

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COUNCIL

MINUTES

The 60th Meeting of the South Australian Heritage Council (the Council) was held on Wednesday 22 April 2015 from 9.30am in the Coorong Boardroom, Level 2, 1 Richmond Road, Keswick.

Statement of Acknowledgement

We acknowledge this land that we meet on today is the traditional lands for Kaurna people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country. We also acknowledge the Kaurna people as the custodians of the Adelaide region and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are still as important to the living Kaurna people today.

PRESENT

South Australian Heritage Council: Chair: Mrs Judith Carr; Members: Ms Carolyn Wigg, Ms Sara Beazley, Mr Rob Donaldson, Mr Jason Schulz, Dr Cameron Hartnell, Mr Gavin Leydon, Professor Alison Mackinnon AM, Mr Michael Queale and Ms Ali Ben Kahn (Acting Member).

Apologies: Nil

Secretariat: Mr David Hanna, State Heritage Unit, Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR)

Guests

Mr Hamish Angas, Senior Policy Officer, State Heritage Unit, (DEWNR)

Mrs Anna Pope, Acting Manager, State Heritage Unit, (DEWNR)

Ms Beverley Voigt, Manager, Heritage, Boards and Committees Secretariat, (DEWNR)

Mr Simon Carter, Heritage Officer, State Heritage Unit, (DEWNR)

Mr Matthew Loader, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI)

Mr Paul Stark, (DPTI)

Mr Nick Manetta, Executive Solicitor, Crown Solicitors Office.

WELCOME

The Chair welcomed all present.

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Agenda was **adopted** with the addition of discussion about the possibility of re-instating the Register Committee.

It was noted that Matthew Loader and Paul Stark from DPTI will attend the meeting at 11:30am to discuss the government's progress with drafting new legislation in respect to planning reform.

Mr Cameron Hartnell indicated that he had a conflict of interest for items 5.1 and 5.2, as he managed the archaeological survey of the Murray Bridge Historic Transport Hub in 2011, and

he was one of the nominators for the Former Military Hospital (Building 64) at Keswick Barracks in 2014.

Mr Michael Queale indicated he had a conflict of interest with Item 6.1 Fort Largs Barracks and Drill Hall, as he wrote the assessment report.

2. INDUCTION / GOVERNANCE

Mr David Hanna provided an induction manual to all members, and presented a slideshow highlighting aspects of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*. The induction process covered a range of governance information, including responsibilities of members, the functions of the Council and information about the registration processes.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was noted that the Minutes of the 59th meeting of the SA Heritage Council held on 12 December 2014 were adopted out of session.

Mr Schulz noted that he was listed as an attendee but did not attend the meeting.

4 ACTION ITEMS

It was noted that there were no actions to progress / discuss.

5 PROVISIONAL ENTRY IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE REGISTER

5.1 Murray Bridge Historic Transport Hub, Murray Bridge

Mr Simon Carter was welcomed to the meeting to provide an overview of the place.

Noted that the State Heritage Unit commissioned an archaeological assessment in 2011.

The proposed boundary of the listing was provided to members in the site plan.

The Council discussed the relative merits of listing the proposed place as a 'Place' rather than an 'Area' (it had been nominated as both). It was agreed that Council is obliged to consider both nominations for 'Place' and 'Area'.

It was noted that the Council can provisionally enter a 'Place', but that the process for listing an Area must go through DPTI and the Minister for Planning. It was also noted that the group of buildings comprising the transport hub had compatible uses and a closely interrelated development and history, in line with many other State Heritage Places.

It was noted there is a number of current State listed places in this vicinity. If the Council decide to list new places adjacent or near them there will simply be extra places in this precinct.

It was noted that the rail line is currently used by the Overland Train to and from Melbourne.

Council members agreed that the name of the listing should be 'Murray Bridge Transport Precinct'.

Council members agreed to list the Murray Bridge Transport Precinct as a 'Place' and therefore no further discussion was required about listing it as an 'Area'.

It was agreed to remove the last sentence under Criterion (b) as follows: 'the site is currently unused by the Australian Rail Track Corporation and railway buildings and archaeological deposits are endangered by future development'.

