrowed down using variables focused on criteria related to a place’s
construction, use, location, heritage listing type, history of conservation management and LGA area. Appendix 8 sets out in detail, the questions asked in the selection process.

Two engine houses, three homesteads and three hotels were selected (Figure 13). For each of these categories one of the chosen sites was included on a local listing and the other two were state heritage listed. As no locally listed engine house is listed in rural South Australia, a third engine house could not be included.

Figure 13 Map of South Australia with case studies and sites (Map: Julia Garnaut).
As no vacant/abandoned local listing was selected within the case studies, a ninth site, the locally listed Farmhouse near Penrice, was chosen to fill this gap and maintain consistency in the data.

Morphetts Engine House is the only case study owned by government; all others are in private hands. This disparity was not intentional but was a result of hotels and homesteads generally being privately owned.

For legal and privacy reasons, names and addresses are withheld from the State Heritage Register and from local heritage lists. Consequently, a process was undertaken with the LGAs to seek permission to obtain the name and address of the owner of the selected properties. Flinders University granted ethics approval to carry out this process (see Appendix 6).

The Clare and Gilbert Valley Council, Light Regional Council and Goyder Regional Council were unable to release private information for the properties. However, the Anlaby Homestead Group and the Magpie and Stump Hotel have contact details listed on the internet enabling owners to be sourced in that way. Morphetts Engine House is owned by the Goyder Regional Council which recommended contact with the lessee, the National Trust.

All contact with owners was successful with the exception of the Farmhouse near Penrice. However, it was decided to continue with this site as its location (less than 5m from the road) meant that adequate survey of the building’s external elements could be carried out without accessing private property.

5.3 Archival Research

Historical data, including conservation information, construction dates, heritage nomination and official registration dates, and heritage significance statements, were obtained through the Heritage Places Database, South Australia's online inventory of state and local heritage places available through Planning in SA (see 2011:n.p). Each heritage place has a Heritage ID or Development Plan Local Government ID (DPLG ID). Using this ID (see Appendix 8), it was possible to access both local and state baseline data electronically. Further information on conservation management, and historical documents stored by government is available through DENR. However it is limited to mainly State Heritage Places. Documents obtained through DENR included conservation and management records, photographs, recording forms, conservation plans and council development plans and reviews.
The information held by DENR for state heritage sites is not uniform or consistent which limits the archival research. The standard Heritage Identification Sheet (see Appendix 1) used to record a State Heritage Place is not completed uniformly (e.g. some boxes are left blank and analysis is not provided). Similarly, there appears to be no standard for recording site data in local Heritage Surveys. When additional surveys are carried out, existing information is commonly ‘recycled’.

5.4 Creating a Condition Template

Creating a template to record the condition of the case studies was a pivotal aspect of the fieldwork. The key sources consulted were: the British Standards Institute (1998:BS7913), English Heritage (2008), Monumentenwacht (Luijendijk 2000), Maintain Our Heritage (2004) and the State of the Environment (SoE) Reports (2001, 2006).

The British Standards Institute (1998:BS7913) recommends that an annual five year condition survey be carried out on any heritage building. Aspects of the condition survey should take into account:

… the condition of the element, the consequential impact the condition has on the performance of the element and also the impact the condition has on other interconnected elements (Dann and Worthing 2005:96).

The majority of methodologies consulted use a four-tiered model of ‘condition’ ranging from ‘good’ to ‘very bad’. Assessment of the interior and exterior fabric ranges from structural elements like the roof, walls, doors and windows, to elements such as vegetation growth and build up of leaves in gutters and paint condition (English Heritage 2011a). Recording is documented through condition assessment forms and, depending on the organisation, entered into a database. Photography and drawings of the various elements of a place are also common (Aplin 2002; Dann and Worthing 2005; Pearson and Sullivan 1995).

English Heritage deems particular buildings to be ‘at risk’ depending on their condition and usage (i.e. whether they are occupied or abandoned). Categorised into the condition types of very bad, poor, fair and good, those places that fall into the category of ‘bad’ or ‘poor’ are officially assessed as places ‘at risk’ and entered into the Heritage at Risk Register. Management for those places is facilitated through a second ranking system (Priority Category) which defines its conservation
status. A total of six ranks exist, with ‘A’ indicating that immediate risk is present and that management must be immediately implemented, whilst ‘F’ indicates that a repair scheme is in progress (English Heritage 2011b:1).

Taking into account these methods, a condition survey format (see Appendix 4) was created which focused on a simple method of recording. Externally, the structural elements of a building were defined as the roof, walls, windows and doors. Internally, the ceiling was substituted for the roof and the floor was added. The category of ‘other’ was included to leave room for any distinctly individual elements.

As per international standards, a tiered assessment of condition ranging from very bad to reasonable, poor and good was included for each element (Table 5). When the element was not inspected this was noted, along with an explanation. Criteria for defining each tier included the level of maintenance, whether the element was structurally sound, whether there were signs of water penetration, rot or damp and whether the deterioration of any element exposed the structure to natural processes (see Table 5). An explanatory sheet outlining these criteria was utilised to ensure consistent recording at each site (see Appendix 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Element is structurally sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No repair work is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine maintenance (weekly/fortnightly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonable</th>
<th>Element is structurally sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor repair work is needed (not immediate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine maintenance (monthly/2 monthly/4 monthly/6 monthly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Signs of water penetration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major rot/damp is present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instability of a structural element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural failure of an element (i.e. loss of an element)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine maintenance (yearly/2 years/rare)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Element completely exposed to nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signs of water penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major rot/damp is present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instability of a structural element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural failure of an element (i.e. loss of an element)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collapse of a structural element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine maintenance (abandoned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Explanation of condition tiers used.
5.5 Interviews and Fieldwork

Interviews were carried out with the owner of each heritage property and conducted in accordance with the ethics agreement. Interviews were structured informally, to last no more than one hour (see Appendix 5 for questions from these interviews). They aimed to gauge the owners’ understanding of the heritage values of their property, how they care for and maintain these values and if they have utilised any aspects of the Heritage Framework. Interviews were conducted as an open conversation. For the North Rhine Engine House, Blanchetown Hotel and Nor’West Bend Station only interviews were recorded and transcribed; notes were taken in all other instances.

Fieldwork was completed on the same day as interviews. The same approach was taken for each site with the exception of the Farmhouse near Penrice due to inability to contact the owner. A GPS co-ordinate was taken, a recording form completed and photographs taken for each relevant structure and its external and internal elements. For a number of the structures it was not possible to record the internal elements due to safety hazards. This has meant that the data available for this category is limited.

The size of the Anlaby Homestead Group and Nor’West Bend complexes, meant that time was a constraint and therefore not every building could be thoroughly assessed. Consequently, certain structures were excluded from individual assessment. At the Anlaby Homestead Group they were the shade house ruins, garden houses, apple and mushroom houses, main courtyard buildings, cottages near the courtyard, dog kennels and shearing shed. At Nor’West Bend Station, the woolshed, stables and other outbuildings were excluded.
Results

This chapter summarises the results of fieldwork and archival research. In 6.10 the comparative results integrate the fieldwork and archival results as well as interview results.

6.1 North Rhine Engine House

Copper was mined at the North Rhine Mine (Figure 14) from 1849 to 1855 and again from 1858 to 1863. In 1858 the engine house was constructed to house a ‘bull’ type Cornish Beam Engine (Connell 1987:11). This engine is a rare example of its type and was of significant technical construction for the time (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1984b:n.p; Saegenschnitter 1980). Located within the Mid Murray Council (see Figure 13), the engine house is listed as a State Heritage Place.

Original features include bluestone walls, timber structural beams, brick quoining on the windows and vents, and the ruins of a chimney (R. Lillecrapp pers.comm., 26 September 2011). No machinery remains at the site (Figure 15).

