

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	133
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Point Nepean		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senators FISHER AND BIRMINGHAM asked:

1. What was the basis of the Government withdrawing support for the University of Melbourne's National Centre for Clean Coasts and Conservation at Pt Nepean?
 - a. Is the Government concerned at the statement of the CEO of Parks Victoria that the Victorian State Government would seek a hotel at Pt Nepean?
 - b. As this is expressly contrary to Government policy, will the Government now call on the Victorian Government to stop the hotel and focus on Marine Education?

Answers:

1. In 2007 a Heads of Agreement was entered into between the Commonwealth and the University of Melbourne for a National Centre for Coasts and Climate, which was conditional on a lease being signed and a funding agreement being agreed. At the time of the transfer of land to the Victorian Government in June 2009 neither of these conditions had been met. As the land is now under Victorian ownership, any negotiation of a lease for the site is a matter for the Victorian Government.
 - a. The Transfer Agreement between the Commonwealth and Victoria for the 2009 land transfer set out conditions regarding the future use of the site. Those conditions ensure that Victoria is required to manage the site in accordance with relevant plans and legislation, and that public consultation over future use of the site occurs.

The Victorian Government may choose to develop a range of accommodation styles, so long as the development is conducted in accordance with the terms of the transfer agreement. This specifically includes protecting and conserving the National Heritage values of the site.
 - b. No.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	134
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Tarkine Forest		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator COLBECK asked:

In December, Minister Garrett announced an emergency heritage listing for the Tarkine forests with a view to make further assessments.

1. I understand that since then there has been a public comment process along with the release of the finalised guidelines for an Environmental Impact Statement. How many comments were received? From who?
2. Can you give me a rundown of what the process will involve from now? What are the timeframes?
3. What has been the feedback from the Tasmanian Government?
4. What is the current consultation process restricted to, if at all? If it is restricted to landowners and indigenous stakeholders, why?
5. What funds have been set aside for the assessment?

Answers:

1. The Australian Heritage Council has received over 100 submissions on the emergency heritage listing for the Tarkine, with submissions expected to continue to arrive until the closing date of 7 July 2010. Submissions have been received from a range of stakeholders including industry, landholders, Indigenous people, recreational users, tourism operators and conservation interests.
2. The closing date for submissions is 7 July 2010. The Australian Heritage Council plans to consider the Tarkine heritage assessment in the coming months. The Council will then provide advice to the Minister to inform his decision on the future of the listing.
3. On 6 July 2010 the Tasmanian Government advised the Australian Heritage Council that it intends to provide a submission on the emergency heritage listing of the Tarkine.
4. The consultation process on the heritage listing of the Tarkine is not restricted in legal terms. There are minimum requirements for this stage of consultation under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, however in the case of this assessment the wider public was also invited to comment by way of public notices in local newspapers and on the Australian Heritage Council's website.
5. The Department's Section Budgets for 2010-11 have not yet been determined, so it is not possible to advise what funds have been set aside for specific assessments.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	135
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Nation Building and Jobs Plan		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

1. From stimulus package funding, how many submissions requesting funding for heritage projects were not funded?
2. What percentage of stimulus funding allocated to heritage projects went to publicly owned premises?
3. Of that, what percentage of places that received funding were State government properties compared to Commonwealth properties?
4. What percentage of stimulus funding allocated to heritage projects went to
 - a. Historic environment
 - b. Natural environment
 - c. Indigenous environment
 - d. Heritage research
 - e. Heritage sector development
5. Has all the money allocated to heritage projects through the stimulus package now been allocated?
6. Will a review be conducted of the outcomes?

Answer:

1. Total number of applications received: 603
Total applications funded: 223
380 submissions were not funded, of which 200 were ineligible, and 180 were eligible but received no funding.
2. Data was not collected on the basis of class of ownership of property, but on type of applicant. The following percentages of total funding apply to the different classes of applicant:
 - Community group: 6.73%
 - Educational Institution: 3.4%
 - Historical Society: 6.14%
 - Indigenous organisation: 1.00%
 - Local Government organisation: 11.83%
 - National Trusts: 26.79%
 - Religious organisation: 8.92%
 - State Government organisation: 34.14%
 - Commonwealth Government organisation: 1.05%

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

3. Data was not collected on class of ownership of property, but on type of applicant. 34.14% of funding went to State Government and 1.05% to Commonwealth organisations, the balance to non-government organisations and religious organisations.
4.
 - a. Historic environment: 78.65%
 - b. Natural environment: 19.59%
 - c. Indigenous environment: 1.76%
 - d. Heritage research: Nil
 - e. Heritage sector development: Nil
5. All funding was allocated.
6. Yes.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	136
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Heritage Budget		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

The Departmental program support item is reduced from \$24.1M to \$19.8M in this budget. Is there any decline in recurrent funding for heritage?

Answer:

The decline in departmental program support funding over the period 2009-10 to 2010-11 is due to the net result of a range of factors. That is:

- the termination of funding provided under the Australian Government's heritage related stimulus program - Jobs Fund program;
- the removal of a one off grant to the Kimberley Land Council;
- the commencement of funding under the Government's new heritage program - Australia's National and Commonwealth historic built heritage;
- a reduction in the amount of corporate overhead costs attributed to Outcome 5; and
- a reduction in expected revenue.

From 2010-11 there is a reduction in funding attributed to the termination of the Kokoda Track – Papua New Guinea assistance package and Distinctively Australian programs, both of which were appropriated as four year programs.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	137
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Heritage Staffing numbers		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

At the last estimates hearing, we were advised that the staffing level for the Heritage Division for 2009-10 was 104. Are these positions all full time equivalents? What is the projection for 2010-11?

Answer:

Yes. The projection for the 2010-11 financial year is 101.9.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	138
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	National Trust Funding		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Is there a danger the Department's shift to project funding will encourage the collapse of the National Trust funding into the Protecting and Conserving Historic Built Assets program?

Answer:

No. They are separate budget appropriations.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	139
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	National Heritage Strategy		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

1. Has there been any headway made on a national heritage strategy?
2. Will the national cultural policy say anything meaningful about heritage?
3. Did the Australian Heritage Council or Heritage Working Group make a formal submission about the national cultural policy?

Answer:

1. The Minister is currently considering the potential merits of developing an Australian Heritage Strategy.
2. The national cultural policy is still being developed.
3. No.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	140
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Heritage Working Group		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

What are the recent achievements of the Heritage Working Group?

Answer:

The Heritage Working Group has provided advice to the Minister on a range of grant applications under the Jobs Fund program. In addition they have provided advice to the Minister on a number of policy and public engagement proposals.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and The Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Budget Estimates, May 2010

Outcome:	5	Question No:	141
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	New Action Nishi Building		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

What expert heritage advice was provided to the Minister on the decision taken under the EPBC Act not to make the Nishi Building development a controlled action? Who provided the Minister with expert heritage advice and whether that advice supported or opposed the development?

Answers:

The Minister was provided with expert heritage advice from the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts and the Australian Heritage Council. Both advised that the development was likely to have a significant impact on the National Heritage values of the Australian Academy of Science Building.

The Minister was also provided with heritage advice from the proponent, which formed part of their referral documentation, which advised the development would not have a significant impact on the National Heritage values of the Australian Academy of Science Building.