It was agreed that there ought to be a larger scale site plan (map) provided. Component boundaries to be included on the site plan shown with red lines and sites of archaeological significance to be identified in graduated scale of colour to differentiate the significance. The Chairperson asked that the State Heritage Unit be consistent with the colour of lines used on site maps. The State Heritage Unit agreed to undertake this work to update the site plan.

It was noted that the whole place within the orange line on the site plan will be designated as a Place of Archaeological significance.

Dr Hartnell abstained from any voting in this matter due to his conflict of interest.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Provisionally entered** the Murray Bridge Transport Precinct, Bordered by: Wharf Road, East Terrace, Bridge Street, Railway Terrace, Mannum Road, Hume Reserve Road and the Riverbank and includes the Murray Bridge and River Murray Rail Bridge, MURRAY BRIDGE, 5253 (CR5684/861, CT5808/957, CT6086/666, CT6040/95, CT5222/299, CT5844/386, CT5419/291, CT5931/785, CT5222/301, CR6105/16, CR5754/295, CT5759/651, CT5222/300, CT6040/94, *Hundred of Mobilong*) as described in the Summary of State Heritage Place, in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place pursuant to section 17(2)(a) of the Heritage Places Act 1993 as it satisfies Criteria (a), (b) and (c), under section 16(1) of the Act:
 - (a) *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution of the State's history; or*
 - (b) *it has rare, uncommon or endangered qualities that are of cultural significance*
 - (c) *it may yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the State's history, including its natural history.*
2. **Designated** the Murray Bridge Transport Precinct as a Place of Archaeological significance pursuant to section 14(7)(b) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.
3. **Approved** the proposed 'Summary of State Heritage Place' for the Murray Bridge Transport Precinct, including the statement of heritage significance, discussion of relevant criteria and site plan with amendments as described above.

5.2 Former Military Hospital (Building 64) Keswick Barracks, 2 Anzac Highway, Keswick

Mr Hamish Angas was welcomed to the meeting and gave an overview of this item.

It was noted that the Council can list State places on Commonwealth land, however the Commonwealth is not bound by the listing. Mr Angas advised that the Commonwealth has abided by the requirements of State listings on its land in the past, and that many State Heritage Places are owned by the Commonwealth (including post offices and military structures).

Criterion (g) had been proposed due to Matron Davidson's close association with Building 64. Council discussed whether the matron's associations with the place might go beyond the

stated arguments, in particular, whether her role as an ANZAC girl and her career in general, might be said to help represent the role of women in society and in the war during the first half of the twentieth century.

It was noted that the building's connection to repatriation history helps promote the case for this building to be listed.

Dr Hartnell advised that he believed the Military Hospital only cared for and repatriated soldiers from World War 1. Council asked DEWNR to investigate whether any soldiers from World War 2 were ever repatriated there.

Dr Hartnell noted that there is an almost identical building to the rear of Building 64, however this nomination is just for Building 64.

It was suggested by Council that the argument for listing against Criterion (a) needs to be extended to include the building's life as a hospital, and its role in repatriation. The argument currently used in the Summary is more appropriate for the Keswick site as a whole.

The Council members queried whether there is evidence of the hospital era in the building – is it manifested in the physical form? An internal investigation would need to be undertaken to determine this.

Mr Schulz queried whether Criterion (f) could possibly be investigated for this building in its role as a Repatriation Hospital?

Mr Queale suggested he thought the strength of the building was as part of the whole site.

Council resolved to defer a decision on the place until further work had been done on the criteria, as discussed above.

Dr Hartnell did not contribute to the decision making in relation to this item.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Agreed** to defer a decision on the nomination of the former Military Hospital (Building 64), Keswick Barracks, 2 Anzac Highway, Keswick pending further investigation into Criteria (a) and (g).

6 CONFIRMATION IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE REGISTER

6.1 Fort Largs Barracks and Drill Hall, Lady Gowrie Drive, Taperoo

Mr Hamish Angas provided a brief overview of this paper and summarised the submission which had been provided to Council. The submission suggested the setting of the place should be considered part of the listing.

The Council discussed the curtilage of this proposal. In general terms, it was agreed that curtilage should be considered on a case by case basis.