Figure 14 North Rhine Mine pre chimney collapse, looking south (Knight 1975:n.p).
6.1.1 Results of Archival Research

Table 6 North Rhine Engine House archival research results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Reason for Investigation</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1980</td>
<td>Geological Investigation of engine house shaft</td>
<td>Timber cladding below ground appeared in as good a condition as the day it was installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>State Heritage Nomination Recording Forms</td>
<td>Poor structural condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Provision of SA Mines Funding</td>
<td>Stabilisation and point work of bottom half of structure to repair 'perilous condition'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Eastern Plains Heritage Survey (Bruce Harry and Associates)</td>
<td>No condition information provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mid Murray Heritage Review (McDougall and Vines)</td>
<td>No condition information provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates that no Conservation Management Plan (CMP) has been completed for the engine house and that it has been 25 years since any condition information has been recorded. Heritage surveys and reviews conducted by the two heritage consultant groups in 1996 and 2009 have not investigated condition.

6.1.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figures 16 to 21 summarise the visual and written recording of the North Rhine Engine House. Due to safety hazards with the mine shaft, it was impossible to complete a full internal inspection.
Roofing

**Condition:** very bad

Roofing was removed by a storm prior to 1984. Evidence of worn, rotting timber and broken slate, which may be the remains of this roof, were found on the southern side of the engine house.

The structure is completely open to the natural elements.

---

Windows

**Condition:** poor

Glass is removed from the window, leaving the structure open to the elements.

Red brick curved arches above the majority of windows appear to be crumbling both internally and externally. This is especially evident within the interior.

---

Walls

**Condition:** very bad

Internally, rising damp is evident at approximately 1.5m above ground.

Externally, the structure’s walls appear in reasonable condition. Rising damp is present but not as evident as on the internal stone work.
Walls (Continued)

All timber beams appear to be in a deteriorating state.

A timber structural beam mounted approximately 5 m above ground level on the western side (which is a main structural element) is visibly worn and appears to be deteriorating continuously.

Figure 19 North Rhine Engine House showing deteriorating timber beam (centre).

Doors

Condition: poor

No doors remain on the structure, leaving it open to the natural elements.

There are no hinges or door frames either internally or externally, however a timber beam survives above the south door entrance.

Figure 20 North Rhine Engine House ground entrance with timber beam.

Structural Condition (other)

Condition (Bob Pit walls): poor

Rising damp is present on all of the Bob Pit walls.

The structure is overgrown with vegetation.

A rotted timber beam from the structure has collapsed inward (north west corner) and is deteriorating under this growth.

Figure 21 North Rhine Engine House Bob Pit with vegetation growth and timber beam (top right).
Figure 22 summarises the results of the North Rhine Engine House condition survey. Out of the five structural elements recorded three were in poor and two in very bad condition.

![Comparison of North Rhine Engine House External Condition Grades](image)

Figure 22 North Rhine Engine House comparative condition data.
6.2 Morphetts Engine House

Opened in 1845, the Burra Copper mine (Figure 23) was run by separate companies over two different periods, finally closing in the 1980s. As one of the most successful mines in South Australia, Burra once produced up to 5% of the world’s copper and employed up to 1000 workers (Drew 1987). Today, the mine complex is a tourist attraction.

Morphetts Engine House, a bluestone structure with gabled roof, housed a Cornish pumping engine (McDougall and Vines 2009:7). Built in 1860 and in use until 1877 it was then vacant until it was recognised as a State Heritage Place in 1984 as part of the Burra Mines Historic Site, and restored with funding from the Department of Mines and Energy (Figure 24). Today funding for, and care of, the engine house are the responsibility of the Goyder Regional Council and the lessee, the Burra branch of the National Trust.
6.2.1 Results of Archival Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Burra Conservation Study (Lester, Howard and Anders)</td>
<td>No condition recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Heritage of the Lower North: Region 8 (Dallwitz and Marsden)</td>
<td>No condition recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Register Nomination Report</td>
<td>Most of it is left as ‘ruins’ (refers to entire Burra Mines Historic Site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Engine House restored</td>
<td>Funding from Department of Mines and Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Morphetts Engine House archival research.

Archival research shows (Table 7) that no recording form has been completed specifically for Morphetts Engine House. Rather, in 1984, as part of the heritage nomination process, the entire mine was recorded as being ‘in ruins’ (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1983:n.p). A CMP was completed for the town of Burra including the mine in 1978, but no condition information was included for Morphetts Engine House. Since the engine houses restoration in 1986 no additional condition information has been recorded.
6.2.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figure 25 to 30 summarise the visual and written recording of the external and internal elements at Morphetts Engine House.

**Roof**

**Condition:** reasonable

This element is not very visible due to the height of the engine house.

Gutters appear in reasonable condition.

Paint is in need of attention in certain areas.

Figure 25 Morphetts Engine House showing paint deterioration on gutters.

**Walls, Windows and Doors**

**Condition:** reasonable

Each element is watertight and no obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 26 Morphetts Engine House with walls (inset), windows and doors (southern elevation).
Ceiling

Condition: reasonable

The slate roof appears structurally sound, although tiles are missing at the southern gable end. This is in need of immediate repair to ensure that the structure is watertight.

Walls

Condition: reasonable

Contained rising damp is evident in the north west corner of the ground floor chamber.

No obvious structural issues present within the middle floor chamber.

A large crack is present on the west wall of the top floor chamber and small holes are present on the bottom of the southern and eastern walls.

Floors

Condition: reasonable

The top and middle chambers’ floor boards appear structurally sound.

The ground floor has slate and wooden floors. No obvious structural issues present.
Figure 30  Morphetts Engine House interior door with fanned window.

Figure 31 demonstrates that, out of the four elements surveyed externally and the five elements recorded internally at Morphetts Engine House, all were in reasonable condition.

Figure 31 Morphetts Engine House comparative condition data.
6.3 Anlaby Homestead Group

The Anlaby Homestead Group (Figure 32) is situated near the town of Kapunda and within the Light Regional Council (Figure 13). Often described as a ‘village’, Anlaby was built in 1840 by F.H Dutton (see Cockburn 1925). The complex, which once encompassed more than 640 square kilometres of land, was confirmed as a State Heritage Place in 1993. The listing includes the main bluestone dwellings, stables, grotto, courtyard and shearing quarters (see Appendix 6). The shearing shed, shearing quarters and slaughterhouse form a separate listing. The complex is undergoing extensive restoration by the owners.

Figure 32 Anlaby Homestead 1936 (State Library of South Australia Image: B9519).

Figure 33 Dog Kennel Manager’s House 1977 (State Library of South Australia Image: B 36742).
6.3.1 Results of Archival research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Heritage Survey Item Identification Sheet</td>
<td>The physical condition of the homestead complex is ‘reasonably well kept’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>State Heritage Places Documentation (listing 11018)</td>
<td>Over a considerable number of years the garden has declined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Anlaby Homestead Group archival research results.

Table 8 indicates that there is no CMP for the Anlaby Homestead Group and that no assessment of condition has occurred for the main homestead and outbuildings since 1990 (listing 11018). Documentation for the Shearing Shed and Quarters, Manager's Cottage and Slaughterhouse has not been updated since 2001 (listing 18416) when the Slaughterhouse was noted as being in poor condition.

6.3.2 Results of Fieldwork

The Anlaby Homestead Group encompasses many heritage listed structures. The following section focuses on three: the Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage (Figure 34), Slaughterhouse (Figure 35) and Anlaby Homestead (Figure 36).
Figure 35 Slaughterhouse 2011.

Figure 36 Anlaby Homestead 2011.
6.3.3 Anlaby Homestead

Figures 37 to 38 summarise the visual and written recording of external elements at the Anlaby Homestead. Although access was granted internally, out of respect for owner privacy a detailed survey was not carried out. Informally, the condition of each of the elements was noted as reasonable.

![Figure 37 Anlaby Homestead roof and walls.](image1)

**Roof and Walls**

*Condition: reasonable*

- Tiled roof appears water tight.
- Gutters are in need of repair in certain areas but maintenance is currently in progress.
- Walls all appear structurally sound.

![Figure 38 Anlaby Homestead diamond lead glass window.](image2)

**Windows and Doors**

*Condition: reasonable*

- All are watertight.
- No obvious structural issue is present.
Figure 39 summarises the results of the Anlaby Homestead external condition survey. It demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded externally all were in reasonable condition.

Figure 39 Anlaby Homestead comparative condition data.
6.3.4 Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage

Figures 40 to 46 summarise the visual and written recording of external and internal elements at the Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage (abandoned). The structure (Figure 34) is located on the northern boundary of the property.

Figure 40 Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage timber finial (top) and corrugated iron roof (bottom).