Mr Angas circulated a copy of an earlier site plan for the place that included red lines around the Barracks and the Drill Hall and also a red dotted line adjacent to the buildings that he said reinforced the open space setting. This was the same site plan originally considered by the Register Committee.

Mr Donaldson said the Council should not concern itself with the amount of curtilage around a State Heritage Place but instead allow the development system (through statutory

instrument) to ensure that any future development that is adjacent to a Place is appropriate and does not detract from it. The Council resolved to not indicate an arbitrary curtilage on the site plan.

It was agreed that the last sentence in the Statement of Heritage Significance should read as follows: 'The position, functional layout, scale and architectural style of both buildings, within the open setting, clearly illustrate their intended purpose and the historic context of the Barracks in 1939.'

It was agreed that the third dot point under the heading 'Physical Description' in the Commentary on the Listing should be removed and inserted in general text above the dot points (within second paragraph).

Mr Queale abstained from discussion on this item given his conflict of interest.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Agreed not to** include a portion of the former parade ground, as delineated on the revised Site Plan for the Summary (**Attachment E**).
2. **Confirmed** the Fort Largs Barracks and Drill Hall, Corner of Strathfield Terrace & Lady Gowrie Drive, Taperoo (CT 6095/84, A200, DP88971, Hundred of Port Adelaide), to the Summary of State Heritage Place, in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place pursuant to section 17(2)(a) of the Heritage Places Act 1993, as it satisfies the following criteria:
 - (a) *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State's history*
 - (b) *it has rare, uncommon or endangered qualities that are of cultural significance.*
3. **Approved** the proposed 'Summary of State Heritage Place' for the Fort Largs Barracks and Drill Hall including the statement of heritage significance, discussion of the relevant criteria and site plan subject to amendments discussed above.

6.2 Normanville Wesleyan Cemetery, 18 Main South Road, Normanville

Council members agreed to the confirmation and designation of the Normanville Wesleyan Cemetery.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Confirmed** the Normanville Wesleyan Cemetery, 18 Main South Road, Normanville (CT 5676/974, A472, FP 165191, Hundred of Yankalilla), as described in the Summary of State Heritage Place, in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place pursuant to section 17(2)(a) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* as it satisfies the following criteria:
 - (a) *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State's history*
 - (b) *it has rare, uncommon or endangered qualities that are of cultural significance.*

2. **Designated** the Normanville Wesleyan Cemetery, as described in the Summary of State Heritage Place, as a Place of Archaeological Significance, pursuant to section 14(7)(b) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.
3. **Approved** the proposed 'Summary of State Heritage Place' for the Normanville Wesleyan Cemetery including the statement of heritage significance, discussion of the relevant criteria and site plan.

7. STRATEGIC MATTERS

7.1 Policy and Governance Committee – for Review

Mr Hanna introduced this item and indicated that the Council has the opportunity to re-instate the Policy and Governance Committee if it wishes, however the members would not receive any remuneration.

Council members considered the policy work required of the Council and determined that there was no requirement to reinstate the Policy and Governance Committee at this time, although it may be reconvened in the future if needed.

Mr Donaldson noted there could possibly be some further work from the audit in 2013, however all Council members agreed to see if Council could manage the policy work in the course of normal business.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Resolved** not to re-establish the Policy and Governance Committee at this time.

7.2 Stakeholder Communication Plan

Mr David Hanna introduced the draft Stakeholder Communication Plan and invited feedback from Council members. Mr Hanna indicated that he was keen for the Council to have ownership of its Plan and ensure that they are comfortable with WHO the Council stakeholders are, WHY they need to engage with them, and HOW they will engage with them.

Mr Queale indicated that ICOMOS could be an important stakeholder for the Council and could assist in partnering with the Council. It was also suggested that the Institute of Architects should be on the stakeholder list.

Council members were requested by the Chairperson to provide feedback to Mr David Hanna out of session.

Professor Mackinnon suggested an annual one-day workshop or symposium with all stakeholders rather than invite them to our regular meetings. The Council has in the past conducted round-table lunches. The State Heritage Unit will investigate this proposal.

It was agreed that the Council's Stakeholder Communication Plan will form an important component of its Strategic Plan, and that it should be revisited during the development of the Strategic Plan.

Resolution

The Council:

- **Resolved** to provide feedback on the draft Stakeholder Communication Plan to Mr David Hanna out of session.

8 GOVERNANCE**8.1 Terms of Reference / Meetings Procedure**

Council agreed to revoke its current terms of reference. There was general consensus that the Council has no need for a terms of reference as its responsibilities are clearly articulated in the *Heritage Places Act 1993*, however, the revised terms of reference that were provided as Attachment C could be renamed 'Summary of role of the Council' and be added to the Council's website to inform the public.

Discussion about the content of the terms of reference led the Council to discuss its requirement under Section 5A (3) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*. Council requested that the State Heritage Unit provide a paper regarding Section 5A (3) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* in that the Council must establish and maintain a list of persons who are recognised by the Council as being appropriately qualified (including by virtue of their skills or experience) for the purposes of this Act, or for the purposes of those provisions of the Development Act 1993 that are relevant to heritage.

The Council agreed to adopt the revised Meeting Procedure provided as Attachment D.

Action

State Heritage Unit to provide advice to the Council about establishing and maintaining a list of persons who are appropriately qualified as per Section 5A (3) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Revoked** its terms of reference.
2. **Agreed** to place a summary of its role on the Council's website.
3. **Approved** the revised 'Meeting Procedure'.

8.2 Advice on listing process (Nick Manetta, CSO)

Mr Nick Manetta, Crown Solicitor, was welcomed to the meeting. Mr Manetta provided a summary of the findings of the Court in the judgement related to the pair of houses, Mackinnon Parade, North Adelaide.

Mr Manetta said that there should be one person who could stand by the recommendations of an assessment report and be willing to appear before Court as an expert witness if required.

A site visit is required at all times. This should be compulsory for any person preparing an assessment report. It should be the main author of the report that conducts the site visit.

It was agreed that other experts may need to contribute specific components to a report (for

example an historian or architect may contribute to the work of the lead author), however it should be simple to identify who is the main author and that that person has produced the recommendations.

It is now clear that attendance at court may be required when an assessor takes on the responsibility of doing an assessment. When the State Heritage Unit contract consultants to undertake an assessment, it will be explicit within their contract that they are expected to attend court if so required.

It is important that quotations are used when cross referencing.

Mr Manetta said that a report needs to be clear on who is the person that says that specific criteria from Section 16 of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* applies. The lead author needs to demonstrate how they arrived at their conclusions and should indicate if they have consulted other people with expertise to help them in reaching their decisions.

Mr Manetta said it must be clear who has reached the opinion and on what basis. The danger of a composite report is that it may not be apparent who has reached the final opinion in regards the recommendations. The Crown would like to see that the main author of the assessment report can be called on

In broad terms the Council considers the Assessment Report of a consultant. In recent times the Department has produced the summary overlay. On some occasions, the departmental staff may consider the content of an assessment report and inform the Council that they disagree with the criteria which are being recommended for listing of a place. Mrs Ben Kahn said she was concerned that the Department's briefing was perceived as a report, when the main assessment report should be the key document in matters of appeal. It was noted that Council makes its own decision and can decide not to accept the recommendation of the department and/or the party preparing the assessment report.

It was noted that when a matter is appealed, the Crown needs to be able to call on its own professionals. Mr Manetta indicated that Council sends expert witnesses and is supported by the Crown Solicitor to inform the Court and help it to reach its own conclusions, not to defend the decision of the Council.

Mr Manetta said that it is critical that the Council always refers back to the legislation that governs it. This will especially relate to the Council now that it is performing the dual role of provisional entry and confirmation. What is the statutory test? Mr Manetta said the Council should expect a consultant to address the criteria in the Act in any assessment report.

It was noted that if the Council believes a place should be listed because it meets more than one of the criteria under Section 16 of the Act, then it is required to provide supporting evidence against each criterion.

Mr Manetta was thanked for his time.