**Roof**
- **Condition**: poor
  - Wooden finial detail has deteriorated due to lack of maintenance.
  - The roof appears watertight. However, signs of rust are evident on both the main and verandah roof.
  - Gutters have deteriorated and are in need of replacement.

Figure 41 Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage showing open window and wall deterioration.

**Walls and Windows**
- **Condition (walls)**: very bad
- **Condition (windows)**: poor
  - The walls have decayed at the base of the structure. No mortar remains from ground level to 0.5-1m high.
  - Large cracks in the stone work are present on the northern external wall.
  - A window on northern side of the structure is ajar, leaving the building open to the elements. Timbers are rotting and need repair.
Doors

Condition: poor

The door is ajar and missing a panel in the bottom left corner (when viewed from outside).

The door, though still present, is in need of urgent repair.

At present, the condition of the door leaves the building open to natural elements.

Figure 42 Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage door with panel missing.

Ceiling and Walls

Condition (walls): very bad
Condition (ceiling): reasonable

Small cracks are present in the ceiling, however it appears to be watertight.

Large cracks are evident on each wall. Timbers on internal walls are completely exposed in areas where plaster has deteriorated and continues to deteriorate.

Figure 43 Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage walls (centre and inset) and ceiling (centre).

Floor

Condition: very bad

Cement has lifted and is rubble in certain areas.

Figure 44 Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage deteriorating internal floor.
Figure 45 Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage open interior window.

Figure 46 demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded externally at the Dog Kennel Manager's House, three were in poor condition and one in very bad condition. Internally, two out of the five elements recorded were in poor condition, whilst the remainder were in either reasonable or very bad condition.

![Comparison of Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage Internal and External Condition Grades](image)

Figure 46 Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage comparative condition data.
6.3.5 Slaughterhouse

The Slaughterhouse (abandoned) is located to the north east of the property. A condition survey was not completed for the internal elements of the structure due to its dilapidation.

Figures 47 to 50 summarise the visual and written recording of external elements at the Slaughterhouse.

**Roof**

*Condition:* poor

Tiles have aged, are loose and are falling off. They are in need of repair or replacement.

Gutters are rusting and are in need of repair.

**Walls**

*Condition:* very bad

Large cracks are present and, in certain areas, cracks have caused render to deteriorate and expose stone work.

Walls have moved away from certain structural elements, including the window frames, and are collapsing.

Figure 47 Slaughterhouse roof with loose and broken tiles.

Figure 48 Slaughterhouse deteriorating walls (centre and top right).
Figure 49 Slaughterhouses deteriorating fly screen and window panes.

Windows

**Condition:** very bad

No full glass pane remains within the structure.

Fly screens are broken and deteriorating.

The timber frames of the windows have aged and are rotting.

Figure 50 Slaughterhouse with missing doors and deteriorating fly screen door.

Doors

**Condition:** very bad

The front eastern door is completely removed. The fly screen for the second door, directly behind this front door, is in place, but the door is not. This is also the case for the southern door.

With no door remaining, the structure is completely open to the elements.
Figure 51 demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded at the Slaughterhouse, one was in poor and three were in very bad condition.
6.4 Nor’West Bend Station

Located near Morgan, Nor’West Bend Station, established c.1850, was one of the largest of its kind in South Australia (South Australian Museum 1977:112). The South Australian State Heritage Register lists the homestead, cottage, underground tank, woolshed, paved wool scouring area and the shearing shed (Figure 52).

The main homestead is constructed of limestone and comprises seven rooms built in a ‘U’ formation on three sides of a courtyard orientated north-south (Register of the National Estate 1995). Today, the complex is located within the Mid Murray Council area (see Figure 13).

Figure 52 Nor’West Bend Station layout (Flight Path Architects 2000:29)

Figure 53 Nor’West Bend Homestead 1909 (State Library of South Australia Image: B9915)
6.4.1 Results of Archival Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>South Australian Museum</td>
<td>Store wool recorded as being in ‘good condition’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Heritage Investigations</td>
<td>No condition information recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mid Murray Heritage Review (McDougall and Vines)</td>
<td>No condition information recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Nor’West Bend Station archival research results.

Table 9 indicates that a CMP, including a Dilapidation Survey, was completed at Nor’West Bend Station in 2000. The CMP recorded, in detail, each of the state heritage listed structures. Since this time no condition reporting has occurred.

6.4.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figures 54 to 58 and 60 to 63 summarise the visual and written recording of the external and internal elements at Nor’West Bend Homestead and the external elements of the Shearing Shed. Due to the internal condition of the Shearing Shed these elements were not recorded.

6.4.3 Nor’West Bend Homestead

Figure 54 Nor’West Bend Homestead roof line.

Roof
Condition: reasonable
No water penetration is evident.
Walls and Windows

Condition: reasonable

Walls are all structurally sound. Paint touch ups are needed.

Windows are all watertight. No structural issue is evident.

Figure 55 Nor’West Bend Homestead southern wall with peeling paint.

Doors

Condition: reasonable

No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 56 Nor’West Bend Homestead double doors (north).

Ceilings and Walls

Condition (ceiling and walls): reasonable, with the exception of the maid’s room in the south east corner of the structure.

Water stains are evident on the wooden ceiling and at the top of the walls.

Elsewhere, no obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 57 Nor’West Bend Homestead governess’ room with water stained roof (inset).
Figure 58 Nor'West Bend Homestead cement floors of store showing deterioration.

Figure 59 demonstrates that, out of the four external elements recorded, all were in reasonable condition. The main internal elements of the structure were in reasonable condition with the exception of the governess' room and the store.

![Comparison of Nor'West Bend Station Homestead External & Internal Grades](image)

Figure 59 Nor'West Bend Homestead comparative condition data.
6.4.4 Nor’West Bend Shearing Shed

**Roof**

*Condition: poor (visible roof)*

Remains of the original shingled roof are protected under the current corrugated iron roof.

Element is watertight but aging.

Gutters have deteriorated and have fallen off in certain areas. They are in need of immediate repair.

*Figure 60 Shearing Shed with roof in view.*

**Walls**

*Condition: very bad*

The northern wall is missing from the building, leaving it open to the elements.

Rising damp is evident, and stone work is heavily exposed around the base of the building as a result of repairs to previous fretting and spalling masonry.

*Figure 61 Shearing Shed showing absent northern wall.*
Figure 62 Shearing Shed window casements with rotting frames.

Windows

Condition: very bad

Windows no longer contain glass panes, which leaves the structure open to the elements.

Timber frames have rotted with lack of maintenance and possibly as a result of a previous white ant attack.

Figure 63 Shearing Shed showing absent doors.

Doors

Condition: very bad

No doors remain, leaving the structure open to the elements.

Timber support beam above the main entrance (south) has weathered. Regardless of this, it appears in reasonable condition, despite suffering white ant problems in the past.
Figure 64 demonstrates that, out of the four external elements recorded at the Shearing Shed, one was in poor and three in very bad condition.

![Comparison of Shearing Shed External Condition Grades](image)

Figure 64 Shearing Shed comparative condition data.
6.5 Farm Complex Gnadenberg Road

The Gnadenberg Road complex was built c.1850s by the Schilling family (Figure 65). An addition to the cottage was completed in 1877 with a second detached cottage (Figure 66) also added later. The property is within the Barossa Valley Council area (Figure 13).

![Figure 65 Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex 2011.](image)

![Figure 66 Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage (foreground), detached cottage (middle left), garage (left) 2011.](image)
6.5.1 Results of Archival Research

The Gnadenberg Road property was recorded as part of the Barossa Heritage Review in 2001 (McDougall and Vines:52). No condition information was recorded at this time.

6.5.2 Results of Fieldwork

The following results include the Farm Cottage at Gnadenberg Road as well as the later Detached Cottage (Figure 67). Figures 68 to 72 and Figures 75 to 80 summarise the visual and written recording of the external and internal elements.

Figure 67 Sketch (not to scale) of Farm Cottage (right) and Detached Cottage (left) (Julia Garnaut).
6.5.3 Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage

Walls and Windows

Condition (walls): poor
Condition (windows): reasonable

The walls have been rendered with cement in the 1970s, which has caused rising damp issues. This problem is currently being addressed by the present owners.

All windows are sealed and watertight.

Doors

Condition: reasonable

All are watertight, though the front screen door (which is original) is in need of repair.

Roof

Condition: good

Some elements, including the gutters, have recently been replaced and appear to be watertight.

Figure 68 Farm Cottage external cement rendered wall (centre and inset).

Figure 69 Farm Cottage front door (left), cottage extension rear door (right).

Figure 70 Farm Cottage roof.
Ceilings

Condition: very bad

Original horse manure and straw ceilings have deteriorated rapidly.

Large cracks have formed due to the large amount of weight bearing down on them.

Figure 71 Farm Cottage ceiling.

Walls, Windows, Doors and Floors

Condition: reasonable

Some cracking is evident in the walls; however, this is in the early stages of repair.

All doors, windows and floors are watertight and no obvious structural issues are present.

Figure 72 Farm Cottage hallway, cracked wall (inset bottom left) and kitchen window (inset bottom right).
Figure 73 summarises the results of the external and internal condition survey. It demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded externally, one was in good condition, one was in poor condition and two were in reasonable condition. Internally, four elements were in reasonable and one was in very bad condition.

Figure 73 Farm Cottage comparative condition data.
6.5.4 Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage

The Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage is partially used. The cottage comprises three rooms that are not interlocked and have separate external entrances (Figure 74). Room 1 and 2 are used by the owners and Room 3 is vacant.

Figure 74 Detached Cottage Sketch (not to scale) (Julia Garnaut)

Figure 75 Detached Cottage roof.

Roof

Condition: good

Roof and gutters were recently replaced.
No water penetration is evident.
Walls and Windows

Condition (walls): poor
Condition (windows): reasonable

Walls have been rendered with cement and suffer from breathability problems.

Rising damp and small cracks are evident.

The windows have no obvious structural issues and all appear watertight.

Figure 76 Detached Cottage walls (inset) and windows.

Doors

Condition: reasonable

Though aged, all doors are watertight and no obvious structural issues are present.

Figure 77 Detached Cottage Room 3 door.

Doors

Condition: reasonable

Pressed metal ceilings have mainly been protected as a result of being covered by carpet.

In certain areas, the paint needs some attention however no obvious structural issues are present.

Figure 78 Detached Cottage carpet covering pressed metal ceiling Room 3.
Floors

**Condition:** ranging from reasonable to very bad

In room 2, the original lino remains however it is significantly worn.

In room 3, cement floors have been excavated to reveal foundations in order to begin repair.

In room 1, floors are in reasonable condition.

No obvious structural issue is present.

Walls, Windows and Doors

**Condition:** poor

Large cracks are present in room 2's walls. This is being addressed by the owner.

In rooms 1 and 3, walls are in need of repair due to small cracks, deteriorated render and aged paint.

All windows and doors are watertight.

---

Figure 79 Detached Cottage original lino floors Room 2.

Figure 80 Detached Cottage cracked walls Room 2.
Figure 81 demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded externally at the Detached Cottage, one was in good, two were in reasonable and one in poor condition. Internally, condition grades for Rooms 1, 2 and 3 ranged from reasonable to very bad.

![Comparison of External and Internal Condition (Rooms 1, 2, 3) at Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage](image)

Figure 81 Detached Cottage comparative condition data.
6.6 Farmhouse near Penrice

The first title for this property located outside of Penrice is dated 1883 (McDougall and Vines 2001:144). The land, including the Farmhouse, was acquired by South Australian Company, Penrice Soda Products in 1991 and is in the Barossa Valley Council.

The structure is constructed of limestone with brick quoins and window dressings (Figure 83). The central part has a gabled roof, whilst the extension to the east has a hipped roof and a skillion extension to the west (McDougall and Vines 2001:144).

![Figure 82 Farmhouse near Penrice 2010 with door intact (Hutchins 2010:n.p).](image)

![Figure 83 Farmhouse near Penrice 2011.](image)

6.6.1 Results of Archival Research

The Farmhouse was recorded in 2001 as part of the Barossa Council Heritage Review (McDougall and Vines 2001:37). At this time, the property was not occupied and had been derelict for some time. Condition of the building was noted as ‘very derelict … although its roof is intact’ (McDougall and Vines 2001:144). Condition of the property has not been updated since.
6.6.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figures 84 to 86 summarise the visual and written recording of external elements at the Farmhouse near Penrice. The survey was carried out from the road.

**Walls**

**Condition:** very bad

Rising damp is present on the southern base of the structure as is a large crack.

Stones have fallen and are deteriorating under the windows on the west side. This has left holes in the wall, exposing it to the elements.

Figure 84 Farmhouse near Penrice walls with stones missing below window frame (top left) and below roof line (bottom left); crack in side wall (right).

**Roof**

**Condition:** poor

Rust is evident, however, the roof appears intact and watertight.

Gutters are not present along the majority of the roof line. The remaining gutters have vegetation growing in them and are in need of repair.

Figure 85 Farmhouse near Penrice roof.
Figure 86 Farmhouse near Penrice absent door and deteriorating window frames.

Figure 87 demonstrates that, out of the four elements recorded at the Farmhouse near Penrice, one was in poor and three in very bad condition.

Doors and Windows

Condition: very bad

No glass is present in any of the windows. Casements are missing on the western windows. The remaining casements and timber arches have deteriorating and/or rotting timber.

The front door (west) is not present and the timber frame has deteriorated and appears to be rotting.

The lack of window glass and a door leave the structure open to the natural elements.

Figure 87 Farmhouse near Penrice comparative condition grade data.
6.7 The Blanchetown Hotel

Built in 1856, the Blanchetown Hotel (Figure 88) adjacent to the River Murray survives as one of the first buildings in the town’s main street.

The hotel’s original features comprise limestone walls with a gabled, belcast iron roof, uncapped gable ends and several chimneys with a staggered build up (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1984a:n.p). A deck has been added to the front (Figure 89). The hotel is in the Mid Murray Council (Figure 13).
6.7.1 Results of Archival Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mid Murray Heritage Review (McDougall and Vines)</td>
<td>No condition information recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Blanchetown Hotel archival research results.

Table 10 indicates that no CMP has been completed for the Blanchetown Hotel. It demonstrates that, in 1982, the structure was recorded as being in reasonable condition but that condition information has not been updated.

6.7.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figures 90 to 94 combine the visual and annotated elements recorded externally and internally at the Blanchetown Hotel.

![Walls](image)

**Walls**

**Condition:** reasonable

No obvious structural issues are present. Paint is in need of attention on the building's northern original gabled side.

Figure 90 Blanchetown Hotel exterior wall, northern wall inset.
Roof, Windows and Doors

**Condition:** reasonable

The roof and gutters are recently new and watertight. No structural issues are obvious.

Windows and doors are watertight. No structural issues are obvious.

---

Ceilings

**Condition:** reasonable

The ceilings are watertight and maintained. No obvious structural issues are present.

---

Walls and Floors

**Condition:** reasonable

Previous damp issues in the stone walls have been dealt with. The ongoing small damp issue in the dining room is being addressed. No obvious issue is present with the structural timber beams.

Floors are watertight and no obvious structural issue is present.

---

Figure 91 Blanchetown Hotel exterior window (inset) and roof.

Figure 92 Blanchetown Hotel ceiling.

Figure 93 Blanchetown Hotel interior walls (left), walls and floors (top right and bottom right).
Figure 94 Blanchetown Hotel interior window (left) and boarded up original door (right).

Figure 95 demonstrates that at the Blanchetown Hotel, all five elements recorded externally and internally are in reasonable condition.

Figure 95 Blanchetown Hotel comparative condition data.
6.8 The Magpie and Stump Hotel

The Magpie and Stump Hotel (formerly the Mintaro Hotel) was built in 1850 (Figure 96) in Mintaro. Fire destroyed the majority of the premises in 1904 and the hotel was subsequently rebuilt (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1982:n.p). Through the 19th century, the hotel catered to the bullock and mule transports running from the Burra copper mine.

The building is of vernacular style with rubble stone walls and brick quoins. A gambrel roof covers the main section of the hotel, whilst a hipped galvanised iron roof exists over what is most likely an earlier addition (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1982:n.p). Internally, several original features survive including pressed metal ceilings. The hotel is in the Clare and Gilbert Valley Council (Figure 13).

Figure 96 Magpie and Stump Hotel 1996 (National Library of Australia Image: an13233522-26-v).
6.8.1 Results of Archival Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>State Heritage Nomination Form</td>
<td>Compromised internally; however, the exterior of the main section of the hotel is reasonable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Magpie and Stump archival research results.

Table 11 indicates that no CMP has been completed for the Magpie and Stump Hotel. No condition information has been documented since 1982, when the structure’s external elements were in reasonable condition.

6.8.2 Results of Fieldwork

Figures 98 to 106 summarise the visual and written recording external and internal elements of the Magpie and Stump Hotel.
Roof

Condition: reasonable

Corrugated iron is deteriorating and will need replacing in the near future. However, the element remains watertight and no obvious structural issues are evident.

Figure 98 Magpie and Stump roof.

Doors and Windows

Condition: reasonable

Windows and doors are all watertight. No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 99 Magpie and Stump Hotel doors and windows (centre and inset).

Walls

Condition: reasonable

No obvious structural issues are present. Paint is in need of attention in areas.

Figure 100 Magpie and Stump Hotel wall with flaking paint (inset).
Figure 101 Magpie and Stump verandah floor.

Structural Condition (Other)

Condition: reasonable

Mintaro slate covers the verandah of the structure. Various cracks from use are present.

Figure 102 Magpie and Stump Hotel pressed metal ceiling.

Ceilings

Condition: reasonable

The pressed metal ceilings are well maintained. No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 103 Magpie and Stump internal wall with crack (left). Exposed random stone wall (right).

Walls

Condition: reasonable

The rear room wall has an obvious crack. However, all other walls are well maintained. No obvious structural issues are present.
Doors

Condition: reasonable
No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 104 Magpie and Stump Hotel interior hallway entrance.

Windows

Condition: reasonable
Stained glass windows appear to have some cracking but can be repaired. No other obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 105 Magpie and Stump Hotel stained glass windows. Cracked glass (inset).

Floors

Condition: reasonable
Timber floor boards and slate floors are maintained. No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 106 Magpie and Stump Hotel floors.
Figure 107 demonstrates that all the elements recorded externally and internally at the Magpie and Stump Hotel are in reasonable condition.

![Comparison of Magpie and Stump Hotel Exterior and Interior Condition Grades](image-url)
6.9 The Lyndoch Hotel

The Lyndoch Hotel (Figure 108) was built in 1869 and was originally known as the Farmers Rest. Fire gutted the hotel in 1914; the exterior walls were the only original element to survive. The hotel re-opened in 1915 and changed its name to the Lyndoch Hotel in 1935 (see Dallwitz and Marsden 1982-1983).

The hotel is constructed of Barossa ironstone, with a bull-nose verandah and ‘ornate cast iron frieze and brackets, and timber posts’ (McDougall and Vines 2001:32). It has a local heritage listing within the Barossa Regional Council.

Figure 108 Lyndoch Hotel c.1972 (National Library of Australia Image: vn4361646-v).

Figure 109 Lyndoch Hotel 2011.
6.9.1 Results of Archival Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey/Investigation Reason</th>
<th>Condition Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Heritage of the Lower North: Region 8 (Dallwitz and Marsden)</td>
<td>No condition information provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Lyndoch Hotel archival research results.

Archival research for the Lyndoch Hotel (Table 12) demonstrates that at the last recording of the structure in 2001, the hotel’s exterior features were in excellent condition. No internal condition information was recorded.

6.9.2 Results of Fieldwork

The Lyndoch Hotel comprises an original and an extended section (Figure 110). Due to the difference in condition between the areas, the condition survey data considers each separately. Figures 111 to 116 summarise the visual and written recording of external and internal elements.

Figure 110 Lyndoch Hotel Sketch (not to scale) (Julia Garnaut).
Roof

Condition: reasonable

Corrugated iron is in a state of deterioration and will need replacing in the near future. However, the element remains watertight.

Walls

Condition: reasonable

No obvious structural issue is present.

Windows and Doors

Condition: reasonable

All are watertight, with original windows at the back of the structure filled in. No obvious structural issue is present.
Ceilings

**Condition:** poor

In the original part of the hotel, ceilings are in poor condition due to large cracks where the ceiling meets the wall.

The ceilings of the hotel's addition are in reasonable condition. No obvious structural issue is present.

Figure 114 Lyndoch Hotel ceiling (original section).

Walls and Windows

**Condition:** ranging from reasonable to poor

In the original section of the hotel, walls have substantial cracking. Walls in the hotel's addition are in reasonable condition with no obvious structural issue present.

Windows throughout the interior are in reasonable condition with no obvious structural features present.

Figure 115 Lyndoch Hotel window (original section) and wall with cracking.

Floors and Doors

**Condition:** reasonable

No obvious structural issue is present in either the original or additional sections.

Figure 116 Lyndoch Hotel hallway (original section).
As summarised in Figure 117, the external condition of the Lyndoch Hotel is reasonable. Condition of the internal original section ranges from reasonable to poor, while the elements of the internal addition are all reasonable.

![Comparison of the Lyndoch Hotel Exterior and Interior (original and addition) Condition Grades](image)

Figure 117 Lyndoch Hotel comparative condition data.
6.10 Comparative Results

Table 13 breaks the study sites into the focal categories of homestead, hotels and engine houses. It summarises if, and how, the structure has been recorded since the time of official heritage listing, and demonstrates that not all of the sites within this study have been systematically recorded. It also reveals the time lapse between recordings of each of the structures. For each site (with the exception of the Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex, Morphetts Engine House and Nor'West Bend Station), condition was recorded at the time of official nomination.

Table 13 also identifies the various terms used by other recorders to describe condition for each of the sites. It shows that no common terms are used in the recording process; rather the recorder individually interprets condition.

Table 14 consolidates all condition data from each case study. It demonstrates that, in general, the majority of elements recorded at each site were in reasonable condition. The three hotels are in reasonable condition, with the exception of the original interior ceilings and walls in the Lyndoch Hotel. The homesteads survive in reasonable condition externally, whilst the Farm Cottage at Gnadenberg Road has internal maintenance issues with the ceilings and walls. Morphetts Engine House is in reasonable condition internally and externally but the condition of the North Rhine Engine House varies between elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Listing Type</th>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>Single Building/Complex?</th>
<th>Main Construction Material</th>
<th>Year of First Heritage Listing</th>
<th>Date Last Recorded</th>
<th>Conservation Management Plan?</th>
<th>Previous Condition Assessment?</th>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Building(s) In Use?</th>
<th>Heritage Advisory Service Established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homestead Complexes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor’West Bend Station</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td>c.1850</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Group</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Light Regional Council</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Well Kept and Good</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Complex, Gnadenberg Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Barossa Regional Council</td>
<td>c.1850</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse near Penrice</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Barossa Regional Council</td>
<td>c.1883</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very Derelict</td>
<td>&lt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Clare and Gilbert Valley Council</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Compromised Internally, Reasonable Externally</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Barossa Regional Council</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent externally</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engine Houses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Perilous</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphets Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Goyder Regional Council</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;1km from town centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a = no condition or conservation management assessment since official listing

* Heritage Listing refers to any register including the National Trust Classified List, The Register of the National Estate, State Heritage Register and local council registers.

Table 13 Correlation of case study construction dates, recording dates and condition information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Roof/Ceilings</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage Exterior</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Kennel Manager's Cottage Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouse Exterior</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor'West Bend Station Homestead Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor'West Bend Station Homestead Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor'West Bend Station Shearing Shed Exterior</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage Exterior</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable &amp; Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage Exterior</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm House Near Penrice Exterior</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Reasonable (Verandah Slate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable &amp; Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable &amp; Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House Exterior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House Interior</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House Exterior</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Poor (Bob Pit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Comparison of each site’s internal and external condition grade.
6.11 Access to and Utilisation of the Heritage Framework

Figure 118 and Table 15 integrate owner interview answers in relation to utilisation of the Heritage Advisory Service.

Six out of the nine sites have access to a Heritage Advisory Service. As no interview was conducted with the owners of the Farmhouse near Penrice, this structure is not included in the following data. Figure 118 shows that, out of the remaining five sites, four of the owners were aware of and have used a Heritage Advisory Service.

![Number of Owners who have Access to, are Aware of and Have Utilised the Heritage Advisory Service](image)

**Figure 118 Owner Heritage Advisory Service data comparison.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Listing Type</th>
<th>Heritage Advisory Service Established?</th>
<th>Owner Aware of Heritage Advisory Service?</th>
<th>Owner Utilised Heritage Advisory Service?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor’ West Bend Station</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Group</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Complex, Gnadenberg Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse, near Penrice</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15 Heritage Advisory Service owner interview responses.**
Table 16 examines the exterior elements of the nine sites in relation to the services that each of the LGAs offers. In the Mid Murray Council, where no Heritage Framework is in place, two out of the three case studies’ external structural elements remain in reasonable condition. The third case study, the North Rhine Engine House, is abandoned and the condition of its structural elements ranges from poor to very bad. Interviews with the owners indicated that access to a Heritage Advisory Service would be beneficial. This was especially evident at the North Rhine Engine House, which faces serious conservation issues (see 6.1). At the time of the interview, the owner was not aware of what was fully available under the Heritage Framework (R. Lillecrapp pers.comm., 26 September 2011).

In the Clare and Gilbert Valley, Light Regional and Goyder Regional Councils, where a Heritage Advisor is available, all three case studies’ external structural elements are in reasonable condition (with the exception of the Anlaby Slaughterhouse and Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage). Owners of the Anlaby Homestead Group have accessed this service once. They found that it was not as beneficial as they would have liked; with such a large complex, it was impossible for the Advisor to offer adequate advice when his once-a-fortnight position afforded time for only a short visit (A. Morphett pers.comm., 12 November 2011).

In the Barossa Valley Council, the Lyndoch Hotel is in reasonable condition with the exception of some internal elements. The owner was unaware of the Heritage Advisory Service. Once explained to him, he felt that he had no use for the Service as he had yet to face any heritage conservation issues. At the Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex, condition ranged from good to poor. Owners were aware of and have accessed the Advisory Service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Access to a Heritage Advisory Service?</th>
<th>Access to State Heritage Fund?</th>
<th>Access to a local heritage Fund?</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor'West Bend Homestead Exterior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House Exterior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor (Bob Pit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare and Gilbert Valley Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable (verandah floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goyder Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa Valley Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse Near Penrice Exterior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Comparison of Heritage Framework service’s offered by each LGA and subsequent condition of each site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Listing Type</th>
<th>Funding Allocated in the last 10 years</th>
<th>Funding Allocated in the last 20-30 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor’ West Bend Station</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Group</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Complex, Gnadenberg Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding allocated from Department of Mines and Energy

Table 17 Government funding awarded to case studies in the past 10 to 30 years.

Data for Table 17 and Figure 119 was correlated from archival research and interview responses (See Appendix 5). They consider those sites that have received government funding in the past 10, 20 or 30 years. Two have received funding in the past 10 years and are both State Heritage Places (Nor’West Bend Station, Anlaby Homestead Group) with more than five heritage listed structures on each property. Both owners bought the properties in a derelict state and have spent ‘whatever it takes’ (S. Peddar pers.comm., 26 October 2011) in terms of time and money to repair and conserve them consistent with heritage guidelines and recommendations. Both the owners of Nor’West Bend Station and the Anlaby Homestead Group found the process of applying for state
heritage funding difficult and rigorous, though both were grateful for the opportunity (A. Morphett pers.comm., 12 November; S. Peddar pers.comm., 26 October 2011).

Three out of the nine structures considered have received heritage funding in the past 20 to 30 years. Financial support for the two engine houses however, was obtained through the Department of Mines and Energy. No local heritage place has received any heritage funding from a local heritage grant or through any other avenue. Three out of the nine have access to a local heritage grant program (Table 17) but none of the owners has taken advantage of the opportunity. Two owners (Lyndoch Hotel and Farm Complex, Gnadenberg Road) were unaware of the grant program. The owner of the Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex, felt that the amount offered through the Barossa Heritage Fund for maintenance ($1000) was not worth the time required, especially considering the funds needed to repair certain elements (see 6.5).

Owners interviewed were mostly proud to own a heritage listed property and to have the opportunity to care for it. Several felt they had to jump ‘through hoops’ to understand the heritage system and its incentives. Many simply chose to disengage from it because they found it offered them no real service (M. Birnie pers.comm., 24 September 2011). At times, some went ahead with conservation decisions without heritage advice because of the delay in waiting for a Heritage Advisor (M. Raymond pers.comm., 15 November 2011).

### 6.12 Use and Location Comparative Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Listing Type</th>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Building(s) In Use?</th>
<th>Building Utilised for Original Function?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nor' West Bend Station</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlaby Homestead Group</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Complex Gnadenberg Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
<td>Yes, with exception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse, near Penrice</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>&lt;1km from town</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchetown Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpie and Stump Hotel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Hotel</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Within Town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>&gt;1km from town</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphetts Engine House</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>&lt;1km from town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adapted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 Case study locations and current use.
Table 18 displays data in relation to the location and current use of each case study. Three of the nine sites are within a town, three are less than 1km from a town and the remainder 1km from a town. Those sites within a town centre (Blanchetown Hotel, Magpie and Stump Hotel, Lyndoch Hotel) all have exteriors and interiors in reasonable condition, with the exception of the Lyndoch Hotel’s original interior (see Table 15). All are commercial businesses and have either contractual or economic incentive to maintain their condition.

Condition fluctuates for those structures past the boundaries of a town. The homestead complexes and the Gnadenberg Road Farmhouse are privately owned, and are personally valued as homes (with the exception of the Farmhouse near Penrice). The exteriors are in reasonable condition; however, internally their condition varies.

The engine houses have contrasting situations. The North Rhine Engine House, which is in a poor to very bad condition, is more than 1km from a town centre and is currently unused but is privately owned and personally valued by the owner (R. Lillecrapp pers.comm., 26 September 2011). By comparison, Morphetts Engine House is located less than 1km from Burra, is owned by the Goyder Regional Council and leased to the National Trust. It is within a large heritage complex, has been adapted as a museum and is marketed as a tourist attraction.

According to Table 18, two of the nine sites are vacant. Three have individual structures that are vacant but remain part of a functioning complex (Anlaby Homestead Group, Nor’West Bend Station and the Gnadenberg Road Complex). Six of the nine properties are used for their original purpose. Morphetts Engine House has been adapted as a museum within the Burra Historic Mine Site.
Discussion

Condition surveys, archival research and interview responses have been used to record the condition of a number of South Australia’s rural built heritage structures. These results allow the effectiveness of heritage legislation and frameworks in a conservation context to be evaluated. Additionally, research has allowed for conservation pressures specific to rural locations to be examined. Discussion on the findings from this research follows.

7.1 Condition: Good, Reasonable, Poor or Very Bad?

In contrast to other condition surveys in Australia (see for example Pearson and Marshall 2006) this thesis applied a method of assessing structures that allowed for an overall and descriptive condition grade of each individual element (e.g. roof, walls, windows and doors). This approach allowed for greater detail and understanding of the condition and conservation status of each site.

In the case of the five structures which received reasonable grades for their elements (see Table 4), interpreting the overall internal and external condition grade as ‘reasonable’ accurately reflected the condition situation of these places. However, for the remaining four sites, where condition was mixed, providing a single definition would have skewed the data and created inaccurate interpretations.

The unrepresentative nature of assigning a single condition to a property is well illustrated by results at the Anlaby Homestead Group. Archival research (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1970: n.p) revealed that past condition grades, which used a single condition definition for the complex, described the complex as ‘good’ and ‘well kept’. The survey for Anlaby Homestead Group undertaken for this study, however, demonstrated that, whilst the homestead itself is in reasonable condition, not all of its outbuildings, including the Slaughterhouse and Dog Kennel Manager’s Cottage (see 6.3.4 and 6.3.5), are in a similar situation. A single definition of condition, therefore, does not accurately describe the state of the complex.