Actions:

In response to Mr Manetta's advice, the State Heritage Unit undertook to do the following:

- review the proforma for its Summary to Council, to ensure authors are clearly identified alongside key references
- ensure future consultants engaged to carry out assessment work are prepared to back up their recommendations in court (if required)
- ensure a field visit to the place is part of the investigations leading to an assessment

report

- negotiate the best possible outcome in the cases where an assessment has already commenced (on the old basis).

8.3 Election of Deputy Chair

Mr Hanna introduced this item by indicating that given this is the start of a new term of the Council, it is appropriate to call for nominations for the position of Deputy Chair.

Mr Gavin Leydon nominated Mrs Carolyn Wigg as Deputy Chair.

It was noted that Mrs Wigg had departed the meeting at this point of the discussion however Mrs Wigg had indicated to Mr Hanna and Mr Leydon previously that she was keen to be nominated for the role of Deputy Chair.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **elected** Mrs Wigg as the Deputy Chair for the time of this Council – 2 April 2015 until 1 April 2018.

9 VERBAL REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Mrs Carr indicated that she met with the Minister on 29 January 2015.

Mrs Carr said the Minister is keen to promote Heritage through Tourism. Since their meeting the Minister has asked for advice from the Council about this matter.

The Minister has also asked the Council to investigate the use of mobile applications (technology) in promoting heritage to the community.

The Minister valued the views from the Council about the Maughan Church and Mission matter when he attended the meeting in December last year.

Another issue raised in the meeting with the Minister was heritage buildings and access for disabled people. Mr Queale indicated the State Heritage Unit should talk to Mr Eric Martin in the ACT who is an expert in heritage and disability access.

Mrs Carr said the Minister is keen on adaptive reuse. The Minister queried the possibility of a revolving fund and asked for some advice on this.

Actions

Council to meet to provide advice to the Minister about promoting Heritage through Tourism. Paper to be prepared by State Heritage Unit.

In response to the Minister's concerns, the State Heritage Unit is investigating the use of applications as part of its Database Upgrade Project, and has recommended the theme of 'Designing disabled access for heritage buildings' as a preferred topic for the next Sustainability Fellowship through the University of South Australia. The Unit will also undertake investigations into revolving funds, and provide a paper to Council in due course.

10 REPORT FROM DEWNR

10.1 Report (including update of State Heritage Key Projects)

Ms Voigt provided an overview of the DEWNR report.

It was noted that DEWNR has a new Chief Executive, Mrs Sandy Pitcher. Mrs Pitcher is very supportive of the work of the State Heritage Unit.

A summary of some of the Unit's priority projects was provided as an attachment, and Council noted the increased profile for heritage projects in the Department. This has included the digitising and sharing of relics and records from Keswick and Netley.

Regarding sustainability, a goal of the Government is to make Adelaide a carbon neutral city. In light of this, matters such as embodied energy, green star energy rating and a demolition levy are being looked at. These sorts of matters should be considered when preparing the Council's strategic plan.

Ms Voigt noted that 18th May 2015 is the next national Shipwrecks Delegates meeting. It is hoped that the Commonwealth will provide an update on the progress of the Australian Heritage Strategy at this meeting.

It was noted that most States and Territories are in a similar situation to South Australia in regards to a shortage of funding for heritage conservation work. An option to increase revenue in this area is a tax opportunity at the national level.

It was noted that Mr Angas has been working with Renewal SA around the Glenside redevelopment. The Council discussed the collapsed wall at Glenside and asked if there was an administrative process for Council to formally write to owners when a State Heritage Place has been damaged? The State Heritage Unit said there is not currently, although it has been in communication with the Department of Health to ensure this matter is resolved satisfactorily.

Council queried the process for consultation of owners prior to provisional entry. The State Heritage Unit currently contacts owners as a matter of good faith to inform them that their place has been nominated and will be considered by Council for provisional entry. The Council noted that this is not a statutory requirement, however agreed that the State Heritage Unit will continue to contact owners prior to provisional entry, but will aim not to let this communication hold up the process of consideration by the Council.

10.2 Status of Nominations and Provisional Entries (as at April 2015)

The Council discussed the status of nominations and provisional entries. There are limitations regarding how many places can be assessed and processed at any one time, and prioritising assessment of nominated places is determined by a number of factors, including advice from Council.