On a smaller scale, this variability was also reflected in results from the interiors of the Lyndoch Hotel and Farm Cottage at Gnadenberg Road. For the Farm Cottage, the majority of the internal elements were in reasonable condition (e.g. the interior floors, walls, doors and windows). However, the ceiling was collapsing in certain rooms and was found to be in very bad condition.
(see 6.5.3). Similarly, at the Lyndoch Hotel, the condition of the original interior walls and ceilings were poor in comparison to its modern interior parts (see 6.9). In summary, to assert that the Farm Cottage and Lyndoch Hotel were entirely in a reasonable state by overlooking the condition of the ceilings and walls would have presented a false representation of the condition of the entire structure.

Descriptive analysis of each element allowed for greater understanding of condition in relation to aesthetic, rather than structural condition. This was seen at the Gnadenberg Road Detached Cottage, where, internally, the structure of the floor in room 2 is in reasonable condition however, the original lino covering was in poor condition. This was also found at the exteriors of Morphetts Engine House, the Magpie and Stump Hotel and Nor'West Bend Station, where, despite the condition of the structures’ walls being reasonable, paint had deteriorated in specific areas and is in need of repair. Likewise, understanding the condition of certain elements which play a disproportionate role in the ongoing maintenance of a building is particularly critical. Lack of windows, for example, will not cause a building to decay rapidly, but if the ceiling collapses (like at the Gnadenberg Road Farm Cottage) deterioration would be accelerated. Noting the individual condition of each element therefore, and providing detail of that specific element, will lead to a greater understanding of the condition of a heritage property.

The inadequacy of reporting condition in a single phrase also demonstrates issues with the methods employed for surveys such as the State of the Environment reports (SoE) from 2001 and 2006. These surveys define the condition of a heritage place within a single category (e.g. poor, fair, good), and do not allow methodological consideration of individual elements. This contrasts with the approaches of this study, and the recommendations and practices of English Heritage (English Heritage 2011b) and Monumentenwacht (Monumentenwacht Nederland n.d-a) (see 3.2.3). Overall, the method applied in this investigation, allows for a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of a building’s condition.

7.2 Conservation Management in South Australia: Proactive or Reactive?

In section 5.4, the methods for monitoring and caring for a site were explored. International organisations Monumentenwacht and English Heritage demonstrate that by applying effective conservation schemes, the tangible elements of a heritage structure can be maintained in a proactive manner.
The results show that at each of the sites with either mixed condition grades, or grades from poor to very bad (Anlaby Slaughterhouse and Dog Kennel Manager’s House, Nor’West Bend Shearing Shed, North Rhine Engine House and the Farmhouse near Penrice), systems implemented by government to conserve this heritage are not working. This is explicitly seen in the ongoing deterioration and abandonment of these sites revealed through the condition survey, archival research and interview results.

Conservation Management Plans (CMP) are the only proactive scheme offered under the Heritage Framework, as they aim to implement long-term conservation management systems and management recommendations. Yet, as they are not compulsory and are costly for an owner, they remain few in number (see Productivity Commission 2006; Smith 2005).

As seen through archival research, no property in this study has been re-recorded in the past ten years (see Table 13). The condition of some (see Chapter 6) has deteriorated in this time particularly the North Rhine Engine House and the Farmhouse near Penrice. Local heritage sites (e.g. the Lyndoch Hotel, Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex and Farmhouse near Penrice) are included in Heritage Surveys and annexed in Development Plans but are not formally recorded to the same degree as state heritage.

The results of this study indicate that not all state and local heritage places are sufficiently cared for or have mechanisms in place to monitor their condition. Consequently, the South Australian government is unable to efficiently assess the current condition of its state and local heritage places. In this situation, conservation practices are unlikely to take into account the heritage condition and as such become reactive rather than proactive. This is in contrast to the systems in place in the Netherlands and England (see 5.4), which have, in the past few decades, committed to understanding the pressures on their heritage and then applying solutions. Without knowing the current state of heritage places, it is impossible to preserve them for future generations, or to claim that the aims of the State Heritage Places Act 1993 (to identify, record and conserve), or the Development Act 1993 (to manage or conserve), are successfully being carried out.

7.3 A Difference in Management: State vs Local Heritage

This research did not identify any systematic difference in building condition between properties listed at a state or local level. This result is surprising due to the differences in incentives offered, and the legislation enacted to provide for the two categories.
Similiarity in condition between the two categories was noted particularly at the Farmhouse near Penrice, and the North Rhine Engine House. At the Farmhouse near Penrice, after being listed as a local site in 2001 (it was vacant and abandoned at the time), no management procedures, such as a CMP, were enacted to preserve it. A similar situation was noted at the state heritage listed North Rhine Engine House, where no management scheme was put in place and no state heritage funding received. Funding was received from the Department of Mines and Energy due to the mining history of the site (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1984b:n.p), however, this contribution was outside of the Heritage Framework being considered in this study. The condition of the structure has subsequently deteriorated further. This comparison demonstrates that, despite both these properties being listed as heritage places under different Acts, the outcomes for their conservation are strikingly similar.

Data from the three hotels in this investigation also suggest that a state or local listing does not affect conservation outcomes. The external and internal elements of the state heritage listed Magpie and Stump Hotel and the Blanchetown Hotel were both found to be in reasonable condition. This was also the case at the locally listed Lyndoch Hotel, with the exception of original parts of the interior. The three hotels demonstrate that neither, a state nor local heritage listing appears to affect the conservation outcomes for the structures. In contrast to the example of the Farmhouse near Penrice and the North Rhine Engine House, however, these examples remain in reasonable condition.

It is difficult to extrapolate these results in the context of rural South Australia with the information available. If, however, these results reflect broad trends in rural built heritage conservation this suggests that heritage frameworks (local or state) have a minor effect on conservation outcomes in South Australia.

7.4 With Reasonable Care? The Effectiveness of Heritage Legislation and Frameworks

In South Australia, framework incentives include the Heritage Advisory Service, the State Heritage Fund, local heritage funds and CMPs (see Chapter 4). Findings from this thesis indicate that the Heritage Advisory Service is the most effective incentive available to both state and local heritage owners. This is in keeping with findings by McDougall and Vines (2008:n.p) that the
program has ‘facilitated revitalisation’ and is run as one of the most efficient heritage incentive as offered nationwide.

The value of the Heritage Advisory Service was evident through interviews conducted with property owners. With the exception of the Lyndoch Hotel (and those places within the Mid Murray Council which are not able to access this service), all participants have used the Service. Owners are able to access the free Service without limit, and are able to seek advice regarding conservation and management that is not easily available through other means (as discussed in more detail in section 4.2.1).

Issues remain with the accessibility of the Advisory Service, which is not actively promoted to owners. At the Barossa Valley Council, Heritage Advisor Sam Hosking is employed on a once-a-fortnight basis and his services offered to over 800 heritage property owners, most of whom, by his own admission (S. Hosking pers.comm., 4 October 2011), probably are not aware of his role. This is in line with the suggestion from the Heritage Advisory Services Handbook that, ‘in rural and regional areas it is generally sufficient for a visit [to a LGA] on a one day a month basis’ (Rogers 2009:8). Despite this, feedback from interviews with the study’s participants indicates that frustration over the Service arose based on the limited time the Advisors had available to spend at any one property and the difficulty in accessing the Service.

Of the nine sites within this study, only two (Anlaby Homestead group and Nor’West Bend Station) have received heritage funding through the State Heritage Fund. At both of these sites, the extent of repairs to all the structures within the complexes has been substantial and so the contribution of state heritage funding to conservation has been relatively insignificant in the bigger picture. The owners who have not applied for funding were either unaware of the program (North Rhine Engine House) or had applied for funding originally but found the process difficult and time-consuming and have not since utilised the Service (Nor’West Bend Station).

Conservation of the North Rhine Engine House, which has access to the State Heritage Fund, and the Farmhouse near Penrice, which has access to the Barossa Valley Heritage Fund, has not been enhanced by access to these services. Neither of these properties has been maintained in the past ten years and funding is needed urgently to avoid collapse.

A specific example of where financial assistance could be effectively applied is at the larger complexes within this study (Anlaby Homestead Group and the Nor’West Bend Station). Owners
of these complexes have demonstrated their commitment to conserving the heritage features of their properties. However, when considering the outbuildings, restoration and conservation costs are often high in light of the buildings’ limited present use. This is well illustrated by the Anlaby Slaughterhouse or the Nor’West Bend Station Shearing Shed, which are no longer operating structures. It is often the case that surplus to use, buildings like these are last to be repaired, despite the owners’ intention to restore them. It is these cases where assistance would be beneficial to help conserve these structures.

Access to heritage funding in this study for many of the sites has therefore not played a significant role in their conservation. Current financial support in South Australia for heritage is insufficient in order to implement conservation strategies and is contributing to the ongoing degradation of South Australia’s built heritage. At present, funding is limited to major repairs and does not take into account those owners who maintain their property vigilantly.

The only site in this study to have implemented a CMP is Nor’West Bend Station. The owners have implemented aspects of the plan over the past ten years, with the shearing shed (which was said to be in a deteriorating condition) remaining as the last structure to conserve. Out of the nine sites considered for this thesis, Nor’West Bend Station was the only one to have been comprehensively recorded with sketches, maps, measurements, photographs and condition and conservation information, which are the direct result of implementing a CMP. This positive result suggest that the value of such plans to assist owners in future conservation and management is currently understated by all government information and incentives related to heritage practices.

Research from this study shows that incentives for heritage in South Australia have varying levels of success. Though each incentives attempts to encourage and support heritage conservation, the Heritage Advisory Service is the most successful. Additionally, CMPs and grant programs, for both state and local heritage, whilst appearing as valuable incentives, are poorly supported and administered which leads to less successful outcomes.

7.5 Valuing the Invisible: How Use, Value and Location Affect the Conservation of Rural Heritage

Results from this study (see 6.12) indicate that successful conservation outcomes are influenced by the continued use of a structure, a high perception of its value by its owners or a community and through being located in a visible area. This is in line with findings from the SoE (Lennon
2001; Pearson and Marshall 2006) and National Trust (National Trusts of Australia 2010) reports, which found that legislation is not framed to conserve buildings that are vacant, abandoned, unable to be adaptively re-used, or isolated.

Each case study that is still in use has either a condition rating of reasonable or is mixed between good, reasonable and poor. These structures are homes and businesses which are cared for and maintained through occupation. An example of this is the Gnadenberg Road Farm Complex which is in use and received a mixed grading of poor to good. Those structures that received a grading of poor, very bad or, mixed between the two are all vacant and simply not cared for in the same way. This was seen at the Farmhouse near Penrice which, has been unused for some time and received ratings of poor and very bad.

The comparison of local heritage places, the Lyndoch Hotel and the Farmhouse near Penrice, serves as a critical example of the effects of value. The Lyndoch Hotel is visible within the main street of Lyndoch and is a viable commercial business valued not only by the owner but also by members of the community who use the building each day. On the other hand, the Farmhouse near Penrice is located outside of the small town of Penrice, and has been abandoned for more than a decade. It appears to not be valued by the community or its owner. This comparison demonstrates that when value is unappreciated it can negatively affect a site and positive conservation outcomes are less likely.

When a heritage structure is in a remote location and its visibility is minimised, this study revealed that successful heritage conservation outcomes have not always been positive. Comparison of the condition of the two engine houses is a case in point. The North Rhine Engine House, which is abandoned and located in the middle of a remote paddock, is not visible to the public or the wider community. Despite the structure being one of only two examples left in the world of the Cornish ‘Bull’ engine (see 6.1), and it being an ideal candidate for long-term preservation, its location hinders this possibility. On the other hand, Morphetts Engine House sits prominently within the Burra mining complex and is part of a State Heritage Area. It is valued and used widely by various parties including the National Trust, the Goyder Regional Council, the local tourism association, the local community and, in a broader sense by the South Australian government that helps to promote it as a tourist attraction. For this structure, its location supports its ongoing conservation.
In rural South Australia, due to changes in economy and population (as explored in Chapter 2), the issue of location and resultant invisibility is often intrinsically greater than in other areas. However, as no urban sites were considered in this study, it is impossible to gauge the full extent of this situation. What can definitively be concluded, however, is that government legislation and frameworks are yet to acknowledge that such pressures may exist.

7.6 Summary

Results of this study suggest that state and local heritage legislation and frameworks play minor roles in the ongoing conservation of built heritage in rural areas. The Heritage Advisory Service was found to be the most effective incentive program in both administration and practice, despite it having a negligible outcome on heritage in this study. Funding schemes and CMPs currently remain reactive, having little effect on sites considered in this thesis.

Regardless of the original function of a building, the best heritage outcomes are achieved if owners continue to use it. This ongoing use (particularly in the case of commercial premises) provides an incentive to maintain the condition of the building that is, in general, divorced from heritage concerns. The perceived value of a structure to the community and its location in a visible area also facilitates its ongoing conservation. The neglect of unoccupied buildings is exacerbated in rural areas where they are away from the public eye.
Conclusion

8.1 Future Directions and Recommendations

The condition of South Australia’s heritage, particularly rural sites, is an untold story. Whilst the State of the Environment reports (SoE) aim to provide a generalised indication on the state of Australia’s heritage, it is up to the South Australian government and heritage profession to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the state’s situation and investigate how it can be addressed. At present the pressures faced by rural heritage remains essentially unexplored and unaddressed by government and the heritage profession.

Debate must occur in government, professional and public forums regarding the integration, maintenance and conservation of historic built heritage into heritage legislation and frameworks. Local heritage legislation, must introduce a duty of care clause much like in the State Heritage Places Act 1993. This would provide power to local government to introduce minimum standards of care and to require owners to maintain their heritage property. At the same time, both state and local government must be encouraged to enforce and address issues of maintenance before it is too late.

The Heritage Advisory Service should be compulsorily implemented by local government and be advertised to heritage owners. If the opportunity for further financial assistance arises, the Heritage Advisor should become responsible for overseeing a process of regular recording and monitoring condition and management information for that LGAs heritage places. A database should be designed to store and track this information.

A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) should be a compulsory requirement for each heritage structure, whether a local or state listing. Such a measure would create a clear path for owners to follow and enable future conservation work to be determined, interpreted and monitored.

Further effective incentive needs to be devised and offered to owners. Guidance could be provided in the forms of publications and a heritage newsletter (issued to new owners and available online) and workshops offered to provide information on heritage management and conservation.
None of this will be possible however, until government addresses the financial inadequacies attached to the heritage sector. Financial assistance, possibly modelled on Western Australia’s or New South Wales’ heritage program and incentives (See Appendix 7), needs to be implemented to support owners, to support council and, by extension, the heritage profession.

8.2 Out of Sight and Then Out of Mind

Research indicates that heritage conservation in South Australia is inadequately supported, funded and administered by government heritage legislation and frameworks. This is despite conservation being acknowledged by both state and local Acts as being a major process in the preservation of the state’s heritage. Without the basic support and funding the heritage industry requires, it is impossible to implement strategies that conserve the state’s heritage sites. Despite this, South Australia continues to list properties of local and state heritage significance because someone cared enough to nominate it.

Though the majority of the study’s sites were found to be in reasonable condition, for those that were not, no mechanism exists to remedy this situation. Due to this, deteriorated structures recorded for this thesis, in 10 years will most likely no longer be standing. Instead, these structures which helped shape South Australia’s rural landscape, and create a tangible link to the past, will slowly deteriorate.

If the conservation of South Australia’s built rural landscape is considered important (as is implied by their heritage listing) a more effective mode of heritage conservation must be implemented. The South Australia government must be proactive and employ systematic methods for recording and conserving built heritage as well as offering effective incentive to owners. Until this time, the heritage profession and the state’s heritage structure’s are powerless, especially those located in the rural environment, against the heightened pressures of neglect, vacancy, isolation and abandonment.

This thesis concludes that the current heritage framework does not adequately support the ongoing maintenance and conservation of built heritage in rural South Australia.
‘Firmly located on the coastal belt with our eyes fixed over the seas, advocacy for this essential building block of our cultural heritage on which we rode to prosperity in the 19th century has so far failed. What will you do about this?’

(Lennon 2007:14)
Allen Consulting Group 2005 *Valuing the Priceless: The Value of Historic Heritage in Australia.*
Unpublished Report to the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand.


Cockburn, R. 1925 *Pastoral Pioneers of South Australia*. Adelaide: Lynton Publications.


Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1982 Magpie and Stump Hotel Item Evaluation Sheet. Heritage ID: 10201, South Australian Heritage Register.


Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 2007 The Register of the National Estate. Canberra: Australian Government.