Action

Mrs Carr asked Council members to advise her if they would like to see a reprioritisation of the priorities.

11 ITEMS FOR NOTING

11.1 Correspondence

The Council:

1. **Noted** correspondence received and sent since the date of the last meeting.

11.2 Report on Decisions Made Under Delegation

The Council:

1. **Noted** the reports provided on the exercise of Council's delegations.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 Planning Reform

This matter was discussed at 11:30am immediately after Item 6.2.

Mr Matthew Loader and Mr Paul Stark from DPTI were welcomed to the meeting.

The DPTI team is commencing the drafting process for the new legislation. Minister for Planning's intent is for the draft bill to be introduced in July.

DPTI has established an inter-agency reference group. Mrs Voigt is a member of that reference group. DPTI is undertaking targeted consultation with the agreement of the Minister.

With regard to Reform 8, the Expert Panel on Planning Reform observed two fundamental matters. The first is that there are too many statutory schemes in place. The processes are not always fit for purpose. There is an opportunity to look at integration. The other matter is a wider thought about heritage. What does it mean? There is an opportunity to look at how different facets of heritage link up. How does heritage in a place based context link with wider policy considerations?

The Government has said there is a two stage process. We need the planning system to have a better link to heritage considerations and look at one list for Local and State. The second is "what is heritage".

Mr Loader said the intention is for a single integrated list, a single set of listing criteria and a wider conversation about what we mean by heritage as it also includes things such as Aboriginal heritage and shipwrecks.

Mrs Wigg noted that it is cumbersome that both listings are included in development plans.

Mr Loader noted that the Government has flagged a move to an online system.

Mr Leydon indicated that the Council supported a single process for managing Local and State Heritage in its submissions in 2014 and asked if there was to be Act only? It was discussed that most likely the *Heritage Places Act 1993* would remain however with consequential amendments arising from the new planning legislation.

Mr Loader said DPTI thinks that the assessment of the significance of a listing is very much a matter for the Heritage Places Act. DPTI wants to make sure that once something has been identified, it is easily identifiable in the planning system, with common terminology across both Acts.

Mrs Wigg queried the use of Heritage Impact Reports in the future? Mr Loader indicated that the Government wants to design legislation that enables codes or other instruments (such as Heritage Impact Reports) to manage heritage.

Mrs Ben Kahn queried what the government means by 'cultural policy' and Mr Loader said that it was about the opportunity to build on what institutions, people hold valuable in the

longer term and that DPTI has examined what other jurisdictions do in this space to enable South Australia to adopt best practice.

Mr Hartnell made the point it will be difficult to reconcile century old differences between different practitioners in areas such as art, history, architecture, archaeological etc.

Mr Loader noted the legislation will be at a very high level, but it was intended to include developments conforming with the Burra Charter in the drafting instructions.

Council was uncertain that the term 'Landmark', suggested to give Government an opportunity to do a 'reset', appropriately captures all heritage as some of it is intangible or not a place.

Mr Donaldson encouraged DPTI to look at how matters have improved at the recent listing work by Council. is now a robust and very well documented process.

Mr Loader said a constant source of confusion in the planning system is what is meant by character? By taking local listing out of the system and take an integrated approach the planning system will interact better. He also suggested that institutions such as Museum and Art Gallery ought to be more involved in the management of heritage.

Mrs Wigg said that integrity and adaptability were very useful part of assessment process.

Mr Loader advised that the drafting instructions could be circulated to Council members for their review.

Action

Executive Officer to organise special meeting of the Council in mid-May to provide comment on drafting instructions for new development legislation.

12.2 Revisit Register Committee

It was noted that the Council can re-instate the Register Committee if it wishes, however members would not be remunerated for their service.

Ms Voigt suggested that Council look at this when there was more clarity on the proposed legislative change.

Mr Leydon stressed that consideration of re-instating the Register Committee was not about remuneration for members, but more about the robustness of the listing process.

Resolution

The Council:

1. **Resolved** not to re-establish the Register Committee at this time.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chair thanked all in attendance and retiring members of the Council for their valuable contributions and their commitment to heritage in South Australia, and closed the meeting at 2:30pm.



Mrs Judith Carr

Chair

23.6.15
Date: