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For our grandchildren’s children
In May 2010 four councils within and adjoining Adelaide’s Mount Lofty Ranges dared to envision a truly world-class future. Not with a hyperbolic marketing campaign, but with a bold growth strategy to secure and enhance the qualities that make this productive agrarian landscape so special. The councils contracted researchers at the University of Adelaide to investigate the feasibility of making a bid for UNESCO World Heritage listing for the working agrarian landscape of the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley, Mount Barker and McLaren Vale.

World Heritage Site status would conserve the area’s unique qualities, not just for future generations of Australians but also for the world. Not as a museum, but as a working, growing, changing landscape under local planning control. This is the report of that investigation.

World Heritage listing for agrarian landscapes is very rare, and rarer still for working agrarian landscapes. The Val d’Orcia in Tuscany is one example. So are Portugal’s Alto Duoro Valley, Hungary’s Tokaj wine region, and Mexico’s famous tequila-producing area of Jalisco. This detailed report provides a wealth of information about what World Heritage Site status is, what it means (and what it doesn’t), the basis for a South Australian bid, the benefits and costs associated with such status, comparisons with other World Heritage Sites and areas seeking listing (for example, England’s Lake District), and the nomination process.

The main conclusion of the report is that seeking World Heritage status is a no-lose proposition, whether or not it succeeds. However, many factors suggest that the probability of success for a South Australian bid is strong – for historical and philosophical reasons that most South Australians probably know little about, in addition to the natural beauty and cultural qualities they might acknowledge but may not fully appreciate.

‘[South Australia] is the Australian version of Tuscany, except they have extraordinary seafood.’
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PREFACE

The idea to explore the feasibility of mounting a bid for United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage listing of Adelaide’s agricultural hinterland was sparked by a collaboration between South Australian researchers and the Thinker-in-Residence program, which in 2009 focused on the Food and Wine Value Chain. Professor Randy Stringer, a University of Adelaide agricultural economist with extensive experience at the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, advanced a proposal, which was then championed by Professor Mike Young, a member of the Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists. Young saw it as a unique opportunity to assist integrated planning and development at the landscape and regional level. The following four councils subsequently commissioned the University of Adelaide’s Environment Institute to conduct the feasibility study:

- Adelaide Hills Council
- The Barossa Council
- District Council of Mount Barker
- City of Onkaparinga

Each council nominated a staff representative to the Mount Lofty Ranges working group (hereafter referred to as the working group), which met monthly during 2011 and early 2012 to discuss and explore relevant topics. Each workshop was held in a different council area so that interested staff members from the host council were able to participate in the discussions. A total of 10 workshops were held and covered questions concerning stakeholder engagement, geographic scope, the values on which a UNESCO bid might be built, the bases for generating economic cost-benefit scenarios, the likely implications of achieving World Heritage Site (WHS) designation, and the bid process and timeframes. The Environment Institute engaged urban planner Stephanie Johnston as project manager, and Julian Morison of EconSearch Pty Ltd as economic consultant and advisor.

In addition, a workshop was held with the Adelaide City Council (ACC) regarding its successful nomination of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout for National Heritage listing. A scoping session with Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) identified alignments between a potential bid proposal and state government policy in a number of strategic areas. A series of seminars were also staged in the Barossa, the Waite Institute and McLaren Vale in

‘[A] place consists of everything that has happened there; it is a reservoir of memories… understanding those memories is not a trap but liberation, a menu of possibilities. The richer the knowledge, the wider the options… The enemy is narrow, singular definition.’

Adam Nicholson, landscape historian
cooperation with PIRSA, Regional Development Australia (RDA) Barossa, and the (then) Department of Planning and Local Government (DPLG).

Through these processes numerous potential stakeholders were identified, and as many as possible were consulted. These stakeholders fall into four broad categories:

- industry, heritage, community and Indigenous representatives;
- councils;
- South Australian government ministers and agencies; and
- Australian government agencies.

To identify potential economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of a successful WHS bid, the researchers gathered a wide range of case-based evidence from other WHSs. Reports commissioned by the British government provided extensive background analysis, in particular concerning the Lake District World Heritage Project, which aims to gain listing on the basis of that picturesque region’s working cultural landscape.

A key motivation for the Mount Lofty Ranges UNESCO bid proposal is to strengthen existing policies and to provide policy guidance for improving development strategies for the highly productive agricultural landscapes surrounding Adelaide. Further, it will provide significant branding opportunities for the region and put it on the world stage, thus increasing farm viability and tourism potential. Many of the region’s stakeholders are already exploring mechanisms to assist in preserving and enhancing these landscapes and their food, wine and tourism economies into the future. The bid’s potential strategic alignment was thus assessed relative to key state and federal government policies and priorities currently influencing the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region.

Finally, the study calls attention to the diverse contributions agriculture makes to the social and environmental life of the region, not simply the economy. Evidence suggests that these contributions are not well understood, seldom analysed in the context of the region’s development, and rarely reflected in local development policy strategies.

‘Just as we have become a minerals and energy giant, Australia can be a great provider of reliable, high-quality food to meet Asia’s growing needs.’

Prime Minister Julia Gillard, 3 May 2012
FOREWORD

‘It is vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of the individual.’

Jeremy Bentham, 19th-century philosopher

After two years of work on this initiative, after all the reading and thinking, the debates and conversations, the presentations and interviews, for me it all comes down to answering one question: ‘If we can get it, why wouldn’t we want it?’

Why wouldn’t we want our region to be recognised as part of an exceptional group of agricultural landscapes? The Lake District in England is mobilising a campaign to gain recognition. Current sites include the Alto Douro in Portugal, the Val d’Orcia in southern Tuscany, Cinque Terre on Italy’s Ligurian Coast, Jalisco’s tequila-producing region in Mexico, and the villages and surrounding landscape of Hungary’s Tokaj wine region.

All these areas are World Heritage Sites because the significance of their agricultural landscapes is considered so exceptional that they are of global importance for present and future generations. Why wouldn’t we want to be part of this group?

I do understand that many of us are just plain incredulous of the whole notion. A common reaction is to ask how can we possibly be part of such an elite group? For most of us, the agricultural landscape bordering our city is merely our backyard. It is easy for us to see the simple, tangible value of its produce – its wine, figs, apples, cherries, eggs and cheeses.

It is often difficult, however, for us to see and recognise the diverse, less tangible values that make up the wealth of the landscape itself. Perhaps it’s even more difficult for us to see the many ways those less tangible values contribute to our sense of place and the ‘liveability’ of Adelaide – that difficult-to-define blend of economic prosperity, community cohesiveness and environmental health.

As a contributor to liveability, our agricultural backyard’s virtues are many, making our city neighbourhoods more attractive places to live and work. We take weekend drives through it, we trek through it, and we ride our bikes through it. We put our visiting relatives in the car to show off our vistas, vineyards, orchards and charming villages. We brag about it.

This agricultural landscape also provides watershed benefits, biodiversity benefits and wildlife habitat. And, yes, our backyard provides us with a sense of place. It is a cultural landscape reflecting how we live, work and play. The nearby countryside helps define who we are as a city and as communities, and how we differ from other cities around the world.

Viewed on our maps, the city boundaries and agricultural landscape are two separate geographies. In our daily lives, no such boundary exists. In Adelaide, we use and depend on our agricultural landscape, the same way we use and depend on our city parks and beaches. No matter where we live in Greater Adelaide, it doesn’t take much more than fifteen minutes to head east into an agrarian world.
Adelaide the city is inextricably connected to the surrounding farmland. Food and wine markets, regulations and policies, and roads and walking trails link city to countryside. What we buy in the city influences what is produced in the countryside – shaping and reshaping how the landscape appears. Similarly, the policies, regulations and growth strategies made in the city shape producer incentives, influencing their ability to invest, compete and prosper. Ignoring any of these connections between the city landscape and the agricultural landscape presents an incomplete picture of their shared world.

This initiative evolved from initial research exploring how best to protect the farmland bordering Greater Adelaide. Australia is one of the only countries in the world that doesn’t take a coordinated, strategic approach to protect farmland. We learned quickly from our work that even the best farmland protection practices do not guarantee profitable farmers.

This report explains how Adelaide has inherited something unique to human history. My colleagues present a compelling case for pursuing World Heritage status, explaining how our inheritance provides an inimitable opportunity to promote the individual interests of agricultural producers. If we can provide our countryside with World Heritage status, it would represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional competitiveness unrivalled in Australia. If we can understand what is in the interest of the individual, then our community interests, our common interests, and our grandchildren’s children’s interests just might prevail.

Do we embrace our unique inheritance, promote it, and celebrate it for our parents, for our children and for the world? Or do we allow our agrarian landscape to predictably and monotonously evolve to look like every other place in the world?

There are eleven UNESCO World Heritage ‘agricultural sites’ on the planet. Only eleven. Not one is in the Southern Hemisphere. No other agricultural landscape in Australia stands a chance of gaining recognition. Only ours. Think about it. No matter how much Melbourne may want it, they can’t beguile it away from us. Not ever. It’s our history, our identity, and our landscape.

Randy Stringer
Professor, Agriculture and Food Policy
University of Adelaide
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

1. Solid grounds exist – on the basis of history and continuing culture and practice – to mount a bid for World Heritage Site (WHS) designation for the Mount Lofty Ranges agricultural region. Such a bid should be pursued in two stages, and would have a good chance of success.

2. WHS designation would stimulate higher economic growth in the region by boosting producers’ global competitiveness (e.g., branding opportunities), supporting continued development of high-value primary production, and attracting investment.

Extensive analysis of direct benefits-to-costs alone shows strong returns for low-, medium- and high-growth scenarios if WHS listing is achieved (taking note of uncertainties in generating such estimates); and real benefits even if it is not, simply by undertaking the process of mounting a bid.

By placing high value on character- and heritage-conserving innovation, WHS listing would provide a much more resilient development path for the region, and help reverse trends of agricultural land loss in the Greater Adelaide area. Existing zoning and proposed legislation will not ensure the economic viability necessary to retain the region’s rural character in the long term.

3. WHS and National Heritage listings will not affect ordinary planning processes for the vast majority of development applications in the region. These processes will remain the same before and after listing.

4. The value of WHS listing is unlocked not by the designation itself, but by the motivation and coordinated action of local stakeholders and the integration of systems of governance marshalled to make the bid work. The bid process would catalyse and unify discussion of issues vital to the future of Adelaide and South Australia, as well as to the region, including ‘intangibles’ with real consequences such as sustainability, climate change mitigation, and ethics, as well as senses of place, identity and community.

5. Continuing loss of productive agricultural land in the region means that securing the place of agriculture in the regional landscape and economy cannot be left to a ‘business as usual’ policy stance. A decisive shift in public policy and in private behaviour is needed, as are multiple vehicles to carry that decision through.

‘The minute it goes on the World Heritage list, it goes into Lonely Planet, Fodor’s, Frommer’s … Visits to Campeche have increased every year since it was nominated, rising 39 per cent from 1999 to 2004; receipts from tourism almost doubled …’

**Why this report was commissioned and by whom**

- The study explores the economic, social and environmental implications of pursuing WHS designation for a series of agrarian landscapes stretching from the Barossa Valley to the Fleurieu Peninsula.

- The Mount Lofty Ranges working group (the working group) commissioned the study and collaborated in its preparation. The working group is made up of representatives of four councils - the Adelaide Hills Council, The Barossa Council, the District Council of Mount Barker, and the City of Onkaparinga – and researchers from the University of Adelaide.

**Who carried out the work?**

- The University of Adelaide Environment Institute, in collaboration with the working group. EconSearch generated the economic impact projections.

**What is a World Heritage Site (WHS)?**

- A unique natural, cultural or combined place deemed to be of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). That means its significance is so exceptional it transcends national boundaries and is of common importance for present and future generations worldwide.

- A WHS is a place or property (e.g., a forest, mountain, lake, landscape, monument, building, complex, or city) that is added to the World Heritage List established by the UNESCO World Heritage Convention.

- Australian WHSs include the Great Barrier Reef, the Blue Mountains, the Australian Fossil Mammal Sites (Queensland and South Australia), the Sydney Opera House, Uluru-Kata Tjuta, and the recently listed Australian Convict Sites.

**Working agrarian World Heritage Sites are very rare.**

- Figure 1 shows that only a small fraction of WHSs are agrarian landscapes. Fewer still are ‘working agrarian landscapes’.

- Working agrarian WHSs include Val d’Orcia (Italy), the Alto Douro Valley (Portugal), the Tokaj wine region (Hungary), and the Jalisco tequila-producing region (Mexico).

Source: UNESCO

**Figure 2** Val d’Orcia, Tuscany (above) and Jalisco, Mexico (below).
UNESCO classifies agricultural landscapes as ‘organically evolved landscapes’ that developed ‘from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative’ and achieved their present form ‘by association with and in response to its natural environment’.

**Why might the Mount Lofty Ranges agricultural region qualify?**

- Two criteria for WHS listing concern outstanding examples that ‘illustrate[…] significant stage(s) in human history’ or are ‘directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas or beliefs…of outstanding universal significance’.

- South Australia was not only the first place in Australia to be planned and developed by free settlers, but also the first place in the world to apply the principles of ‘**systematic colonisation**’.

- The theory of systematic colonisation advanced by Edward Gibbon Wakefield aimed to avoid the mistakes of historical every-man-for-himself colonisation in favour of long-term sustainability and resilience through planned development based on surveys. The theory was promoted in London by two of the greatest philosophers of the 19th-century, John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham, through the Colonization Society. The society’s principles were enshrined in the laws that established South Australia. The agricultural landscapes first surveyed in the 1830s thus signified a turning point in the colonisation of Australia, and indeed the world.

- The region’s links to this unique philosophical movement of ‘universal significance’ and the continuing reflection of these ideas in the modern landscape and land use policy, will form the basis of a WHS bid.

**Why would we want to seek World Heritage listing?**

- To gain the global competitive edge and associated socioeconomic benefits that flow from WHS status, which, roughly speaking, is to natural and cultural sites what Michelin stars are to fine restaurants.

‘The planning of the colon[y of South Australia] should not be with an exclusive view to the private interest of the first founders but with a deliberate regard to the permanent welfare of the nation afterwards.’

John Stuart Mill, 1891

![Figure 3 From left: E.G. Wakefield, J. Bentham and J.S. Mill](image-url)

‘World Heritage status has, over time, evolved from a technical measure aimed exclusively at preservation into an acclaimed and widely respected brand.’

Ryan and Sylvanto, 2009
To benefit from the coordination and integration of state and local development policies and processes that will protect and enhance the special characteristics of the Region which may well be lost otherwise.

To benefit from a host of ‘intangibles’ with real consequences that flow from listing.

To benefit from the process of nomination, even if listing is not achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Australia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (GRP)</td>
<td>$278m</td>
<td>$141m</td>
<td>$71m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$132m</td>
<td>$67m</td>
<td>$34m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related (GRP)</td>
<td>$43m</td>
<td>$21m</td>
<td>$13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$23m</td>
<td>$11m</td>
<td>$7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State (GRP)</strong></td>
<td>$321m</td>
<td>$162m</td>
<td>$85m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jobs</strong></td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$155m</td>
<td>$78m</td>
<td>$41m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (GRP)</td>
<td>$194m</td>
<td>$97m</td>
<td>$49m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$84m</td>
<td>$42m</td>
<td>$21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related (GRP)</td>
<td>$20m</td>
<td>$10m</td>
<td>$6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$10m</td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>$3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Study Area (GRP)</strong></td>
<td>$214m</td>
<td>$107m</td>
<td>$55m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jobs</strong></td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$94m</td>
<td>$47m</td>
<td>$24m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EconSearch Projections are for accrued benefit over a period of 10 years. The experience of existing WHSs indicates that economic growth attributable to listing is likely to occur mostly in the early years following listing. Economic activity is likely to plateau or a slow after a number of years.

Figure 4 Estimated direct economic benefits of World Heritage Site listing over 10 years by region, industry segment and growth scenario.
What are the socioeconomic benefits?

- WHS listing represents a singular, strategic determinant of regional competitiveness, which means substantially higher economic growth from tourism, investment, new business opportunities, and ‘branding’ and reputation premiums for local products.

- EconSearch estimates of direct impacts of WHS listing on agriculture and tourism, for both state and region, are shown in Figure 2 based on high-, medium- and low-growth scenarios. Even a low-growth scenario has the potential to bring attractive returns.

- Numerous studies show that WHS listing attracts the high-yielding tourist segment, especially to sites not already ‘on the global map’, such as the Mount Lofty Ranges.

- Experience shows that WHS listing encourages high-quality architecture and landscape design, and often results in improved infrastructure and transport.

Benefits for land use policy and development processes

- The nomination process alone requires a whole-of-government, cross-sector approach involving primary producers, business, communities and individuals as well as governing bodies at all levels, which has potential benefits for planning and policy.

- WHS listing would encourage the meaningful reflection in land use planning and policy of several desiderata, including environmental management, biodiversity protection and climate change adaption, in addition to enhanced agricultural production.

WHS listing aligns with numerous existing local, state and federal government policy directions, including: i) proposed Character Preservation legislation for McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley; ii) the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide; iii) South Australia’s Strategic Plan, which includes a focus on ‘Clean green food as our competitive edge’; and iv) central platforms of the South Australian Tourism Plan and South Australian Tourism Brand.

Intangible benefits with real consequences

- WHS listing provides a powerful ‘place-making’ tool, with the potential to strengthen local pride, sense of place and identity within the region.
A WHS bid would increase recognition of the economic, social, environmental and cultural contributions of agriculture and agricultural landscapes, at a time when - for the first time in human history – more people live in urban areas than on the land. Evidence suggests these contributions are not well understood and are seldom analysed in the context of the region’s development.

The bid process offers opportunities for community participation across the region in value-chain thinking, healthy eating, and sustainable consumption.

**Will World Heritage Site listing mean new rules and bureaucracy that will unduly restrict how business is done?**

- No. Primary producers will still be able to switch crops, construct new buildings, and improve infrastructure in ways that allow them to prosper as agricultural producers.

- The federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act applies once an area appears on National, Commonwealth or World Heritage lists. However, it only comes into play when development (e.g., a mine, airport, expansion of the urban boundary) might significantly impact on the listed agricultural and tourism values of the area. The Act does not affect assessment processes for the vast majority of development applications.

**How should we go about seeking World Heritage Site listing?**

This study strongly recommends a **two-stage process**.

**Stage 1**

- Ultimately the federal government seeks World Heritage listing on behalf of all Australia, so National Heritage listing must be obtained first. Both bids would therefore be carried out concurrently.

- WHS listing requires establishment of OUV based on UNESCO's cultural criteria. The bid thus will aim to meet two or three of the criteria listed in Figure 3.

- The bid documents must link the UNESCO criteria with: (i) the land policy and socioeconomic values of the Wakefield plan for systematic colonisation; (ii) the values incorporated in ongoing zoning policies that continue to reflect those original values and principles; and (iii) relevant values and objectives that underpin the proposed Character Preservation legislation for the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale and other planning policy documents (e.g., South Australia’s Strategic Plan the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide).

---

**Figure 6** UNESCO’s cultural criteria.
Stage 2

- The actual WHS nomination process, which is carried out by the federal Department for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, with state and local assistance.

- The Australian government will only place sites that have a strong chance of success on the Tentative World Heritage List, so commitment to Stage 2 is only likely to occur if political support and a strong case has been built in Stage 1.

How much will it cost and who will pay?

Stage 1

It is recommended that the four councils on the working group commit to partner with the state government to fund the actual costs.

- Local funding is recommended to be $10,000 per council per year for three years, starting from July 2012.

- State government funding of $50,000 per year for three years is suggested.

- Actual funds would pay for (i) a part-time coordinator or ‘project champion’ to manage this stage of the bid process; (ii) formation of a project management team and an industry steering group; and (iii) stakeholder and public engagement, communications, research, documentation and photography.

- An ‘in-kind’ budget of partner time would involve a project management team comprised of the participating councils and representatives of state agencies (e.g., the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia, the South Australian Tourism Commission, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.)

- Further support is anticipated via separate funding of related projects and studies by a combination of the public, private and university sectors, and the establishment of a not-for-profit foundation or similar public fundraising mechanism. Early commitment by the government parties to pursuit of Stage 1 would greatly enhance this effort.

- Commitment to completing Stage 1 is strongly recommended. It represents a ‘no regrets’ strategy, with relatively low risk financial and in-kind commitment spread over a number of local and state government bodies, for a high level of potential gain for the whole region.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>$269–$279K</td>
<td>$136–$146K</td>
<td>$405–$425K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>$200K</td>
<td>$680–$728K</td>
<td>$880–$928K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$469–$479K</td>
<td>$816–$874K</td>
<td>$1285–$1353K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 7 Estimated actual and in-kind costs of a two-stage nomination process.
Stage 2

- While nomination to the Tentative List and World Heritage nomination is undertaken by the federal government, it is typical for the coordinating department to work in cooperation with the relevant state agency, and for the actual and in-kind investment to be shared between the state and federal governments.

- No local government funding is envisioned, although in-kind contributions through staff time likely will continue.

- Government investment is anticipated to continue to attract industry, private sector and education sector investment in supporting studies and projects.

How long will it take?

- Each stage is estimated to take three to five years to complete.

- The total project will take six to 10 years.

How likely are we to succeed?

This is hard to predict, but the chances are good for the following reasons.

- National Heritage status has already been obtained for the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout, which is listed under six of the nine relevant national criteria.

- The Mount Lofty Ranges bid would be a somewhat similar case to the multiple-location Australian Convict Sites WHS, which is listed under criteria (iv) and (vi) for its reflection of an important stage of human history and as an extraordinary example of global ideas and developments during the Age of Enlightenment and the modern era.

- A recent UNESCO gap analysis identified several categories as under-represented on the WHS list, including: (i) the Pacific and Australasian region; (ii) agricultural and viticultural sites in particular; and (iii) colonial cultural sites generally. A Mount Lofty Ranges bid could address all three.

- The successful WHS bid of the Italian Val d'Orcia working agricultural landscape was built on somewhat similar grounds: how the aesthetics of that landscape reflect its history of good governance.
What happens if we don’t get it?

- There are still more positives than negatives from seeking listing. Stage 1 in particular represents a ‘no regrets’ strategy, with the potential benefits far outweighing costs.

- According to a Price Waterhouse Coopers UK analysis in 2007 related to the Lake District WHS bid: ‘Even if bids are unsuccessful, the journey itself can be expected to provide benefits … in terms of partnership, heritage protection, promotion of cooperative planning, and through attracting funding to support research … and projects.’

What happens if we do nothing?

- The characteristics of the region that might make it a candidate for WHS now very likely will be lost in the long term – not for lack of foresight or motivation, but because of the inherent limitations of conventional land use policy.

- The undeniable trend over the past half-century has been increasing loss of productive agricultural land in the region. Reversing this trend will require multiple mechanisms.

- While the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and the proposed Character Preservation legislation for McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley aim to preserve high-value primary production areas, both are still some way from fruition. ¹

- Land use policy can only mitigate negative pressures. What it fails to do is provide a context that can inspire and energise agri-food businesses to keep them economically viable. WHS listing would stimulate the food, wine and tourism economy of the region in ways that land use regulations could never do.

- A ‘business as usual’ policy stance cannot secure the economic viability of the agricultural landscape of the region. A deliberate decision is required to engender a shift in public policy and in private behaviour. A bid for WHS listing would provide an engine for such a shift.

¹ The McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley Character Preservation bills passed through the lower house on May 16 2012.
I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What are World Heritage Sites?

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world. This is embodied in an international treaty called the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World’s Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 1972. The UNESCO World Heritage List recognises both natural and cultural properties or sites deemed to be of ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ (OUV) to humanity. OUV implies that their significance is so exceptional that it transcends national boundaries and is of common importance for present and future generations.

A UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS) is a place or property (such as a forest, mountain, lake, landscape, monument, building, complex or city) that is listed by UNESCO as being of special cultural or natural significance. Cultural heritage refers to monuments, groups of buildings and sites (such as archaeological sites), and towns and landscapes with historical, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific, ethnological or anthropological value. Natural heritage refers to outstanding physical, biological and geological formations, habitats of threatened species of animals and plants, and areas with scientific, conservation or aesthetic value. Mixed properties satisfy part or the whole of the definitions of both cultural and natural heritage. At November 2011 the World Heritage List included 936 properties. These included 725 cultural, 183 natural, and 28 mixed properties across 153 countries. As of November 2011, 188 countries worldwide have ratified the World Heritage Convention.

In Australia, at the time of writing, there are 19 WHSs. Many of these are natural sites, such as the Great Barrier Reef, the Blue Mountains and the Australian Fossil Mammal Sites at Riversleigh, Queensland, and Naracoorte, South Australia (South Australia’s only listed site). Three sites, (i) the Royal Exhibition Building, Melbourne (ii) the Sydney Opera House, and (iii) the recently listed multiple-location Australian Convict Sites, are listed for their cultural value, and a few other sites, such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta, Kakadu, and the Tasmanian Wilderness, are mixed properties that are listed for both their natural and cultural values.

1.2 The Mount Lofty Ranges World Heritage agrarian landscape

The listing of cultural landscapes, and in particular agricultural landscapes, is a relatively recent concept in the evolution of the World Heritage designations. At the time of writing only 11 of the 936 WHSs are agrarian landscapes and only a few of these are ‘working landscapes’, including Italy’s Val d’Orcia, Portugal’s Alto Douro Valley, and the 28 villages and surrounding landscape of Hungary’s Tokaj wine region. Agricultural landscapes remain the most under-represented category of WHS status (Erickson, 2011). They are a subset of cultural landscapes, coming under the category of the ‘organically evolved landscape’, which, according to UNESCO,

… results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment (UNESCO 2011b).
World Heritage experts acknowledge that ‘conservation’ and ‘preservation’ are probably the wrong terms to use when discussing a moving target such as a dynamic and complex working agricultural landscape (Cook, 1996). They argue that any attempt to freeze an agricultural landscape as a museum object or an heirloom, in some present state or moment in the past, will condemn it. They also point out that agricultural landscapes have tangible and intangible value for the contemporary world, and recommend that priority should be given to listing unique agricultural landscapes that are in danger of being forever lost and those that show promise for sustaining present and future populations (Erickson, 2001). A recent gap analysis of the World Heritage List and its associated Tentative Lists also identified that the Pacific and Australasia is the least represented region in the world, and that agriculture and viticulture are under-represented in general (ICOMOS, 2004).

For the Mount Lofty Ranges, a World Heritage nomination process will involve establishing the OUV of the agricultural landscapes, based on UNESCO’s cultural criteria. National Heritage listing is the first stage in the World Heritage bid process. This is discussed in detail in Section 7.
1.3 Geographic scope and rationale of the proposed site

1.3.1 Settlement surveys

The initial scope of this feasibility study encompassed the geographic area from Clare Valley to the Fleurieu following the Heysen Trail and other historical and market linkages. This intuitive starting point was soon reinforced by the materialisation of an early survey map (the ‘Preliminary Survey Districts and Special Surveys to 1840’ map) that arguably reflects the implementation of the Wakefield Colonization Plan. It is important to note, however, that UNESCO advises that property boundaries should not be determined ahead of the establishment of the heritage values and the OUV documents that are going to inform the bid.

Early on it was decided that locations not within the boundaries of the four councils participating in the feasibility study, but that may need to be eventually included in a WHS (e.g., Seppeltsfield/Southern Fleurieu), should remain within the scope of the feasibility study and ongoing bid process, but be treated separately to the area within the participating council boundary. For example, the EconSearch economic analysis (Section 4) focuses on creating economic scenarios within the council boundaries, but also necessarily encompasses impacts and benefits outside of those boundaries, and in particular on the city of Adelaide itself.

1.3.2 Geographic Information Systems layering

In order to begin to identify the mosaic of agricultural landscapes and cultural sites that may become the subject of a WHS listing, the Mount Lofty Ranges working group used a McHargian values overlaying process utilising Geographical Information Systems (GIS) to explore the geographical area in question. The working group has thus commenced a process of overlaying: (i) geological information including water courses; (ii) Indigenous land use patterns and stories/legends; (iii) settlement surveys and settlement patterns; (iv) family ownership, migration, economic and cultural influences (e.g., German Hufendorf settlement patterns and Lutheran influences); (v) trail linkages (e.g., Tjilbruke, Yurrebilla, Heysen and Kidman trails); and (vi) contemporary zoning and planning boundaries, the proposed Character Preservation areas, identified primary production priority areas, and recognised scenic routes and view lines. It is envisaged that this overlaying exercise, along with the identification of the values to be incorporated in the case for OUV will continue to evolve to form the basis for future decision-making around the site boundaries.

1.3.3 Cellular versus contiguous

It is likely that the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges WHS will be a working agricultural landscape that includes the towns, villages, cropland, forests, trails and conservation parks that make up the rural landscape surrounding Greater Adelaide, based on the early survey maps. What is and is not included will be determined within the context of the values and degrees of authenticity that are ultimately determined to support the case for OUV. These values will be directly linked to the original founding principles of the colony (including provisions in the founding documents that attempted to reserve or protect Aboriginal rights to land), and also to the ongoing local and state government policies regarding the rural land, the historic settlements, the primary production priority areas, the conservation areas, the tourism destinations, the trails, and finally to the market linkages with the population of Adelaide (and overseas markets) which all contribute to the long-term sustainability of the working agricultural landscape.

---

2 See discussions in Section 6.1 and Appendix 4
3 Ian McHarg was a 20th-century landscape architect and urban planner who pioneered a method of analysing broad geographical areas by overlaying economic, ecological and socio-cultural value maps to facilitate land use planning, a technique that informs modern GIS analysis.
While the working group’s early geographical concepts revolved around identifying a mosaic of exemplary cellular sites, the decision to use the preliminary survey map as a template may lead to a site that combines both cellular and contiguous elements (figures 1.2 and 1.3). This ties in with a key
lesson from the Rebanks analysis commissioned by the Lake District World Heritage Project: ‘World Heritage Status: Is there opportunity for economic gain?’ The analysis identified that using WHS as an engine of economic development requires WHSs of scale. The sites the research identified as best practice were those places that were living, breathing communities, with population and businesses located within them; by definition meaning WHSs that are of significant size (Rebanks, 2010).

Source: Paul Mickan

**Figure 1.3** Geographic scope of the study: Preliminary surveys and special surveys superimposed onto a modern map with the relevant council boundaries identified.
2. THE CASE: VALUES, JUSTIFICATION AND LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS

2.1 Do we want it?

2.1.1 Potential economic benefits of World Heritage Site listing

The accumulated case study evidence indicates that UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS) listing could represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness. A WHS, as a globally recognised designation, would present countless opportunities to achieve substantially higher economic growth and a much more resilient development path. Economic assessments of existing sites suggest the Mount Lofty Ranges region could expect a wide range of direct tangible and intangible benefits. In particular, WHS designation has over time evolved from a technical measure aimed exclusively at preservation into an acclaimed and widely respected brand that countries use to attract heritage tourists, and that tourists, in turn, rely on in selecting the destinations they will visit (Ryan and Sylvanto, 2009).

WHS listing attracts the high-yielding tourist segment, and means more tourists, spending more money on local food, local wine, local restaurants and staying more nights in local hotels per visit. It also means investments and income from walking, cycling and gourmet groups who trek, ride and eat their way from town to village and from winery to restaurant around the new WHS area.

Most importantly to the regional economy, however, WHS listing strengthens the branding opportunities for local produce and products, and would thus provide a context that would inspire and energise agri-food businesses.

The working group therefore commissioned EconSearch Pty Ltd to assess the value of agriculture and tourism to the Local Government Areas (LGAs)’ regional economies, including related industries such as packing and processing (including winemaking), wholesale/retailing, food service (restaurants), and other tourism enterprise. The LGAs are the Adelaide Hills, Barossa and Mount Barker and the non-metropolitan portion of the Onkaparinga LGA. The analysis identifies three possible growth scenarios on top of a base case of no WHS inscription, based on different levels of funding and investment, and guided by evidence from other WHSs, and in consultation with the working group. The assessment is contained in Section 4 of this report, and more fully in the accompanying economic impact projections report (EconSearch, 2012).

The EconSearch analysis of agricultural impacts across the whole region over a 10-year period shows WHS designation could increase gross regional product (GRP) by up to $278 million in a high-growth scenario, adding up to 2409 fte jobs and increasing household income by up to $132 million. The impacts of listing on tourism and tourism-related industry could add up to a further $20 million to GRP, up to 256 fte jobs and another $10 million to household income. Some regions stand to benefit more than others, depending on the importance of agriculture and tourism to their...
respective economies. The Barossa LGA benefits the most from the potential impacts on both agriculture and on tourism, in absolute and relative terms. The impacts on agriculture are projected to be similar in the Adelaide Hills and Southern Onkaparinga economies, while Southern Onkaparinga is projected to benefit more from the tourism impacts than the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker.

The cost-benefit analysis summarised in Section 4 of this report and detailed in the separate EconSearch analysis (2012) shows that even a low investment scenario combined with WHS listing generates higher net benefits to the community than the base case (no WHS) scenario. The benefit-cost ratio (BCR) for the low growth (Scenario 1) was calculated to be 2.9, which indicates a potentially attractive investment. The interpretation is identical for scenarios 2 and 3 (medium- and high-investment scenarios), with both these scenarios also showing strong and positive returns. However, EconSearch noted that estimated net present value (NPV) increases as the level of investment increases, whereas the BCR and therefore the rates of return decline, suggesting a greater level of risk associated with the highest level of investment (Scenario 3).

![Cost-Benefit Framework](image)

Source: PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007

**Figure 2.1** The PricewaterhouseCoopers cost-benefit framework.

Figure 2.1 shows the cost-benefit framework identified in a 2007 PricewaterhouseCoopers report to the UK government. While that study did not take in any agricultural sites, it provides a picture of the kind of general economic and social benefits that might be anticipated from WHS listing, in the context of a likely cost framework for pursuing a bid - all of which will be explored further in sections 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of this report.
2.1.2 Potential social and environmental benefits of World Heritage Site listing
In addition to the economic growth scenarios explored in the EconSearch analysis, studies of existing WHS sites around the world suggest the sites and associated regions can expect substantial impacts in the following social, cultural and environmental areas:

- Investments, grants and funding in appropriate local infrastructure.
- Unique and high-quality architecture and landscape design.
- Branding opportunities for communities and local products.
- Catalyst effects for entrepreneurial business opportunities.
- Enhanced coordination for more sustainable transport policies.
- Integrated planning, recreation and environmental policies.
- Protection of aesthetic values, heritage and wildlife habitat.
- Education, learning, community and cultural benefits.
- Partnerships for economic and cultural development.

2.1.3 Potential alignment with local, state and federal government policies and strategies
A scoping exercise conducted with PIRSA identified the following list of government policies and strategies as being among those that align with pursuing a UNESCO WHS landscape designation:

- Proposed Character Preservation legislation objectives and values.
- ‘Clean and green food industry’ focus.
- South Australia’s Strategic Plan.
- The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.
- PIRSA strategic directions.
- Draft National Food Plan.
- South Australian Tourism Plan 2009–2014 and South Australia’s Tourism Brand Framework.

‘We will need to involve all sectors that intersect with our food production system – energy, land use, conservation and tourism. People throughout our region and the world will know that South Australian produce is clean and green.’

His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce AC CSC RANR, Governor of South Australia

• 2011 State Natural Resource Management (NRM) Plan (Draft) and the Adelaide Mount Lofty NRM Plan.

• NatureLinks and ‘Eat well be active’ strategies.


• Barossa Regional Road Map; Regional Development Australia, Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island Regional Roadmap, and Southern Economic Development Board Economic Plan.

• Integrated Design Commission Guiding Principles.

These potential alignments are discussed in detail in Appendix 1.

2.1.4 Issues and concerns
The most sensitive issue raised by stakeholders is whether UNESCO status brings additional layers of rules and procedures impacting on primary producers. While primary producers easily recognise the potential branding and premium status that UNESCO WHS listing will bring, they are concerned about what it means for their ability to switch crops, construct new buildings, and improve infrastructure in ways that will allow them to prosper as agricultural producers.

Surveys of the existing agricultural landscape nominations reveal that for the current UNESCO sites inscribed as working agricultural and cultural landscapes, the pre-existing planning and development processes, zoning rules and regulatory policies have provided the basis for those sites’ inscription, and have remained in place to deal with development matters. In other words, if the existing planning processes form the basis of the management system or framework that is put forward in the bid, activities approved by the existing planning and development rules are, by definition, contemplated within the UNESCO site. As mentioned in the introduction to this report, UNESCO recognises that any attempt to freeze an agricultural landscape as a museum object or an heirloom, in some present state or moment in the past, will condemn it. In short, listing does not decrease opportunities for farmers to develop their land, nor for tourism enterprise to develop facilities and infrastructure.

The working group recommends this policy be applied to the Mount Lofty Ranges agricultural landscapes bid, stating explicitly in the WHS bid nomination file that the existing planning processes and policies of each of the councils, combined with the relevant state and federal government legislation and planning processes, define the management system. It is important to note here that the federal Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act would come into play in the first stage of the bid process, along with National Heritage listing. The implications of the EBPC Act are explored in detail in Section 6 of this report, and the conclusion of the analysis is that

... world heritage listing will not impose any additional obligations for primary production and common development activities. That is, any application for planning permission for such activities within the boundary of the proposed WHS would continue to follow the general procedures already in place.
This statement confirms that primary producers, processors, landowners and tourism operators would face the same zoning and regulatory processes after the area is inscribed as they do now. Notwithstanding, it is anticipated that the related plans and policies would evolve over time according to a WHS strategic management framework that would be designed to support agricultural production and agitourism. Indeed it is envisaged that during the bid process, such plans and policies could start evolving to support the agricultural values being promoted by the bid.

Other concerns raised by stakeholders, to be explored further in Section 6, include:

- Obligations to manage the site properly, and to ensure that management plans or frameworks are prepared and implemented across the region in an ongoing fashion.
- The challenge of unlocking value and the need to provide infrastructure for increased tourism.
- The negative effects of increased tourism and the need to balance viable agriculture with the desire to encourage more tourists.
- Ensuring that the potential benefits of listing accrue across the whole area and to all stakeholders, including Indigenous stakeholders.
- Control and management of the branding and entrepreneurial opportunities that may arise from listing.
- The planned geographic scope of the WHS boundar(ies) and whether those boundaries will require buffers.
- Connotations of ‘heritage’ as freezing the landscape in time, and development industry concerns about the image of Adelaide as conservative or ‘anti-development’.
- The costs of mounting the bid and likelihood of success.

2.1.5 Conclusions
Within the context of existing local, state and federal government policy, the pursuit and attainment of WHS listing for the Adelaide agricultural hinterland could have significant benefits for the region and the state as follows:

- It could represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness for the region.
- It will reinforce the rural landscape and built heritage objectives and values contained in the proposed Character Preservation legislation for McLaren Vale and the Barossa by assisting those areas to become more viable for agriculture, viticulture and tourism.
- It clearly aligns with one of seven areas of strategic focus recently identified by the state government, namely supporting and developing ‘Clean green food as our competitive edge’. WHS listing would provide a recognised global platform for communication, promotion and realisation of that ambition.
- It will reinforce the notion that South Australia is a great place to live and to visit, a core tenet of South Australia’s Strategic Plan.
• It will put the region and its produce on the world stage and give it global prestige, thus driving the economic and social agendas of state and regional development and local government authorities.

• It solidifies and entrenches the South Australian government’s objective as outlined in the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide to protect primary production land within the Greater Adelaide region, and it would reinforce the plan’s objective to reduce carbon emissions by containing urban growth.

• It will bring to life and communicate ‘an authentic South Australian story’ based on the state’s utopian beginnings as a free settlement, where tolerance, civil liberty and opportunity have always been valued, and where food and wine have played a distinctive role – core platforms of the South Australian Tourism Plan and the South Australian Tourism Brand Framework.

• By highlighting the original intent of the founding principles, including the provisions that reserved Aboriginal rights to land, it will assist public understanding of the thwarted aspirations of the founding theorists and the role and basis of evolving Native Title Claims today in reconciling those aspirations.

• It will have many positive spin-offs for both the agricultural and tourism sectors of the local and state economy, which the participating councils and associated Regional Development Authorities wish to bolster and support in whatever way they can.

• It has the potential to result in increased recognition of the economic and cultural role and value of the agricultural landscape in a global context, thus reinforcing the symbiotic relationship between landscape, tourism and sustainable communities.

• It will strengthen the branding opportunities for local produce and products, which will benefit farmers and tourism operators within the region.

• It will improve marketing opportunities for the region as a tourist and visitor destination with global prestige, and it will help turn South Australia into a world-recognised culinary tourism destination.

• It will increase the number of international visitors, the length of stay and visitor spending.

• It will encourage a whole-of-government and cross-sector approach to economic development of the Greater Adelaide region.

• The development of a strategic management framework for the agrarian landscape site will encourage a landscape-based approach to integrating agricultural production, environmental management, biodiversity protection and climate change adaption – all core tenets of state and regional NRM plans and state government strategies for climate change resilience.

• It will encourage joint effort by bringing together for a common purpose all levels of government, business, communities and individuals throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges and associated wine and agricultural regions.
• It will help put community ownership and responsibility at the centre of landscape-scale management.

• It will build intra- and inter-regional relationships and encourage the sharing of knowledge and information.

• It will improve food security for the Adelaide region by supporting a low-carbon food source, by improving farm viability, and further assisting with the protection of primary production land for this purpose.

• It will enable tourist facility owners and farmers to pursue value-adding enterprises to their businesses as a result of having the prestige of the World Heritage brand.

• It will result in increased investment, new business opportunities, and potential ‘reputation premiums’ for local products.

• It will enhance the sense of local pride, place and identity within the region and support integrated design approaches to creating quality built environments, towns and landscapes.

• It will promote community participation in value-chain thinking, healthy eating and sustainable consumption across the region.

• It will support health and recreation initiatives that encourage an active, healthy lifestyle.

• It will support niche cycling tourism strategies for the region.

• As a powerful ‘place-making’ tool, WHS listing has the potential to generate wide socio-economic impacts and fundamental change in the region.

• It has the potential to act as a catalyst for development, using heritage as a tool to develop new identities for places, and transformative programs of actions across the region.

These potential social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits and related policy alignments are discussed in more detail in sections 3, 4 and 5 and in Appendix 1.
2.2 Can we get it?

2.2.1 Historical premise

The theory of ‘systematic colonisation’ espoused by Edward Gibbon Wakefield and promoted by utilitarians John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham aimed for the long-term sustainability and resilience of the South Australian colony, rather than the short-term profit of its founders. South Australia’s links to these ideas and philosophical movements of ‘universal significance’ developed by some of the greatest thinkers of the 19th century, and their reflection in the modern landscape and in ongoing land use policy, will form the basis of the bid. Like the National Heritage listed Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout site, the agricultural landscapes first surveyed in the 1830s signified a turning point in the colonisation of Australia, and indeed the world.

South Australia was the first place in Australia to be planned and developed by free settlers, not as a penal settlement or military outpost, and it was the first place in the world to apply the principles of systematic colonisation. The colony was established by incorporation as a commercial venture supported by the British government, based on Wakefield’s theory. According to that theory, to be commercially successful there needed to be contained settlement to avoid speculative land sales, and this settlement needed to be designed and planned to attract free settlers and to provide them with security of land tenure. Land would be sold for £1 per acre with the proceeds being used to pay the cost of transporting unemployed tradesmen and labourers in sufficient numbers. To ensure a supply of labour to work the farms and feed the new colony, settlers would be offered the right to purchase land in Adelaide’s ‘square mile’ for £1 per acre, on condition that for each city acre they would purchase an 80 acre country section, also for £1 per acre. The process of surveying the city square mile and associated country sections was conducted ahead of the sale of the land, enabling both rapid settlement and certainty of title. The price of the land was set so that labourers would need to work for a few years before purchasing their own land, which would in turn fund the transport of more labour.

Wakefield was responding to problems in colonisation that he was reading about, including in Robert Gourlay’s Statistical Account of Upper Canada (1822). Gourlay described a population scattered thinly over the landscape that gradually declined into a kind of barbarism, because of isolation. Each person had to be an expert in everything, children received little education and markets were distant. Massive investment was lost in the wilderness. Similarly at Swan Bay, Australia, the 1829 attempt at settlement had resulted in failure because large land grants were under-capitalised and labour was scarce. The colony only took off in 1849 with the arrival of convict labour. But to Wakefield and the utilitarians, this form of compelled labour was highly undesirable. Utilitarians were implacably opposed to slavery and saw convict labour as too closely resembling slavery as to be conscionable. As well, they were not keen on the cultural effects of a large convict presence. So it was that Wakefield’s proposal never relied on convict labour.

Wakefield was part of a revolutionary movement in the early 19th century that saw the private ownership of land by individuals – what Adam Smith called ‘the sacred rights of private property’ – as the key to social progress. Wakefield’s

‘The planning of the colony of South Australia should not be with an exclusive view to the private interests of the first founders but with a deliberate regard to the permanent welfare of the nation afterwards... Of the modes in which a fund for the support of colonization can be raised in the colony, none is comparable in advantage to that which was first suggested, and so ably and perseveringly advocated, by Mr Wakefield …’

John Stuart Mill
general theory became part of a program of the leading philosophic ‘Radicals’ of the time. They believed that private ownership could be used to found a model society, providing the land could be disposed of and mixed with capital and labour in exactly the right formula, leading to a ‘New British Empire’ (Cross, 2011).

The first to be converted by Wakefield was Jeremy Bentham. Bentham became persuaded that colonisation was ‘a work of the greatest utility’, and agreed to frame a charter for a society whose purpose it would be to settle parts of Australia upon the lines set by the program of systematic colonisation. In the light of the Canadian experience, Bentham added the notion of ‘concentration of settlement’ to the theoretical ideals that were embraced by the newly formed National Colonization Society. He argued that the settlement should be founded on an entirely new principle entitled the ‘vicinity-maximising’ or ‘dispersion-preventing’ principle, a notion which was to have direct impact on the way that Adelaide and its surrounding rural landscapes were first surveyed (Figure 1.2).

Another utilitarian who turned his attention to the colonisation of South Australia was British philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill:

*The planning of the colonies should not be with an exclusive view to the private interests of the first founders but with a deliberate regard to the permanent welfare of the nation afterwards... Of the modes in which a fund for the support of colonisation can be raised in the colony, none is comparable in advantage to that which was first suggested, and so ably and perseveringly advocated, by Mr Wakefield: the plan of putting a price on all unoccupied land, and devoting the proceeds to emigration.*

*... Before the adoption of the Wakefield system, the early years of all new colonies were full of hardship and difficulty: the last colony founded on the old principle, the Swan River settlement, being one of the most characteristic instances. In all subsequent colonisation, the Wakefield principle has been acted upon, though imperfectly, a part only of the proceeds of the sale of land being devoted to emigration: yet wherever it has been introduced at all, as in South Australia, Victoria, and New Zealand, the restraint put upon the dispersion of the settlers, and the influx of capital caused by the assurance of being able to obtain hired labor, has, in spite of many difficulties and much mismanagement, produced a suddenness and rapidity of prosperity more like fable than reality* (Mill, 1891).

Richard Mills (1915) covered the topic in his book *The Colonization of Australia (1829-1842): The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building*. This text, along with numerous other notable sources including the writings of Wakefield, Bentham and Mills, will be used to argue the national and global historical significance of the Mount Lofty Ranges and Fleurieu Peninsula’s agricultural surveys and related cultural landscapes. Notably, Mills’ book emerged from a PhD thesis completed at the Fabien Institution, the London School of Economics, supervised by the key Fabien, Graham Wallas, who places the Wakefield systematic colonisation scheme in a global context in his introduction to the book.
In his speech on the 175th anniversary of settlement of South Australia, then premier Mike Rann described Wakefield’s plan as ‘one of the most innovative human settlement initiatives in recorded history’ (M. Rann, 2011). He also cited Wakefield’s own statement that it was ‘the first attempt since the time of the ancient Greeks to colonise systematically’ (Wakefield, 1838). The WHS nomination bid will thus focus on how these ideas of universal significance led to the successful colonisation of South Australia, how they subsequently influenced colonisation elsewhere, and how they continue to be reflected in the contemporary landscapes, landholdings and settlement patterns, as well as in modern policy and modern agricultural practice.

2.2.2 World Heritage values and nomination criteria

The World Heritage nomination process will involve the establishment of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the agricultural landscapes in question, based on UNESCO’s cultural criteria. The nomination documents must link the nomination criteria with: (i) the land policy and socio-economic values of the Wakefield plan, including the sacred doctrine of ‘survey before selection’ and the ‘principle of concentration’; (ii) the values incorporated in ongoing zoning policies that continue to reflect those original values and principles; and (iii) the relevant values and objectives that will eventually underpin the proposed Character Preservation legislation for the Barossa and McLaren Vale4 and other relevant planning policy documents such as South Australia’s Strategic Plan and the South Australian Government’s 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. WHS nomination of the agricultural landscapes of McLaren Vale, Adelaide Hills/Mount Lofty Ranges and Barossa Valley is thus likely to aim to meet two or three UNESCO cultural criteria from the following:

(Criterion iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history.

(Criterion v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change.

(Criterion vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.

4 The McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley Character Preservation bills passed through the lower house on May 16 2012.
2.2.3 Likelihood of success of bid

It is likely that the Mount Lofty Ranges bid would invoke a similar historical case to the Australian Convict Sites World Heritage multiple-site property, which is listed under criterion (iv) and (vi) for its significance as an important stage of human history (Criterion iv), and as an extraordinary example of global ideas and developments during the Age of Enlightenment and the modern era (Criterion vi). National Heritage listing, the first stage in the World Heritage bid process, is likely to have comparative links with the National Heritage listing of the Australian Convict Sites, and with the national listing of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout (which is listed under six of the nine relevant National Heritage List criteria.)

Because there are only 11 agricultural landscapes listed by UNESCO at the time of writing, and only a few of those are working landscapes, it is difficult to assess the bid’s chances using comparative analysis with other agricultural sites. However, because a recent UNESCO gap analysis has identified that the Pacific and Australasian region is under-represented, that agricultural and viticultural sites in particular are under-represented, and that there is under-representation of colonial cultural sites generally, the chances of success are increased (ICOMOS, 2005).

An analysis of the minutes documents of the World Heritage Committee determinations on the Australian Convict Sites property, and on the Italian Val D’Orcia Working Agricultural Landscape indicates that the unique history of settlement of the Adelaide hinterland and its reflection in the landscape could provide a feasible basis for a bid, by providing comparable bids. In the case of Val D’Orcia, the bid was based on how the aesthetics of that landscape reflect its history of good governance, and in the case of the Brickendon and Woolmers Convict sites, the values are presented through the manner in which the farm landscapes and associated properties represent the unique history of convict settlement, an analysis that could also be applied to the reflection of systematic free settlement in the Mount Lofty Ranges landscape. In addition to Adelaide City Council’s assistance, a number of state government departments, including the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA), have helped the working group to explore the potential case, and to link the bid’s potential objectives with state and federal government policy objectives.

Research for this report has unearthed the work of local, national- and UK-based professional scholars and heritage experts who could be involved in developing a successful bid further, during Stage One of the bid process. (Section 6 and Appendix 4 contain some initial commentary from them.)

2.2.4 The multiple values of agrarian landscapes

‘The charming landscape which I saw this morning, is indubitably made up of some twenty or thirty farms. Miller owns this field, Locke that, and Manning the woodland beyond. But none of them own the landscape. There is a property in the horizon which no man has but he whose eye can integrate all the parts, that is, the poet. This is the best part of these men’s farms, yet to this their land deeds them no title.’

Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1836
The Mount Lofty Ranges landscapes, from the Barossa to the Fleurieu, have been a favourite subject for the region’s best known artists since settlement, illustrating how society and future generations gain in the long term from providing certainty of future land use and from preserving these landscapes for their full range of values. Some of the multiple values that will support the case for pursuing WHS listing might therefore be:

**Aesthetic values**

- beauty, character, rural vistas
- recreational values (‘the lungs of the city and suburbs’)
- a highly distinctive and rural ‘sense of place’
- magnificent coastal scenery and beaches

**Cultural and economic values**

- Kaurna, Ngarrindjeri, Ramindjeri and Peramangk stories and perspectives
- agricultural and tourism enterprise
- historical and heritage values
- our unique planned settlement ideals
- cultural values (the Barbizon/Heidelberg of South Australia)
- cultural enterprise (art, music and literary festivals)
- built form values
- self-sustaining communities
- a diversity of lifestyles for residents
Ecological values

- qualities of the rural and natural environment
- flora and fauna
- creek, river and ocean systems
- greenhouse/climate change resilience
- regional food security
- water catchment and recycled water supply

2.2.5 Conclusions
While the core case for OUV of these landscapes is likely to be based around their historical associations, many other intrinsic values are likely to inform the bid for WHS listing in order to justify investment in its pursuit and to bolster its chances of success. The proposed state government bills to introduce Character Preservation legislation to the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale will further enhance the region’s chances of putting forward a successful bid, as ‘making sure adequate protection, conservation and management is provided’ is identified by UNESCO as a key stage in the WHS nomination process. Finally, the Australian government has enjoyed a solid record of success with its nominations in the past, so it is likely that if the state and federal governments were to make a strategic decision to get behind the proposal it would be given every chance of success. Sections 7, 8 and 9 of this report go into more detail about the likely bid process and the associated financial and administrative implications of pursuing a bid.
3. SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT BACKGROUND STUDIES
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Figure 3.1 Potential areas of benefit from World Heritage Site designation.

This section and the following three sections of the report look at the potential economic, social and environmental benefits that may accrue to the Adelaide and Mount Lofty region as a result of World Heritage Site (WHS) listing. In their submission to the then Department for Planning and Local Government on the proposed Barossa and McLaren Vale Character Preservation legislation, Professors Stringer and Young argued that ongoing rural zoning and proposed legislation of the urban boundary in some parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges will not necessarily protect these lands, nor retain their rural character in the long term due, to the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the threats (Stringer and Young, 2011). This is backed by overseas research which suggests that multiple mechanisms may be required to tackle the multiple existing threats to the viability of peri-urban agriculture (Essels et al., 2008).

Key message:
For the agrarian landscapes of the greater Adelaide region to survive into the next century they must remain viable for agriculture, and a key strategy for attaining that long-term viability could be through the value-adding benefits of bidding for, and hopefully one day attaining a UNESCO World Heritage Site listing.

Stringer and Young, 2011

The working group also discussed how the potential benefits are likely to vary depending on the scope and nature of the site, and this raised some questions, such as: Are the benefits likely to be more discernible and concentrated if the site is a discrete settlement, natural feature and/or building, and will this have a bearing on how we subsequently define the WHS boundaries (i.e., as one large contiguous area, a more concentrated area or a number of non-contiguous sites)? The numerous studies that have been conducted to date, covering a wide range and number of WHS sites, and the cumulative results of countless smaller studies from specific sites, reveal:

- The existing economic geography of the site matters - a remote site with a small local population and a finite tourist market will confer limited social and economic benefits.

- Size matters - WHSs that are relatively large in scale (those that have multiple points of access and offer a layer of attractions, with communities and businesses located in them) benefit the most from international tourism and other socio-economic impacts as they often serve as ‘destinations in their own right’.
• The system of site governance matters - the more open the system to input from the local population, the greater the impact on community capacity.

• Local leadership matters - where confident site management leaves power with strong local businesses and community leaders, economic and social benefits may be marked.

In summary, the cumulative evidence indicates that the impact value of WHS listing is not automatically created by the designation itself, but is unlocked by the motivations and actions of the local stakeholders and the establishment of open and integrated systems of governance.

The next four sub-sections introduce the potential economic and employment benefits and issues that may result from WHS listing by examining a select number of recent national and international reports and case studies that have informed this feasibility study.

3.1 2006 Lake District and Cumbria ERS Report

This preliminary report compiled by Carlisle-based economic research consultants ERS on the ‘Potential Social and Economic Benefits for Cumbria’ was commissioned by the Lake District World Heritage Project Steering Group in 2006. The study consulted a wide range of key stakeholders and businesses, compiled case study evidence from other WHSs, and assessed the strategic fit of key policies and priorities that influence Cumbria and the Lake District.

3.1.1 Tourism impacts
The ERS research raised a number of points in regard to the potential tourism impacts of WHS listing for the Lake District and Cumbria, England’s largest national park and a large agricultural landscape, which began exploring the feasibility of mounting a WHS bid for the second time in 2002 (following a deferred attempt in the 1980s before UNESCO recognised cultural landscapes as a World Heritage category). The report demonstrates that the strengthening of UNESCO’s World Heritage activity has proceeded against a background of growing international tourism and that it is difficult for studies to isolate the impact of WHS listing from other drivers that have boosted visitor numbers and which would have occurred irrespective of World Heritage inscription. As a result, these studies often refer to perceived change rather than actual change, ‘based on what respondents think, not on concrete statistics’ (Van de Baart, 2005 cited in ERS, 2006).

3.1.2 Impact of existing global profile
The ERS report, however, pointed to evidence that those sites with an already strong global profile (e.g., the Egyptian pyramids or the Great Wall of China) appear to benefit little from marketing of the World Heritage brand because the intrinsic characteristics of the site are already well regarded. ‘Some sites are so well known that it seems obvious for visitors that they are on the World Heritage List’ (Ratz and Puczo, 1999 cited in ERS, 2006).

Related research looked at the changes in tourism numbers since inscription using a sample of 86 WHSs. The research also concluded that those tourist sites that were already well-established destinations in their own right did not register any increase in visitor numbers as a result of World Heritage listing (Van de Baart, 2005 cited in ERS, 2006). In a subsequent study, the scale of other potential economic benefits to be gained from WHS listing were shown to be in inverse proportion to the global status of the site in question (Rebanks, 2010).

3.1.3 Comparative analyses of listed and non-listed sites
Research looking at WHSs compared to non-listed heritage sites in Australia attempted to assess
the impact of inscription on visitor numbers (Buckley, 2004 cited in ERS, 2006 and Gillespie Economics, 2008). Despite shortcomings with available statistical data, it was shown that there was a greater relative growth in the number of visitors to the WHSs compared to non-listed sites and a greater relative growth in economic impacts in general. Further evidence from the United States suggests that increased visitation closely correlates with WHS listing. ‘During the period 1990-95, visitation to US world heritage parks increased 9.4% as opposed to a 4.2% for all parks’ (Galvin, 1997 cited in ERS, 2006). This difference was attributed to increased international tourism and that WHS designation made it more likely that foreign visitors with special interests would visit.

3.1.4 Domestic versus international visitors
The ERS study also highlights a clear distinction between domestic and international visitors, with WHS listing being more likely to induce an increased number of international visitors. Information from the Grand Canyon National Park (a WHS where international visitors constitute 40 per cent of the overall total) reports that ‘foreign visitors respond more readily to the “World Heritage” designation than just the “National Park” term’ (Galvin, 1997 cited in ERS, 2006). Certainly the Shark Bay, Western Australia, WHS case study in Section 5 of this report shows a significant increase in the proportion of overseas visitors to local visitors since listing (from 10 per cent of all visitors to around 40 per cent).

3.1.5 Impact of geographical scale and access points
WHSs that are relatively large in scale (those that have multiple points of access and offer a layer of attractions) benefit the most from international tourism as they often serve as ‘destinations in their own right’ (Van de Baart, 2005 cited in ERS, 2006). So not only do these sites benefit from high numbers of visitors but also these visitors are more likely to stay within or close to the site boundary for a longer period of time. Evidence from the Lake District Project’s Rebanks (2010) analysis and this report’s Shark Bay WHS case study (Figure 5.1 in Section 5) strongly supports these views.

In summary these studies revealed:

• Economic benefits to be gained from WHS listing are likely to be in inverse proportion to the global status of the site prior to listing.

• There was a greater relative growth in the number of visitors to the WHSs compared to non-listed sites.

• There was a greater relative growth in economic impacts in general to the WHSs compared to non-listed sites

• WHS listing is likely to induce an increased number of higher-yielding international visitors.

• WHSs that are relatively large in scale (those that have multiple points of access and offer a layer of attractions) benefit the most.
3.2 Gillespie Economics 2008 Study of the Economic Activity of Australia’s World Heritage areas

The Australian Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and Arts (formerly DEWHA, now DSEWPaC) engaged Gillespie Economics, in collaboration with the BDA Group, to undertake a study of the economic activity of Australia’s World Heritage areas (Gillespie Economics, 2008).

The aim of this study was to:

- Analyse and report on the economic activity and contribution of 15 of Australia’s WHSs to the regional, state/territory and national economies.
- Analyse and report on the historical perspective of the financial costs and benefits of the operation of each WHS.
- To the extent possible, separate and report on the financial costs of the World Heritage management component of each property (i.e., costs directly attributable to WH status).

The report concluded that management of and visitation to WHSs can have significant economic impacts at regional, state and national levels. It found that total impacts of management expenditure to the nation were in the order of:

- $663 million in annual direct and indirect output or business turnover;
- $320 million in annual direct and indirect value-added;
- $205 million in annual direct and indirect household income; and
- 3910 direct and indirect jobs.

Impacts of visitor expenditure to the nation were in the order of:

- $15,441 million in annual direct and indirect output or business turnover;
- $6,925.3 million in annual direct and indirect value added;
- $3,906.4 million in annual direct and indirect household income; and
- 79,439 direct and indirect jobs.

At the national level, the total impacts of 15 WHSs were thus found to contribute:

- $16,104.3 million in annual direct and indirect national output or business turnover;
- $7,246.1 million in annual direct and indirect national value added;
- $41,115 million in direct and indirect national household income; and
- 83,349 direct and indirect national jobs.

Source: Gillespie Economics, 2008

The study points out that it is difficult to discern to what extent the WHS designation itself is responsible for these identified impacts, as visitation levels and management expenditure over time may be affected by a wide range of economic, logistic and market factors - such as economic upturns and downturns, changes in oil prices, pilot strikes, major national tourism marketing campaigns and so on - as well as the WHS listing. It is important to note, however, that visitor expenditure impacts far outweigh the management cost impacts associated with WHSs (at a ratio of 19:1). However, other Australian and US-based comparative analyses of similar listed and non-listed sites over a similar time-frame have demonstrated that economic impacts can be attributed to WHS inscription.
(see Section 3.1). Figure 3.2 is a case study of the listing of the Naracoorte Fossil Site in South Australia, which illustrates these findings at the local level.

**Naracoorte case study and Gillespie Economics national study**

According to an independent 2008 analysis of 15 WHSs in Australia, WHS status was estimated to contribute:

- $7011.4 million in annual direct and indirect regional output or business turnover;
- $3135 million in annual direct and indirect regional value added;
- $2117.3 million in direct and indirect regional household income; and
- 42,873 direct and indirect regional jobs.

Management and visitation to the site at Naracoorte (the only WHS listing in South Australia) was estimated to contribute:

- $6 million in annual direct and indirect state output or business turnover;
- $2.8 million in annual direct and indirect state value added;
- $1.9 million in direct and indirect state household income; and
- 47 direct and indirect state jobs.


The World Heritage listing of the Naracoorte Fossil Site also:

- Generated $3 million in immediate investment from federal, state and local government and partner Flinders University.
- Led to the construction of the $1.8 million Wonambi Fossil Centre.
- Doubled visitor numbers immediately - this has since settled back to an annual average visitor count 60-70 per cent higher than prior to the listing.
- Increased B&B accommodation, backpackers accommodation and eating and drinking places around Naracoorte.
- WHS has become the focal point for the area’s regional tourism strategy and the site is supported by Tourism Australia campaigns that promote Australian World Heritage sites to the international tourism market.

Source: Steven Bourne, Manager, Naracoorte Caves National Park, World Heritage Fossil Site, Department for Environment and Heritage in an interview with Stephanie Johnston conducted in May 2010.

**Figure 3.2** Naracoorte World Heritage Site case study
3.3 2007 PricewaterhouseCoopers Report

In 2007 the UK Government’s Department for Culture, Media and Sport commissioned consultants to investigate the costs and benefits of WHS status in the UK (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007). This research included a review of existing research literature, consultation with more than 70 organisations, a cost survey of 17 of the 24 UK domestic WHSs, six case studies, and surveys of more than 1600 residents.

The research showed that benefits are relatively well-evidenced for most sites – including WHS listing as a catalyst for more effective partnership working, civic pride, social capital, learning and education, and additional funding and investment. The research also suggested that the existing evidence base does not justify some of the claims for economic benefits made of WHS status. While the report concludes that ‘WHS status is what you make of it’, a subsequent and much more extensive study argues that the PricewaterhouseCoopers research methodologies failed to do justice to the complexities of WHSs, overlooking the differing motivations and actions of sites. This gap was identified by and has been addressed in the Rebanks analysis that was commissioned by the Lake District World Heritage Project (Rebanks 2010).

3.4 2010 Lake District World Heritage Project Rebanks Analysis

3.4.1 Socio-economic analysis results

The 2010 analysis of 878 sites across the world commissioned by the Lakes District World Heritage Project examined for the first time the different motivations that led to places becoming WHSs. The research identified four kinds of World Heritage site, as defined by the perceptions held of WHS status, and revealed the following:

- **A celebration designation**; Places that see the designation as a ‘celebration’ do not use it to achieve socio-economic impacts; preserving the heritage was the achievement, WHS the reward.
- **A heritage ‘SOS’ designation**; Places that want it as an ‘SOS’ to save heritage, go on to try and do just that - save heritage - and the results are efforts to preserve heritage.
- **A marketing/quality logo/brand**; Places that want the designation for marketing or branding go on to use it in their marketing and branding with little additional activity other than the development of tourism.
- **A ‘place-making’ catalyst**; Only the ‘place-making’ WHSs use it to generate wider socio-economic impacts and fundamental change to communities and places. (This view treats WHS status as a powerful catalyst for economic development using heritage as a tool to develop powerful new identities for places, and powerful programs to change places fundamentally.)

The research revealed that for a significant minority of sites, gaining WHS status created a situation whereby the local stakeholders collectively ask themselves the critical question, ‘Why is our place unique, special and globally important?’ According the research, a

... handful of World Heritage Sites have, as a result of answering that question, found themselves at the cutting edge of a movement around the world which seeks to focus the economic
development of places on their uniqueness, their authenticity, their distinct sense of place, and the depth of their identity and culture. They use the added stimulus of WHS status to engage with the rest of the world from a position of confidence, selling distinct products and services at added value based upon their provenance. The report points out that achieving these aspirations is not easy, or achieved on the cheap. Successful places direct significant effort and investment into achieving this, but it appears that WHS status, and the catalyst and confidence it provides, can play a significant role in this movement to high quality and distinctiveness (Rebanks, 2010).

Figure 3.3 is a Rebanks (2010) ‘place-making catalyst’ case study into the impacts of WHS on the working agricultural landscape of Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the islands of Palmaria, Tino, and Tinetto, Italy. The 40 years of decline prior to Cinque Terre achieving WHS status had resulted in land abandonment, population loss, and poor-quality developments and housing. In short, Cinque Terre was on a socioeconomic trajectory that was disastrous to the community and the landscape.

Some other examples of WHS listing as a ‘place-making catalyst’, cited by Rebanks (2010) are:

(i) **Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town of Quedlinburg WHS (inscribed 1994)**
A living/working community trying to find a sustainable and dynamic economic future through modernization within a fragile historic environment

(ii) **Blaenavon Industrial Landscape WHS (inscribed 2000)** WHS stimulus to the regeneration of a town around the ‘cultural glue’ of its industrial heritage through a mixture of new investment and repurposing of existing investment to deliver significant change

(iii) **Town of Bamberg WHS (inscribed 1993)** Key destination in the debate about attracting higher value visitors by using WHS status as a cultural tourism brand

(iv) **Roman Frontiers/Hadrian’s Wall WHS (inscribed 1987)** The value of providing the right management structure and lead organisation to coordinate capital investment

(v) **Canadian Rocky Mountains WHS (inscribed 1984)** WHS as a stimulus to a more ‘authentic’ and deeper cultural visitor experience based upon an understanding of distinctiveness and sense of place based on its natural and cultural heritage

(vi) **Völklingen Ironworks WHS (inscribed 1994)** WHS as a catalyst for reinventing a world class visitor attraction through a combination of industrial heritage and contemporary creativity

(vii) **Bordeaux – Port of the Moon WHS (inscribed 2007)** Using the WHS brand as a leading destination identity for the marketing of a large progressive European city

(viii) **Derwent Valley Mills WHS (inscribed 2001)** Using the WHS brand as a catalyst to investment in the historic environment through public realm projects in commercial and residential areas.

(ix) **The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh WHS (inscribed 1995)** Using WHS status to improve the quality of life of residents through engaging people in conservation, and to focus on raising the quality of development in the city to attract new people to live and work there.

(x) **Vegaøyan - The Vega Archipelago (inscribed 2004)** Using WHS status as a catalyst for rural economic development in an isolated rural region.
Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the islands o Palmaria, Tino, and Tinetto (Italy) case study. (Area inscribed in 1997.)

A national park/WHS with focus on the preservation of a socioeconomic way of life through investment in the structures, facilities, products and branding to return greater added value to private sector producers who maintain the WHS landscape.

The unique hillsides of Cinque Terre are terraced for the production of grapes, olives, herbs and lemons. For most of the 20th century the population of the hard and historically isolated region of Cinque Terre was in steep decline. Only approximately 10 per cent of the landscape that was once cultivated is now farmed (140 hectares out of a total of more than 1400). In the 1980s the social and economic crisis facing this landscape and its communities was recognised by regional and national governments. In the 1990s a number of initiatives emerged which have halted this decline and changed Cinque Terre markedly. Cinque Terre and Portovenere successfully lobbied to become a WHS and was inscribed in 1997 as a Cultural Landscape - followed in 1999 by the area being designated a national park.

Stakeholders in the Cinque Terre WHS understood a simple equation: their world-renowned landscape emerged and survives solely through the survival of a traditional agricultural socioeconomic system. The key goal had to be the preservation and support of that agricultural economic system. However, not everyone in Cinque Terre welcomed the WHS inscription process in the 1990s - farmers and the business community were skeptical, fearing that WHS status would stop change, restrict planning, result in another layer of bureaucracy, and slow economic development. Ten years later this has changed; nobody thinks that becoming a WHS was a panacea for all the problems of Cinque Terre, but there is widespread agreement that it has been a catalyst for positive change. This change has been particularly marked with regard to producing and marketing higher-quality products and services.

The Price of Lemons: The economic impact of the initiatives in Cinque Terre is probably best illustrated by a very humble example of real importance to farmers - the price of lemons. The cooperatives have an open-door buying policy for local producers for a range of products grown on the terraces of the WHS. Producers are paid more for this produce than they can receive elsewhere, and they can supply in whatever quantities they are able to provide. In 2009 cooperatives were buying organic lemons for € 2.50 per kilogram, compared with a commodity price of €1.70-€1.80 for the same product outside the WHS/national park - a 68% premium.

Source: Rebanks, 2010

Figure 3.3
Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the islands Palmaria, Tino, and Tinetto, (Italy) case study.

Source: Rebanks, 2010
3.5 Implications of the background studies for the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges site

The cited studies and case studies demonstrate that a site with a relatively low global profile such as the Mount Lofty Ranges might expect greater economic benefit to accrue from inscription than better-known sites, and that the region and its products could expect to gain economically relative to non-listed similar regions. As a tourism region the Mount Lofty Ranges could also expect to gain a higher proportion of the higher-yielding international tourist segment, while the benefits to the food wine and tourism economies are likely to be bolstered by the significant size of the proposed site, and the fact that it already contains towns, settlements and a multi-layered economy. Finally, if the pursuit and management of WHS listing is used as an engine of economic development (that simultaneously preserves the agricultural landscape), and if it is accompanied by adequate investment to that end, then a catalyst effect on the economy can be anticipated. These assumptions inform the EconSearch (2012) analysis in the accompanying economic impact projections report, which are summarised in the following section of this report.
4. ECONOMIC IMPACT PROJECTIONS

4.1 Introduction

This section of the report was prepared for the Mount Lofty Ranges Working Group by EconSearch Pty Ltd (the full report is provided in the accompanying economic impact projections EconSearch (2012)). The objective is to provide economic analysis that will assist the working group in the preparation of a feasibility study for World Heritage Site (WHS) listing of the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape. Specifically, the requirements were to provide:

- A baseline analysis of the value of agriculture and related industries to the four regional economies represented by the Local Government Areas (LGAs) of the Adelaide Hills, Barossa and Mount Barker and the non-metropolitan portion of the Onkaparinga LGA.

- A projection of the baseline into the future using existing trends of losses of agricultural land to alternative uses.

- An understanding of the context for the agricultural and related industries in each of the four LGAs.

- Identification of up to three scenarios (additional to the base case) around possible economic growth targets guided by evidence from other WHSs and in consultation with the working group and others.

- An analysis of how each of the scenarios would impact the four LGAs in terms of employment impacts and contribution to gross regional product (GRP).

The projections of economic impact presented in this report were based on the use of the input-output (I-O) method. The I-O models developed for this project were extended as demographic-economic models. Tourism expenditure was incorporated in the models.

The Adelaide Hills, Barossa and Mount Barker economic impact models were based on the LGA boundaries for these regions. The Southern Onkaparinga model was based on the southern, non-metropolitan portion of the Onkaparinga LGA and includes the Statistical Local Areas (SLAs) of Onkaparinga Hills and the Onkaparinga South Coast. The four regions and component SLAs are listed in Table 4.1 and illustrated in Figure 4.1.

### Table 4.1 The four regions by Statistical Local Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Statistical Local Area a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills LGA</td>
<td>Adelaide Hills (DC) - Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adelaide Hills (DC) - Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adelaide Hills (DC) - North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adelaide Hills (DC) - Bal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa LGA</td>
<td>Barossa (DC) - Angaston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barossa (DC) - Barossa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barossa (DC) - Tanunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Barker LGA</td>
<td>Mount Barker (DC) - Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Barker (DC) - Bal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Onkaparinga</td>
<td>Onkaparinga (C) - Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onkaparinga (C) - South Coast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Table Builder

a DC refers to ‘district council’ and C refers to ‘city’.
For the purpose of estimating the value of agriculture and related industries in the regions, and in order to describe the current level of regional economic activity, regional I-O models were constructed for 2009/2010. The data sources and method used to construct the models are detailed in EconSearch [Section 2] (2012).
4.2 Indicators of economic impact

The following indicators of economic impact were generated using the economic modelling framework described: gross regional/state product (GRP/GSP); and employment.

**Gross regional/state product** is a measure of the net contribution of an activity to the regional/state economy. GRP/GSP is measured as value of output less the cost of goods and services (including imports) used in producing the output. In other words, it can be measured as the sum of household income, ‘gross operating surplus and gross mixed income net of payments to owner managers’ and ‘taxes less subsidies on products and production’. It represents payments to the primary inputs of production (labour, capital and land). Using GRP/GSP as a measure of economic impact avoids the problem of double counting that may arise from using value of output for this purpose.

**Employment** is a measure of the number of working proprietors, managers, directors and other employees, in terms of the number of full-time equivalent (fte) jobs. Employment is measured by place of remuneration rather than place of residence.

Estimates of economic impact are presented in terms of direct impacts; flow-on impacts; and total impacts.

4.3 Profile of economic activity in the regions

A brief profile of economic activity for 2009/2010 is outlined below by region highlighting the main industries and regional population. This is followed by a summary of the local economic contribution of the two industries of principal interest to this study, agriculture and tourism. Economic contribution is measured in terms of employment (fte jobs) and GRP.

**Adelaide Hills**
Economic activity in the Adelaide Hills region is dominated by agriculture (predominantly fruit and nuts and viticulture), but the region also has a significant resident population (approximately 40,100 persons at 30 June 2010) (ABS 2011c) with associated housing stock and service sectors.

**Barossa**
Economic activity in the Barossa region is dominated by manufacturing (predominantly wine) but also has a significant agricultural industry associated with wine grape growing. As well there is a significant resident population (approximately 22,900 persons at 30 June 2010) (ABS 2011c) with associated housing stock and service sectors.

**Mount Barker**
Economic activity in the Mount Barker region is dominated by significant resident population (approximately 30,500 persons at 30 June 2010) (ABS 2011c) with associated housing stock and service sectors. Manufacturing and agriculture also contribute significantly to the regional economy.

**Southern Onkaparinga**
Economic activity in the Southern Onkaparinga region is dominated by manufacturing, a large part of which is wine industry related and agriculture, which is predominantly viticulture. As well there is a significant resident population (approximately 43,500 persons at 30 June 2010) (ABS 2011c) with associated housing stock and service sectors.
4.3.1 The contribution of agriculture to economic activity in the regions

Estimates of the economic contribution of the agriculture value chain to the regional economies in 2009/2010 are presented below. The definition of the agriculture value chain is consistent with that employed in PIRSA’s Food for the Future value-chain analysis. The following stages in the marketing chain have, therefore, been included in the direct economic impact:

- the direct value of agricultural output (gross value of production)\(^5\); and
- downstream impacts, including the net value of local agricultural products processing, and the net value of local retail and food service (e.g., hotels and restaurants) trade in these products.

The flow-on economic impacts (indirect effects) are the impacts felt in the input supply industries (transport services, fuel, merchandising, business services, etc.) and the industries supplying the goods and services to the households of employees in the agriculture value chain.

The direct and flow-on effects of regional agriculture were estimated in terms of GRP and fte employment. Estimates of these indicators for the four regional economies are detailed in tables 4.2 and 4.3.

**Adelaide Hills**

In aggregate, it was estimated that the contribution of the agricultural value chain in the Adelaide Hills region in 2009/2010 (approximately $349 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity (direct and flow-on):

- $285 million in GRP, which represents 25 per cent of the regional total ($1.1 billion) (Table 4.2).
- Approximately 2900 fte jobs, which represent 31 per cent of the regional total (9750 fte) (Table 4.3).

**Barossa**

In the Barossa region it was estimated that the contribution of the agricultural value chain in 2009/2010 (approximately $1014 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity (direct and flow-on):

- $710 million in GRP, which represents 57 per cent of the regional total ($1.3 billion) (Table 4.2).
- Approximately 6300 fte jobs, which represent 56 per cent of the regional total (11,300 fte) (Table 4.3).

---

\(^5\) Value of output is a measure of the gross revenue of goods and services produced by commercial organisations (e.g. farm-gate value of production) and gross expenditure by government agencies. Total output needs to be used with care as it can include elements of double counting when the output of integrated industries is added together (e.g. the value of winery output includes the farm-gate value of grapes).
Mount Barker
In aggregate, it was estimated that the contribution of the agricultural value chain in the Mount Barker region in 2009/2010 ($144 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity:

- $139 million in GRP, which represents 16 per cent of the regional total ($895 million) (Table 4.2).
- Almost 1500 fte jobs, which represent 17 per cent of the regional total (9000 fte) (Table 4.3).

Southern Onkaparinga
In the Southern Onkaparinga region it was estimated that the contribution of the agricultural value chain in 2009/10 (approximately $425 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity (direct and flow-on):

- $319 million in GRP, which represents 35 per cent of the regional total ($903 million) (Table 4.2).
- Approximately 3300 fte jobs, which represent 42 per cent of the regional total (7900 fte) (Table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Flow-on</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Regional share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Barker</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mount Lofty Ranges Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Gross regional product attributable to agriculture by region, 2009/2010 ($m).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Flow-on</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Regional share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>6,385</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Barker</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Onkaparinga</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mount Lofty Ranges Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>7788</strong></td>
<td><strong>6385</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,174</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Employment attributable to agriculture by region, 2009/2010 (fte jobs).

Clearly, the agricultural value chain is a significant contributor to each of the four regional economies that comprise the Mount Lofty Ranges Region. The agricultural value chain is most dominant in the Barossa region followed by Southern Onkaparinga, Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker.

In the Mount Barker region the contribution of the agricultural value chain is around 16 or 17 per cent of the regional economy (depending on the indicator). In the Barossa region the industry contributes well over 50 per cent of the economy in terms of both GRP and employment.
Across the whole Mount Lofty Ranges regional economy, the agricultural value chain generated over $1.4 billion in GRP (35 per cent of the regional total) and more than 14,100 jobs (38 per cent of the regional workforce).

4.3.2 The Contribution of tourism expenditure to economic activity in the regions

Whilst tourism is not specified as a separate sector within the extended I-O model, the relative contribution of tourism to economic activity in the region can be readily measured. Explanation of how the profile of tourism expenditure was estimated is provided in EconSearch (2012). Estimates of GRP and employment impacts provided in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 below indicate both the direct and flow-on effects attributable to expenditure by tourists.

**Adelaide Hills**

In aggregate, it was estimated that expenditure by tourists in the Adelaide Hills region in 2009/2010 ($55 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity:

- $34 million in GRP, which represents 3.0 per cent of the regional total ($1.1 billion) (Table 4.4).
- Approximately 400 fte jobs, which represent 4.2 per cent of the regional total (9750 fte) (Table 4.5).

**Barossa**

In aggregate, it was estimated that expenditure by tourists in the Barossa region in 2009/2010 ($128 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity:

- $78 million in GRP, which represents 6.2 per cent of the regional total ($1.3 billion) (Table 4.4).
- Almost 1000 fte jobs, which represent 8.7 per cent of the regional total (11,000 fte) (Table 4.5).

**Mount Barker**

In aggregate, it was estimated that expenditure by tourists in the Mount Barker region in 2009/2010 ($46 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity:

- $31 million in GRP, which represents 3.5 per cent of the regional total ($895 million) (Table 4.4).
- Almost 400 fte jobs, which represent 4.5 per cent of the regional total (9,000 fte) (Table 4.5).

**Southern Onkaparinga**

In aggregate, it was estimated that expenditure by tourists in the Southern Onkaparinga region in 2009/2010 ($105 million) generated the following level of regional economic activity:

- $59 million in GRP, which represents 6.6 per cent of the regional total ($3.7 billion) (Table 4.4).
- Almost 800 fte jobs, which represent 9.9 per cent of the regional total (7900 fte) (Table 4.5).
In total, across the whole Mt Lofty Ranges regional economy, tourism generated over $203 million in GRP (almost 5 per cent of the regional total) and more than 2500 jobs (just under 7 per cent of the regional workforce).

### 4.4 Trends in land use change

The implications of rural population growth and dwelling construction activity for the study region’s agricultural land base become evident in data that summarised land use change across the Mount Lofty Ranges more generally during the 1990s (Flavel and Ratcliff, 2000). These data relate to an area that includes but is more than twice the size of the current study region, and indicates that there was a significant change in agricultural land use between 1993 and 1999 as well as an overall loss of agricultural land, attributable largely to rural living development.

Australian Bureau of Statistics Agricultural Census data for 1996, 2001 and 2006 indicate, at the broadest level, a general decline in the area of land used for agricultural purposes in each of the LGAs, despite a number of policy interventions (such as the establishment of an urban growth boundary in South Australia in 2003). For the most part, the average annual rate of change in each of the LGAs was a decline of between 1 and 2 per cent, averaging 1.6 per cent per annum between 1996 and 2006 (excludes Barossa) and also averaging 1.6 per cent between 2001 and 2006 (includes Barossa). The implications of these trends are analysed in more detail in Section 6.5 of this report.

Observations about the increasing number of sub-commercial agricultural properties and declining average property size are consistent with analyses of population growth and rural dwelling construction. They are also supported by data describing land division activity across South Australia. Unpublished analysis of so-called ‘boundary realignments’, where parcel boundaries are shifted but no new allotments are created, suggests this activity is heavily concentrated in the Outer Metropolitan region. Anecdotal evidence from land use planners in local and state government...
suggests that this type of land division is used to create an increasing number of rural lifestyle allotments. The corollary of this is a declining number of commercial-scale properties.

Collectively, all of these data point to a steadily fragmenting and shrinking agricultural land base across the study region, with practical implications for remaining primary producers. While it is not possible to provide a definitive statement about land use change trends in the study area, it appears to be occurring at a rate somewhere between 0.4 per cent per annum described by Flavel and Ratcliff and the 1.6 per cent derived from ABS data.

### 4.5 World Heritage inscription and trends in visitation

Gillespie Economics and BDA Group (2008) undertook an economic impact analysis of World Heritage Sites (WHSs) in Australia. They found no clear association between World Heritage inscription and an increase in visitor numbers, although the study did reveal significant increases in visitor numbers for several sites, and an increased proportion of international visitors. As discussed in Section 3 of this report, an important difference between the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape WHS and many of those analysed in Gillespie Economics and BDA Group (2008) is that the historical and cultural attributes of the region are not well known, and therefore World Heritage inscription has the potential to significantly lift awareness and therefore visitations to the area. Further research in Australia and the United States, referred to in Section 3.1, found those tourist sites that were already well-established destinations in their own right did not register any increase in visitor numbers as a result of WHS status, while lesser known sites did (Buckley, 2004, and Galvin, 1997 cited in ERS, 2006). The Gillespie Economics study also clearly pointed to broader economic impacts at the regional, state and national levels, as summarised in Section 3.2.

The Rebanks (2010) assessment of 878 WHSs found that the motivation for WHS inscription fell into four broad categories, and that only a very small minority of sites perceive WHS status as being as a tool for socio-economic impact, perhaps as few as five to 10 per cent of sites. This implies that for those sites that do not seek it, there is no direct correlation between inscription and economic growth – and no ‘free lunch’ from simply getting the designation. However, if WHS designation is used to support programs for changing places and communities it can be and has shown to be a powerful catalyst to achieve those socio-economic outcomes, as illustrated by the Cinque Terre case study and the list of examples in Section 3.4.

### 4.6 Impact of World Heritage Site inscription

#### 4.6.1 Scenario development

In light of the discussion in sections 4.4 and 4.5, three growth scenarios have been developed to consider the impact that WHS status may have on the economies of the four LGAs that comprise the proposed WHS. The impact projections reported below are for a range of modest industry growth targets assumed to be achieved over a period of 10 years following listing, as the experience of existing WHSs indicates that economic growth attributable to inscription is likely to be experienced mostly in the early years following inscription, with economic activity likely to plateau or at least slow after a number of years.

Against a do-nothing base case (no WHS designation), the impacts of three growth scenarios, detailed in Table 4.2, were estimated:

1. Low-growth scenario whereby there is a World Heritage overlay with minimal investment.
2. Medium-growth scenario that includes World Heritage overlay with moderate funding.
3. High-growth scenario that involves World Heritage overlay with significant funding (e.g., more than $100 million in infrastructure spending and landscape rehabilitation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario 1 Low Growth</th>
<th>Scenario 2 Medium Growth</th>
<th>Scenario 3 High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/private investment ($m)</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>5–20</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-farm production</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value adding</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism visitations</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Growth scenarios in response to World Heritage Site status designation.

If the current trend of lost agricultural land were to continue, the total Mount Lofty Ranges region would continue to lose around 15 per cent of agricultural land per decade. The on-farm production scenarios, detailed in Table 4.6, range from a low of 2.5 per cent to a high of 10.0 per cent, which are modest increases in light of the likely declines under the base case of no WHS designation.

Growth in the processing and value adding of agricultural products will be driven by (i) an increase in the local supply of product, and (ii) increased opportunities for product transformation and product marketing related directly to WHS designation. The potential value-adding scenarios under WHS inscription detailed in Table 4.6, range from a low of 5 per cent to a high of 20 per cent.

If WHS designation is used to support programs for changing places and communities it can be a powerful catalyst to achieve socio-economic outcomes. The WHS support programs are likely to range from regional tourism marketing to infrastructure spending and landscape rehabilitation, each of which will be designed, in part at least, to increase the attractions and attractiveness of the region. The tourism visitation scenarios, detailed in Table 4.6, range from a low of 3 per cent to a high of 10 per cent, which appear to be realistic targets under the proposed scope of funding and support scenarios.

4.6.2 Impact of World Heritage Site inscription on agriculture

Against a base case of continued loss of agricultural land at an average rate of 1.6 per cent per annum (15 per cent over 10 years), it has been assumed that the fall in production associated with the loss of agricultural land would be offset, at least partially, under WHS designation. This will increase the supply of product for processing/value adding activities and, additionally, WHS designation creates new opportunities for product transformation and product marketing.

The pattern of impacts is similar for the three scenarios; with the magnitude of the impacts increasing in line with the size of the stimulus generated by the WHS designation and associated activities. For Scenario 2 (Table 4.7), medium growth, the results for agricultural impacts show:

- In absolute and relative terms the impacts are projected to be largest in the Barossa and smallest in Mount Barker.
- In the Barossa there are projected to be an additional 517 jobs and $63 million in annual GRP, a rise of more than 5 per cent in GRP and 4.6 per cent in employment.
- The impacts would be next largest in Southern Onkaparinga, with jobs rising by more than 130 and GRP up by $19 million, representing rises of around 2 per cent in GRP and 1.7 per cent in employment.
- At the state level the impacts are considerably higher, with over 1200 jobs in aggregate and $141 million in GSP. This represents an increase of 0.2 per cent for both indicators.
### 4.6.3 Impact of WHS inscription on tourism

Assuming the number and length of stay of visitors to the regions will increase if World Heritage agrarian landscape status were achieved in the currently under-recognised Mount Lofty region, there is likely to be a corresponding increase in visitor expenditure. As with the projected agriculture-related effects, the pattern of impacts from increased visitor expenditure is similar for the three scenarios, with the magnitude of the impacts increasing in line with the size of the stimulus generated by the WHS designation and associated activities. For Scenario 2 (Table 4.8), medium-growth impacts on tourism, the results show:

- In absolute and relative terms the impacts are projected to be largest in the Barossa and Southern Onkaparinga regions.
- In both regions there are projected to be an additional 40 to 50 jobs and $3–4 million in annual GRP; in both cases a rise of more than 0.3 per cent above current levels.
- The impacts are projected to be similar in the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker economies, with jobs rising by 20 and GRP up by $2 million; both impacts representing rises of around 0.2 per cent above current levels.
- At the state level the impacts are considerably higher, around 250 total jobs and $21 million in GSP. Most of the additional jobs would be generated in Adelaide.

### Table 4.7 Impact of the increase in agriculture and agricultural value-adding, medium-growth scenario (Scenario 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change from baseline ($m)</td>
<td>Regional share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Barker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Onkaparinga</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mount Lofty Ranges Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South Australia</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.8 Impact of the increase in tourism, medium-growth scenario (Scenario 2).**
As mentioned previously, the impact projections reported above have been for a range of modest industry growth targets assumed to be achieved over a period of 10 years following listing.

Assuming that public and private investment in WHS-related infrastructure and marketing in the Mount Lofty Ranges WHS is supported and maintained in the longer term, it is likely that economic growth attributable to inscription will continue, albeit at a lower rate. For the purpose of these projections it was assumed the annual rate of growth in years 11 to 20 would be around 20 per cent of that achieved in years one to 10. On this basis, the 20-year impacts in terms of GRP and employment were estimated and are shown in figures 4.2 and 4.3 for the medium-growth scenario (Scenario 2).

These projections attributed to WHS inscription include the estimated impacts from avoided agricultural land losses, growth from value adding to agricultural production and processing and increased tourist visitation levels. It should be noted that the estimated impacts illustrated in figures 4.2 and 4.3 are annual impacts not cumulative impacts. For example, the total GRP impact in year 10 of $162 million shown in Figure 4.3 corresponds to the year 10 impact reported in Table 4.2. Similarly, the year 10 SA employment impact shown in Figure 4.4 (1544 fte) is the same as that reported in Table 4.2.

4.6.4 Aggregate and longer-term impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (GRP)</td>
<td>$278m</td>
<td>$141m</td>
<td>$71m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$132m</td>
<td>$67m</td>
<td>$34m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related (GRP)</td>
<td>$43m</td>
<td>$21m</td>
<td>$13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$23m</td>
<td>$11m</td>
<td>$7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State (GRP)</strong></td>
<td>$321m</td>
<td>$162m</td>
<td>$85m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New jobs</strong></td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income</strong></td>
<td>$153m</td>
<td>$78m</td>
<td>$41m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (GRP)</td>
<td>$194m</td>
<td>$97m</td>
<td>$49m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$84m</td>
<td>$42m</td>
<td>$21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related (GRP)</td>
<td>$20m</td>
<td>$10m</td>
<td>$6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>$10m</td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>$3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Study Area (GRP)</strong></td>
<td>$214m</td>
<td>$107m</td>
<td>$55m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New jobs</strong></td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income</strong></td>
<td>$94m</td>
<td>$47m</td>
<td>$24m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EconSearch (2012). Projections are for accrued benefit over a period of 10 years. The experience of existing WHSs indicates that economic growth attributable to listing is likely to occur mostly in the early years following listing. Economic activity is likely to plateau or a slow after a number of years.

Figure 4.2 Summary of estimated direct economic benefits of World Heritage Site listing over 10 years by region, industry segment, and growth scenario.
The experience of existing WHSs indicates that economic growth attributable to inscription is likely to be experienced mostly in the early years following inscription with economic activity likely to plateau, or at least slow after a number of years. Because part of the anticipated economic impact comes about from avoiding loss of agricultural land, and that avoided loss is accumulating over time, the annual impacts could be expected to show some increase over time as illustrated in figures 4.3 and 4.4.
4.6.5 Cost-benefit analysis

There are high levels of uncertainty surrounding the economic outcomes that may be generated by WHS inscription (i.e., those impacts projected in figures 4.3 and 4.4) and the level of both private and public investment required to achieve those outcomes. Despite these uncertainties, a cost-benefit analysis was undertaken to give an indication of the net benefits associated with the estimated regional economic impacts and the types of investment that would likely be required to generate those benefits.

The results of the cost-benefit analysis are presented in Table 4.8. The results have been expressed in terms of two evaluation criteria – the net present value (NPV) and the benefit-cost ratio (BCR). The NPV is a measure of the aggregate, annual net benefits (i.e., benefits – costs) of the project over a 25-year period, discounted (i.e., expressed as a present value) using a discount rate of 7 per cent. The BCR is the ratio of the present value of benefits to the present value of costs.

The net present value of Scenario 1 (low growth) for the financial analysis was estimated to be approximately $79 million. This indicates that the investment in Scenario 1 generates higher net benefits to the community than the base case (no WHS) scenario. The BCR for Scenario 1 was calculated to be 2.9, which indicates a potentially attractive investment.

The interpretation is identical for scenarios 2 and 3, with both scenarios showing strong and positive returns. Note that estimated NPV increases as the level of investment increases whereas the BCR and therefore the rates of return decline, suggesting a greater level of risk associated with the higher level of investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Present value Benefits ($m)</th>
<th>Present value Costs ($m)</th>
<th>Net present value ($m)</th>
<th>Benefit cost ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1 (low growth)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2 (medium growth)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3 (high growth)</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EconSearch analysis

Table 4.8 Cost-benefit analysis summary results.

In conclusion, the cost-benefit analysis shows strong returns for all three investment scenarios based on achieving WHS listing, while recognising that these results are based on high levels of uncertainty surrounding the economic outcomes that may be generated by WHS inscription. That said, the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges site falls into the category of an under-recognised region with strong heritage attributes, a region that is motivated by socio-economic development and is therefore likely to benefit significantly from WHS inscription.

---

6 The present value is the value now of a sum of money arising in the future. Money now is worth more than money in the future because it could be invested now to produce a greater sum in the future. The present value of money in the future is calculated by discounting it at a rate of interest equivalent to the rate at which it could be invested (Bannock et al., 1979).
5. THE SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CASE

‘It could be said that World Heritage Site status is what you make of it.... Where the status has been used to full effect it has brought partners together, leveraged additional funding, led to new development and enhanced educational benefits, improved conservation and even led to regeneration in some locations. Where these opportunities have not been seized there have been more limited benefits. The benefits that the sites attribute to World Heritage Site status are therefore strongly related to the motives they had for bidding and correspondingly what they have used the status for.’

PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007

In addition to the potential economic benefits to agriculture, wine and food production, and tourism outlined in Section 4 of this report, studies of existing World Heritage Sites (WHSs) around the world suggest the sites and associated regions can expect substantial impacts in the following social, cultural and environmental areas:

- Investments, grants and funding in appropriate local infrastructure.
- Unique and high-quality architecture and landscape design.
- Branding opportunities for communities and local products.
- Catalyst effects for entrepreneurial business opportunities.
- Enhanced coordination for more sustainable transport policies.
- Integrated planning, recreation and environmental policies.
- Protection of aesthetic values, heritage and wildlife habitat.
- Education, learning, community and cultural benefits.
- Partnerships for economic and cultural development.

5.1 Investments, grants and funding in appropriate local infrastructure

5.1.1 World Heritage Fund limited to developing countries
The potential for attracting funding and investment as a result of WHS listing is well recognised. The mobilisation of local stakeholders and partners through WHS listing has led in many cases to the attraction of financial support from a number of different sources, particularly at a local and regional level (Van de Baart cited in ERS, 2006). The attraction of indirect funding is important given the limited funding support available through UNESCO, which is often targeted at those sites in developing countries that are ‘in danger’.
5.1.2 Australian examples of funding leverage

The Australian Government has signed a convention to protect all WHSs, and has pledged to provide adequate resources for their protection. Regarding indirect funding, good examples of local participation and levered funding from local, state and federal bodies include the generation of $3 million in immediate investment on the listing of the Naracoorte Fossil Site in South Australia (from federal, state and local governments, and partner Flinders University), which led to the construction of the $1.8 million Wonambi Fossil Centre (see the Naracoorte case study in Figure 3.2, Section 3). Similarly, the WHS listing of Shark Bay, Western Australia, resulted in a number of federal and state funding initiatives, which are summarised in Figure 5.1 and in the site management snapshots in Figure 9.1 (in Section 9). The Brickendon Estate case study (Figure 5.3) provides an example of how federal government support became the motivation for listing, as the private owners couldn’t hope to maintain their asset without it. Since listing Brickendon has secured well over $1.2 million in federal grants towards restoration, conservation and the first stage of a fire-proofing system as a result of WHS.

5.1.3 Regional funding

WHS inscription often leads to regional bodies donating more funding, such as the defence line in Amsterdam and the Wouda Pumping Station in Friesland, Holland (Van de Baart, 2005 cited in ERS, 2006). The Ironbridge Gorge Museum in Shropshire, UK, also stated that ‘world heritage inscription played a significant role in securing funding from the Regional Development Agency’. (It should be noted here that there is no direct equivalent of a European ‘regional body’ in Australia. While Australia has federally funded regional development authorities, our state governments are a closer equivalent to a UK or Dutch regional development body.)

5.1.4 Sources of national and international funding

Many WHS site managers in the ERS study agreed that WHS listing made it easier to source funding from bilateral funders, NGOs or national authorities, with the UNESCO designation serving as confirmation of the global significance of a WHS. This is true of the Galapagos Islands WHS managers, who stated that the UNESCO label helped them to source funding for preservation projects; ‘World Heritage, as in the case of most protected areas, increases the associated funding potential of the site’ (Castro, cited in ERS, 2006). This is also illustrated in Australia, where the level of federal government involvement in the listing process helps ensure ongoing federal support and resourcing of site management:

Your Community Heritage is a new approach to supporting and protecting Australia’s cultural heritage that enables local communities around Australia to celebrate their local heritage. Supplementary funding of up to $8 million over two years has been made available by the Australian Government in addition to the existing annual funding stream Protecting National Historic Sites (which incorporates Commemorating Eminent Australians) of up to $4.42 million each year, and the Caring for Our Country funding stream of $2 billion over five years which provides ongoing support to management systems and related projects for natural WHSs.

Source: DSEWPaC

5.1.5 Public/private partnerships

There is evidence of opportunities created for public/private partnerships to draw in new funding from industry, corporate and philanthropic bodies, which in turn can benefit the wider community. At a time when funding for agriculture is under significant pressure, it is likely that the federal government (and its agencies) would find it harder to ignore funding partnership appeals from industry and corporate bodies based in an agricultural area that has WHS designation. These partnership opportunities might be further enhanced through the establishment of a not-for-profit foundation dedicated to fundraising, as described in Section 8.6.1.
5.1.6 More international examples
There is international evidence that successfully securing additional funding, whether it is from localised, national or multinational sources, can directly contribute to wider economic objectives through the delivery of projects or initiatives within or close to the WHS. Projects created to pursue promotion or enhancement of the area can result in employment and capacity building opportunities for local people. For example, external funding from the Global Environmental Facility in conjunction with the Mexican government resulted in the delivery of a number of conservation projects in Sian Ka’an, Mexico. In Dorset and East Devon, UK, £300,000 of local authority funding supported the appointment of a staff team to carry out conservation activity and to support sustainable tourism initiatives. Other UK examples include Maritime Greenwich, Stonehenge and Avebury (ERS, 2006).

5.1.7 Conclusions regarding funding and investment
It is understood that there is no direct UNESCO funding that will accrue to an Australian site as a result of WHS inscription. However, WHS inscription could act as a conduit or add weight and give more strength to applications and requests for all types of funding, including public/private partnerships, from a variety of potential sources. This would rely on local partners using and fully exploiting the status that comes with WHS to strengthen their funding arguments on a case-by-case basis. The potential for funding linked to agriculture and the landscape, and to related environmental and conservation initiatives, will be explored further in the following subsections.

Shark Bay case study
Shark Bay, Western Australia, was accorded WHS listing in 1991, one of only 11 sites in the world that met all four of the applicable natural criteria at the time. Some benefits of listing have been:

- Following WHS listing in 1991 the state government purchased Peron Peninsula Station for $1.4 million to transform it into Francois Peron National Park.
- Boardwalks were built for the protection of the natural assets (stromatolites) and an $850,000 scenic ring road around the Denham township was built with state and federal government funding.
- Funds were subsequently made available for a major redevelopment of the foreshore, and for environmental surveys of dugongs and other wildlife.
- Project Eden was funded to clear Peron Peninsula of feral cats and foxes and to restore native animals such as the burrowing bettong. Shell Beach rehabilitation and other environmental projects were funded.
- The Peron Station shearer’s quarters were restored and turned into an interpretive centre, and by 1999, with the promise of federal and state funding, the Shark Bay Shire was planning a multi-million dollar museum and visitors’ centre.
- The $8 million Shark Bay World Heritage Discovery and Visitors’ Centre and associated galleries were opened to the public in 2006 to showcase the history of the area, including that of the Dutch, English and French explorers, from Dirk Hartog’s visit in 1616 to the present time.
- Future infrastructure plans through the Shire of Shark Bay for Denham and surrounds include seasonal workers accommodation, expanded marine facilities (including a marina), replacement of the Monkey Mia jetty, a lifestyle village for retirees, a water spray park, and others.
- WHS listing has acted as a ‘brand’ that attracts international visitors in particular. The proportion of total visitors from overseas has grown steadily from 10% in 1991 to over 40% in recent times.
- WHS listing has been used to value add to local businesses.
- Many international tourists visit this area because it is a WHS.
- Tourists are tending to stay longer in Shark Bay, and therefore the economic value of tourism has increased.
- Visitation to Western Australia’s WHSs is estimated to generate $72 million annually in output or business turnover, and support around 450 jobs.
- Shark Bay has received in excess of $12 million from state and federal governments since listing in 1991.
- WHS listing is a factor in maintaining visitor numbers to Shark Bay, despite the emergence of other dolphin experiences around Western Australia.

Source: Cheryl Cowell, project officer, World Heritage, Shark Bay World Heritage property

Figure 5.1 Shark Bay Case Study.
5.2 Unique and high-quality architecture and landscape design

In terms of the physical landscape, maintaining the physical value of a working agricultural landscape includes the rural landscape, the public realm and the built environment. All of these areas are of critical importance to a WHS, irrespective of the assets identified in the nomination documents and the related values statements.

It is useful to note that the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPaC) acknowledges the role of the World Heritage List in ensuring that the stated values are maintained:

*The way in which a World Heritage place is managed can have an impact on its heritage values. Management arrangements are therefore required for each Australian property included on the World Heritage List. The Commonwealth considers such plans as vital in implementing Australia’s obligations under the World Heritage Convention* (DSEWPaC website).

It is likely that WHS listing can play a supportive role in the maintenance, protection and development of the rural, built and public landscapes of an area. This is an important consideration for the Mount Lofty Ranges bid, as this could allow WHS inscription to be used to help support the role of agriculture in the maintenance and enhancement of the living landscape within the Mount Lofty Ranges region.

5.2.1 The experience of other World Heritage Sites, based on the ERS report

The agricultural landscape
Where there is an agricultural aspect to a WHS, the relevant management plan or framework needs to take farming and landscape into consideration, as seen, for example, in UK sites such as Derwent Valley Mills, and Hadrian’s Wall, which show the links between agriculture, landscape and WHS inscription. The importance of engaging the farming community, the recognition of the level of private ownership, and the resultant key role that private owners have had in the implementation and development of the management framework for such sites are important considerations for the Mount Lofty Ranges bid. Other such examples include Giant’s Causeway, New Lanark and Stonehenge and Avebury in the UK. Notwithstanding these examples, the likelihood that WHS listing will ensure landowners receive direct funding to continue to manage the landscape is a matter for speculation. However, it can be argued that the condition of the landscape is so intrinsic to an agrarian landscape bid, and to the universal value of the WHS, that government attention to the role and sustainability of farming in the region would gain greater priority.

The built environment (including the public realm)
The regeneration of buildings, the built environment and the public realm have taken place at a number of UK WHSs. Whilst it is difficult to ascertain what level of investment for each would have been achieved without obtaining WHS listing, a number of sites recognise and are aiming to achieve conservation-led regeneration, including the old and new towns of Edinburgh, Blaenavon and Derwent Valley Mills.

The public landscape
There are numerous examples of regeneration and development of the public landscape in the UK (which has by far the most WHS listings compared to any other country), such as Maritime Greenwich, Edinburgh and Blaenavon. The condition of public toilets, signage and street furniture feature to varying degrees in a number of management plans for UK WHSs, and examples include Bath, Saltaire, Durham, Liverpool, Stonehenge and Derwent Valley Mills.
5.2.2 Implications for the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges site

It will be important to recognise the many values of the agricultural environment and landscapes of the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and Fleurieu Peninsula, and the assertion that these would be the key asset of any WHS bid. As such, clear emphasis should be placed on using WHS inscription to support the maintenance and enhancement of the landscape in the hope that, given the critical role that the landscape will have in achieving WHS designation, WHS listing will directly or indirectly add value and provide benefits to all aspects of the landscape’s ongoing value to humanity.

A number of different ways in which this could be realised have been identified by the working group. These included the potential for WHS listing to help positively influence decision making in terms of local investment in the landscape or in the built environment, where, instead of going for the easy or low cost option, the ‘quality’ option (ensuring any investments are about the enhancement of the landscape and the use of quality materials) would be selected. It is also anticipated that inscription could provide some indirect benefits in terms of funding for agriculture and landscape management. Again, this is likely to be in the form of the ‘added weight’ that WHS inscription provides to the argument for funding.

The UK studies also note that the potential for the availability of financial rewards for continuing to maintain the landscape resulted in local farmers being positive about WHS inscription. Such incentive policies already exist throughout Europe, and it is feasible that a WHS listing could play a role in bringing them into the Australian policy arena in future. That is, a WHS listing could result in the development of a scheme that gives financial reward for the maintenance of culturally significant farming practices, and may also unlock opportunities for additional funding for the training of land managers in techniques that help to perpetuate the agricultural landscape and support environmental imperatives.

5.3 Branding opportunities for communities and local products

Sources: Left, the UNESCO logo and right, photo courtesy of Stephanie Johnston

Figure 5.2 Branding opportunities for communities and local products.

One aspect of WHS listing that has been the subject of varying levels of development in different WHSs relates to the branding of local products and local produce. It is important to note that UNESCO gives State Parties (in Australia’s case, the Australian government) the right to grant usage of the World Heritage emblem (Figure 6.1).
The ERS report suggests that using the World Heritage emblem is likely to be less relevant, or of less benefit, to small sites where there are few local products or where there is already intense competition in the realm of local products/produce. However, the linkages between local food produce and WHS have been developed by a number of agricultural sites; for example, Val D’Orcia in Italy uses food trails, while many other WHSs have strong food and drink associations, including the Upper Middle Rhine Valley in Germany, Tokaji in Hungary, Wachau in Austria, and Porto in Portugal (ERS, 2006). Given the importance of food and wine production to the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges site, and to Adelaide and South Australia in general, it is likely that these market linkages will be exploited to the full.

### 5.4 Catalyst effects for entrepreneurial business opportunities

The Rebanks (2010) research revealed numerous references to WHS status positively affecting the profile of places, and particularly through raising profile with opinion formers like guidebook editors and tour operators. The research also unearthed a growing number of tour companies developing package tours that are wholly or partly about offering access to clusters of WHSs – suggesting a growing demand for such products.
Brickendon and Woolmers case study

Brickendon Estate and Woolmers Estate near Longford, Tasmania, are adjacent farming properties that date back to 1817 and a time in world history when convicts were used to provide labour to settlers in exchange for food and clothing. Both these farming properties have been held and continuously farmed by six generations of a single family (the Archer family), stretching back from the early 19th century (the convict era) through to the present. The estates were jointly inscribed onto the Australian National Heritage List in November 2007 as being of Outstanding National Significance because of their close association with the convict consignment system. In July 2010 they were included on the World Heritage List along with 10 other sites around Australia to make up the Australian Convict Sites property. Five out of those 11 convict sites are located in Tasmania. Interviews with the owner/managers of the estates revealed:

- The initiative to pursue WHS listing for the serial convict sites property was championed by Barry Jones, who was the vice-president of the World Heritage Committee from 1995 to 1996 and a member of the Executive Board of UNESCO from 1991 until 1995. Jones still chairs the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority.
- From a decision to proceed, national listing and world listing took a total of five years.
- Brickendon embraced WHS inscription as an essential tool for maintaining a huge heritage asset the family business could never hope to sustain on their own in the long term.
- Brickendon and Woolmers, while being separate businesses (the former a working farm and the latter now a public trust) complement each other and work together on the marketing of their WHS status.
- Both have benefitted from opportunities rising from the catalyst effect of having five of the 11 listed convict sites in their state, including from Tourism Tasmania’s visiting journalist program that focuses on the WHSs and which has gained them exposure they could never have secured or afforded on their own, particularly in Asian markets, where there is great interest in WHS listing.
- The farm stay experience at Brickendon is sought after by an increasing percentage of Hong Kong Chinese visitors (at least 40 per cent of all visitors this summer) directly as a result of TV coverage that came from Tourism Tasmania sending a Hong Kong documentary (and TV star) their way.
- Tourism Tasmania has revived heritage as a strategic area for the marketing of the state (in addition to food, wine and wilderness). Heritage in general and WHS listed convict heritage in particular as a point of difference has been incorporated into a brand-new state heritage strategy.
- There has been a drive to develop links between the history behind the WHS sites and the state and national school curricula, and this is seen as a strong positive benefit of WHS.
- Brickendon has secured well over $1.2 million in federal grants towards restoration, conservation and the first stage of a fire-proofing system as a result of WHS.
- The sites have both benefitted from a state government funded expert conservation consultant.
- The opportunities for securing grants have, however, reduced recently, despite both sites being identified as ‘vulnerable’ by UNESCO due to their non-government ownership and management.
- More work has been created for the managers as a result of WHS listing, and this has not yet been offset by enough income generation to hire new employees.
- The management of the sites, and in particular the encouragement of proper restoration using traditional building methods, has greatly enhanced the standard of conservation of the listed buildings and farm landscapes. A management plan and a landscape plan have become ‘the bible’ that management refer to when undertaking such work.
- Heritage red tape can be a headache at all levels of government; between them the sites have only however undertaken one EBPC Act self-assessment since listing, and there was no ministerial referral.
- There have been no restraints on farming activities at Brickendon since listing, although changes to farming practice that would significantly impact on the landscape values would come under EBPC Act scrutiny.
- The family business at Brickendon still earns on average around 75 per cent of its income from farming practice. However, farm stay tourism, functions and so on provide a very useful buffer to the less productive farming years, which can be in the negative from one year to the next. The tourism business also has the potential to expand to double the current number of visitors and clients.
- The managers are optimistic that it is early days, and that increased economic benefit will flow over time as a result of the extensive additional local, national and international exposure due to WHS listing.

Source: Interviews with Louise Archer, owner of Brickendon Estate and Damien Saunders, manager of Woolmers Estate

Figure 5.5 Brickendon and Woolmers case study.
5.5 Enhanced coordination for more sustainable transport policies

According to the Lake District ERS report, the issue of transport, especially sustainable transport, is recognised and developed by a number of WHSs in their management plans: ‘This is due to the fact that an important factor in improving visitor experience and attracting visitors is a sound transport infrastructure.’ Transport, traffic and visitor management issues therefore need to be considered in the context of any potential future increases in tourism.

5.5.1 Evidence from other World Heritage Sites

A number of UK WHSs place emphasis on the importance of sustainable transport in their management plans, linking directly to sustainable tourism – notably Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape and Giant’s Causeway. Derwent Valley Mills funded a new train, while Hadrian’s Wall, and the Dorset and East Coast site both supported new bus services. There has also been a drive to increase cycle tourism at many European WHSs, notably the Upper Middle Rhine Valley (ERS, 2006).

5.5.2 No car areas

During stakeholder consultation for the Lake District nomination process a significant number of businesses noted that they would like to see their business benefit from WHS inscription through improvements in local public transport and roads infrastructure. Businesses also suggested that WHS inscription could help to give more thought to further development of means of sustainable transport. Examples suggested included the piloting of ‘no-car’ areas in certain places, encouraging visitors to leave their cars outside the ‘honey pot’ areas and instead use free buses to access the national park. An example of this concept can be found in the Cradle Mountain World Heritage area in Tasmania (Figure 5.2).

Cradle Mountain shuttle bus service

Explore the World Heritage listed Cradle Mountain National Park the leisurely way, with the Cradle Shuttle Service. Leave your car outside the park and get on and off the shuttle as often as you like – it’s a great way to enjoy the tranquility and peace of this ancient landscape without driving or parking hassles. Car parks inside the Cradle Mountain park boundary fill early so plan your trip to include the shuttle.

Summer Shuttle bus service

During the spring, summer and autumn months (September to May), the shuttle buses run every 20 minutes throughout the day, and every 15 minutes during busy periods, with room for backpacks and walking gear.

Winter Shuttle bus service

During winter the shuttle service is equipped to travel in snowy and icy conditions. The winter schedule, running 17 May through mid September, is less frequent with two buses running every 30 minutes from 9 am to 4 pm. The shuttle connects with all popular locations and walks, including the Dove Lake Circuit, the Cradle Valley Boardwalk and the Overland Track. It departs from the Cradle Mountain Information Centre at the former airstrip, outside the park boundary.

Source: Discover Tasmania website www.discovertasmania.com/travel_information/cradle_shuttle
Figure 5.5 The Cradle Mountain Shuttle Bus keeps cars away from the ‘honey pot’ sites inside the park.

5.5.3 Conclusions for the Mount Lofty Ranges UNESCO bid proposal

The Lake District stakeholder consultation process raised a number of key concerns about transport links and transport infrastructure. While it was recognised that these issues needed to be addressed irrespective of WHS nomination, it was thought that WHS inscription would reinforce the need to develop sustainable transport options. Similarly, it is likely that WHS listing would add impetus to sustainable transport agendas for the Greater Adelaide region, and could be used to support initiatives such as cycling and walking trails around improved transport infrastructure.
5.6 Integrated planning, recreation and environmental policies

A WHS bid would bring together numerous partners, agencies and community groups that are already involved in landscape planning and landscape management throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges and associated wine and agricultural regions. Indeed, the feasibility study process has already brought together a number of different councils that are facing similar issues in terms of agricultural planning, tourism, recreation and environmental policy challenges.

Contemporary theory puts community ownership and responsibility at the centre of natural resource management (Government of South Australia, 2011). It also advocates taking a 'landscape approach' that transcends land and water boundaries, and which integrates the management of agricultural production with environmental conservation. A WHS is likely to reinforce these policy directions across government agencies and other bodies such as NRM boards, and communicate them to the community. In this way, the pursuit of a WHS bid should be a 'no regrets' policy, as not only do benefits follow WHS designation, but the mere prospect of nomination can have effects on the way sites are managed and protected.

Key message: no regrets
Even if bids are unsuccessful, the journey itself can be expected to provide benefits, primarily in terms of partnership, heritage protection, promotion of cooperative planning, and through attracting funding to supporting research and to supporting projects.
Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2007

5.7 Protection of aesthetic values, heritage, and wildlife habitat

Federal legislation in the form of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EBPC) Act 1999 provides the legal framework to protect and manage National Heritage sites and World Heritage sites, defined in the Act as matters of National Environmental Significance (NES). The Act ensures that an assessment process is undertaken for proposed actions (e.g., mines, wind farms, airports, or large township subdivisions) that will or are likely to have a significant impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of a declared National Heritage Site or WHS. The legal implications are explored further in Section 6 of this report, which points out that the EPBC Act already applies to the protection of wildlife habitat in these regions, and that it would come into play with regard to the agricultural heritage values from when the region attains National Heritage listing.

5.8 Education, learning, cultural and community benefits

5.8.1 Educational and cultural impacts
Education is an important strand of the World Heritage ethos, and is one where social and economic impacts are intertwined. The many background research papers that inform this feasibility study demonstrate how WHS status can improve levels of appreciation, understanding and respect for an area, which in turn may lead to greater support towards the aim of maintaining the value of the WHS.

The 2006 ERS report cites the Upper Middle Rhine Valley as a good example of this approach. According to the report, the area was listed for promoting culture exchange between the Mediterranean region and the north for two millennia, and it continues to do so. It was also listed for its organic cultural landscape and for being an outstanding example of an evolving traditional way of life and communication. This makes it a potential comparative site for listing of the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape. The report also provides numerous examples of UK WHSs being involved in formal and informal education through real and virtual interpretive centres, educational resources, and so on.
Educational resources thus allow WHSs to widen the appreciation and understanding of the area and its universal value. This has variously meant educational opportunities for the local population and visitors regarding the value of the site, improved interpretation of a site’s universal value through improved visitor facilities, promotion of a site’s literary or artistic associations, school trips for activities linking the site with school curricula, linking sites with local higher education institutions through the running of heritage- and WHS- related courses, and, more generally, by creating a climate for a wide range of non-academic learning. All of these opportunities could apply to the Mount Lofty Ranges region. One example might be education about of the history of landscape painting in the Fleurieu region in association with the promotion of the Fleurieu Art Prize, which has a school projects element to its program.

A South Australian university could become a centre for excellence in heritage management, especially if other potential WHS listings, such as the proposed Arkaroola natural site and the Cornish Mining cultural site came into play with the existing Naracoorte Fossil Site, to create a regional cluster of WHSs. Links between universities and WHSs are encouraged by UNESCO through a memorandum of understanding between the World Heritage Centre and individual universities. Activity typically includes joint research projects, student or academic staff exchanges, consultancy services, organisation of meetings, and sharing documentation and information. European examples given by UNESCO of World Heritage and university links include:

- Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany: Master’s Degree, World Heritage Studies.
- University College Dublin, Centre for Continuing Professional Education, Ireland: Master of Science, Diploma and Higher Diploma in World Heritage Management.
- Moscow State M.V. Lomonosov University, Moscow, Russian Federation: Natural and Cultural Heritage Lecture Course.

The ERS report provides examples of relevant UK courses taught at universities located near WHS areas, including Birmingham University, Bradford University, Bristol University and Kent University, as well as examples of universities located near to a WHS offering relevant courses such as architectural conservation, heritage education and management. In addition, there is the potential to link universities and WHS through research programs and research centres. For example, the 10th UNESCO International Seminar on Cultural Landscapes was held last year at the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies (ICCHS) at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. Similarly, the Hadrian’s Wall WHS Education Initiative is currently the subject of a five-year research study.

At school level the reintroduction of history to the state and national curricula could provide an opportunity to link the story of South Australia’s systematic colonisation to the local primary school curriculum. According to a recent report in the local media, a pilot program in Willunga that teaches children about local history has been so successful it will be replicated in schools across the nation. The Willunga National Trust is working with the state Department for Education and Child Development to create a model for the new Australian history curriculum, which will be taught to students from Reception to Year 8 from 2013 (Southern Times Messenger, 2011). The pilot program involves students dressing in historical clothing and taking lessons, complete with slate boards and chalk, at the 1854 Bassett School in Willunga. Similarly, in Tasmania, there has been a drive to develop links between the convict history behind the WHS sites and the state and national school curricula, and this is seen as a strong positive benefit of WHS.

The Environment Institute
Where ideas grow
By involving schools, universities, libraries and other cultural institutions, the WHS bid process has the potential to reinforce the cultural policies of local, state and federal government for Adelaide and South Australia, and to encourage associated social, environmental and cultural research. This will be explored further in Section 6.

5.8.2 Social and community benefits

As well as the range of potential educational benefits that may accrue as a result of WHS inscription, there will also likely be a number of examples of social and community benefits and impacts. For example, conservation efforts and the refurbishment of local buildings can improve civic pride, which in some cases can ‘lead to a virtuous circle of increased private investment’ (Atlantic Consultants, 2003, cited in ERS, 2006). By managing the needs of local communities, WHSs stand to benefit from the activity of local residents groups that support the preservation and maintenance of the sites’ assets. When residents are able to participate in the preservation of community heritage, they can act as WHS ‘natural protectors’ and can help to enhance a site and minimise the risks of potential detrimental impacts of inscription (Musitelli 2005, cited in ERS, 2006). This is likely to be supported through funding sources such as the previously mentioned ‘Caring for Our Country and Your Community Heritage’ federal grants schemes.

According to evidence in the ERS (2006) report, the ability to effectively engender civic pride will be determined by the extent to which residents feel a belonging to the community within the WHS area. In the case of the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges geographical area, there would be a number of communities that identify strongly with the agricultural heritage of the various landscapes within the region, including the residents of suburban Adelaide. In addition to people living at or near a WHS, organisations working to support a WHS bid can get real pride from achieving WHS status and WHS sites can use it as a lever to help in preservation, conservation, development and marketing (ERS, 2006).

The ERS report also provides examples of cultural events and activities that are developed specifically for locals as well as visitors. The World Heritage nomination of Parati (aka Paraty), a picturesque colonial port in Brazil (currently on Brazil’s Tentative List), has been accompanied by the development of a comprehensive cultural policy that places an emphasis on high design standards in the built realm and on staging numerous cultural events throughout the calendar year. The success of such events as FLIP, an international literary festival that was established in tandem with the WHS nomination process, means accommodation rates are at a premium for the duration of the five-day festival, a luxury that previously only applied to the new year carnival and other established religious festivals. Parati is also an example of a site that has been exploiting the brand early by promoting itself as ‘a UNESCO nominated World Heritage site’ since being placed on Brazil’s Tentative List in 2004, illustrating that benefits can start flowing ahead of formal designation.

5.9 Partnerships for socioeconomic and cultural development

There is strong recognition that the process of applying for WHS inscription can bring a number of process-related benefits, especially around improved partnership working between key stakeholders and local communities. This is partly a reflection of the need for effective partnership working to be in place in order for WHS inscription to be successful.

5.9.1 Evidence from other WHSs

The participants in the international workshop Cultural Landscapes: the Challenges of Conservation at the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in Ferrara (Italy) concluded that

Cultural landscape management and conservation processes bring people together in caring for their collective identity and heritage, and provide a shared local vision within a global context. Local communities need therefore to be involved in every aspect of the identification, planning and management of the areas, as they are the most
According to the ERS commentary on the UK experience of WHSs, the partners to a WHS management plan typically include the relevant local authorities, English Heritage, the National Trust, private landowners and farmers, voluntary groups such as ‘friends’ groups, the Countryside Agency, the Forestry Commission, local trusts related to the site, regional and local development agencies, national parks, English Nature, and others. The Mount Lofty Ranges working group recommends that the Australian equivalents of such groups be identified early in the bid process.

Involvement with a WHS may also prove to be a spur for the partners to become involved with wider but related issues to do with best practice. The ERS report cites the example of Tynedale Council, which is closely associated with the Hadrian’s Wall WHS, being designated a beacon council for sustainable tourism in 2004. Another benefit identified in the ERS report is around the opportunities for networking that arise as a result of inscription. These include the World Heritage Conference, the World Heritage Information Network (WHIN), a global network of World Heritage information providers, and the Local Authority World Heritage Forum (UK), a network of authorities that have the whole or part of an inscribed WHS or Tentative Site within their administrative boundaries. Similarly, the Australian World Heritage Advisory Committee (AWHAC) was established by the Environment Protection and Heritage Council (EPHC) to provide advice to Australian government and state and territory ministers on issues of a national, cross-cutting nature that affect Australia’s WHSs. AWHAC comprises one representative from each WHS in Australia and provides a forum for Australia’s WHS managers to share information on best-practice management and to encourage continual improvement for the protection of our valuable WHSs.

The list of partners currently involved in the Lake District bid gives insight into how the bid process can bring corporate, government and local community partners together:

**PROJECT STEERING GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allerdale Borough Council</th>
<th>Forestry Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Borough Council</td>
<td>Government Office North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantwood</td>
<td>ICOMOS UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Association of Local Councils</td>
<td>Invest in Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle City Council</td>
<td>Lakeland Arts Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland Borough Council</td>
<td>Lake District National Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Land and Business Association</td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Cumbria</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria County Council</td>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>Northwest Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Cultural Partnership</td>
<td>South Lakes Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Rural Enterprise Agency</td>
<td>South Lakeland District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Tourism</td>
<td>The National Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Vision</td>
<td>The University of Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>The Upland Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>United Utilities plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fells and Dales Leader+</td>
<td>Wordsworth Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Lake District</td>
<td>World Commission on Protected Areas UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/supporters.html

**Figure 5.7** Lake District World Heritage Project Steering Group.
In addition to the steering group list, the following financial partners and sponsors are listed:

**LAKE DISTRICT WORLD HERITAGE PROJECT FINANCIAL SPONSORS**

Natwest and Royal Bank of Scotland; First Milk; The Lake District Cheese Company; Natural England; the Northwest Regional Development Agency; English Heritage; Carlisle City Council; the Forestry Commission; the National Trust; Cumbria Vision; Allerdale Borough Council; Copeland Borough Council; South Lakeland District Council; Friends of the Lake District; The Nuclear Decommissioning Agency.

Source: http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/supporters.html

Figure 5.7 Lake District World Heritage Project Financial Sponsors.

5.9.2 Benefits of developing the management framework

It is anticipated that the formation of such an all-embracing partnership team in the Greater Adelaide region could help to address the divergences in agendas between different levels of government, between different ‘silo’ agencies, and between government, industry and the community – by helping to remove and minimise the natural suspicions between such groups. To get all partners to commit to and cooperate to establish an overarching management framework for the agricultural region would be an enormous achievement in itself.

It is indeed recognised by a number of reports (PWC, 2007; ERS, 2006; Rebanks, 2010) that the degree of impact of WHS listing across all of the potential benefits depends on how well partners work together to support and implement the management framework. It was considered that pursuing a bid may help by laying down key criteria and action plans, enabling partners to work to the same shared agenda and vision.

5.9.3 The journey is as important as the destination

One final benefit of WHS in terms of partnership working is that the WHS inscription process engenders a longer-term vision through the development of the management framework, and brings with it a responsibility to deliver actions to support the framework, thereby using the WHS process to ensure ‘buy-in’ from all stakeholders. This was noted by a number of reports (PWC, 2007; ERS, 2006; Rebanks, 2010) which indicate that the WHS nomination journey is as important as the destination. This notion is explored further in sections 8 and 9, which outline the bid process.

5.10 Conclusion: A World Heritage Site bid could be a ‘rising tide that lifts all boats’

The potential for a successful WHS bid to bring social and community benefits to the Greater Adelaide region has been gaining recognition during the consultation process, with stakeholders starting to link the potential social, environmental and economic benefits together. The international background research papers reinforce the notion that if the economic benefits are achieved and managed in the right way, these should result in parallel cultural and community benefits, seen in increases in the quality of life for residents and in assisting the maintenance and enhancement of services to agritourism regions and their communities. In this sense, WHS listing could be viewed as a ‘rising tide that lifts all boats’.
6. STAKEHOLDER REACTIONS, ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Stakeholder consultation with government agencies, producers and representative industry bodies conducted to date has produced strong interest and support for exploring the potential benefits and implications of bidding for and achieving UNESCO status. A copy of this feasibility study and the associated economic analysis will be circulated to all those industry and community groups that have been consulted to date, as well as individuals, institutions and industry bodies that have been identified for future consultation and potential partnership. Government ministers, politicians and decision-makers among South Australia’s state government agencies have offered a range of reactions during the course of the study, from neutral responses to strong support. Among those who have assisted the four councils to explore the feasibility of the proposal are Adelaide City Council, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA), Regional Development Australia (RDA) Barossa, the Department for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPaC), and the Native Title Claim Resolution Unit at the Attorney General’s Department. It is anticipated that stakeholder consultation will be an ongoing process as the results of the feasibility study and associated economic scenario analysis are circulated and feedback is sought. (See Appendices 1 and 2.)

6.1 Summary of meetings, presentations and consultation

6.1.1 Industry, heritage, community and Indigenous groups

Ascertaining and building support for Professor Stringer’s proposal to pursue an elite landscape designation for the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes began from the ground up. Stringer’s proposal originally evolved from collaboration with South Australian colleagues on the Food and Wine Value Chain Thinker-in-Residence program, who were already in the process of researching and exploring mechanisms that might assist in supporting and enhancing the region’s agricultural landscapes and developing its food, wine and tourism economies into the future.

The idea gained the interest of environmental economist Professor Mike Young, director of the Environment Institute and member of the Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists, who saw it as a potential way to bring about fundamental socioeconomic and environmentally sensitive change across a broad landscape. Other early adopters include Anne Moroney, CEO of Regional Development Australia (RDA) Barossa, who invited Professor Stringer to air his ideas at a 2011 seminar on the future of the Barossa region, which was attended by numerous key industry and government representatives. Similarly, Professor Stringer was invited to present his ideas to community and industry groups in the McLaren Vale region at an early stage.

The proposal came to the attention of the Adelaide Hills/Mount Barker regions a little later, after some strong initial resistance to the concept from a group of Adelaide Hills’ producers who were concerned about the possible impacts of ‘red tape’ on their ability to improve agricultural infrastructure in ways that allow them to prosper as agricultural producers. Cam Stafford, chair of the Lenswood Coldstores Cooperative, subsequently invited Professor Stringer to present to a group of representative apple growers from the Adelaide Hills, many of whom were skeptical to
start with but most of whom soon agreed it worthwhile to explore the potential benefits and implications of a WHS bid.

Robert Brokenshire, MLC, organised a presentation to his Food Security Group, which is made up of many of the key food and agriculture industry bodies in the state. Once again, there was support for exploring the idea further. Food SA’s CEO Catherine Barnett has also been briefed.

Regarding consultation with the relevant Indigenous groups, a list of legal representatives of the Kaurna, Ngarrindjeri, Ramindjeri and Peramangk groups has been established in consultation with the Attorney General’s Department Native Title Unit, and feedback from one of those representatives was sought ahead of publication of this report. The representative expressed reservations about whether celebration of an agrarian heritage will be of benefit to Indigenous interests. Other advice suggests that Aboriginal heritage groups are likely to be keen to explore ways to incorporate Aboriginal stories and land management practices into interpretation and integrated planning of the modern cultural landscape. Peer commentary from a World Heritage expert recommended that the impacts on the landscape of both the Indigenous peoples and the agrarian settlers will need to inform the development of the bid, and conceptualisation of the final property to be listed. The working group recognises that this will be a complex matter for the project teams to work through, and suggests that there will be benefit in mapping the landscapes from all cultural and historical perspectives, and in telling the story of the original intentions of the Letters Patent signed by King William IV to protect Indigenous rights. The ultimate aim would be for the public at large to explore these issues openly and honestly, so that new and enriched relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people can be established. Should a decision be made to proceed with the WHS bid, it is recommended that the feasibility study be circulated to the relevant Indigenous groups and individuals, ahead of formal consultation, possibly in tandem with the Adelaide and Mount Lofty NRM Aboriginal Nations consultation processes. Additionally it is recommended that a specialist advisory group be formed, that the ongoing cultural mapping of the area involve Indigenous groups and individuals, and that resources be allocated to those purposes.

Similarly, the historian consulted commented that distinctions will need to be made between the ideals and intentions of Wakefield, Bentham, Mills and others, and their practical execution by the South Australian Company and others in the early days of settlement. For example the ‘Special Surveys’ that were implemented in the Mount Lofty Ranges were perceived by some as a deviation from the Wakefield ‘systematic’ and ‘concentrated’ 80 acre survey model, and were initially criticised and resisted by Wakefield himself. That said, the same expert asserts that the ultimate practical implementation of the Wakefield ‘concentrated’ colonisation scheme in the Mount Lofty Ranges defines the region, and ultimately successfully realised many of the Utilitarians’ original utopian ideals. Equally important, she asserts, is the implementation of the ‘voluntary principle’ that ensured the absence of any politically dominant church, and framed the religious development of the colony which was critical to the settlements in the Barossa and Hahndorf. Finally, advice sought from a social policy expert advocated the future application of non-market valuation methods to help
quantify the value of ecosystems services in the Mount Lofty Ranges, suggesting that this might also be applied to educational, cultural and other benefits.\(^7\)

The detailed responses of the peers consulted to date can be found in Appendix 4, while a full list of the stakeholders consulted to date may be found in Appendix 2. The working group recognises that there is also more work to be done in consulting food processors, and, indeed, corporations and industry bodies who may be interested in financially supporting the bid process in the future. Many of these potential industry partners have been identified in the policy alignment discussion in Appendix 1 as ‘key partners’ in the delivery of the various state government strategies and policies related to agriculture, food and wine tourism, and Natural Resource Management. The working group has also discussed the idea of identifying potential high-profile ‘champions’ of the bid in the food, wine, tourism and heritage sectors.

### 6.1.2 Local government

On viewing Professor Stringer’s presentation in early 2010, City of Onkaparinga mayor, Lorraine Rosenberg, initiated a series of workshops with staff and elected representatives of relevant Mount Lofty Ranges’ councils. These were followed by a series of presentations and workshops with interested individual councils, leading to the joint funding of the feasibility study by the Adelaide Hills Council, The Barossa Council, the District Council of Mount Barker, and the City of Onkaparinga. As mentioned in the introduction to this report, it is envisaged that those councils that elected not to participate in the feasibility study and those that are yet to consider the idea will continue to be informed of the progress of the working group and be provided with a copy of the final report. This applies in particular to the councils that are encompassed by the ‘Preliminary Survey Districts and Special Surveys to 1840’ map (Figure 1.2 in Section 1), which became the working template for the bid during the feasibility study process. Additionally, Adelaide City Council staff, Lord Mayor Stephen Harwood and Deputy Lord Mayor David Plumridge have been kept in the information loop, due to the historical relationships between the original town and country surveys, the market and tourism linkages between the agricultural landscapes and the city population, the potential for linkages with the recent National Heritage listing of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout, and the fact that many of the economic benefits of WHS listing will impact directly on the city tourism, restaurant and convention industries (as discussed in the EconSearch analysis in Section 4 of this report).

---

\(^7\) Ecosystems services are the benefits provided to humans through the transformation of resources (or environmental assets, including land, water, vegetation and atmosphere) into a flow of essential goods and services e.g. clean air, water and food. Costanza, R. et al. (1997) ‘The value of the world’s ecosystem services and natural capital’, Nature 387: 253–260.
6.1.3 State government
As mentioned earlier, various government ministers, politicians and decision-makers among South Australia’s state government agencies have to date offered a range of reactions to the WHS bid proposal, from neutral reactions to strong support. A number of state agencies have been identified as having relevance to the bid, and those consulted to date include:

- PIRSA, who have engaged in workshops and a policy alignment scoping exercise;
- the then Department of Planning and Local Government (now the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI)), who offered to hold a workshop for their senior staff that will be taken up on publication of this report;
- the Department for Environment and Natural Resources (DENR);
- the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC); and
- the Attorney General’s Department (AGD)’s Native Title Unit.

Offers to assist and support the four councils to build the case have come from Adelaide City Council, PIRSA, DENR and the AGD, while the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resource Management Board arranged a workshop late in 2011 for interested staff and board members, which resulted in a request to be ‘kept in the loop’. A recent meeting was held with Minister Gail Gago, who at the time of writing oversees the Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Forests, Regional Development and Tourism portfolios, both of which stand to gain from the pursuit of a bid, as detailed in Section 5 of this report. Minister Gago has already voiced her support for the Barossa and McLaren Vale Character Preservation legislation initiative of Member for Mawson Leon Bignell and Minister John Rau, and Leon Bignell has also stated in correspondence with the authors of this report that he sees the WHS bid proposal as a natural progression of that initiative.

6.1.4 Preservation versus branding
One of the key debates to emerge from these consultations has been whether WHS listing would essentially be motivated by and aimed towards the preservation and protection of the highly productive agricultural lands in the Mount Lofty Ranges, or whether the economic development of the food, wine and tourism industries, and therefore the region in general, would be its main purpose. With regard to the preservation of primary production priority areas, some agencies felt that the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and the proposed Character Preservation legislation for McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley would achieve that end, while existing mechanisms in the Adelaide Hills (such as those for watershed protection) already successfully perform an agricultural protection role. However, the Econsearch analysis of trends in land use change and the discussion around it in Section 6 concludes that addressing the trends of agricultural land loss in the study area will require multiple mechanisms that support the ongoing economic viability of agriculture and agribusiness and that WHS listing would inspire the food, wine and tourism economy in ways that the existing and proposed regulations could never do.

The World Heritage Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2011a) state;

> World Heritage nominations are fundamentally concerned with the potential outstanding universal value of properties. The nomination process should not be primarily motivated by perceived economic development opportunities.

It is, however, clear to the working group that the key pathway to protection and celebration of the (threatened) universal values of the Mount Lofty agrarian landscapes will be to strengthen their economic viability in the long term. The economic development of agriculture and tourism thus becomes the mechanism for long-term character preservation by using WHS as a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness for the agricultural and tourism sectors.
This in turn would solidify the protection of primary production priority areas, character preservation and heritage protection initiatives.

As mentioned previously, recent studies show that WHS designation has over time evolved from a technical measure aimed exclusively at preservation into an acclaimed and widely respected brand that can be used to add value to both agricultural, viticultural and tourism product (Ryan and Sylvanto, 2009). We have established that UNESCO advisors recognise that ‘conservation’ and ‘preservation’ are probably the wrong terms to use when discussing a moving target such as a dynamic and complex working agricultural landscape, and that any attempt to freeze an agricultural landscape, as a museum object or an heirloom, in some present state or moment in the past will condemn it. UNESCO also recognises that agricultural landscapes have tangible and intangible value for the contemporary world and that priority should be given to listing unique agricultural landscapes that are in danger of being forever lost, and those that show promise for sustaining present and future populations (Cook, 1996).

Some of those consulted during the process of compiling this report also recognised the intangible benefits (in attracting a skilled workforce and building a creative knowledge economy, for example) that could come from Adelaide being perceived as a desirable place to live, with a World Heritage area in close proximity, and indeed a possible cluster of WHSs should the Arkaroola Resort and Wilderness Sanctuary, Cornish Mining Sites and the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes eventually join the Naracoorte Fossil Site in achieving successful nominations. The working group recognises that there may be more work to be done in communicating how protection of the agricultural values and the pursuit of economic viability for the agrarian landscapes will need to go hand in hand. A full list of the meetings held with state government agencies and state government ministers to date can be found in Appendix 2.

6.1.5 Federal government agencies
The federal government agency for national, Commonwealth and WHS nominations is the Heritage and Wildlife Division, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWaP). They have been consulted regarding the key steps in the nomination processes for National Heritage listing, for getting onto Australia’s Tentative List for WHS nomination, and the current policies and practices of WHS nomination, including likely timelines and limitations on the number of WHS nominations that can be made each year (currently restricted to one cultural and one natural nomination per year per State Part, i.e., the Australian government). There are currently two boundary extensions to existing natural sites on Australia’s Tentative List, and two more sites being processed to go on it. Australia has had a recent ‘hit rate’ of achieving a successful WHS listing every two years, and while that is not necessarily an indication of future hit rates, it seems feasible that around a half a dozen sites might be successfully inscribed over the next decade.

Also, Australia has for the most part been successful with all its nominations to date, although in some cases the UNESCO Committee may have changed the values and boundaries from those proposed in the original nomination. Which sites go forward depends on the deliberations of the Environment Protection Heritage Council (EPHC), which is made up of ministerial representatives of each state and territory and which gives due consideration to the likelihood of success of a nomination, in the context of ongoing ‘gap’ analyses by UNESCO and the availability of resources in Australia to pursue nominations. It is interesting to note here that sites are likely to start celebrating the WHS association early, with many examples of bids-in-progress tapping into the brand ahead of any formal nomination. The following sites are simply in the process of pursuing a bid, with Brazil’s Paraty yet to be fully inscribed and only making it onto Brazil’s Tentative List in 2004, despite wide web-based and printed tourism entities promoting it as a fully fledged WHS (see
Certainly the World Heritage Convention did not even exist in 1958! This phenomenon supports the notion that the ‘journey is the destination’, and that the nomination process itself creates multiple benefits. It may also explain why some sites get their WHS ‘lift’ earlier than their actual listing date.

As discussed in more detail in Section 7, a nomination for National Heritage listing could be made by the current working group directly to DSEWaP, with the Australian Heritage Council conducting the assessment. However, a WHS nomination must be made by the Australian government in cooperation with the state government through DENR, with the EPHC making the final assessment. DSEWaP also drew the working group’s attention to EPHC’s National Tourism and Heritage Taskforce, which is made up of representatives of federal, state and local governments, heritage organisations, the tourism industry, universities and Indigenous organisations, and was established to identify issues and opportunities for the development of natural and cultural heritage tourism in Australia. Additionally, and in order to develop priority assessment lists, the Australian Heritage Council commissions studies by independent experts on key themes relating to Australia’s national heritage. These thematic studies are designed to assist in raising public awareness of Australia’s special heritage places and to help the council identify places for possible future consideration for inclusion in the National and Commonwealth Heritage lists. Similarly, UNESCO commissions global thematic studies to the same end with regard to the World Heritage List.

While there has been no formal consultation to date at the federal level with Regional Development Australia, local RDA representatives have hosted and attended seminars at which Professor Stringer has presented the WHS nomination proposal, and it is intended that this feasibility study be circulated to RDA (ACT), RDA Barossa, RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island as well as the Adelaide RDA, which covers the McLaren Vale region. Preliminary readers of the report have identified that this will be an important area for future engagement, and that the local RDAs ought to be involved in the establishment of the proposed steering group and management team, should a decision be made to proceed with the bid.

### 6.2 Public presentations and media coverage

Numerous public presentations have been made by Professor Stringer and Professor Young and project manager Stephanie Johnston prior to and during the feasibility study process. Similarly, there has been extensive media coverage in specialist, local and mainstream print and radio media, stimulating debate in the broader community. Consultation will continue after the release of the final report, in order to continue pursuing the broad community support that will be essential for successfully moving through to the next stage of the nomination process.

In late 2011 the working group, in cooperation with PIRSA, RDA Barossa and the then DPLG, brought international experts Dave Sands (Vancouver BC Agricultural Land Reserve) and Sonia Callau (Barcelona Agricultural Park) to Adelaide for three seminars on ‘edge’ planning and
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Agricultural policy in peri-urban regions. The seminars brought together industry associations, local government elected members and staff, state government agency staff, as well as community groups, farmers and industry groups. Staged in the Barossa, McLaren Vale and the Waite Institute, the seminars were well attended and stimulated extensive debate around agricultural policy issues and marketing and branding concepts, including WHS listing. The Waite Institute seminar also included a discussion panel made up of Professor Mike Young, Carol Vincent from the South Australian Farmers’ Federation (and member representing agricultural development on the Minister for Planning’s Development Policy Advisory Committee), and Cam Stafford, chair of the Lenswood Coldstores Cooperative.

A full list of the presentations, seminars and media coverage to date can be found in Appendix 2.

6.3 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act implications

As already highlighted in this report, one of the key concerns of stakeholders from the start has been planning and development, and the fear that WHS listing could increase planning constraints in the region. As previously stated, the most sensitive issue for primary producers is whether UNESCO status brings additional layers of rules and procedures that might affect their ability to switch crops, construct new buildings and improve infrastructure in ways that allow them to prosper as agricultural producers. Those wishing to develop tourism infrastructure voiced similar concerns. To this end, the working group has analysed the role of the federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act. The EPBC Act is invoked once a property appears on the National, Commonwealth (natural, Indigenous and historic heritage places owned or controlled by the federal government) or World Heritage lists. This brings both benefits, in the form of grants and financial support from the federal government, and obligations.

6.3.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act referrals

Firstly, those involved in administering development assessment and environmental impact assessment (EIA) processes, such as local councils, need ideally to be in a position to provide a very basic level of information to the public about the potential for the need for Australian government environmental impact approval. However, there is no legal requirement for the councils to do this – they are not responsible for administering or enforcing the EPBC Act; the Australian government is.

The proponent of a proposed action in or near a national or World Heritage listed site therefore needs to undertake a ‘self-assessment’ to decide whether or not the action is likely to have an adverse or significant impact on the listed World and/or National Heritage values of the site, which are defined by the Act as Matters of National Environmental Significance (NES). So, it is not the property per se that is protected by the EPBC Act, but the listed ‘natural heritage’ and ‘cultural heritage’ values contained in the property. The values for National Heritage listed properties can be accessed on the DSEWPaC website, and the World Heritage values adopted by the World Heritage Committee are contained in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) available on UNESCO’s website.

An action is likely to have a significant impact on national heritage or cultural heritage values if there is a real chance or possibility that it will cause:

- one or more of the values to be lost;
- one or more of the values to be degraded or damaged; or
- one or more of the values to be notably altered, modified, obscured or diminished.

The self-assessment as to whether actions are likely to have an adverse or significant impact on the
listed World and/or National heritage values should be objective and based on sufficient information. (It is important to note that actions may indirectly impact or have subsequent effects on the values also.) The self-assessment process should:

- Consult the listed values to ensure the proposal is consistent with the values.
- Consult a management plan, if there is one, to ensure the proposal is consistent with the management recommendations and/or conservation policies.
- Consult the World and National Heritage management principles, and be consistent with them.
- Consider the action in the broadest context, including its related activities and infrastructure.
- Look at all possible alternatives to the action or proposal.
- Look at any possible subsequent effects the action may have on other matters of NES or in the future.
- Select an action that does not or is not likely to significantly impact on heritage values.
- Undertake measures that mitigate the impact on World and/or National Heritage values.
- Document the decision about taking the action and demonstrate how the action is not likely to have an adverse impact on heritage values.
- Refer actions that may have a significant impact.

This information should be compiled as supporting information for the proposed action for a referral if one is to be lodged with the DSEWPaC and as a record of change to the place. The proponent should make the decision as to whether or not to refer an action to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. If there is uncertainty about whether or not the action is likely to have a significant impact, then a referral should be made. The minister is obliged to make a decision within 20 business days as to whether or not the proposal requires approval under the EPBC Act.

The kind of actions that might trigger the EPBC referral process will be defined by the values established in the nomination process of the WHS. If the gazetted nomination documents eventually list agricultural production as a key value, then actions (such as large housing subdivisions) that might impact on agricultural production will trigger the referral process. Similarly, if tourism and recreational values are listed, then actions that impact on those values (such as a large mine or airport) will need to be referred. If historic, cultural and aesthetic values are listed, then actions that might impact on those values (such as a large wind farm development) will need to be referred and assessed. Finally, if some of the current zoning rules and proposed character preservation objectives are incorporated into the values statement, then actions that go against those rules and objectives may need to be referred – in the same way that approvals of non-complying development require concurrence from other statutory bodies.

The basic stages in the current EPBC Act EIA process are:

**I. Referral:** The action is referred to the environment minister after a self-assessment process, for a determination of whether further assessment is required. An action can be referred to the minister in a number of ways:

(i) by the person wishing to undertake the action;
(ii) by a state or territory or an agency of a state or territory;
(iii) by a Commonwealth agency, which can refer an action by another person in certain circumstances; or
(iv) by the minister, who can ‘call in’ the action.
2. **Controlled action decision:** The minister decides whether the action is a ‘controlled action’ that requires assessment under the EPBC Act.

3. **Assessment decision:** If the action is a controlled action, the minister decides what level of assessment is appropriate. The minister can immediately label an action ‘clearly unacceptable’ and inform the person of that decision and recommend appropriate action. The action may also be categorised as a ‘controlled action particular manner’ or a ‘not controlled action’, terms defined on the DSEWPaC website that require different levels of assessment and response.

4. **Assessment:** The assessment is carried out.

5. **Approval:** The minister considers results of the assessment and decides whether or not to approve the action, and, if it is approved, what conditions to impose on the approval.

The EPBC Act also acknowledges that multiple developments, plans and programs may often have a cumulative significant impact on matters of NES, but individually will not necessarily trigger the project assessment provisions of the EPBC Act. This process of strategic assessment is discussed in more detail in the following section.

### 6.3.2 Strategic assessments under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

**Background**

In addition to the referral, assessment and approval process (known as ‘project-by-project assessments’), the EPBC Act also provides a strategic assessment process for higher-level approval for actions that are likely to have a significant impact on matters of NES.

A strategic assessment (Part 10 of the EPBC Act) provides the opportunity to review and approve a series of new proposals or developments (actions) over a much larger scale and timeframe. Strategic assessments are a landscape-scale assessment and, unlike project-by-project assessments, they can consider a broader set of issues – for example, a regional strategic plan. The strategic assessment process essentially comprises two steps:

1. **Assessment and endorsement of a ‘policy, plan or program’**.

2. **Approval of actions (or classes of actions) associated with the policy, plan or program.** This step potentially allows development to proceed across a large area without the further need for EPBC Act approval of individual developments (project-by-project assessments).

A strategic assessment happens early in the planning process and looks at the potential impact of actions stemming from one or more policy, plan or program. These may include changes to local development plans or policies and regional strategic land use plans. The intent is that a strategic assessment will ensure long-term protection of the matter of environmental significance by looking at broad impacts before policies are changed and before any development begins, rather than at individual projects.

Once a program has been endorsed under the EBPC Act and the types of development or activities allowed to take place have been approved, individual projects do not need any further approval under national environment law. This provides greater upfront clarity to landholders, planners, industry, government and the community.
According to the Commonwealth Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, a strategic assessment may be the most appropriate form of assessment for:

- High-growth areas with a large number of projects requiring assessment by the Australian government Environment Minister.
- Projects involving multiple stakeholders or complex, large-scale actions.
- Where projects are characterised by multiple values.
- Where a proactive and consistent approach to NRM across jurisdictions is considered effective.
- Where there is scope for developing regional capability.
- When environmental protection is best integrated with higher-level planning.


**Recent example**

A recent example of a strategic assessment undertaken under the federal EPBC Act was the Melbourne Urban Growth Boundary Strategic Assessment, which looked at the potential impacts of actions stemming from changes to the urban growth boundary proposed in the ‘Melbourne @ 5 Million’ and related projects in the Victorian Transport Plan.

The strategic assessment confirmed that a number of matters protected under the EPBC Act are found within or around the revised urban growth boundary, including the Ramsar Wetlands, the threatened growling grass frog, southern brown bandicoot, golden sun-moth and striped legless lizard, and two threatened ecological communities – the natural temperate grassland and the grassy eucalypt woodland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain.

In the Melbourne case the strategic assessment process ensured that potential impacts on these nationally protected matters were fully considered and minimised before any decisions were made about growth area boundaries. The assessment concluded that in addition to avoiding areas of protected grasslands, and retaining more than 80 per cent of all protected woodlands within the revised urban growth boundary, the Victorian government would establish and actively manage more than 15,000 hectares of reserves for the natural temperate grassland and the grassy eucalypt woodland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain, boosting the current two per cent of the protected grasslands to 20 per cent.

The strategic assessment process also addressed several measures to reduce impacts on threatened species and the Ramsar Wetlands, including place management plans and conservation strategies, buffer areas near waterways, and requirements for development designs to be water sensitive and to protect native vegetation.

The federal Environment Minister subsequently approved several prescriptions for ecological communities and threatened species associated with the Melbourne strategic assessment. The prescriptions specify requirements for protection of nationally protected matters that must be followed in preparing subsequent precinct structure plans and in undertaking individual developments.
Potential implication for the Mount Lofty Ranges World Heritage agrarian landscape bid
Examples of when a future strategic assessment may be required or recommended in relation to the Mount Lofty listed area include:

- Proposed changes to the planning strategy (e.g., the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide) to extend the ‘urban lands boundary’ into a primary production area.
- A Development Plan Amendment to rezone land for rural living.
- A proposed change to development policies that facilitate large farming or horticultural buildings in a council area which would impact on landscape character.

There appears to be no requirement as to when a strategic assessment is undertaken; however, in relation to a strategic policy change it may be appropriate for it to occur during initial investigations, prior to public consultation. In the sense that a strategic assessment has an associated ‘approval’ from the Commonwealth minister, a logical approach would be to deal with this aspect as early in the process as possible.

An alternative approach may be for strategic planners and policy writers to undertake an informal strategic assessment outside the EPBC Act process, whereby potential impacts are assessed as part of preliminary investigations. In the context of the Melbourne case, an example would be where the state government proposes to designate a new growth area within a World Heritage area whereby the impacts on the values (landscape, primary production, etc) of the selected area are assessed prior to or at the same time as infrastructure and transport network analyses, as part of the site suitability review.

6.3.3 Ongoing management and review
After a place is inscribed on the World Heritage List it will be subject to ongoing scrutiny and review by the World Heritage Committee to ensure robust decision-making processes are in place in respect to actions that could impact on the place’s values. This has been evident recently in respect to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.

The Great Barrier Reef was declared a World Heritage Area in 1981. In 2011 the World Heritage Committee requested Australia undertake a number of initiatives to ensure the long-term protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area as it faces a number of pressures, including growth and development along the Queensland coast.

During the World Heritage Committee’s June 2011 meeting, concern was raised about the impacts of development on the OUV of the area. This was prompted by the approval of the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) developments on Curtis Island near Gladstone, which sits within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.

At the time the Committee passed a decision that requested Australia:

- Undertake a comprehensive strategic assessment of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, identifying planned and potential future development that could impact on the reef’s OUV to enable a long-term plan for sustainable development.
- Report to the World Heritage Committee its intention to undertake or to authorise any new development that may affect the OUV of the property.
• Invite the UNESCO World Heritage Centre/International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) monitoring mission to consider the state of conservation of the Great Barrier Reef, and to contribute to the strategic assessment process.

• Provide a State Party Report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012 on the course of action taken in response to this decision for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

The Australian and Queensland governments are now working together to undertake a comprehensive strategic assessment of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area and the adjacent coastal zone. The goal is to create an agreed long-term plan for sustainable development within the Great Barrier Reef region that provides greater certainty for industry and decision-making in the area, while ensuring the values of the World Heritage Area are protected into the future.

There are two key components to the comprehensive strategic assessment – a marine component and a coastal component. The marine and coastal ecosystems are intrinsically linked and their function is inter-related. Together these components will form a comprehensive strategic assessment of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area and the adjacent coastal zone.

• The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority will lead the marine component, which will look at the arrangements in place to manage and protect the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and World Heritage Area.

• The Queensland government will lead the coastal component, which will look at coastal development such as planning for urban, industrial and port development and the processes and management arrangements in place to ensure development occurs sustainably and does not impact unacceptably on matters of NES.

The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the Queensland government are working together to analyse impacts at the marine/coastal interface from activities such as shipping, water quality management in reef catchments, and island management, with the aim of completing the initiative over the next 18 to 24 months. The strategic assessment will help identify, plan for and manage existing and emerging risks to ensure ongoing protection and management of the unique environmental values of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and adjacent coastal zone. This will be achieved by:

• Investigating the adequacy of the existing management arrangements for the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area; and

• Assessing current and future planned development in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area and the adjacent coastal zone and analysing its likely direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.


6.3.4 Before and after scenarios

It was originally intended for this feasibility report to include detailed ‘before and after’ scenarios to ascertain if WHS listing would affect the development assessment and approval process for selected types of developments and activities in the Mount Lofty Ranges proposed site.

When reviewing approval processes post-listing it is important to remember that existing local development plan policies will continue to apply. As mentioned earlier, a difference will be that in addition to existing approval processes, a proponent of a specific project will need to undertake a
self-assessment to determine if their project will have a significant impact on a matter of NES (i.e., on the National Heritage place and World Heritage place).

On closer analysis it was determined that undertaking detailed scenarios was problematic in that development planning policies vary significantly across the area, and that many activities that could impact on the heritage values may not actually require development approval in the first place (e.g., removal of native vegetation or water-affecting activities).

It is also important to note that various actions may already require referral if they potentially impact on other matters of NES such as National Heritage listed places or listed threatened species and ecological communities. In this regard it is relevant to note that the areas being investigated for possible listing in the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes bid are currently within the area covered by the Peppermint Box (Eucalyptus odorata) Grassy Woodland of South Australia and Iron-grass Natural Temperate Grassland of South Australia ecological communities, each of which are listed as ‘critically endangered’. This means that certain actions may already be subject to the EPBC Act referral process and approval obligations, and that WHS listing would not impose additional obligations.

In practical terms, the impact of a proposal will also depend on the actual values applicable to a specific development site or area. Therefore, in lieu of preparing detailed before versus after scenarios, this feasibility report has instead reviewed a number of potential actions (including policies, plans and programs) and whether or not they may require referral under the EPBC Act. See Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Potential significant impact/future process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land division to facilitate primary production (i.e., not for rural living purposes) | • No likely threat to values.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                   |
| Dwelling on a vacant rural allotment        | • No likely threat to values if siting and design in accordance with local development policies.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                 |
| Cellar door outlet                          | • No likely threat to values.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                                       |
| 200m² s farm building                      | • No likely threat to values if siting and design in accordance with local development policies.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                                      |
| Alternative farming and horticulture including new crop types, GM crops, etc             | • No likely threat to values.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                                         |
| Farmgate trading (e.g., temporary roadside stall during fruit season, permanent flower stall) | • No likely threat to values if siting and design in accordance with local development policies.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                                    |
| Small-scale tourist facility (e.g., B&B)   | • No likely threat to values if siting and design in accordance with local development policies.  
• No additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.                                                                                               |
Exploring UNESCO World Heritage Site listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Activity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Large-scale tourist facility (e.g., resort and function/conference centre)           | • Potential threats to open rural landscape values if siting and design not in accordance with local development policies; may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Possible additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes. |
| Alteration to the planning strategy (30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter)       | • Threats to active primary production area values and to open rural landscape values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act ('strategic assessment').  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes. |
| Development Plan Amendment to rezone land for rural living                            | • Threats to open rural landscape and primary production values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Strategic assessment undertaken in addition to current state government process.     |
| Development Plan Amendment to facilitate intensive horticulture activities            | • Possible threats to open rural landscape values addressed through 'informal' strategic assessment, which resulted in siting and design criteria to limit visual impacts and no need for formal strategic assessment.  
• No additional obligations to current state government process.                         |
| Wind farm                                                                             | • Threats to open rural landscape values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.    |
| Large horticultural building for hydroponics                                         | • Potential threats to open rural landscape values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.     |
| Extractive industry                                                                   | • Threats to active primary production area values and to open rural landscape values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.    |
| Native vegetation clearance                                                           | • Threats to landscape values may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.    |
| Land division which removes ‘Hufendorf'-style allotment pattern                       | • Threats to values associated with early agrarian practices in small settlements may trigger assessment under the EPBC Act.  
• Additional obligations to current state and local government assessment processes.    |

Source: Paul Mickan

**Table 6.1** Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC) implications.

**Commentary**

Based on the above analysis the working group believes that WHS listing will not impose any additional obligations for primary production and common development activities.
6.3.5 No change to the vast majority of planning applications

It is important to note that the WHS nomination process requires an effective management plan or documented management system to be in place at the time of nomination, and to form part of the nomination file. As mentioned earlier, previous agricultural landscape nominations reveal that for the current UNESCO sites listed as working agricultural landscapes the pre-existing planning and development processes, zoning rules and regulatory policies provided the basis for those sites’ inscription and have remained in place to deal with development matters. In other words, if the existing planning processes form part of the nomination file of the Mount Lofty Ranges bid and the proposed management framework, any activity approved by those processes is, by definition, anticipated within the UNESCO site. Primary producers, processors, landowners and tourism operators would face the same zoning and regulatory processes after the area is inscribed as they do now. As demonstrated in the working group’s analysis, listing does not decrease opportunities for farmers to develop their land, nor tourism enterprise to develop facilities and infrastructure. Notwithstanding, these processes would result in plans and policies being adapted over time, as they are designed to do.

It is particularly important to note that the EBPC Act comes into play on National Heritage listing, the first stage of WHS nomination. We can therefore look to the National Heritage listing of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout for an indication of how the EBPC Act may impact on common development applications. According to Adelaide City Council, while there have been occasions of self-assessment against the listed values, at the time of writing there has not been a single EBPC referral, despite the processing of thousands of development applications for the CBD, the Park Lands and North Adelaide since the 2008 listing.

Indeed, rather than WHS inscription providing UNESCO with powers to interfere and block developments, the lack of sanction available to protect the WHS has been advanced as a criticism of the World Heritage List. Foster (2008) notes that:

> If a global scheme such as the World Heritage List initiative is going to facilitate better management and protection of the planet’s unique heritage, natural and built, it must be set up so to do. At a pretty basic level this means adequate funding to enable the necessary management of the assets on the list. This management must be implemented through a well-resourced, central administration that can both distribute funds as necessary and offer advice and assistance as required on a site by-site basis.

In the case of Australian WHSSs, concern about effective management and protection of sites led to the development of strategic assessments under the EBPC Act, as described in the previous section. In the context of recent responses to the proposed Character Preservation legislation, and the related interim Development Plan Amendment (mentioned in Section 6.3.2), some stakeholders raised concerns that World Heritage listing may simply reinforce an already overly restrictive
planning regime. For the most part, however, the food, wine and tourism bodies are united in their support of local and state government taking adequate measures to preserve the agricultural values of the region, and to protect them from urban encroachment in the long term.

Given the noted concerns and perceptions, it will be important for any future development of the Mount Lofty Ranges WHS bid to continue to clearly and effectively communicate the situation with regard to the planning implications to all interested parties.

6.4 Other consultee issues and concerns

Consultation with stakeholders and a review of the ongoing studies into the costs and benefits of achieving WHS status has identified some further issues, which are discussed in the following paragraphs.

6.4.1 Obligations to manage and monitor the site properly
Regional NRM boards, local councils and site management committees need to be aware that there are a number of opportunities under the EPBC Act for the Australian government to act cooperatively with states and territories, local government and other stakeholders in relation to listed areas. Where a World Heritage property or National Heritage place is wholly or partly within a state or territory, the Australian government must use its best endeavours to ensure that a management plan or strategic management framework for that property is prepared and implemented in cooperation with the relevant state or territory. Implementation of the plan is discretionary; the Act stipulates that the Australian government and its agencies must take all reasonable steps to ensure they do not act inconsistently with the plan. In addition, Australian government financial assistance may be provided under the EPBC Act to a state or territory in which a declared World Heritage property or National Heritage place occurs, for the protection or management of that property.

The preparation of a management plan or strategic management framework, and the mapping and documentation of existing management systems, will be a critical part of the nomination process. Time is needed to put in place appropriate plans or documentation, and to demonstrate that these work, before the nomination is submitted. Achieving this could have a considerable influence on the timetable for the nomination process. Given the complexity of the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges site, and the fact that it covers a number of local government areas, tourism regions, wine and agricultural regions, and NRM areas, it is likely that a strategic management framework would be created to protect the listed values and that an ongoing management team be formed to implement it. Existing management systems, planning systems, strategies and state and federal legislation in all their complexity will thus be mapped and presented as part of the nomination file, and reviewed and revised over time to align with the framework.

6.4.2 Unlocking value and the provision of infrastructure
... it could be said that WHS status is what you make of it. Where the status has been used to full effect it has brought partners together, leveraged additional funding, led to new development and enhanced educational benefits, improved conservation and even led to regeneration in some locations. Where these opportunities have not been seized there have been more limited benefits (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007).

Key message:
The Lake District analysis identified that sites that have achieved significant positive impacts have had a clear logic chain from the identification of the issues and problems they wished to address, a clear understanding of how WHS status could be used to catalyse change, following through to investing in the resources, activities and processes to deliver the desired impacts.
Rebanks, 2010
It has been established that WHS listing has the potential to add value to the regional economy, but this is in part highly contingent on the mechanisms by which partners use listing to develop specific policy and intervention initiatives on a case-by-case basis. Listing in itself is no policy panacea to unlock the latent potential of a site – the evidence contained in the various reports commissioned by the Lake District bid suggest it very much depends on the way the WHS inscription is used, furthered and celebrated.

Another issue is the ongoing need for the public sector and site management team to ensure that management and infrastructure are fit for purpose. The Lake District analysis identified that sites that have achieved significant positive impacts have followed a logical path from the identification of the issues and problems they wished to address, a clear understanding of how WHS status could be used to catalyse change, and a follow-through through to investing in the resources, activities and processes to deliver the desired impacts (Rebanks, 2010).

6.4.3 The negative effects of more tourism on agricultural practice
In some cases the impacts of WHS inscription can result in a number of negative impacts as a consequence of increased visitor numbers. Often this can be in relation to detrimental effects on the retention and preservation of the unique features of the region that were the justification for WHS inscription in the first place. The danger is that tourism and the pursuit of the economic benefits of tourism are promoted at the expense of agricultural practice and environmental and community sustainability. An example of this tension occurred in the Adelaide Hills, when preservation of the views from the Heysen Trail and other scenic routes had the potential to negatively impact on farming practices by restricting the use of environmental covers.

Negative impacts of visitor numbers have been reported at a number of WHSs, including Kakadu National Park (Australia), Stonehenge (UK), and Lascaux Caves (France) (Van de Baart, 2005 cited in ERS, 2006). Examples of poor management of the balance between locals and visitors are evident at some sites where overemphasis on visitor numbers and income generation has been pursued at the expense of the community. While these issues may not currently be relevant to the Mount Lofty region, it is important to consider what the long-term impacts of a significant increase in tourism may have on the region, its natural resources and its agricultural communities.

Discussions around the proposed Character Preservation legislation have reinforced some of the issues identified here, with concerns being raised about the balance between character preservation and the need for sustainable development of the wine and food economy, and the desire for a strong tourist economy, which could be strengthened and enhanced through WHS inscription. Despite these concerns, most stakeholders and consultees welcome the potential tourism-related benefits of WHS and are keen for further development of this sector to help sustain the regional food and wine tourism economies, which were seen by most consultees as underdeveloped.

6.4.4 Ensuring that the potential benefits of listing accrue across the whole region and to all stakeholders
One of the important issues that have been reinforced during the feasibility study process is the need to ensure that any potential benefits that do accrue as a result of WHS inscription are spread, where possible, throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges region and beyond, and to Adelaide itself. The EconSearch analysis demonstrates how the benefits of WHS are likely to be the greatest in the region where the food, wine and tourism economy is already of greatest significance to the local economy, namely in the Barossa and Southern Onkaparinga. It also shows that significant spin-offs of a WHS listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges may well be gained outside the LGAs studied, and in central Adelaide in particular, given that most of the proposed site is within a day trip of the city centre, which enables visitors to the WHS area to stay in the city if they wish. A bid could therefore tie in with other ‘SA grown’ initiatives that promote the relationship between available wine and fresh produce and Adelaide’s markets and restaurants. There is also the potential, as touched on in the discussion in Appendix 1, about alignment with the state government’s ‘Clean Green Food as a
Competitive Edge’ emphasis, that the WHS branding of our agricultural history could help promote and sustain the wider food industry across the state, especially given that listing will impact on food and wine grapes that are sourced from outside the listed area yet are processed within it.

Other examples exist where the marketing of a specific WHS is aimed at benefiting the wider area, though in the case of Bath, UK, links are made from the listed site in the city to destinations outside the city. It will therefore be necessary to pursue policies that ensure that the benefits of WHS accrue to all of the Mount Lofty Ranges region and not just to the established tourist destinations. This could help address issues such as improved access to key services in semi-rural communities such as Mount Barker, which, while still standing to benefit from a listing, does not stand to benefit as much as the other LGAs that were in the scope of the economic analysis. That is, WHS inscription could result in benefits for the rural areas outside of the known tourism regions, whose agricultural sector may presently be in decline. Indeed the evidence outlined in Section 3 shows that lesser known areas often benefit more from WHS listing than better-known areas.

This all links to policies to promote Adelaide itself in the relevant marketing and promotional material by highlighting the city as a food destination that enjoys a supply of fresh, green produce from its nearby hinterland. It will be important for any next steps in this process, and especially in the documentation of the management plan/system to ensure that these issues are taken on board and addressed.

6.4.5 Control and management of the branding and entrepreneurial opportunities that may arise from listing

Authorisation to use the World Heritage emblem is inextricably linked to the requirement that the national authorities may exert quality control over the products with which the emblem is associated. As highlighted earlier, the State Parties to the Convention (in Australia’s case this is the Australian government) are the only parties authorised to approve the content (images and text) of any distributed product appearing under the World Heritage emblem with regard to the sites located in their territories. UNESCO provides a list of guidelines and principles for using the emblem; however, these are not the only branding issues that are likely to arise (UNESCO, 2009). It is anticipated that a plethora of challenges would come out of the control of WHS branding, in addition to simple quality control. For example, the working group has already had debates about what to include in the economic impact analysis – produce that is grown in the region versus produce whose ingredients may have been sourced from elsewhere and processed in the region and so on. There will be many branding issues to address, but this is likely to be a ‘problem’ that most stakeholders would welcome.

6.4.5 The planned geographic scope of the World Heritage Site boundary(ies) and the potential impacts of possible buffer zones on adjacent land uses – and the need for clarification of these issues

The issues regarding the size of the WHS are all linked to ongoing requests for more information about the boundary(ies) that will be set as part of the WHS inscription process. There are concerns from some consultees that the determination of the boundary of the WHS will have an influence on some of the other issues discussed in this section of the report. Questions and issues raised throughout the consultation process include:

• What is the likely boundary for the Mount Lofty Ranges WHS!
• Will different boundary options result in the accrual of different levels of benefits, or a focus of benefits within the WHS to the detriment of the rest of the Greater Adelaide region?
• Will the boundary impact on any planning implications of WHS?
• Will there be buffer zones associated with the boundaries, and if so where will they be?

It will be essential to answer these questions, thereby addressing concerns and providing more clarity around key aspects of WHS inscription. This is especially true if the Mount Lofty Ranges bid goes forward, where clear communication of the planned boundary and clarification about any buffer zone will be vital. It is important to note, however, that the nomination bid manual specifically stipulates that the final boundaries of any site should not be delineated until the Outstanding Universal Value statement has been fully defined. UNESCO also reserves the right to determine the final boundaries. This will be discussed further in sections 6 through 9.

6.4.7 Negative connotations of ‘heritage’ as freezing the landscape in time, concerns about the image of Adelaide as ‘conservative’ and ‘anti-development’

Through the consultations it was identified that one of the concerns around the inscription of the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes as a WHS relates to the negative connotations of ‘heritage’. This also links to the need to communicate what the OUV of the site is to wider interested parties. Some of the concerns identified relate to a strong feeling that that WHS listing should not mean ‘frozen in time’ as the area is a living and working environment, and that this needs to continue, and not be negatively impacted on by WHS listing. These concerns were balanced by modern interpretations that regard heritage as an asset for economic development rather than a hindrance. This notion is reflected in recent initiatives to position the city of Adelaide as the heritage and design capital of Australia, for example, and in the WHS listing of Edinburgh, Scotland, and other European cities and cultural landscapes that are using heritage as a tool for reinvention. (See Section 3, and Appendix 1 for the related Integrated Design Commission principles and objectives of the Renew Adelaide initiative.)

References to the need to avoid the creation of a ‘museum’ link back to the issues identified previously about character preservation allowing, and indeed promoting, reasonable development that supports the agricultural, historical and tourism values. Many people recognise that while the agricultural landscape is the key to the area and should be the key to the WHS designation, it has evolved significantly over time through the combination of man and the environment to form a unique and universally significant mix, and needs to be allowed to continue to do so. As a result, the working group emphasises the need to communicate that WHS nomination has been conceived from the beginning as a positive pro-development strategy for the region.

Once again, clarity around what will be contained in the Statement of Significance, in the case of National Heritage listing and the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the WHS nomination, plus effective communication of the purpose of pursuing WHS listing, will help to address the concerns that exist around the connotations of heritage in the context of a Mount Lofty Ranges WHS bid.

6.4.8 Concerns about the costs of mounting the bid and the likelihood of success

As outlined in the letter from the then premier Mike Rann to the then CEO of the City of Onkaparinga, Jeff Tate, mounting a WHS bid is likely to need a not insignificant allocation of resources over a five to 10 year period, with no guarantee of success at the end of the process. It will require investment and support from the ground up, from local community groups through to the federal government; it will necessitate planning and management across several sectors including agriculture, tourism, regional planning and natural resource management; and it will need the
support and involvement of both the private and public sectors. While this may have been raised as a concern by some consultees, for the most part the prospect of pursuing a bid has been perceived as a visionary opportunity to bring all these parties together to plan and secure a desired future for the region, for a relatively small investment in comparison to potential returns, and with a concrete objective providing the incentive to do so.

For the majority who could see the powerful potential benefits of pursuing a bid, the reservations were more to do with the likelihood of achieving success. Many consultees were initially unable to see why the landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges are so special compared to other similar areas. This can perhaps be attributed to an education curriculum and common perceptions in the South Australian population which to date have focused on the story of Colonel Light and Governor Hindmarsh, and the surveying of the City of Adelaide, while neglecting to communicate the role of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the unique and universally significant story of systematic colonisation, the utopian ideals and philosophical movements on which the experiment was founded, and the involvement in that process of some of the greatest intellectuals of the 19th century. South Australian historians who have been consulted have, on the other hand, had no problem understanding and endorsing the validity of building a case for the global significance of the region based on that unique history and those universally significant associations (see Appendix 4). Other consultees were more accustomed to the listing of natural sites (the most common type of listing in Australia) rather than cultural sites, or they associated cultural sites with buildings rather than landscapes.

6.5 Implications of not proceeding

6.5.1 Loss of competitive edge
The food and wine regions of South Australia face ongoing challenges for their global competitiveness. Global market volatility, changing consumer preferences and customer demands are placing pressure on commodities. Understanding, maintaining and developing markets will be crucial in responding to these drivers, and to capturing new value-adding opportunities for the region’s food, wine and tourism industries. As import restrictions are lifted, there are additional new challenges for fruit growers in the Mount Lofty region, for example, who must now compete with cheaper imports. Neglecting to invest in value-adding opportunities such as WHS designation will increase the risk to all links in the food, wine and tourism chain.

For example, consumer perceptions regarding quality, safety and ethical values based on production system integrity are changing global food consumption patterns. Consumers are increasingly vigilant regarding the sustainability of the production and delivery systems including economic, social and environmental aspects behind the food they are buying. Failure to respond to consumer wants and needs through appropriate production, marketing and branding responses will inhibit the growth of profitable value chains.

Similarly, healthy and nutritional foods are becoming a key deliverable, not only for consumers but also for governments around the globe. The global obesity epidemic linked to changing lifestyle, as well as an ageing population, are driving the escalating rates of preventable chronic diseases often associated with unhealthy diets. Failure to take advantage of the opportunity to brand existing and new products to meet these shifts in global consumer patterns for healthier, nutritional and ethical food choices will also make South Australian products less competitive.

6.5.2 Missed land management opportunities
From an environmental perspective, South Australia’s food and wine industries have a strong dependence on natural resources and energy. The urgency of climate change and the need for early action requires a holistic approach across the value chain. Community expectations regarding
sustainable production will increase, and initiatives that respond to the scarcity of natural resources will be paramount. South Australia will need to be adaptive and considered to ensure sustained growth. Government failure to support integrated landscape approaches to sustainable agricultural production that involve the community from the ground up will put Adelaide’s peri-urban industries and communities at risk.

6.5.3 Missed tourism opportunities
With regard to the tourism industry, the attribute most strongly associated with South Australia is its ‘authentic and credible wineries’ followed by ‘wine and food’, but research shows that this cannot be taken for granted. SA Tourism has identified a significant competitive gap between trend and target growth, and South Australia still comes third to New South Wales and Victoria as a recognised food destination (Project Trend, BDA Marketing Planning, February, 2008). The research points out that these gaps will have to be bridged through ‘developing a more appealing and accessible SA of tomorrow based on our inherent strengths’. Additionally, the road ahead for food and wine tourism is likely to prove quite challenging as more states target and invest heavily in this opportunity, thereby potentially eroding Adelaide’s tourist market share. The same research clearly shows that new experiences and products will be required to create a greater sense of place, connection and exciting ‘new news’ about South Australia that will inspire people to visit the state and buy its produce while here, and through the state’s export markets. These issues are explored further under government policy alignments in Appendix 1.

6.5.4 Trends in land use change
The Econsearch (2012) analysis for the period 1996 to 2006 cited in Section 4 indicates a general decline in land use for agricultural purposes in each of the LGAs averaging 15 per cent per decade. It also reveals a decline in the average property size from 80 to 55 hectares (outside the Barossa). Additionally, independent research indicates that peri-urban agriculture, while occupying only two per cent of total agricultural lands in the state, contributes approximately 25 per cent of the state’s agricultural income (Horticulture Australia, 2008).

It is likely that residential development has contributed directly and indirectly to the recorded loss of agricultural land as a result of: fragmentation; ‘loss of critical mass’ leading to a decline in agricultural services and their viability; alienation of land for future agricultural production; and excision of land from future expansion of agricultural enterprises.

It has also been argued that the loss of agricultural land has a negative impact on regional economies in terms of reducing the value of production and therefore the viability of LGAs and decreasing employment in the agricultural sector (Horticulture Australia, 2008).

6.5.5 Conclusions regarding the implications of not pursuing World Heritage Site designation
To model the likely economic impact of a WHS inscription based on agrarian landscapes (cited in Section 4 and detailed in the separate report), EconSearch assumed a direct relationship between the area of agricultural land use in the region and the size of its agricultural sector. Likewise, they assumed that changes in the area of agricultural land use would have a corresponding impact on the regional economy. In order to operationalise these assumptions they examined trends in agricultural land use change across the study region and the Mount Lofty Ranges more generally. Their aim was to identify an average rate of change in the total area of agricultural land, such that could be used to project a ‘do nothing’ scenario 10 years into the future, and model the economic impact of inscription against this base case.
This was not an easy task. Lack of systematic data and monitoring of agricultural land use change is an acknowledged problem at state and national levels in Australia (Buxton et al. 2006; Budge, pers. comm. 2011; EPA 2012; Millar and Roots, 2012). Nevertheless, it was possible to derive a likely annual rate of agricultural land use change (-1.6 per cent per annum) based on data for the period 1996–2006. Projected forward, this would see a 15 per cent decline in the total area of agricultural land in the four LGAs over the 10 years of the modelling exercise. For the purpose of indicative modelling, this rate is reasonable and comparable with findings reported in similar Australian peri-urban circumstances (Buxton et al., 2007). However, agricultural land use change only occurs at a consistent annual rate in hindsight, and only after an averaging process. In real time, and especially within peri-urban regions, it is an unpredictable, often ‘lumpy’ phenomenon that can be subject to abrupt events that see major land use change occur within relatively short periods of time. Sometimes these changes arise out of circumstances within the agriculture sector itself, as happened following the commencement of the wine boom in the 1980s, and again after deregulation of the dairy industry in the 1990s. Sometimes they arise from events outside the sector.

Without seeking to prejudice the modelling reported above, it necessarily simplifies the agricultural land use change phenomenon and the challenge of understanding future trends, especially for a peri-urban region where development pressures are high and often surrounded by volatility. Indeed, there are reasons, quite apart from the suitability and choice of data, which mean that an average annual rate of land use change from the past decade may be a poor guide to the coming decade. As part of a feasibility study that seeks to make the case for WHS inscription, some additional dimensions of agricultural land use change should also be considered.

First, the rate of land use change used in the modelling is based on data for a period of historically low population growth and slow urban development activity in South Australia (DPLG, 2009). There is a chance that -1.6 per cent may prove conservative once growth pressures associated with new development projects and the state’s apparently revived economic fortunes begin to play out. In particular, proposals for major urban expansions at Roseworthy and Mount Barker will see not just an expanded resident population within those urban centres but there will very likely be significant spill-over development into their respective hinterlands. Likewise, the completion of the Northern Expressway and pending duplication of the Southern Expressway will increase accessibility to rural areas north and south of the city, as the South Eastern Freeway did for the central Adelaide Hills in the 1970s, and with similar results in terms of urban encroachment into the Hills (Ford, 1997; DPLG, 2009). Collectively these projects will stimulate the rural balance population of the study area during the coming decade.
to an extent that could not have been contemplated during the decade from 1996 to 2006.

Second, research in peri-urban districts consistently shows that the circumstances that predispose agricultural land to eventual conversion are set in train long before it is evident in the landscape or recorded in official data (Krushelnicki and Bell, 1989). Fragmentation and dilution of the ‘critical mass’ of farm activity needed to maintain the presence of infrastructure and service industries are often underway well before agricultural land is actually converted (Wu et al., 2011). In other words, agricultural land use change in the study region is unlikely to end neatly at the end of the 10-year modelling timeframe, and 15 per cent may not be the final quantum of land lost. Change processes starting now may take 10 years to be realised, and processes started in year 10 may still be playing out several years later.

In the study region and the wider Mount Lofty Ranges, this lag effect is clearly evident in the seemingly relentless process of ad hoc dwelling construction on vacant rural allotments, the majority of which have been in existence for many years. There has been only rudimentary examination of this phenomenon in South Australia (Houston and Balodick, 2007). However, councils in Melbourne’s peri-urban region have commissioned sophisticated modelling of the scenarios for agriculture, water resources and remnant native vegetation which are likely to unfold by 2040 as a result of these same ‘sleeper’ effects (Buxton et al., 2011). For a group of councils contemplating a WHS inscription based on agrarian landscapes in a similar peri-urban setting, an equivalent level of awareness about land use change processes that will inevitably challenge the integrity of those landscapes would seem desirable.

Mindful of these extra dimensions of land use change, the case for WHS listing takes on a different form. What started as a question about the feasibility of WHS inscription begins to look like a question about the feasibility of maintaining working agricultural landscapes and regional food, wine and tourism economies without something like WHS listing to catalyse a change of course. This conundrum is not a problem for councils that do not see agriculture as part of their long-term future; but for those that do, the place of agriculture in the regional landscape and regional economy cannot be left to a ‘business as usual’ policy stance. It will need a deliberate decision to engender a shift in public policy and in private behaviour, and multiple vehicles to carry that decision through.

In this regard it is important to note that strategic directions affecting agricultural land in the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and in the proposed Character Preservation legislation are still some way from fruition. Furthermore, neither of those initiatives proposes anything positive for local agri-food businesses. As observed frequently by North American researchers and commentators (Esses et al., 2008), land use policy can only mitigate negative pressures; what it fails to do is provide a context that can inspire and energise agri-food businesses. On the other hand, a WHS inscription would help inspire the food, wine and tourism economy of the region in ways that regulations could never do.

It has been a theme of this report to point out that the agricultural production values are not the only values lost when governments fail to intervene to prevent losses of agricultural land to housing. It seems reasonable to conclude that the consequences of ongoing land use change from agriculture to housing will incrementally impact on the viability of the entire food, wine and tourism economy of each LGA in the Mount Lofty Ranges region. That said, WHS listing alone will not necessarily reverse this trend, just as the proposed Character Preservation legislation of rural and heritage values and the strategic directions of the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide cannot guarantee the future economic viability of agriculture and tourism in the peri-urban arena. It is, however,
reasonable to conclude that a combination of policy approaches will be required to deliver on government directions for these regions, and that failure to include the pursuit of WHS listing in any policy package will likely undermine those espoused policy directions.

6.6 Conclusions regarding levels of in principle support for a bid

While WHS branding is not a guaranteed panacea to all the challenges outlined in the previous section, it does offer the potential of being a ‘rising tide that lifts all boats’, for a relatively small investment. If industry and government fail to take up the idea, it is likely to represent a lost opportunity for the state’s key food, wine and tourism sectors. Failure to recognise, protect and enhance the multiple values provided by Adelaide’s agricultural hinterland through all available means will only reinforce the ongoing threats to the long-term sustainability of the region. For those who ask the question ‘Why would we want to do this?’, an appropriate response might be ‘If we can, why wouldn’t we?’

It is important to note that as publicity has been generated around the Mount Lofty Ranges feasibility study, businesses and potential individual ‘bid champions’ have been contacting the working group to express their interest and support for the concept. While it is premature to make these names public, they will all be invited to read the feasibility study and related economic impacts report and to participate in future discussions if the bid proceeds to the next stage.

By providing clarity around all the issues of concern to stakeholders and clarity about what the bid will be defining as its OUV, and by effectively communicating this information in an appropriate format to government, businesses and the wider community, the result will be a clearer picture in terms of the level of engagement, buy-in and appreciation of the purpose of pursuing WHS listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges region, and the likely implications of failing to do so."
7. THE BID PROCESS

National Heritage Listing

The Tentative List

World Heritage Nomination

Source: Stephanie Johnston
FIGURE 7.1 The bid process

7.1 National Heritage listing and the Tentative List

Only the Australian government can nominate a site for World Heritage Site (WHS) listing, and only sites that are on Australia’s Tentative List can be put forward. The Tentative List is taken from sites that are on the National Heritage List. There will therefore be two distinct stages in the WHS bid process. The first stage will involve nomination for National Heritage listing, and the working group envisages that the participating councils and key partners would be invited to commit to this nomination process. The Australian Heritage Council (AHC) assesses if a National Heritage List-nominated place is considered to have heritage value, and is required to advise the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities if the place meets one or more of nine National Heritage List criteria.

As well as assessing a place against criteria for its heritage value, the AHC is required to apply a 'significance threshold' test to judge the level of significance of a place’s heritage value by asking, ‘How important are these values?’ To reach the threshold for the National Heritage List, a place must have ‘outstanding’ heritage value to the nation – to be important to the Australian community as a whole. To determine whether a place has outstanding heritage value, it is compared to other similar places. This allows the AHC to determine if one place is ‘more’ or ‘less’ significant compared to other similar places, or if it is unique. The degree of significance can also relate to the geographic area; for instance, the extent of a place's significance locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

A useful case study for the working group has been the successful national nomination of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout by the Adelaide City Council (ACC). The site is on the National Heritage List because, among other things, it signifies a turning point in the settlement of Australia. According to the National Heritage List Summary Statement of Significance: ‘It was the first place in

Key message:
In the case of National Heritage listing the Australian Heritage Council is not bound by the nominated boundaries and values put forward by the nominee(s), and is free to develop its own definition of the property, and the associated values. Similarly, for WHS listing the UNESCO Committee has the final say on the criteria under which a site is subscribed, the associated values statement, and the final scope of the boundaries of the property.
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Australia to be planned and developed, not as a penal settlement or military outpost, but as a place for free settlers.’ (DSEWPaC, 2008).

**National Heritage List criteria**
The National Heritage criteria against which the heritage values of a place are assessed are:
a. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history
b. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history
c. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history
d. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of:
   i. a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
   ii. a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments;
e. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group
f. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period
g. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
h. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history
i. the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance as part of Indigenous tradition.


**FIGURE 7.2 National Heritage list criteria**

The site was listed under six of the nine National Heritage List criteria, and the process from nomination to acceptance took three years. In a workshop with the working group, an ACC staff member shared her knowledge of the nomination process, which involved working with the AHC to refine the final nomination documents. The ACC has also conducted budget scenarios for WHS nomination of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout site, and shared that information. A key message to emerge from the workshop was the need to address the criteria with a comprehensive description of the related values early in the nomination process, along with the development of a Statement of Significance, so that the inscription clearly presents a set of values against which the self-assessment of plans, policies and development proposals can be conducted. That said, the AHC is not bound by the nominated boundaries and values put forward, and is free to develop its own definition of the property and associated values.

Each year, the (federal) Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities invites nominations to the National and Commonwealth Heritage lists in accordance with an annual assessment cycle. However, a nomination may be made at any time. For example, nominations for the July 2012 to June 2013 assessment period closed at the end of February 2012, but any nomination received after the end of February would join the list for assessment in the next period. Anyone can nominate a place with outstanding heritage values, including the minister and the AHC. State government involvement in the nomination process is not required, so an ongoing local government/university based working group could submit the nomination. However, given the process is political, support from the state government is seen as essential. Nominations must set out the qualities or values of the nominated place that make it outstanding to the nation by indicating how the place meets one or more of the National Heritage criteria. There is
then a process by which a Priority Assessment List is developed and finalised, and public comment is sought. Once on the finalised Priority Assessment List there are time limits on the AHC assessment process, with a maximum of five years in extensions allowed (DSEWPaC website).

Another useful case study is the only working agricultural landscape on the National and World Heritage lists that is listed for its agricultural values. Brickendon Estate in Northern Tasmania is listed as a rare example of a property that has been continuously farmed by generations of the same family since the 1820s. It is a 458-hectare mixed farming property with boundaries corresponding closely to the 1820s land grant. The property contains a set of pre-1850s farm buildings and a Georgian country house dating from 1829–1830. Since William Archer commenced farming in 1824 the property has remained in the ownership of his direct descendants, has been lived in by seven generations of the Archer family, and is still managed as a working farm on the extensive alluvial soils of the Macquarie River floodplain. Although some crops grown at Brickendon are relatively new arrivals, notably poppies, many others have been grown on the estate since its early days, including barley and wheat. Just as it did in the 1820s, Brickendon continues to function as a mixed farm and, in addition to agricultural produce, approximately 2000 sheep are run on the property.

According to its National Heritage listing Statement of Significance, ‘Brickendon provides an outstanding record of the experiences of colonial settlers and convicts assigned to rural estates’. It is deemed nationally significant for its association with the convict assignment system, and as a designed landscape that provides a record of continuous mixed farming practice. The estate is listed under three of the nine National Heritage List criteria as follows:

(a) The place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place’s importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia’s natural or cultural history.

(b) The place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place’s possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia’s natural or cultural history.

(c) The place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place’s potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia’s natural or cultural history.

Source: DSEWPaC website

The property went on to attain WHS status as a part of the Australian Convict Sites bid, under WH criteria (iv) and (vi) for its Outstanding Universal Significance as:

(a) An exceptional example of the forced migration of convicts – an important stage of human history (criterion iv).

(b) An extraordinary example of global ideas and developments associated with the punishment and reform of the criminal elements of humanity during the Age of Enlightenment and the modern era (criterion vi).

Source: DSEWPaC website

As discussed in Section 2, the case for National Heritage listing of the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes will be based around Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s and the 19th-century utilitarian movement’s influence on Australia’s early development from a penal colony to a settler colony, and in particular the influence of Wakefield’s theory of systematic colonisation on land policy and the early agrarian surveying of South Australia, where small settlements and family owned farm holdings continue to be a part of the modern agricultural landscape.
7.2 World Heritage listing Stage One

It is likely that the preparation of nomination documents and the nomination process for National Heritage listing will occur concurrently with the first stage of preparation for nomination for World Heritage listing. While the timeline for this cannot be easily predicted, DSEWPaC estimates a three- to five-year year process for achieving National Heritage listing (and the completion Stage One of the World Heritage bid process). The steps for preparing Stage One of a WHS nomination are outlined below; however, it is important to note that nomination at the national level only requires establishing outstanding significance to the nation, whereas nomination at the world level requires OUV to be established.

- Establish prima facie evidence of OUV to the nation, and to the world, including authenticity and integrity (comparative analysis).

- Establish whether the site falls into an under-represented category on the National and World Heritage lists and how it relates to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee Global Strategy (gap analysis).

- Establish the extent to which the site is subject to development pressures which might affect OUV, and how this will be managed.

- Establish the extent to which there is international cooperation or linkages to be followed up actively.

- Establish whether the application could be viewed as an extension to an existing site.

The World Heritage Resource Manual (UNESCO, 2011b) offers the following advice for this first stage of the WHS bid process.

7.2.1 Gather existing information on the property

As a preliminary to any nomination it is helpful to assemble what is known and whether more work is needed on:

- Research – is existing research relevant to the nomination adequate or is more needed to articulate the values and to understand the global and cultural contexts of the property’s history and attributes?

- Inventories – what inventories documenting the property exist and is further work needed to complete or update them?

- Documentation – referring to the many categories of information required in the nomination format: what exists to be able to complete the nomination and what more might be needed?

- Stakeholder analysis – who needs to be involved in the nomination, including who lives or has direct relationships with the property? What are the social, economic and political realities of the property?

Source: UNESCO 2011b
7.2.2 Setting up a team
According to UNESCO (2010), preparing a WHS nomination usually requires a team approach because of the complexity of the task, the range of key stakeholders, and the breadth of expertise required. It is usually helpful to compile a list of key stakeholders as a first step in forming a team. In the South Australian context this list would include many of those consulted to date, including or representing landowners, primary producers and processors, federal government and state government agencies, national and local heritage agencies, Regional Development Australia and Natural Resource Management boards, the Aboriginal nations associated with the site, local communities, environmental and heritage groups, universities, researchers and academics, local businesses, tourism operators, and user groups (such as bushwalking, cycling and equestrian groups).

The range of contributors on the team should reflect the range of values of the nominated property, and ideally should include experts who have some understanding of the property within an international context. These stakeholders and experts should be part of or be represented on the nomination team, or at least have direct access and input to the work of the team. According to the UNESCO manual, the team membership should have some flexibility to take account of the possibility of emerging interests, and ‘it is usually essential to identify a single project leader who can take responsibility for managing the complete nomination process and delivering the final document’ (UNESCO 2011b).

The team can be important in many ways, including fostering support at local, national and international levels for the nominations, and for long-term protection and management of the property (in this case the agricultural landscape). According to UNESCO it may be useful to have a small core team to work on the nominations themselves, and a larger reference group to support the work. It may also be helpful to establish specialist technical or scientific advisory group(s) at different stages of the process, to support the development of the values statements and significance statements, to develop the comparative analysis, and to assist with community and stakeholder engagement. Possible management structures for pursuing the bid will be explored further in Section 9.3.

7.2.3 Resources and stakeholder participation
It is important to stress the need for a realistic work plan; a rushed nomination is not likely to be satisfactory and is more likely to encounter problems during evaluation. Stakeholder participation and community engagement should also be a priority from the start of the process, through to the ongoing management of the property. There are many reasons for this, including the need to develop a shared understanding of the property and a common purpose for pursuing the bid. UNESCO also suggests that the nomination team might, with some changes, play an ongoing role after inscription in promoting, protecting, managing and monitoring the property and implementing the strategic management framework for the site. The nomination team for pursuing both the national listing and the UNESCO listing is likely to evolve over the nomination process, and will also need adequate skills, resources and funding to support their work. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 8.3.

7.3 World Heritage listing Stage Two
Once National Heritage listing has been achieved and Stage One of the UNESCO process is completed, the working group envisages that further state and federal support will be needed to make the World Heritage Tentative List and to proceed through Stage Two of the UNESCO nomination process. While the timeline for this phase of the bid also cannot be easily predicted and
is likely to be subject to political support over time, the working group envisages a three- to five-year process for completing the steps outlined in the UNESCO Operational Guidelines (2011a):

- Gather evidence that the site is the best or most representative example nationally and internationally of the kind of cultural or natural heritage which it represents.

- Demonstrate how the application meets the requirements of the global strategy and the gap studies.

- Provide evidence of strong local support for the application.

- Make the Tentative List.

- Propose arrangements for future site management in ways which will protect its OUV, including necessary funding.

- Where appropriate, identify the support we would be able to offer to a country or countries whose heritage is under-represented on the World Heritage List.

Source: UNESCO 2011a

The final timeframes within which each stage can be completed will depend on political will and the funding available. This is explored further in Section 8.
8. THE KEY STEPS

8.1 Defining and understanding the property in the context of National Heritage listing and World Heritage listing

Developing a thorough understanding of the proposed site will be vital to developing successful nominations at the national and international level, as noted in 8.2.1. The key steps in the nomination bid are outlined in this section.

8.1.1 Identifying and defining potential Outstanding National and Universal Value of the landscape and settlement patterns of the Mount Lofty Ranges in the context of national criteria and World Heritage criteria

A fundamental part of World Heritage Site (WHS) nomination is being able to demonstrate why a property should be considered to have potential Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Ideally, this is set out when a property is put on the Tentative List and developed from its National Heritage listing Statement of Significance. As previously highlighted, a National Statement of Significance for the Mount Lofty Ranges bid would likely refer to Wakefield’s systematic colonisation scheme as being a turning point in Australia’s history, whereas an OUV statement would present the Wakefield scheme within the context of 19th-century world history, of evolving European social and economic theory and colonial experiments throughout the ‘new world’.

Identifying and defining these values will require a mixture of knowledge and methodology. UNESCO advises that it is usually helpful to structure this process initially to bring out as far as possible all the values of the property, with a view to establishing which of these might provide the basis for supporting a WHS nomination over time. These definitions of the value(s) should be set out in a relatively short text that will eventually form part of the formal Statement of OUV. The text should be a brief synthesis, not necessarily in distinct sections, setting out:

- An evocation of the property (in this case an agricultural landscape) and what it consists of – a word picture for those who do not know it, its character and especially for cultural properties, its meaning and the ‘stories’ associated with it.
- Why the landscape could be considered to be of potential OUV.
- A summary of the attributes (physical and conceptual) that convey the potential OUV of the landscape.
Identification of the meaning and relative value of a site should start with the identification of which of UNESCO’s related themes provide the context for the assessment. For example, the UNESCO Gap Analysis (UNESCO, 2005) identifies ‘cultural associations’, ‘human interaction in society’ and ‘branches of knowledge’ as themes. Other themes include ‘utilisation of natural resources’ (with ‘agriculture and food production’ a subcategory) and ‘movement of peoples’ (with ‘migration’ the relevant subcategory). The thematic assessment then proceeds to the chronological-regional assessment (likely to be based around European colonialism of the 19th century) and finally defines the typology to be proposed (in this case, a cultural landscape). The statement thus encapsulates the whole rationale for the nomination and proposed inscription. It is important to note that while the focus of the WHS nomination must be of potential OUV, properties will invariably have local and national values as well. These other levels of value should also be understood and, where appropriate, link to the OUV in the final statement.

8.1.2 Identifying attributes and features of the Mount Lofty Ranges landscape and settlements that reflect their Outstanding Universal Value

Having considered what the potential OUV of the site might be, it will be essential to consider the attributes or features that convey the potential OUV and allow an understanding of that value. These attributes will be the focus of protection and management actions and institutional arrangements, and they will inform the boundary(ies) of the site. Attributes might be physical qualities or built fabric, but they can also be processes associated with a site that impact on physical qualities, such as natural or agricultural processes and social arrangements or cultural practices that have shaped the landscape. As discussed in Section 1.4, the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape bid will encompass both the physical attributes of the landscape and township settlements, as well as the historical and contemporary ideals, theories, processes and policies that continue to shape them. It is envisaged that the working group’s mapping analysis will help illuminate the relationship between these attributes and also highlight conflicts or management issues, as well as assist with the delineation of the final boundaries.

8.1.3 Checking potential Outstanding Universal Value against World Heritage criteria and identifying appropriate criteria

An integral part of the process of demonstrating potential OUV is to justify one or more of the World Heritage criteria (listed in Section 2). There should be a clear and logical connection between the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the selection of criteria. If this connection is not clear then this could indicate that the selection of criteria is not appropriate for the property and needs reconsideration.

Only one criterion needs to be satisfied for a property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List (although in the case of criterion (vi), the UNESCO committee considers that it should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria). UNESCO advises that there is no necessity or particular advantage in trying to nominate a property under as many criteria as possible if they are not well supported by the research and documentation of specific value and attributes.

The text must go beyond merely asserting that the selected criteria are satisfied, and it must explain why the property justifies each of the criteria. It should also identify the attributes or features that convey the potential OUV. For example, with criterion (iv), the testimony should avoid saying that the landscape illustrates a significant stage in human history without explaining what that stage is, and how it can be perceived through the attributes of the landscape and settlement patterns.
Similarly for criteria (v) and (vi), the reasons why the landscape is an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, how it is tangibly associated with ideas of universal significance, and why those ideas are significant must be explained. Through the identification of physical and non-physical attributes, the testimony should also demonstrate whether and how the ideas of universal significance can be appreciated or experienced in some way in the landscape, and this must be demonstrated in the global agricultural/migration context. In summary, the context should be clear and the reasons why the property is an outstanding example in the established context should be detailed.

8.1.4 Assessing ‘authenticity’ and ‘integrity’ as defined by UNESCO

Authenticity is a measure of how well the identified attributes convey potential OUV. Integrity is a measure of the completeness or intactness of those attributes. Accordingly, a clear understanding of the potential OUV is required before it is possible to assess the authenticity or the integrity of the site.

The UNESCO Operational Guidelines suggest that the following types of attribute might be used in assessing authenticity:

- form and design;
- materials and substance;
- use and function;
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language and other forms of intangible heritage; and
- spirit and feeling.

Source: UNESCO, 2011b

The assessment of integrity needs to set out how the collection of features, processes and/or attributes that convey potential OUV are contained within the boundaries, that the site does not have substantial parts that have lost their values, or parts where none of the relevant features or attributes are present, and that the property exhibits a satisfactory state of conservation and its values are not threatened. UNESCO requires a rational justification for the selection of the area to be nominated.

Examples of some questions that could be used in the authenticity assessment of the landscape attributes are provided in Figure 8.2.

UNESCO also provides the following examples of questions that might be useful in the integrity assessment:

- Are the key features and attributes of the property that carry potential OUV whole or intact?
- Does the property include all the elements necessary to express its potential OUV?
- Is the property of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey its significance?
• What is the condition of the key features and attributes of the property, and are they well conserved / in good condition?

• In the case of cultural landscapes, historic towns or other living cultural properties, are the processes, relationships and dynamic functions essential to their distinctive character maintained and in a robust state?

Source: UNESCO, 2011b

Figure 8.2 Authenticity assessment of how well the identified attributes convey potential OUV.

8.1.5 Comparative analysis with other sites

According to the World Heritage Resource Manual (UNESCO, 2011b), the purpose of the comparative analysis is to ascertain (i) whether there is scope in the World Heritage List for the inclusion of the nominated site by comparing the nominated site with other similar sites already inscribed, and (ii) to demonstrate, in the case of cultural sites, that there are no comparable sites in the same geo-cultural area with similar values that could be nominated in the future. The geo-cultural area varies according to the values expressed by the property and might be defined at the regional level or worldwide.

Given that systematic colonisation theory, the associated ‘survey before selection’ doctrine, ‘vicinity maximising’ principle, and the ‘South Australian experiment’ in general also impacted on land policy and subsequent settlement patterns in other parts of Australia, New Zealand and Canada, it is likely
that a comparative analysis will need to look at relevant agricultural landscapes in those regions, notwithstanding that the South Australian colony is likely to be viewed as the first holistic attempt to put those colonisation theories into practice. Also, there are only a dozen or so agricultural landscapes on the World Heritage List, and only a few of those are working landscapes, so there will be few available comparative sites on the existing list. At the time of writing, Val D’Orcia in Tuscany provides the closest comparative model, with ‘an idealized model of good governance’ being the basis for the listing of that working landscape.

Finally, the comparative analysis must draw conclusions. Thorough and objective comparative analyses greatly contribute to successful nominations. According to the World Heritage Resource Manual, the result of the comparative analysis may lead to three different outcomes:

- The property ranks highly when compared with similar properties and can fill a critical gap on the World Heritage List, and the State Party should go ahead with its nomination process.
- The property ranks at a low level when compared with similar properties and it does not fill any gap on the World Heritage List, and the State Party may wish to carefully reconsider the nomination of the property.
- The property ranks at the same level of importance as other similar properties. This may also indicate that the case for potential OUV is relatively weak or a borderline case. If there are only a small number of other high-ranking sites, then this might indicate the potential to enlarge or link the concept to other properties in a serial and/or transnational nomination.

Source: UNESCO, 2011b

8.1.6 Writing Statements of Outstanding National Significance and Outstanding Universal Value

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is one of the most difficult and important tasks in writing a good nomination and it requires careful consideration. According to UNESCO the statement should be:

- A powerful description of the potential OUV to inform future protection, conservation, management and monitoring. The statement should be capable of explaining the property’s value and attributes to decision-makers, politicians and the general public.
- The strongest statement of value that can be made for the property, and a description of the attributes that convey the value.
- A robust justification of the chosen criteria.
- Concise – sufficient to convey information about the most important features of the property.
- Written to engage a wide range of people, and if possible avoid jargon and specialised language.

Key message: The team should actively review the OUV throughout the process.

Source: UNESCO, 2011b

The work required to develop the Statement of OUV can also establish a shared understanding among all those involved in the nomination process about the potential value of the property. The statement also underpins all sections of the nomination dossier – the description, justification, conservation, protection, management and monitoring. Finally, the same objectives and principles apply to the development of the Statement of Outstanding National Significance that is required for the Stage One National Heritage listing nomination.
8.1.7 Establishing robust boundaries that encompasses the potential Outstanding Universal Value

According to UNESCO there should be an explicit rationale or explanation for the chosen boundary, and this should be included in the integrity section of the nomination dossier. In summary:

- The property boundaries must encompass the attributes necessary to meet the condition of integrity, that is a complete and intact set of attributes that convey potential OUV.
- Boundaries must be logical and defensible in relation to the identification of attributes that convey the value of the property.
- Boundaries must be clearly defined in relation to the legal protection and management of the property.
- Boundaries should be readily identifiable if they are to be useful for management and they will often be based on physical features and sometimes on natural features.
- Boundaries may also be based on human-made features such as roads, which may often be critical features in relation to management. However, more care is needed with using such features to ensure that the area enclosed meets the condition of integrity.
- Good-quality mapping of boundaries is essential.
- It is also essential that the establishment of boundaries (including zoning schemes) within a nominated property is carried out in conjunction with defining the management priorities and requirements for the property, and with effective stakeholder engagement.

Source: UNESCO, 2011b

In the context of determining the boundaries, it is important to note that every World Heritage property needs protection and management arrangements for activities outside the property, including in their immediate setting. Buffer zones are one commonly used means to achieve this protection and management. However, a buffer zone is not always a requirement if, as outlined in the Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2011a), there are also legal, regulatory and other methods available to protect the site from wider threats. These may include recognition in land use plans or development regulations, or ensuring landscape-level connectivity between protected areas under the EPBC Act. It will therefore be necessary to ascertain, during the nomination process, whether or not buffer zones will be required for the proposed agricultural landscapes.

8.1.8 Describing the present state of protection and any threats or pressures

Threats to or pressures on the potential OUV of the nominated property are an important consideration in the assessment process. The UNESCO Operational Guidelines mention four such factors – development, environmental, natural disasters, and visitors/tourism (UNESCO, 2011a). Accordingly, the information provided about the state of conservation of the nominated property should be realistic and supported by evidence, and not overstated on the one hand or understated on the other. For example, claims that a property is in good condition must reflect reality, and substantial threats should not be ignored or downplayed. In addition, trends are vital to understand the situation – ‘good and improving’ is dramatically different to ‘good and deteriorating’. It is therefore likely that the introduction of Character Preservation legislation and the existing planning policy and land management documents will help establish that the Mount Lofty Ranges area is classified as the former. A key task of the evaluation mission is to check and report on threats, including looking for evidence of threats that have not been reported.

8.1.9 Management and monitoring

Nominated properties need to demonstrate that they have an adequate management plan or documented management system to define their management arrangements. If neither of these is in place, it is important to set realistic timeframes for their development, and this may impact on the nomination timetable. Importantly, management plans and documented systems should be put
forward as tried and tested arrangements rather than ‘paper’ plans that will be implemented in the future.

In the case of the Mount Lofty Ranges area, it is likely that the site management system will be an amalgamation of the various existing planning and NRM systems, with a possible overarching WHS strategic management framework that is a relatively simple reference document designed to focus on maintaining and enhancing the identified WHS values, and able to be aligned with all other related planning and management documents over time. In the case of a large area such as the Mount Lofty Ranges, which involves several stakeholders and jurisdictions, it is not necessary to create a specific management authority for the site – if the existing management plans or systems are working well. It may be useful, however, to maintain an ongoing management team, perhaps evolved from the original nomination steering committee, whose role would be to monitor the site in the context of its strategic management framework. According to UNESCO’s advice, a nomination for a property which does not have satisfactory management systems in place will struggle to achieve World Heritage inscription (UNESCO 2011b).

Similarly, the World Heritage system includes formal periodic reporting whereby inscribed sites are subject to monitoring reports that every six years assess the property in the context of the maintenance of its OUV. A monitoring process should therefore be part of any strategic management framework, and the nomination dossier should include key indicators that relate to the attributes that convey potential OUV. Monitoring should be undertaken regularly, according to a timeframe that is appropriate to the character of the property. In the case of a large site this may be in the vicinity of every 6 years. An important issue is who undertakes the monitoring, as this can influence the real or apparent credibility of the monitoring results. In general, monitoring will have greater credibility if undertaken in a transparent way by relevant and independent experts. A few snapshots of Australian site management structures are provided in Section 9.

8.1.10 Preparing the nomination file and the evaluation process
A World Heritage nomination is, in essence, the official application form for World Heritage designation. It is an official document that is submitted to UNESCO by the relevant State Party (in this case the Australian government), or two or more state parties in the case of transnational nominations. The purpose of the nomination dossier is to set out as clearly as possible:

- What the property consists of and how it is documented.
- Why it has potential OUV.
- The state of conservation and the factors affecting the property.
- How the property is to be protected, conserved, managed, presented and monitored in relation to its potential OUV.

In the case of a Mount Lofty Ranges bid, the dossier is likely to be prepared by the Australian government through DSEWPaC in consultation with the state government through DENR, who in turn would consult with the locally based project management team and its associated advisory groups. The whole nomination process is led by the federal government, and funded by a combination of federal and state government funding. This is discussed further in the following section.
The nomination is the basis for the evaluation of the property for the World Heritage List, and subsequent decision by the World Heritage Committee whether or not to inscribe it on the list. In carrying out its evaluation of nominations of cultural properties, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) is guided by the Operational Guidelines (UNESCO 2011a). The evaluation process involves consultation with the wide range of expertise represented by the membership of ICOMOS and its national and international committees, as well as the many other specialist networks with which it is linked. Members are also sent on expert missions to carry out confidential onsite evaluations. This extensive consultation results in the preparation of detailed recommendations that are submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its annual meetings.
8.2 How will we manage the bid process?

As mentioned previously, the advice from DSEWPaC and the Adelaide City Council is that the current structure of a working group made up of local government representatives and a University of Adelaide-based administrative structure could develop the case and apply for National Heritage listing and undertake Stage One of the World Heritage nomination process (as described in Section 7.2). While this could proceed with or without the support of the state government, the working group advises that in principle support from the South Australian government be formally established before proceeding with the National Heritage List nomination.

As discussed in Section 7.2, it would also make sense for the preliminary steps of pursuing WHS listing to be conducted at the same time as National Heritage listing nomination. This would require the involvement of state government agencies, in particular a representative from DENR and ideally representatives from PIRSA, DPTI and SA Tourism (as well as local government representatives) in forming a preliminary project management team, along with the establishment of a broader scope steering group.

A useful case study here has been the structure that has been adopted by the Lake District bid (a similar working agricultural landscape bid that is currently in progress) which has a core ‘Project Management Group’ that meets regularly, a larger ‘Project Steering Group’ (chaired by a high-profile identity) that meets a couple of times a year to oversee the work of the management team, an employed project director, and a number of technical advisory groups that are sourced and activated from the broader steering group at different stages of the bid process – to address such items as cost-benefit analysis, stakeholder and community engagement, and the preparation of the nomination dossier (Figure 8.5).
In the case of the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges bid, it is likely that some of the advisory groups, including a management plan group (or strategic management framework group), would come into existence further down the track, during Stage Two, when DSEWPaC takes over the nomination process.

Stage One’s management structure would therefore involve the establishment of a project management team, ideally involving both local and state government representatives, who would go about engaging with industry and the wider community to form the project steering group that would oversee the management team’s bid for National Heritage listing, and secure state government as well as industry support and commitment to pursuing tentative listing and World Heritage listing. It is envisaged that both teams would continue to be supported by an independent coordinator/secretariat administered by the University of Adelaide during Stage One.

Should the nomination proceed to Stage Two, it is likely that DSEWPaC would take over leadership of the project in ongoing consultation the South Australian-based project management team and steering group, most likely through DENR representatives. It is also envisaged that the management team and steering group would adapt and evolve over time to meet the needs of the federal government-led process. As discussed in the previous two sections, the management team and steering group could also eventually evolve into a steering committee or management team that oversees the ongoing monitoring, marketing and strategic management of the site, after WHS listing.
8.3 How long will it take?

With early local and state government commitment to supporting the process it is likely that Stage One could be completed within three years from a decision to proceed. Without early commitment from the state government, a three- to five-year timeframe may be more realistic. The working group has structured the Stage One budget detailed in Appendix 3 so that pursuit of National Heritage listing could be achieved by an ongoing partnership of the four participating councils over three years. A ‘slow track’ scenario would thus be to complete the two aspects of Stage One sequentially over five years (National Heritage listing followed by World Heritage Site (WHS) preparation), whereas a ‘fast track’ scenario would be to conduct those two tasks simultaneously, over three years, with local and state government, as well as industry support. The working group recommends that local and state government support be secured early for a ‘fast-track’ approach that would involve commitment from both tiers of government to complete Stage One within three years.

Similarly, the Stage Two timeline will be entirely dependent on the commitment of the state government and subsequent support of the federal government, which is in turn likely to be influenced by the commitment of industry and community to the whole process. It is, however, possible for a bid to go all the way through to the completion of the written nomination dossier, and then to be unsuccessful in achieving federal government ministerial support to proceed to a formal submission to UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. The working group therefore advises that the project steering group aim to secure bipartisan support for the initiative during Stage One of the bid process. The working group has also based the budget range outlined below and more fully in Appendix 3 on completing Stage Two of the process within a three- to five-year timeframe. The assumption therefore is that while the nomination may be a ‘stop/start’ process over time, the actual amount of time (and related budget) specifically allocated to pursuing the bid would be six years in total over the two stages.

8.4 How much will it cost?

The budget outline in Appendix 3 is based on a 2007 analysis of UK WHS bids by PricewaterhouseCoopers, discussions with DSEWPaC and the Adelaide City Council, and information provided by the Lake District World Heritage Project. It follows the suggested Stage One and Stage Two approach and includes the budget for the completed preliminary stage (incorporating the completion of this feasibility study and the related EconSearch economic analysis). As mentioned in the previous section, while the timeline could range from three to five years for completion of each of Stage One and Stage Two, meaning up to 10 years (or even longer) for completion of the nomination process, the working group’s budget is based on a ‘fast-track’ scenario, whereby the process is completed in six years, starting in July 2012. It is assumed that should the process take longer (i.e., the likely scenario of a ‘stop/start’ process occurring along the way), the projected budget allocations would be approximately the same, but would be spread over a longer period of time. Some adjustments have therefore been made for inflation over 10 years, and a budget range based on those inflation adjustments is provided where appropriate.
It is important to note that the overall investment associated with WHS nomination is difficult to define due to the fact that the sites are so different in terms of ownership, scale, nature and location. In particular, a significant amount of investment is tied up in the time input from partners (and these inputs are particularly hard to define), with the total investment being largely related to the number of partners and the nature of their involvement. The research and case studies suggest that the larger and more complex the ownership of the site, the larger the partnership that is required to develop the bid. PricewaterhouseCoopers use an average number of partners of 13; however, the working group has used the modal number of eight, representing four local government partners and four state and federal agencies for the core project management team. The University of Adelaide is also identified as an 'in kind' partner. While many more industry and community partners will be involved in the larger steering group over time, that group is only likely to meet twice a year, so such 'in kind' contribution is not included in the budget.

In summary, the investment associated with becoming a WHS under the recommended 'coordinator model' outlined by PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007) is likely to be in seven main areas over both Stage One and Two. These include:

(i) **The time for a WHS coordinator**: The staff costs, overheads and administration time associated with coordination of the many partners and processes involved in a bid, which is covered through a dedicated coordinator in most cases. The dedicated coordinator model is recommended by the UNESCO manuals and those who have had experience of mounting a bid. The working group therefore recommends that an independent part-time coordinator be appointed to oversee Stage One of the process, and points out that DSEWPaC is likely to take over that role should the bid proceed to Stage Two.

(ii) **Local, state and federal government partner time** The staff time of local, state and federal government partners involved in the bid, plus University of Adelaide partner time.

(iii) **Consultation and communications** The costs involved in industry consultation, public consultation, stakeholder engagement, and media communications over six years.

(iv) **The production costs of the two nomination dossiers (National List and World List)** The costs associated with document production and photography, which is an important aspect of WHS bidding, given the criteria for inscription.

(v) **The cost of supporting studies** The costs associated with external supporting studies, which are not a direct requirement of WHS bidding but which are an essential aspect of a good nomination or management framework. These are variable and are not included in the total actual and in-kind budgets, although an indication of budget range is provided.

(vi) **The cost of supporting projects**: These are projects undertaken independently by government partners, industry and community that will support the bid preparation. These are necessarily variable and are not included in the total actual and in-kind budgets, although an indication of range is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>$269-$279K</td>
<td>$200K</td>
<td>$469-$479K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-kind</strong></td>
<td>$136-$146K</td>
<td>$680-$728K</td>
<td>$816-$874K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$405-$425K</td>
<td>$880-$928K</td>
<td>$1285-$1353K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ supporting study costs
+ supporting project costs

Figure 8.6 Estimated actual and in-kind costs of a two-stage nomination process.
(vii) Development of the management plan or strategic management framework:
As with other areas of WHS bidding and management, the development of the management framework
does not follow a consistent process but in general appears to have been either (i) outsourced to
consultants or (ii) undertaken predominantly by WHS coordinators. The working group has made the
assumption that the strategic management framework will be prepared internally by the DSEWPac
coordinator in consultation with state-based stakeholders, and that the associated documentation and
photography costs or creating the framework will be covered by the overall production budget.

The projected budget for the proposed two stages of the bidding process is shown in Figure 8.6 (and
detailed in Appendix 3).

8.5 Who will pay?

8.5.1 Funding of Stage One
The working group recommends that the four councils that have participated in this feasibility study
(the Adelaide Hills Council, The Barossa Council, the District Council of Mount Barker and the City
of Onkaparinga) commit to partner with (a) state government agency(ies) to fund the actual costs of
Stage One of the nomination process. The suggested level of commitment is $10,000 per council per
annum over three years, starting from July 2012 and totaling $120,000. This figure represents the total
‘actual’ amount that would need to be contributed by local government to the entire project budget from
here on.

The working group also recommends a state government commitment, possibly through PIRSA or
SA Tourism (or a suitable combination of state government agencies), of $50,000 per annum or
$150,000 over three years to make up the $269,000 estimated total budget for completion of Stage
One. (This expands to $279,000 if the process takes longer.) An additional ‘in-kind’ budget of
around $136,000 in partner time would likely involve a project management team made up of the
participating councils and representatives of state agencies such as DENR, PIRSA, DPTI and SA
Tourism. It is anticipated that this stage of the project would be supported further through the
separate funding of supporting projects and supporting studies by a combination of the public,
private and university sectors, and the establishment of a not-for-profit foundation or similar public
fundraising mechanism.

The $269,000 of local and state government funding would go towards paying a part-time
coordinator to manage the Stage One of the bid process over three years, including the formation of
a project management team and project steering group as described in Section 8.2. It would also
support stakeholder and public engagement, communications, research, documentation and
photography. It is proposed that the University of Adelaide’s School of Agriculture, Food and Wine
administer the budget. The anticipated outcomes at the end of three years would be:

(i) National Heritage nomination delivered to DSEWPac and assessment undertaken;
(ii) Definition of the site and drafting of a preliminary Statement of OUV for World Heritage
nomination based on initial research and stakeholder engagement;
(iii) Achievement of state government and federal government support for putting the Mount Lofty
Ranges agrarian landscapes site forward to the Tentative List, subject to it attaining National
Heritage listing;
(iv) Establishment of a local support structure involving the public and private sectors for pursuing
both stages of the bid (the project management team and project steering group); and
(v) Establishment of a not-for-profit foundation or appropriate industry and public fundraising
mechanism, and the development of a sponsorship strategy.

Finally, the working group is confident that an early commitment to completing Stage One from the
four councils and the state government would help leverage significant further funding opportunities
from the public, private, university and philanthropic sectors over the three-year period. It is also
possible that one or two other councils may decide to participate in Stage One, once the feasibility study and economic analysis have been circulated and the potential benefits of WHS listing to LGAs is understood.

8.5.2 Funding of Stage Two
Nomination to the Tentative List and World Heritage nomination is undertaken by the federal government through DSEWPaC. It is standard, however, for DSEWPaC to work in cooperation with the relevant state agency, and for the ‘actual’ and ‘in kind’ investment to be shared between the state and federal governments. It is likely that the participating councils would continue to contribute ‘in kind’ through staff time allocated to supporting the project management team, technical advisory groups and the overarching steering group; and it is also anticipated that government investment would continue to attract industry and other private sector and education sector investment in the supporting studies and supporting projects during this stage.
9. SITE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Ongoing management costs differ from site to site, again depending on their particular characteristics and management structures. As discussed in previous sections of this report, it is likely that a successful nomination for the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscapes would be based on existing management, zoning and protection mechanisms.

That said, ongoing monitoring and periodic reporting on the maintenance of the listed values, and implementation of the strategic management framework or system to support those values, is a requirement of UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. It has been suggested in previous discussions that an ongoing advisory team that oversees the implementation of the strategic management framework could be formed from the nomination advisory and management teams. It is useful here to present a brief overview of three different Australian examples and their management and funding arrangements, ranging from the very complex to the somewhat simple (Figure 9.1).

It is likely that the UNESCO obligations for management and reporting could be met through existing state and local government management structures and systems referring to a strategic management framework. However, given that the ambition of the World Heritage Site (WHS) listing is to celebrate and make known the region’s agricultural history, its working agricultural landscapes and their associated food, wine and tourism industries, it seems likely that industry would assist in funding an ongoing strategic marketing structure for the site in the long term. The working group therefore recommends consideration of setting up a fundraising mechanism, which could be an ongoing function of the not-for-profit fundraising foundation discussed in 8.5.1. The aim of the foundation would be to attract ongoing government and private sector investment in exploiting WHS listing opportunities in the long term.

**Snapshot One: Management of a complex cultural site made up of many properties across a number of states and territories and under many different ownership arrangements.**

**Australian Convict Sites**

The secretariat for the Australian Convicts World Heritage Sites rests with DSEWPaC. This is not a typical arrangement but is in place because of the complex nature of the property being spread across a number of states and territories. There is no funding provided for this function – it is additional to the other responsibilities of DSEWPaC staff.

The Australian Convicts Sites steering committee is made up from representatives from the state and territories and sites, and is not separately funded either. The costs associated with attending meetings, addressing needs/concerns, etc is born by the relevant sites and jurisdictions. That said, the individual sites and properties are able to apply for funding, under DSEWPaC’s National Historic Sites program, through a competitive process for conservation planning and conservation works.

Source: DSEWPaC
**Snapshot Two: Management of a large natural site that is also a national park and tourism destination**

**Shark Bay, Western Australia**

The Shark Bay World Heritage Advisory Committee evolved out of two separate previous committees and comprises both community and scientific/technical members as well as Indigenous members. Its role is to provide advice to the relevant government minister and environmental bodies regarding:

(a) Scientific research priorities which will contribute to the protection and conservation of the property and understanding of its natural history.

(b) New information or developments in science relevant to protection, conservation or presentation of the property.

(c) The scientific basis of management principles and practices.

(d) Appropriateness of research funded by agencies in terms of scope, quality and relevance to management of the property.

(e) Maintenance of Outstanding Universal Values and integrity of the property.

There is a strategic plan and a draft management plan that cover the site.

The executive officer for the committee is a state environment department employee externally funded by the federal government. Those funds are sourced through DSWEPaC’s Caring for Our Country program and must be applied for annually. Funding for the conduct of the advisory committee is on the same basis, although the state government meets the costs dollar-for-dollar with the federal government.

For projects conducted within the World Heritage area, applications are made to the federal government through the Caring for our Country stream. Not all proposals are funded and there is no guarantee of continuity for projects.

The federally funded project for the executive/project officer is currently $86,000 per annum and the conduct of the committee (federal government portion) is around $30,000 per annum.

Source: West Australia Department of Environment and Conservation

**Snapshot Three: Management of a relatively small natural site that is also a national park and tourism destination**

**Naracoorte Fossil Site, South Australia**

There is a management plan in place for Naracoorte Caves National Park that was adopted in 2001. While this plan was adopted pursuant to the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Act, it also fulfils the site’s obligations to the federal government in regard to managing the WHS values. The park (and WHS) is managed by DENR with funding through the state government. There is no management committee for the site.

Funds are also obtained from the federal government for specific projects, mainly research on the fossils, rather than management.

The site’s obligations mainly relate to ensuring that the WHS values are maintained and reporting to the federal government on funded projects and being involved in the periodic reports to the World Heritage Committee.

Source: DENR

Figure 9.1 Snapshots of Australian site management scenarios.
According to UNESCO (2011b) the management of a property should in any case have a realistic vision for the medium- to long-term future of the property, including the changes and challenges that could arise from inscription in the World Heritage List. When the management of a property relies on a number of management plans or documented systems, as is likely to be the case with the Mount Lofty Ranges, it is important that these various plans or systems provide an integrated or complementary and effective management outcome relative to the potential OUV.

Tourism management can also be a major issue for World Heritage properties, given the great interest by people in visiting properties, the potentially large scale of visitation, and the need to provide information about a property as well as other visitor facilities. The specific effects of WHS listing on visitor numbers vary and should be specifically anticipated and tourism management consistent with and sympathetic to the protection, conservation and management of the potential OUV. In many cases, a separate tourism management plan may need to be integrated with the general property management plan or system.

In summary, useful questions regarding a management strategy might include:

- Does the management plan/system specify how the potential OUV will be sustained through protection and conservation?
- Is the management plan/system practically effective in achieving on-ground outcomes?
- In the case of multiple plans or systems, are these integrated or complementary to achieve effective outcomes?
- Does the management plan or system have priority over other types of plans or systems (e.g., tourism, development and regional economic plans)?
- Do stakeholders in the property have a shared understanding of the property?
- Does the management plan/system include a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback?
- Are the impacts of trends, changes and proposed interventions monitored and assessed?
- Are sustainable development principles integrated into the management?
- Does the management plan/system involve stakeholders, especially property owners and managers, and is there strong support for the plan/system?
- Is the plan/system adequately resourced, both at the moment and into the future?
- Is there adequate finance and business planning to meet current and future needs of the nominated property?
- Does the plan/system include relevant capacity building?
- Does the plan/system provide a transparent description of how the system actually functions?
- Does the management plan include risk preparedness?
- Is the management system fully integrated with the protection of the property?

Source: UNESCO 2011b
10. CONCLUSIONS

Debates about the potential for World Heritage listing impact can be polarised, and often uninformed. On the one side are fears about the fossilisation of living communities as heritage ‘theme parks’, and on the other side are assertions about World Heritage designation being a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for positive change (Rebanks, 2010).

Recent analyses show that this debate is partly at cross-purposes, with people talking about differing intentions and different kinds of sites. Some sites – such as the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia and the Tasmanian Wilderness – are about the strict preservation of natural and cultural heritage, while other sites – such as the terraced landscapes of Cinque Terre in Italy or the old and new towns of Edinburgh, Scotland – are about supporting dynamic improvements to living, working communities and economies. Many people still assume that WHS listing is exclusively about focussing on a ‘dead past’, when in fact it can also be about a route to the future (Rebanks 2010).

Like the Lake District World Heritage Project in the United Kingdom, the proposed Mount Lofty Ranges World Heritage bid has a core ambition to deliver real and lasting socioeconomic benefits to the population of the Greater Adelaide region. Over the course of this feasibility study, government and industry representatives have come to recognise that WHS listing is a means to an end, not an end in itself. By realising this, they are placing themselves at the cutting edge of WHSs who see the designation as a catalyst for other things (Rebanks 2010).

The Mount Lofty Ranges bid anticipates using the Rebanks (2010) study’s identification of best practice models to pursue WHS listing as a ‘place making’ catalyst for the region, and as a stimulus for economic development. WHS designation based on our unique planning history and agricultural heritage would be used as a tool to develop an enhanced identity for the region that would be supported by a program of actions to fundamentally influence its economic trajectory. The agricultural landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges are the product of a distinct economic, social, cultural and agricultural system. By implication, this system will need to be supported in order to sustain and maintain those unique landscapes, which have been recognised since settlement as one of the state’s most important assets.

It might be argued that existing policies, such as the 30 Year Plan’s protection of Greater Adelaide’s primary production priority areas, and the introduction of Character Preservation legislation for the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale wine districts, are sufficient mechanisms to protect and sustain these landscapes in the long term, and to turn around the significant ongoing trends of agricultural land loss.

It could also be argued that an investment program on its own would produce significant benefit to the region. This may well be the case, but as we have seen in the EconSearch economic impact projections for agriculture and tourism, even relatively small percentage shifts in the agriculture value chain, or in visitor spending that might be attributed to WHS listing, can return significant added value.

There is therefore a powerful economic argument for using WHS listing to add value to a program of investment in high-quality, high-value food, wine and tourism product in order to target the high end of the food and wine export markets, and to attract higher-spending international and domestic visitors to the region.

Critically, the Lake District Project Rebanks study (2010) suggests that any new WHS will be most effective if it has a very clear strategy that identifies the desired outcomes, and the role and function
of WHS listing in delivering them, as well as identifying the resources and processes required to implement positive change. By having clear socioeconomic objectives, a Mount Lofty Ranges WHS nomination should be able to set objectives and targets that can be more effectively monitored and evaluated in the context of a WHS strategic management framework.

While WHS branding is not a guaranteed panacea to all the challenges facing the region, it does offer the potential of being a ‘rising tide that lifts all boats’. If industry and government fail to take up the idea, it is likely to represent a lost opportunity for the state’s key food, wine and tourism sectors. Failure to recognise, protect and enhance the multiple values provided by Adelaide’s agricultural hinterland through all available means will only augment the ongoing threats to the region’s long-term sustainability.

Mindful of these threats, the case for WHS listing takes on a different form. What started as a question about the feasibility of WHS inscription begins to look like a question about the feasibility of maintaining this working agricultural landscape and regional food, wine and tourism economy without something like WHS listing to catalyse a change of course. The place of agriculture in the regional landscape and regional economy cannot be left to a ‘business as usual’ policy stance. It needs a deliberate decision to engender a shift in public policy and in private behaviour, and multiple vehicles to carry that decision through.

For those who ask the question ‘Why would we want to do this?’, an appropriate response might be ‘If we can, why wouldn’t we?’ To cite the Rebanks report (2010) one last time, the biggest question about WHS status for the Mount Lofty Ranges region may not be whether to pursue WHS, but instead to identify what kind of WHS (in terms of both motive, actions and delivery mechanisms) would be most desirable and beneficial. The choices to be made are quite profound, and have the potential to build on 175 years of agricultural and planning heritage to shape the region for generations to come.

Key Message:
The choices to be made are quite profound, and have the potential to build on 175 years of agricultural and planning heritage to shape the region for generations to come.
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APPENDIX 1. ALIGNMENT WITH GOVERNMENT POLICY AND STRATEGIES

In the context of existing state and federal government policy, the pursuit and attainment of World Heritage Site (WHS) listing could have significant benefits for the region and the state, aligning with several with federal, state and local government policies and strategies. A scoping exercise conducted with the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) identified the following list of government policies and strategies as being among those that align with pursuing a UNESCO landscape designation:

1.1 Alignment with Clean Green Food Focus, South Australia’s Strategic Plan (SASP) and The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide

Pursuing WHS listing for the Adelaide agricultural hinterland and its associated production and tourism enterprises clearly aligns with one of the seven primary areas of focus identified by Premier Jay Weatherhill’s government, in the Governor’s opening address to the second session of the 52nd Parliament, namely ‘Clean green food as our competitive edge’, as WHS listing would provide a global platform for communication, promotion and realisation of that ambition.

Similarly the 30 Year Plan’s objective to preserve 375 hectares of priority primary production land, to support urban consolidation and to contain greenfield development to 30% of all new development by 3036 aligns with the proposed WHS bid. Additionally, a bid would align with the core economic, social and environmental objectives of South Australia’s Strategic Plan (SASP) and with the South Australian Government’s proposed character preservation legislation for the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale, and the related objectives and values that have been designed to support agriculture and tourism.1 These plans, strategies and legislation initiatives will in turn support and reinforce the bid nomination process.

1.1.1 Alignment with SASP economic goals

By branding the region and its produce with a prestigious global brand, the pursuit of WHS designation also has the potential to further the following economic goals and targets of South Australia’s Strategic Plan (SASP). A commentary regarding alignment with the goals of the proposed WHS bid is provided following each set of targets.

Objective: Growing prosperity

**Goal: We are known world-wide as a great place to live and visit.**
**Target 4: Tourism industry** Increase visitor expenditure in South Australia’s total tourism industry to $8 billion and on Kangaroo Island to $180 million by 2020

**Goal: South Australia has a resilient, innovative economy.**
**Target 35: Economic growth** Exceed the national economic growth rate over the period to 2020
**Target 37: Total exports** Increase the value of South Australia’s export income to $25 billion by 2020

---

1 The McLaren Vale and Barossa Character Preservation Bills passed through the lower house on May 16.
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Goal: We develop and maintain a sustainable mix of industries across the state.
Target 40: Food industry Grow the contribution made by the South Australian food industry to $20 billion by 2020

Commentary: The separate EconSearch (2012) analysis demonstrates how different levels of investment, supported by WHS branding could contribute significantly to both agricultural and tourism income both in the Mount Lofty Ranges agitourism regions, as well as in the city of Adelaide, and the rest of South Australia.

1.1.2 Alignment with SASP environmental goals
If UNESCO listing is pursued with the specific aim of creating economic, social and environmental benefits for the region, as outlined in the Rebanks (2010) analysis, it is also likely to support the following environmental objectives of the state’s strategic plan by bringing together landowners, producers and government custodians across the region to create a strategic management framework for the sustainable future of the landscape and its natural resources.

Objective: Attaining sustainability

Goal: We adapt to the long term physical changes that climate change presents.
Target 62: Climate change adaptation Develop regional climate change adaptation plans in all State Government regions by 2016

Goal: We want Adelaide to grow up more than out.
Target 68: Urban development By 2036, 70% of all new housing in metropolitan Adelaide will be being built in established areas

Goal: We look after our land, rivers and wetlands.
Target 69: Lose no species Lose no native species as a result of human impacts
Target 70: Sustainable land management By 2020, achieve a 25% increase in the protection of agricultural cropping land from soil erosion and a 25% improvement in the condition of pastoral land
Goal: We respect and enjoy our environment.
Target 72: Nature conservation Increase participation in nature conservation activities by 25% by 2015

Goal: Industry and agriculture are highly efficient and innovative in their use of water.
Target 75: Sustainable water use South Australia’s water resources are managed within sustainable limits by 2018

Commentary: Contemporary theory advocates putting community ownership and responsibility at the centre of natural resource management. It also advocates taking a ‘landscape approach’ that transcends land and water boundaries, and that integrates the management of agricultural production with environmental conservation and enhancement. The proposed WHS bid, and the development of the associated strategic management framework for the bid is likely to reinforce this policy direction.

1.1.3 Alignment with SASP social and cultural goals
Finally, bidding for WHS listing is likely to align with the following social and cultural objectives of the plan:

Objectives: Improving wellbeing, building communities and expanding opportunity

Goal: We are known world-wide as a great place to live and visit.

Commentary: WHS branding would immediately lift the status of the region as desirable place to live and as a tourism destination with a unique cultural history that is of global historical significance.
**Goal:** We are proud of South Australia and celebrate our diverse culture and people.
**Target 5: Multiculturalism** Maintain the high rate of South Australians who believe cultural diversity is a positive influence in the community.

**Commentary:** By telling the story of the contribution of different migrant groups to agriculture, and the contribution of agriculture to the Adelaide population since the time of settlement, mounting a bid would highlight the roles of migrants in a positive manner.

**Goal:** We have a sense of place, identity, belonging and purpose.
**Target 6: Aboriginal wellbeing** Improve the overall wellbeing of Aboriginal South Australians.

**Commentary:** By highlighting the original intent of the founding principles, including provisions in the founding documents that aimed to reserve and protect Aboriginal rights to land, the bid will assist public understanding of the history of interaction between the settlers and the Indigenous inhabitants, the thwarted aspirations of the founding theorists, and the role and basis of evolving Native Title Claims in reconciling those aspirations.

**Goal:** We are committed to our towns and cities being well designed, generating great experiences and a sense of belonging.

**Commentary:** WHS branding can lift the level of investment and aspiration for achieving a quality built environment and generally promote civic pride.

**Goal:** New developments are people friendly, with open spaces and parks connected by public transport and bikeways.
**Target 2: Cycling** Double the number of people cycling in South Australia by 2020

**Goal:** South Australia’s transport network enables efficient movement by industry and the community.
**Target 56: Strategic infrastructure** Ensure the provision of key economic and social infrastructure accommodates population growth

**Goal:** We are physically active.
**Target 83: Sport and recreation** Increase the proportion of South Australians participating in sport or physical recreation at least once per week to 50% by 2020

**Target 86: Psychological wellbeing** Equal or lower the Australian average for psychological distress by 2014 and maintain thereafter

**Commentary:** WHS branding can lift the level of investment in green infrastructure and in public transport infrastructure, including cycling tracks and recreational trails. A bid would also highlight how the recreational values of nearby agricultural landscapes, and the associated trails, parks and conservation areas all contribute to the wellbeing of the suburban population.

**1.1.4 Alignment with the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide’s Objectives and Principles**
The core objectives of the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide revolve around (i) the social objective of liveability (ii) the economic objective of competitiveness and (iii) the environmental objectives of sustainability and climate change resilience:
A bid for WHS listing of the agricultural and production values of the Greater Adelaide region is likely to align with the following economic, social and environmental principles of the 30 Year Plan:

**Objective: Liveability**

**Principle 1**

*A compact and carbon-efficient city*

Create a compact and efficient city capable of supporting population and economic growth without creating an unsustainable demand on infrastructure and natural resources. The Plan proposes to locate a larger share of medium-density dwellings in the existing areas of Adelaide to drive energy and carbon efficiencies.

**Commentary:** By promoting and enhancing the agricultural and tourism values of the nearby landscapes, WHS listing would bolster South Australian government policy to increase urban density, and help provide the political will and community support to tackle urban consolidation policies. It would also reinforce the key role that the Adelaide agricultural hinterland plays in making the city liveable.

**Principle 5**

*World-class design and vibrancy*

New developments should reflect world-class building and suburb designs to create the sustainable urban character of the future and encourage a vibrant and creative culture.

**Commentary:** Numerous studies have shown that WHS branding can lift the level of investment and aspiration for achieving a quality built environment and generally promote civic pride.

**Principle 7**

*Heritage and character protection and enhancement*

The existing heritage, history and character of Greater Adelaide should be preserved and enhanced by:

- valuing and protecting Adelaide’s heritage places and areas
• reinforcing the scale and character of small villages and townships.

**Commentary:** WHS branding would lift the level of appreciation and understanding of South Australia’s agricultural landscape heritage as being complimentary to the state’s built heritage from the time of settlement. This would help value and protect those heritage areas, and help reinforce the character and the historic significance of both the landscapes and the historic towns and settlements within them.

**Principle 8**
**Healthy, safe and connected communities encouraging more active lifestyles.**
Sedentary lifestyles are associated with the rise in obesity levels, which has subsequent health costs. Address by
• planning for integrated sporting and active recreational facilities that are accessible by all members of the community.

**Commentary:** WHS branding could lift the level of investment in green infrastructure and in public transport infrastructure, including the cycling tracks and recreational trails of the Greater Adelaide region. A bid would also highlight how the recreational values of nearby agricultural landscapes, and the associated trails, parks and conservation areas all contribute to the wellbeing of the suburban population. Similarly it would highlight the role of farmers in providing nearby access to fresh, healthy, seasonal produce.

**Objective: Competitiveness**

**Principle 10**
**Economic growth and competitiveness**
Create the conditions to enable strong economic growth by:
• protecting primary production lands

**Commentary:** UNESCO World Heritage Site designation could represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness for the agricultural producers of the Greater Adelaide region. This would help ensure long term protection of the priority primary production lands by enhancing their viability. As illustrated in the EconSearch (2012) analysis, UNESCO’s globally recognised branding would present countless opportunities to achieve substantially higher economic growth and a much more resilient and sustainable development path for both the agriculture and tourism sectors.

**Objective: Sustainability and climate change resilience**

**Principle 11**
**Climate change resilience**
Create the conditions for Adelaide to become resilient to the impacts of climate change by:
• reducing the growth in emissions through a reduction in car dependency

**Principle 12**
**Environmental protection, restoration and enhancement**
Planning controls protect vital environmental assets through unambiguous mapping and designation of key assets.

**Principle 13**
**Natural resources management**
Maintain and improve the health of natural resources by:
• ensuring land is appropriately zoned and sustainably used for current and future generations

**Commentary:** As previously mentioned in this appendix, contemporary land management theory advocates putting community ownership and responsibility at the centre of natural resource management and taking a ‘landscape approach’ to planning and management that integrates the management of agricultural production with environmental conservation and enhancement. A WHS bid, and the development of the UNESCO required strategic management framework for the listed
agricultural landscapes is likely to reinforce this policy direction and thus reinforce the zoning and land use objectives of the 30 Year Plan. It would also reinforce the plan’s objective to reduce carbon emissions by containing urban growth.

1.2 Alignment with PIRSA’s strategic directions

PIRSA has recently shifted its strategic focus from Primary Industries and Resources to Primary Industries and Regions. This shift in focus aligns with the WHS bid proposal, which would aim to provide a means to support the value-chain development of the food and wine industries in a regional context.

PIRSA’s Vision
The South Australian food industry will be a vibrant, robust and sustainable industry contributing $20 billion per annum to the South Australian economy, by the year 2020. The State’s regional population will have increased to 320 000 with employment across a range of industry sectors. The regional economy will continue to be underpinned by primary production but will be supported by a more diversified economy through an increasing focus on value added food, fibre and beverage processing, tourism and resources. The increased economic wealth of the regions will support an improved level of amenity making regional South Australia one of the most desirable locations in the world to work and live.

PIRSA’S Mission
PIRSA’s mission is to grow sustainable, competitive regions. Our focus on growing industries and regional development includes policy development, research, biosecurity and integrated solutions for agriculture, seafood, forestry, fibre, wine and food. PIRSA is also responsible for the continued development of our regional areas through the harnessing of opportunities for regional industries and their communities.

PIRSA’s Strategic Priorities
1. To effectively influence State and national policy agendas to ensure decisions impacting water, land use, natural resource management and climate change adaptation support sustainable primary production and other regional industries;
2. Drive greater connection between government policy making to develop a whole-of-government policy framework that enables industry to innovate, adapt and compete in a rapidly changing international marketplace;
3. Build on Australia’s clean and green reputation and South Australia’s world class biosecurity practices to enhance the value of primary production outputs and secure access to existing and emerging markets;
4. Harness the value-adding opportunities from primary production such as food and wine tourism and food and beverage processing;
5. Involve and engage with regional communities and government agencies to integrate the implementation of plans for each region on issues such as regional development, tourism, infrastructure, resource allocation and workforce attraction, retention and skilling; and
6. Encourage and assist the development of existing, new and diversified regional business activities through a fully integrated case management approach that supports access to capital attraction, investment attraction, marketing opportunities (including export marketing), mentoring, and government grant funding.

PIRSA Partnerships
PIRSA recognises the importance of developing partnerships so that these objectives can be achieved. This is reflected in our commitment to a highly collaborative approach. PIRSA will develop a close working relationship with the South Australian Tourism Commission, leveraging the opportunity from both portfolios coming under the one Minister. This approach will be the hallmark of our interaction with regional communities and other State Government agencies, particularly Department for Water and the Department for Environment and Natural Resources and Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy as well as federal and local government.

Source: PIRSA website

Commentary: UNESCO World Heritage Site designation could represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness. This globally recognized designation would present countless opportunities to achieve substantially higher economic growth and a much more resilient and sustainable development path for both agriculture and tourism.
1.3 Alignment with Wine: A Partnership 2010–2015  
**Key Partners:** PIRSA and South Australia Wine Industry Council Executive (SAWIC)

Among the priorities and strategies of the Wine Partnership between the South Australian Wine Industry and the South Australian government that could be boosted by a successful bid for WHS designation are objectives to value add through improved branding, to increase industry infrastructure, to protect primary production from urban encroachment, and to develop wine and wine tourism products for domestic and international markets:

**WINE: A PARTNERSHIP 2010 – 2015**

**Branding:** There is unrealised potential to increase the value of South Australian wine that is consistent with the national marketing approach.  
Objective: An Industry, Government and market that promotes and appreciates a sustainable, higher value South Australian wine product.  
Strategy: Continue to work with Wine Australia to inform and support strategies to promote both the national and South Australian Wine Industries.

**Infrastructure:** The wine industry is reliant upon the provision and maintenance of infrastructure.  
Objective: The maximisation of existing infrastructure and the identification and assessment of future infrastructure needs.  
Strategy: Identify public and private infrastructure requirements to support Industry, and regional and urban economic growth through cost-effective and innovative solutions.

**Land Access:** Urban and industrial development are potential threats to primary production land use.  
Objective: An approved strategy that will allow the identification and assurance of future areas of primary production.  
Strategy: Actively contribute to land use planning proposals to protect agricultural land use where appropriate.

**Market:** Fundamental to Industry’s current success, the development of the domestic and international markets for Australian wine remains important to future prosperity.  
Objective: Access to, and development and maintenance of, both existing and new markets.  
Strategy: Facilitate collaboration within Industry and co-ordination of effort between Industry and Government to pursue proposed market development programs and address market access issues.

**Wine Tourism:** The diversity of wine tourism opportunities within the State are not fully realised.  
Objective: The realisation of tourism opportunities and synergies between the Food, Wine and Tourism Industries to allow mutual benefit.  
Support for the goals outlined in the South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Strategy.  
Strategy: Explore opportunities for collaboration between the South Australian Tourism Commission (and tourism sector) and the Premier’s Food Council Executive with a view to expanding both domestic and international food and wine tourism markets.  
Source: South Australian Wine Industry Council

**Commentary:** At the core of the WHS bid proposal is the ambition to make the wine and tourism industries in the Mount Lofty Ranges region more profitable and viable in the long term by value adding through the globally-recognised UNESCO WHS brand. The sustainability of the wine and food industries will increasingly benefit from collaboration with the tourism industry to develop common branding, and WHS listing would provide the branding platform to achieve that goal.

1.4 Alignment with South Australian Food Strategy 2010–2015  
**Key Partners:** PIRSA and Premier’s Food Council Executive

A core tenet of the WHS bid proposal is that the globally recognised branding of WHS could enhance all links in the food value chain in South Australia by providing branding opportunities and opportunities for creating ‘story’ background to products. It should also assist the marketing, environmental and community development imperatives of the food strategy, by highlighting the
story of systematic colonisation, and the social, economic and cultural role of agriculture in the region since its foundation.

SA FOOD STRATEGY 2010 – 2015

Vision
South Australian Food - beyond the expectations of consumers around the globe.

Key Targets
- Generate $16 billion in Gross Food Revenue by 2015
- Increase the food industry’s contribution to South Australian’s wellbeing
- Reduce the South Australian food industry’s impact on the environment

Priorities
1. Consumer insight & market development
2. Enhancing knowledge, collaboration & leaderships
3. Enhancing capacity and productivity
4. Optimising environmental sustainability
5. Leading in product integrity
6. Fostering regional & community development

Source: PIRSA website

Commentary: While much of the food produced in South Australia comes from outside the Mount Lofty Ranges region, it has been demonstrated that the region plays an important role in supplying the city’s food demands and in supplying niche premium markets globally. Independent research indicates that peri-urban agriculture, while occupying only 2% of total agricultural lands in South Australia, contributes approximately 25% of the state’s agricultural income (Horticulture Australia, 2008). There would also inevitably be an association between the heritage listed agricultural landscapes of the Adelaide hinterland and the wider region. Indeed, as the colony expanded, the principles and practice of systematic colonisation quickly extended beyond the boundaries of the initial settlement surveys to the great grain growing areas beyond, as described in Donald Meinig’s (1988) On the Margin’s of the Good Earth: The South Australian Wheat Frontier 1869 to 1884.

1.5 Alignment with Draft National Food Plan Objectives

Key Partners: Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Industry Stakeholders

Similarly, by bringing attention to the value of agriculture, and by enhancing the sustainability of the fertile Adelaide agrarian hinterland, the proposed WHS bid could help to highlight and support some of the following objectives of the National Food Plan recently drafted by Senator the Hon. Joe Ludwig, the Australian Government Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry:

DRAFT NATIONAL FOOD PLAN OBJECTIVES
- Identifying and mitigating potential risks to Australia’s food security
- Contributing to global food security
- Reducing barriers to a safe and nutritious food supply that responds to the evolving preferences and needs of all Australians and supports population health
- Supporting the long-term economic, environmental and social sustainability of Australia’s food supply chain
- Supporting the global competitiveness and productivity growth of the food supply chain, including through research, science and innovation
- Reducing barriers faced by food businesses to access international and domestic markets
- Contributing to economic prosperity, employment and community wellbeing in regional Australia.

Source: Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry website
It is likely that a bid based around the agrarian landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges region would support the ongoing social and economic traditions of family-owned farming in a region that will continue to play an important role in supporting the local, national and global food supply chain. The bid would highlight the current tensions between agricultural land use and housing subdivision pressures in this peri-urban region, and analyse the real and many values that agriculture contributes to sustainable land management practice, to supplying food from a low carbon source, and to the general health and well-being of the suburban population.

The National Food Policy Working Group includes representatives from:

- Linfox Logistics
- CSIRO
- Simplot Australia
- Organic Federation of Australia
- National Farmers’ Federation
- Boost Juice
- Australian Food and Grocery Council
- Elders Ltd
- Australian Consumers Association
- Graincorp
- ACTU Secretary
- University of Wollongong

Source: Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry website

Appendix Figure 1.2 The National Food Policy Working Group

SUSTAINABLE FOOD AND WINE VALUE CHAINS
Professor Andrew Fearne, a world-recognised leader in value chain management and consumer behaviour, was a recent Adelaide Thinker in Residence. His focus was ‘Food & Wine Value Chains: Prosperity through Collaboration’. He actively promoted community participation in value chain thinking, healthy eating, and sustainable consumption across the South Australian population, through the development of stronger linkages between health, environment, agriculture, education, retail and consumers.

His final report ‘Sustainable Food and Wine Value Chains’ (Fearne, 2009) details that South Australian food and wine faces steep challenges to enhance their strategic thinking and management practices. In the report he has set a challenge for South Australia’s food and wine industries to “focus on consumer demands or risk losing your international competitiveness.”

The report includes the five following key recommendations, and it was through involvement in this program that Professor Stringer’s proposal for pursuing World Heritage Site designation for Adelaide’s agricultural hinterland emerged:

- **Thought leadership** – increase understanding of value chain principles amongst government and industry senior managers.
- **Integrated market intelligence and consumer insight** - an integrated market intelligence and consumer insight service that is accessible to all stakeholders in the respective, sector specific value chains.
- **Holistic food policy** - development of a holistic food policy, which supports the implementation of the SA Food Strategy and interacts with other plans (trade and development, health, education, workforce development, sustainability and climate change).
- **Education and training** - review the current education and training provisions for the South Australian food and wine industries.
- **Regional co-innovation clusters** - create virtual networks that are rooted in the regions but extend globally and target young people.


Appendix Figure 1.3 Sustainable food and wine values chains

1.6 Alignment with South Australian Tourism Plan 2009-2014

**Key partners: South Australian Tourism Commission, South Australian Tourism Industry Council**

The core alignment between a WHS listing and the objectives of SA Tourism would be to increase visitor numbers, in particular the number of international visitors, and to increase length of stay and visitor spending through developing and ‘bringing to life an authentic South Australian story’ based on the unique story of systematic colonisation and the state’s historic associations with some of the
The greatest thinkers and philosophical movements of the 19th century. It is important to note that this history has led to the region’s enviable food and wine culture, which is reflected in the historic townships, landscapes and produce of the Adelaide agricultural hinterland, all within an easy ‘day trip’ of the Adelaide Central Market and city hotels.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM PLAN 2009-2014
VISION

Our vision is that:

By 2020 South Australia will have capitalised on its massive tourism potential and will be a world’s best destination supporting a sustainable and profitable industry.

South Australia will reap enormous benefits from developing its leading Australian experiences (e.g. food and wine, major events and the natural environment), along with its vibrant convention and education tourism sector. The SA experience will be characterised by our:

- Bringing to life an authentic South Australian story
- Marriage of heritage with contemporary expression
- Engagement with people on their life journey
- ‘Bundling’ and presentation of quality, value for money, activities
- Excellence in innovative sustainable design
- Provision of choice and exceeding visitor expectations.

Source: SATC website

Commentary: A bid for WHS designation would provide a unique opportunity for the wine, food and tourism sectors to come together for a common purpose, and to articulate a shared vision based on the state’s authentic food and wine heritage that is reflected in its historic buildings, townships and agricultural landscapes. For example, the Mount Lofty Ranges Agrarian Landscape feasibility study has already created opportunities through regional seminars and workshops for the different wine, food and tourism regions to share information and viewpoints regarding the proposed character preservation legislation and other policy responses to supporting food and wine production and agritourism in the domestic and international arenas.

1.7 Alignment with South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Strategy 2009-2014

Key partners: South Australian Tourism Commission; South Australian Tourism Industry Council and Wine and Tourism Industry Stakeholders

At the heart of the SA Food and Wine Tourism Strategy is a bold vision to turn South Australia into the world’s leading culinary tourism destination. Five core objectives to that end are based around better communicating the food and wine experiences available here, creating better experiences, better bundling of food and wine tourism packages, creating better links between stakeholders within the industries, and improving industry professionalism. It is anticipated that all these themes would be reinforced by a successful WHS bid based on Greater Adelaide’s agrarian landscapes, with global recognition and global branding at its core. Some of those potential alignments are underlined below:

South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Strategy 2009-2014
Objective 1: Communicate the best of SA’s food and wine experiences of today

Strategies:
1. Integrate food and wine as a key experiential theme in SA tourism campaigns.
2. Identify strategic, affordable cooperative marketing opportunities between the tourism, food and wine industries.
3. Promote and further develop Tasting Australia as Australia’s most significant food and wine tourism event.
4. Identify and promote authentic food and wine tourism products and hero brands via strategic and cost effective public relations activities.
5. Continue to promote the integration of food and wine experiences into existing flagship events and pre and post conference and event itineraries.

Objective 2:
Create more appealing SA food and wine experiences of tomorrow
Strategies:
1. Increase the range and appeal of South Australia’s innovative food and wine experiences.
2. Encourage investment in 4+ star experiential accommodation and conference and meeting facilities within wine regions.
3. Encourage the ongoing development and improvement of existing food and wine tourism experiences and products.
4. Strategically align the State’s planning policy framework to support opportunities for developing authentic food and wine experiences.
5. Make telling the story about SA’s food and wine an outstanding competitive advantage.

Objective 3:
Make the South Australian food and wine experience easy to access
Strategies:
1. Bundle and package as appropriate, the best of South Australia’s food and wine tourism opportunities.
2. Develop a specialised ‘food and wine devotee’ component of the existing southaustralia.com website.
3. Strengthen food and wine tourism distribution systems.

Objective 4:
Be creative in working together as an industry
Strategies:
1. Develop stronger working links between food, wine and tourism stakeholders.
2. Build intra and inter regional relationships and share knowledge and information.

Objective 5:
Increase industry understanding and professionalism
Strategies:
1. Improve professionalism of operators and business performance.
2. Develop career paths in food and wine tourism and keep talent within the State.
3. Fill gaps in research information on visitor characteristics, satisfaction and opportunities.
4. Raise awareness of tourism within the food and wine industry and of food and wine within the tourism industry.

Headline Key Performance Indicators
KPI 1: South Australia will increase its association with distinctive dining and fresh regional produce from 24% in 2007 to 40% by 2014
KPI 2: Increase South Australia’s share of visitors to Australian wineries from 17 per cent in 2007 to 22 per cent in 2014
KPI 3: As SA’s food and wine flagship, the Barossa, will increase its domestic visitor preference (consideration) from 400,000 in 2007 to 750,000 in 2014

Commentary: Current strategies to build and package food and wine tourism experiences that are less than one hour from the city and the Adelaide Convention Centre tie in particularly well with the geographic

South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Stakeholders
A primary role of the South Australian Food and Wine Strategy is to inform, connect and foster productive partnerships and projects amongst industry stakeholders. Among the stakeholders relevant to the strategy’s implementation and who could also become engaged with a World Heritage bid are:

South Australian Tourism Commission • South Australian Tourism Industry Council • Food SA • SA Wine Industry Council • SA Wine Industry Association • Primary Industries and Regions South Australia • Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy • Regional Food Groups • Regional Tourism Marketing Committees • Regional Wine Organisations • Winemaker’s Federation of Australia • Restaurant and Catering Association • Australian Tourism Export Council • Local Government • Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority • Adelaide Central Market Authority

Source: South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Strategy
Appendix Figure 1.4 Food and wine stakeholders
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scope of the Mount Lofty Ranges bid. Similarly, by providing a strategic advantage through a brand that sets South Australia apart from all other food and wine regions in the country, it is envisaged that WHS listing would send food and wine tourism traffic SA’s way relative to other Australian tourism destinations. In particular it is likely to increase the traffic of overseas visitors who better recognize the WHS brand.

1.8 South Australia’s Tourism Brand Framework Alignments

Key partner: South Australian Tourism Commission, South Australian Tourism Industry Council

Further alignments between a WHS bid based on highlighting the South Australia’s unique story of free settlement and systematic colonisation, and the core attributes and brand values outlined in SA Tourism’s brand framework are underlined below:

SA’s TOURISM BRAND FRAMEWORK

CORE ATTRIBUTES

Enterprising tradition of creativity and innovation
SA has a unique history. It was founded as an economic and social experiment in a spirit of enterprise and innovation. The characteristics of freedom, tolerance, idealism, lifestyle, passion and hope were an integral part of SA’s utopian beginnings as a free settlement, and food and wine were a distinctive part of these beginnings. SA has been a pioneer and leader in many fields punching well above its weight as a small State.

Home of exceptional wine and produce
With over 60% of Australia’s wine exports and recognition for producing the best quality wines in Australia SA is undisputedly the home of wine. SA also has a strong tradition in food and is aspiring to achieve stronger recognition in this regard.

Beautiful city and a festive spirit
With Adelaide’s Mediterranean climate and aforementioned qualities, it has often been tagged the Athens or Tuscany of the south. Descriptions by visiting journalists over the years capture this notion: ‘the locals enjoy a quality of life second to none, with a relaxed and sophisticated lifestyle that centres round good food, good wine and a good time ... despite being a big city, nowhere else can one be so soon out of the city to experience a beautiful countryside ... people here take winemaking seriously, but they also know how to enjoy life to the hilt’. Wine, food, events and tourism have a natural affinity and synergy.

Unspoilt nature at close proximity
Travellers seek a range of experiences that will provide them with an enhanced connection with the natural environment. Linking food and wine with other appealing attributes – especially nature, coastal and recreational attributes – provide a compelling and delightful attractiveness.

BRAND VALUES

Clean and Green
The desire to create a sustainable environment is a significant global trend. SA is taking a leading role in this regard and the SA tourism industry through SATC’s ‘Sustainable Tourism Package’, and the Minister’s Tourism Round Table. ‘Sustainability as a Competitive Advantage Strategy’ sees this as an integral part of the SA brand. The wine industry is the first sector to sign an Emission Target Agreement with the State Government. Together, tourism, food and wine industries can deliver credible outcomes in this regard.

Living Heritage and Tradition
One of the stronger consumer perceptions about SA to emerge from a wide body of tourism research is its heritage ambience, particularly of Adelaide. The blend of the old and the new in contemporary ‘living heritage’ provides a sense of continuity and connection with the past, often missing in places with a faster pace of life and change. With food and wine’s strong traditions and the emerging ‘locavore’ (or slow food) trend, there is a great opportunity to build authentic character and visitor appeal.

Opportunities to utilise heritage, infused with contemporary expression, and importantly telling the story of SA’s past, present and future aspirations, in memorable ways, can bring SA and its food and wine history and products alive to the visitor.

Free Thinking
South Australia’s origins as a free settled state where tolerance, civil liberty and opportunity were and still are valued, has imbued the State with a certain ‘free thinking’ culture and personality. SA has been at the forefront of many social changes from being the first jurisdiction to give women the right to vote to its pioneering and thriving arts and cultural reputation. This is an aspiration of this State.

Key message:
An important part of the food and wine experience will be telling the authentic South Australian story...

Source: SA’s Tourism Brand Framework

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE
AUSTRALIA

The Environment Institute
Where ideas grow
Genuine & Personal

While participating in a progressive world that is increasing in pace and technological know-how, where people often feel like they’ve been reduced to a mere number, South Australia is still seen as a safe, warm and friendly place where good service is valued. Retaining this characteristic can be an important competitive advantage in an increasingly uncertain world. The conviviality of food and wine experiences can play a major role in this regard. Meeting the winemaker or passionate producer can be a value added highlight of the experience.

Source: South Australian Food and Wine Tourism Strategy 2009-2014

Commentary: The framework goes on to present ‘Authentic Experiences’ as being a key ‘brand filter’ by putting forward the idea that ‘An important part of the food and wine experience will be telling the authentic South Australian story’. In a simple and all-encompassing way, a successful WHS bid would instantly place the authentic story of free settlement and systematic colonisation at the centre of all food and wine tourism experiences, and put everyone, from local school children to exclusive hotel guests on the same page of that shared story.

1.9 Alignment with the Australian Government National Long-Term Tourism Strategy (Tourism 2020) and the South Australian Government Cycle Tourism Strategy 2005 – 2009

Key Partners: Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET); South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC); Office for Recreation and Sport (ORS); Office for Cycling and Walking (OCW); Department for Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and Forestry SA

1.9.1 Asian focus

A key objective of Tourism 2020 is to refocus and sharpen the emphasis on six identified areas that must be addressed to allow the tourism industry to achieve its maximum potential. The first of these is:

Grow demand from Asia, while maintaining investment of a balanced market portfolio

Renewed efforts will be taken to support the targeted strategies and campaigns initiated by Tourism Australia and state tourism organisations to convert new business in growing markets, particularly China and India.

Source: Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, 2011

Commentary: According to the Tourism 2020 report Australia has a unique opportunity to drive demand from Asia. Over the 2010-20 period, Asia is expected to contribute more than half of the projected growth in international visitation with 42 per cent of that growth expected to come from China. (Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, 2011). Most countries in Asia have growing economies with good consumer confidence, burgeoning growth in the middle class (especially China, India and Indonesia), and Australia is a near “western developed”, English-speaking country, with strong destination appeal. A WHS listing would provide an easily recognizable brand to these markets and provide a point of distinction for Greater Adelaide as a food, wine and heritage tourism destination.

1.9.2 The Cycle Tourism Niche

A previous Australian government’s Tourism White Paper noted that ‘the cycle tourism niche is an ecologically sustainable product that is expected to grow in popularity’ (Commonwealth of Australia, 2003). This theme has been taken up in numerous South Australian government plans and strategies as the state works to leverage the Santos Tour Down Under cycling race to make South Australia the ‘home of cycling in Australia’ and to raise the profile of cycling in the state generally. This reflects a growing consumer interest in the outdoors and healthy lifestyles and healthy holiday experiences. The strategy notes that ‘community, business and industry involvement will be an essential component in the strategy’s success’ and provides the following vision:
Cycling Tourism Strategy Vision

South Australia will be one of the most appealing cycling tourism destinations in the world, set apart by its excellence in urban design, integration with the natural environment, human scale, liveability and ease of movement.

A number of regional areas will be desirable cycling destinations, attracting visitors with a wealth of landscape variety, attractions and opportunities for cycling adventures and enabling visitors to see Australia in a “Different Light”, as promoted by Tourism Australia.

Commentary: From its inception, the proposal to mount a World Heritage Site (WHS) bid has envisaged listing the agricultural landscapes and the linkages between them. These linkages would encompass the original Aboriginal stories that link key geographic landmarks such as the Tjilbruke Dreaming and Yurebilla Dreaming, the European settlement trails and townships, and more modern conceptions such as the Heysen Trail and the developing network of cycling and recreational trails that link city dwellers with the rural areas. The role of the Santos Tour Down Under in identifying and defining some of the most scenic routes in the region will be reflected in the mapping overlay process that is being undertaken to help define the final WHS site. WHS branding would also presumably assist the state’s Cycling Tourism Strategy by highlighting the proximity of the agricultural and natural landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges to the city base, and by supporting the development of recreational infrastructure in the region.

1.9.3 Growing High Yield Tourism

Another ongoing platform of both federal and state government tourism strategies is ‘Growing High-Yield Tourism’. Heritage and cultural tourism are identified as growth markets for the high yielding market segment, contributing 37 per cent of world travel and growing by 15 per cent per annum (Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, 2009).

Commentary: Like other market sectors, tourism customers are attracted to the diverse range of new and innovative products and experiences provided by the market. Such innovation and improvement is the basis of growth and success. South Australia needs to be at the forefront of such innovation, with a focus on developing high-yield market segments. It has been demonstrated that WHS listing would help highlight South Australia as a cultural tourism destination, increase the number of international visitors, increase the length of stay and increase visitor spending.

1.10 Alignment with the 2011 State Natural Resource Management (NRM) Draft Plan and Adelaide and the 2008 Mount Lofty Ranges Region (AMLR) NRM Plan

Key partners: NRM Board; AMLR NRM Board and DENR

The State Natural Resources Management (NRM) Plan is the driver for NRM in South Australia, and this has recently undergone revision, with a draft currently out for public consultation. The Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Region (AMLR) NRM Plan is developed in line with the vision and goals of the State NRM Plan. Both plans refer to ‘communities’ and their role in ‘managing’ and ‘caring’ for natural resources, both plans advocate taking a landscape approach to natural resource management, and both advocate the integration of the management of production and conservation.

SA’s Natural Resources Management Draft Plan

The State Natural Resources Management Plan establishes a direction for the overarching management of natural resources in South Australia.

The aims of the revised draft plan that align with WHS might therefore be:

- put community ownership and responsibility at the centre of natural resource management
- improve participation of Aboriginal people in natural resource management
- take a ‘landscape approach’ that transcends land and water boundaries
- integrate the management of production and conservation
- adopt an adaptive approach where we look at continuously improve by evaluating, learning and responding
2008 Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Region (AMLR) NRM Plan Goals

- Ecological processes for life and livelihood
- Communities engaged and active
- Amenity, culture and environment valued
- Knowledgeable decisions and action partners

The following targets of the AMLR NRM Plan specifically align with the aims of pursuing and attaining WHS designation:

**Twenty Year Regional Targets for the Adelaide Mount Lofty Region**

**Target 5: Productive capacity of agriculture**
- Maintain productive capacity at current levels
  
  Increasing urbanisation will result in a reduction in the extent of productive land available for agriculture. Recognising that primary production is a significant contributor to economic, social and environmental outcomes for the Region, this target aims to support and promote innovative solutions which maintain the productive output of the Region, whilst continuing to support sustainable natural resource management.

  Indicator: Productive output

**Target 6: Land condition for primary production**
- Improve land condition by 15%
  
  Land condition for primary production relates to the physical, chemical and biological status of soils and the impact of land management practices on soil health (e.g. vegetation cover, cultivation activities, livestock management). Improvements in land condition will have a follow-on effect on adjacent waterways and the marine environment.

  Indicators: Catchment sediment loads; Soil health (e.g. acidity, soil erosion, soil carbon content); Vegetation cover.

**Commentary:** A workshop held with staff from the Mount Lofty Ranges Region (MLR) NRM board recognised that there is potential for pursuing alignment between the aims of a WHS bid and the aims and goals of the State’s NRM plan, as well as the MLR Regional Plan, specifically in the area of community engagement, and in taking a landscape approach to integrating agricultural production and environmental management. Certainly the planning and management practices of the NRM boards will form a key role in providing the foundations for a bid, and in contributing to an overarching strategic management framework for the site. In turn pursuing WHS listing may well provide an ‘innovative solution’ for maintaining the productive agricultural output of the region. It is also important to note that the original inhabitants and caretakers of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges landscape included the Kaurna, Ngadjuri, Ngarrindjeri and Permangk peoples. These groups comprise the Four Nations NRM Governance Group for the area, and it is envisaged that a WHS bid would link in with the same affiliations, with the possible addition of the Ramindjeri peoples of the Southern Mount Lofty Ranges, depending on the final geographical scope of the bid.

**1.11 Cape Borda to Barossa NatureLinks Plan Alignments**

*Key Partners: DENR; AML NRM; Kangaroo Island NRM; SA Murray Darling Basin NRM and Four Nations NRM Governance Group*

Linking into the NRM Plans is the Cape Borda to Barossa NatureLinks plan for one of five broad ‘biodiversity corridors’ encompassed in a state-wide approach to managing and restoring large areas of plant and animal habitat. These include existing conservation areas on public and private land, which the Cape Borda to Barossa plan seeks to expand where possible, to enable native wildlife to survive and adapt to environmental change.

Specifically, the iconic landscapes of Kangaroo Island and the Mount Lofty Ranges have many plant and animal species found nowhere else, and in recognition of these outstanding biodiversity values the Australian Government has declared the area one of 15 national biodiversity ‘hotspots’.

15
**Commentary:** The Mount Lofty Ranges NatureLink area encompasses a variety of land uses including conservation, primary production, recreation, industry and urban townships. A WHS nomination and the associated strategic management strategy would recognise that a healthy and diverse environment is crucial to the social and economic well-being of agriculture, and that natural ecosystems underpin agricultural, horticultural, fishing and nature-based tourism industries. A bid would help bring together state agencies, conservation organisations, landholders and local communities to restore and manage the stretches of land and sea that are associated with the bid.

1.12 **Alignment with the ‘Eat Well Be Active’ Strategy for South Australia 2006-2010**

*Key Partner: Department for Health*

The strategic directions for the ‘Eat Well Be Active’ healthy weight strategy identify a number of settings to focus on in promoting physical activity and a healthy food supply that embraces fresh, local seasonal produce.

- **‘Eat Well Be Active’ Strategic Directions Alignments with WHS bid**
  - **Supportive environments that foster a diversity of physical activity and healthy eating opportunities.**
    - Promote excellence in the location, design, construction, management and use of facilities and public spaces that encourage participation in intentional and incidental physical activity.
  - **Increased active transport.**
    - Create comprehensive metropolitan and regional bicycle networks consisting of off-road paths, on-road bicycle lanes and back street routes that are safe and accessible for the diverse range of people who cycle.
  - **Increased opportunities for healthy eating and safe physical activity including sport, recreation and play in neighbourhoods.**
    - Increase community awareness of local opportunities for physical activity.
    - Develop and implement local programs and services to promote healthy eating and physical activity that respond to the needs of local communities. Examples include food co-operatives, community gardens, farmers’ markets, home deliveries, walking groups, activity programs.
    - Ensure urban and natural environments provide sustainable opportunities for people to be active.
  - **Improved access to an appropriate and affordable food supply**
    - Implement the South Australian Fruit and Vegetable Coalition Strategic Plan, which includes the promotion of local, fresh, seasonal and minimally processed produce.

- **Commentary:** By instilling pride in the nearby agricultural landscape, the associated recreational opportunities it provides, and the role of the farmers who cultivate it, a successful WHS bid would promote and help develop this highly accessible area as a resource for the enjoyment of physical activity, and the provision of a fresh and healthy local food supply.

1.13 **Alignment with A Draft Climate Change Adaptation Framework for South Australia 2010 and South Australia’s Greenhouse Strategy 2007-2020**

*Key Partners: The State Government, including the SA Research and Development Institute; Local Government; Regional Development Australia including regional natural resources management boards; South Australian Farmers Federation; Conservation Council of South Australia and Agricultural Excellence Alliance.*

Objective 3 of the Climate Change Adaptation Framework aims for ‘resilient, well-functioning natural systems and sustainable, productive landscapes’. Specifically it aims to increase the resilience of terrestrial, aquatic, marine ecosystems and primary production systems and to link climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation and sustainable landscape use. The framework recommends an integrated approach to landscape planning and acknowledges that adaptation to climate change is a
shared responsibility that will involve a joint effort by all levels of government, business, communities and individuals. The framework also points to opportunities in the agricultural sector, including the opportunity to lead internationally on the development of sustainable food and farming systems, as well as leading the adoption of new farming options that are better suited to climate variability.

Similarly, South Australia’s Greenhouse Strategy is based on three imperatives: the need for shared responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; the need to adapt to climate change; and the need to innovate.

**Commentary:** A core focus of the WHS bid proposal is the long-term economic and environmental sustainability of the Mount Lofty Ranges agricultural landscapes, and this will need to be considered and planned for in the context of climate change, and with a clear understanding of the role of natural resource management in sustaining agricultural productivity.

### 1.14.1 RDA Barossa Regional Road Map

Regional Development Australia Barossa (RDA Barossa) represents the council areas of Mallala, Gawler, Light and Barossa and works in partnership with local, state and federal government to deliver an outcomes-based economic roadmap that encompasses the following regional objectives:

**RDA Barossa Regional Road Map Objectives**

- Improved Community & Economic Development
- Enhanced Community Engagement and Consultation
- Improved Regional Planning
- Enhanced whole of government approach
- Enhanced awareness of government programs

The following identified opportunities in the RDA Barossa Regional Roadmap are relevant to the WHS bid:

**The RDA Barossa Roadmap Opportunities and Target industries for sustainable economic growth**

- Food, Wine, Tourism and related services
- Education and training, including executive education, in food, wine, tourism
- Higher Education Hub and knowledge precinct
- Science Technology and Innovation clusters around research hubs: (Dryland agriculture/Veterinary science/Logistics/Food manufacturing and technology)
- Growth in profile and value of regional wine product
- Innovative Food production, including niche, branded and value added product
- Intensive Horticulture and ancillary value adding: production and packaging
- Diversified tourism including racing (horse, pacers, motor and motor cross, cycle) and adventure, sport and outdoor tourism (building on several recognised trails)
1.14.2 RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island Regional Road Map

The following strengths, challenges and opportunities identified in the RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island Regional Roadmap for the mainland subregions are relevant to the WHS bid:

**RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island Regional Roadmap**

**Key strengths of the Mainland Sub Regions**
- Proximity to key markets (e.g. Adelaide Metropolitan area)
- Natural environment including wildlife, geography, topography, natural resources, climate and amenity
- Diverse tourism assets with focus on tourism experience
- High quality, primary production land
- Reliable water resources
- Large population base

**Key challenges for the Mainland Sub Regions**
- Responding to changing population patterns (population numbers and changing demographics)
- Cost and logistical difficulties of constructing/augmenting infrastructure (e.g. transport, broadband, energy such as reticulated gas)
- Gentrification pressure for changing land use, particularly in respect of primary production land
- Peri-urban pressures such as land use constraints linked to third parties (e.g. water catchment for metropolitan Adelaide area and pressures on ‘right to farm’ in the Adelaide Hills)

**Key opportunities for the Mainland Sub Regions**
- Further managed population growth
- Development of service industries driven by the changing needs of a growing population
- Further development of the tourism industry
- Further value adding to primary industries
- Managed and collaborative planning through regional planning authorities and the development of Structure Plans under the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

1.15 Southern Economic Development Board Plan for a New Economic Future

Recognising the need for the business community to take ownership of the push to grow the economy, the Cities of Marion and Onkaparinga invited a cross section of business leaders to form the Southern Adelaide Economic Development Board. The Board’s regional plan gives priority to targeting specific industry sectors that offer development opportunities into the future. Among those that are relevant to the WHS bid are underlined here:

**Southern Economic Development Board Plan Sector Opportunities**
- Environmental industries
- Food products
- High-value services – education and health
- Medical technologies
- Tourism
- Wine

**Commentary:** According to the SEDB analysis Southern Adelaide has a relatively low global participation rate when measured in export performance, with around 2% of regional businesses exporting compared to the Australian average of 4% (SEDB, 2005). The low, medium and high growth agriculture and tourism sector scenarios discussed in the EconSearch(2012) economic analysis indicate that WHS listing would help address export performance in the Southern Onkaparinga LGA.
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1.16 Application of Integrated Design Principles

Key partners: Integrated Design Commission and RDA Barossa

While the current focus of the Integrated Design Commission is on delivering a pilot project in the form of a renewal strategy for inner Adelaide (5000+, 2011), the framework established by Professor Lee in her report *An Integrated Design Strategy for South Australia: Building the Future* is a model that can be adapted elsewhere. The model looks to the principles of integrated design as the basis of a decision-making process that any city, region or local community can adapt to their environments and needs. Barossa RDA for example, has already adopted ID principles into their Regional Roadmap, and it is likely that the Integrated Design Commission’s pilot project 5000+ and the guiding principles of integrated design will inform the process of mounting a WHS bid.

1.17 Alignment with proposed Character Preservation legislation objectives and values

As discussed throughout the report, nomination for WHS listing would be bolstered by the proposed introduction of character preservation legislation for the Barossa and McLaren Vale regions and align with the following objectives and character values that are contained in the proposed legislation:

**Character Preservation legislation objectives**

(a) to recognise, protect and enhance the special character of the district while at the same time providing for the economic, social and physical well being of the community; and

(b) to ensure that activities that are unacceptable in view of their adverse effects on the special character of the district are prevented from proceeding; and

(c) to ensure that future development does not detract from the special character of the district;

(d) otherwise to ensure the preservation of the special character of the district.

**Character Preservation legislation values**

(a) the rural landscape and visual amenity of the district;

(b) the heritage attributes of the district;

(c) the built form of the townships as they relate to the district;

(d) the viticultural, agricultural and associated industries of the district;

(e) the scenic and tourism attributes of the district.

1.18 Conclusions

In the context of existing state and federal government policy, a bid for WHS listing could have significant benefits for the region and the state, and align with state and local government policies and strategies as follows:

- It could represent a singular, strategic determinant of regional, national and global competitiveness;

- It will reinforce the rural landscape and built heritage objectives and values contained in the proposed Character Preservation legislation for McLaren Vale and the Barossa by assisting those areas to become more viable for agriculture, viticulture and tourism;

- It clearly aligns with one of seven areas of strategic focus recently identified by the State Government, namely supporting and developing ‘Clean green food as our competitive edge’, as it would provide a recognised global platform for communication, promotion and realisation of that ambition;

- It will reinforce the notion that South Australia is a great place to live and to visit, a core tent of South Australia’s Strategic Plan;
• It will put the region and its produce on the world stage and give it global prestige, thus driving the economic and social agendas of state, regional development and local government authorities;

• It solidifies and entrenches the South Australian Government’s objective as outlined in the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide to protect priority primary production land within the Greater Adelaide Region, and it would reinforce the plan’s objective to reduce carbon emissions by containing urban growth;

• It will bring to life and communicate ‘an authentic South Australian story’ based on the state’s utopian beginnings as a free settlement, where tolerance, civil liberty and opportunity have always been valued, and where food and wine have always played a distinctive role – core platforms of the South Australian Tourism Plan and the South Australian Tourism Brand Framework;

• By highlighting the original intent of the founding principles, including provisions that reserved Aboriginal rights to land, it will assist public understanding of the thwarted aspirations of the founding theorists, and the role and basis of evolving Native Title Claims today in reconciling those aspirations.

• It will have many potential positive spin-offs for both the agricultural and tourism sectors of the local and state economy, which the participating councils and associated Regional Development Authorities wish to bolster and support in whatever way they can;

• It has the potential to result in increased recognition of the economic and cultural role and value of the agricultural landscape in a global context, thus reinforcing the symbiotic relationship between landscape, tourism and sustainable communities;

• It will strengthen the branding opportunities for local produce and products which will benefit all farmers and tourism operators within the region;

• It will improve marketing opportunities for the region as a tourist and visitor destination with global prestige and it will help turn South Australia into a world recognised culinary tourism destination;

• It will increase the number of international visitors, the length of stay and visitor spending;

• It will encourage a whole-of-government and cross-sector approach to economic development of the Greater Adelaide region;

• The development of a strategic management framework for the agrarian landscape site will encourage a landscape-based approach to integrating agricultural production, environmental management, biodiversity protection and climate change adaption, a core tenet of state and regional natural resource management plans and state government strategies for climate change resilience;

• It will encourage joint effort by bringing together all levels of government, business, communities and individuals throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges and associated wine and agricultural regions for a common purpose;

• It will help put community ownership and responsibility at the centre of landscape-scale management;

• It will build intra and inter regional relationships and encourage the sharing of knowledge and information;

• It will improve food security for the Adelaide region by supporting a low carbon food source, by improving farm viability and further assisting with the protection of primary production land for this purpose;

• It will enable tourist facility owners and farmers to pursue value adding enterprises to their businesses as a result of having the prestige of the World Heritage brand;
• It will result in increased investment, new business opportunities and potential ‘reputation premiums’ for local products;

• It will enhance the sense of local pride, place and identity within the region and support integrated design approaches to creating quality built environments, towns and landscapes;

• It will promote community participation in value chain thinking, healthy eating, and sustainable consumption across the region;

• It will support health and recreation initiatives that encourage an active, healthy lifestyle;

• It will support niche cycling tourism strategies for the region;

• As a powerful ‘place-making’ tool it has the potential to generate wide socio-economic impacts and fundamental change in the region; and

• It has the potential to act as a catalyst for development, using heritage as a tool to develop new identities for places, and transformative programs of actions across the region.
APPENDIX 2: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Meetings, presentations, media coverage and correspondence to 1 June 2012.

Industry and heritage groups:
Meetings with Margaret Lehmann and Jan Angas (Food Barossa); Robert O’Callaghan (Rockford Wines); Sam Holmes (Barossa Grape & Wine Association Incorporated); McLaren Vale Grape Wine & Tourism Association; Southern Community Coalition including Pip Forrester at Willunga Farmers Market; the Willunga National Trust; State Heritage Council and Catharine Barnett (FoodSA). A presentation to Robert Brokenshire’s Food Security group included Ray Najar (Murray Darling Association), Mayor Ken Grundy (Naracoorte Lucindale Council), Cam Stafford (Australian Import Taskforce), Anne Stepien (Citrus Growers SA), Mike Redmond (Grow SA), Trevor Ranford (SA Horticultural Services), Tim Grieger (SA Fresh Fruitgrowers Association), Angelo Demasi (Adelaide Produce Market), Ken Lyons (SA Dairyfarmers Association), Greg Butler (SA No-Till Farmers Association), Andrew Green (SA Citrus Industry Development Board) and a representative of the SA Farmers Federation. Cam Stafford, (Chair of the Lenswood Coldstores Cooperative) subsequently invited Prof Stringer to present to a range of apple growers from the hills.

Councils
Presented: Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council, Light Regional Council, The Barossa Council, Adelaide Hills Council, City of Onkaparinga, District Council of Mt Barker, and Don Donaldson set up a workshop with Katherine Russell (Adelaide City Council).
Correspondence only: Alexandrina Council, District Council of Yankalilla, Adelaide City Council’s Lord Mayor Stephen Yearwood and Deputy Lord Mayor David Plumridge.

Ministers, State Agencies and NRM boards
Steven Bourne, then Manager, Naracoorte Caves National Park, World Heritage Fossil Site, DENR provided background to an early case study. Meetings with (i) Minister O’Brien, and (ii) Tim Mares, Helen Lamont and Stuart West at PIRSA in 2011 resulted in offers of support and sharing of data; (iii) Greg Lehmann and Dr Bob Inns at DENR resulted in a letter of support and offer of internal resources from Minister Caica; (iv) Meetings with lan Nightingale then CE of DPLG and Planning Minister Rau’s then adviser Shannon Simpson resulted in an invitation to present to then DPLG staff (not yet realized at the time of writing); (v) Letter from Jeff Tate to then Premier Mike Rann resulted in a letter of in principle support; (vi) Meeting with Tim Horton Integrated Design Commissioner garnered support; (vii) Meeting with Minister Hill resulted in a statement of in principle support; (vii) Meeting with Stephen Smith at the Mt Lofty Ranges Natural Resource Management Board resulted in a workshop for interested staff and board members and community officers at end 2011; (viii) Meeting with Phillip Broderick and Tom Gara at the Attorney General’s Native Title Unit identified the Aboriginal groups associated with the study area; (ix) David Lake at SATC has been briefed (x) Justin Ross hosted a presentation at PIRSA in Feb 2012 and (xi) Minister Gago was formally briefed in April 2012. Member for Mawson Leon Bignell has also been kept in the information loop.

Federal Government Agencies
Correspondence and phone interviews with Ilse Wurst, Veronica Blazely and Lawrence Bourke at DSEWPaC; Consultaion with Regional Development Australia through RDA Barossa.

Public Presentations to date
Presentations by Professor Stringer to the Environment Institute; Friends of Port Willunga; RDA Barossa ‘Can we have it all?’ Regional Forum with Tim Horton (Integrated Design Commissioner), Lyn Leader-Elliot (Flinders University), Sarah Noack (youth representative), Sam Holmes (Barossa Grape & Wine Association), Michael Hickinbotham and David Heinjus (Agricultural businesses).

Presentations by Stephanie Johnston to the Planning Institute of Australia Heritage Seminar; the State History Conference; the National Professional Historians Conference in 2011 and the Planning Institute of Australia national conference in May 2012.

In late 2011 the working group, in cooperation with PIRSA, RDA Barossa and the then DPLG, brought international experts Dave Sands (Vancouver BC Agricultural Land Reserve) and Sonia Callau (Barcelona...
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Agricultural Park) to Adelaide for three seminars on ‘edge’ planning and agricultural policy in peri-urban regions. The seminars brought together industry associations, local government elected members and staff, state government agency staff, as well as community groups, farmers and industry groups. Staged in the Barossa, McLaren Vale and the Waite Institute, the seminars were well attended and stimulated extensive debate around agricultural policy issues and marketing and branding concepts, including WHS listing. The Waite Institute seminar also included a discussion panel made up of Professor Mike Young, Carol Vincent from the South Australian Farmers’ Federation (and member representing agricultural development on the Minister for Planning’s Development Policy Advisory Committee), and Cam Stafford, chair of the Lenswood Coldstores Cooperative.

**Media coverage to date**
Several articles including cover stories in the Southern Times Messenger, The Courier, The Barossa & Light Herald, the Stock Journal’s Smart Farmer and articles in the Advertiser. One hour panel interview with Randy Stringer, Anne Moroney, David Heinjus and Cam Stafford on ABC’s Country Hour; ABC news coverage; Radio National’s Bush telegraph and ABC TV’s Lateline. Stephanie Johnston and Marc Salver were interviewed on ABC Radio National’s PM program, and Stephanie on ABC Radion National’s Country Hour and on ABC Adelaide 891’s drive time. The Feasibility Study will be circulated widely to the media on its release, with articles already pitched to the Advertiser, Barossa Living Magazine and Adelaide Hills Magazine.

**Ongoing consultation**
The feasibility study and associated economic impact study will be circulated to all the individuals, organisations and government representatives who have been consulted to date. Should the four participating councils decide to proceed to Stage One of the bid process, potential members of a broader steering group will be identified, and budget allocated to further government, industry and community consultation, including greater engagement with PIRSA, with the SATC board and executives, with RDA boards and staff nationally and locally, and with the key food, wine and tourism industry stakeholders identified in Appendix Figure 1.3. Formation of the steering group will also involve and oversee further consultation with heritage and history experts, community groups and Indigenous representatives, with relevant private corporations, and with DSEWPaC, DENR, DPTI, DMITRE and the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM board and staff. It is likely that specialist advisory groups will be formed along the way; for example the working group has recommended that a specialist Indigenous advisory group be formed to advise the project management team and steering group.
## APPENDIX 3. MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WORLD HERITAGE BID DETAILED BUDGET ESTIMATE

### MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WORLD HERITAGE BID DETAILED BUDGET ESTIMATE*

**Preliminary Stage:** Actual costs feasibility study and economic analysis July 2011 to June 2012 (Completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$Actual</th>
<th>In kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination &amp; research</td>
<td>Deliver feasibility report: Identify and consult key stakeholders, ascertain support for, and likelihood of success of bid. Research budget and management models, analyse economic impact scenarios and propose a management framework for proceeding with Stages One and Two: Approx 48 days @ $600/day</td>
<td>28,800 (GST nil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council in kind contribution</td>
<td>Partner staff time assuming an average of $80k per annum staff cost and average 8 working days contribution from each of 4 partners</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University in kind contribution</td>
<td>Contribution of Prof Mike Young and Prof Stringer based on 16 working days contribution @ University of Adelaide consultancy rates of $1500/day</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>‘Edge’ seminars, document production and communication and miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>2,200 + GST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting studies</td>
<td>EconSearch analysis of Economic Impact Projections</td>
<td>20,000 + GST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI administration</td>
<td>15% of 60,000 + GST</td>
<td>9,000 + GST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:**

Feasibility Study and Economic Impact Projections (completed)

**Preliminary stage costs (GST exclusive):**

| TOTAL ACTUAL: $60,000          |
| TOTAL IN KIND: $33,850         |
| TOTAL BUDGET: $93,850         |
**Stage One:** Estimate costs of National Heritage listing nomination and preparation for WHS bid: Timeline 3 years
Assume state government agency(ies) match council financial contribution and in kind contribution with possible “stop/start” timeline over 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$Actual</th>
<th>In kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and research</td>
<td>Assume a part-time coordinator to prepare the National Heritage Listing nomination dossier and prepare Stage One of WHS bid at $80k per annum @ 0.6 fte starting 48k @ 3 years with possible “stop/start” spread over 5 years @ 3.5% inflation</td>
<td>149-159k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and state government in kind</td>
<td>Assume an average of $80k per annum staff cost and 8 days per annum, and using the modal number of 8 partners gives an average cost in partner time starting at $19,692 pa over 3 years. Assume an average of 3.5% pa inflation with possible “stop/start” spread over 5 years (Assumes state government partner involvement)</td>
<td>61-66k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University in kind contribution</td>
<td>Contribution of Prof Stringer based on 16 working days pa contribution @ University of Adelaide consultancy rates of $1500/day = starting at 24k pa over 3 years (with possible “stop/start” spread over 5 years) @ 3.5% pa inflation</td>
<td>75-80k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and consultation</td>
<td>Communications, stakeholder engagement and consultation, website etc @ $30k pa over 3 years</td>
<td>90k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Photography and document production for the National Heritage listing nomination</td>
<td>15k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project administration</td>
<td>@ 5% total actual budget</td>
<td>15k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting studies</td>
<td>Commence economic, tourism, cultural, environmental, comparison studies @ $20k-100k per study Fund through industry, education sector and philanthropic partnerships</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting projects</td>
<td>Projects undertaken independently by government, partners, industry and community that will support the bid preparation</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:**
(i) National Heritage nomination delivered to DSEWPaC and assessment undertaken
(ii) Define property and develop preliminary Statement of Outstanding Universal Value based on initial research and stakeholder engagement
(iii) Achieve state government and federal government support for putting Mount Lofty Ranges Agrarian Landscapes site forward to the Tentative List
(iv) Establish local support structure involving public and private sectors (Project Management Team and Project Steering Group) for pursuing bid
(v) Establish not-for-profit foundation or appropriate industry fundraising mechanism and develop a sponsorship strategy

**Stage One estimated investment over 3-5 years (GST exclusive):**

TOTAL ACTUAL: $269-$279k
TOTAL IN KIND: $136-$146k
**TOTAL: $405-$425k**

+ supporting studies + supporting projects
### MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WORLD HERITAGE BID DETAILED BUDGET ESTIMATE (CONTINUED)*

**Stage Two:** Estimate costs WHS nomination: Timeline 3 years  
Assume DSEWPaC and state government agency led process with possible stop/start over 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$Actual</th>
<th>In kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead partner</td>
<td>DSEWPaC takes on the lead partner role @ $100k per annum cost in the first year, and the process takes 3 years, (but with a possible stop/start process over 5 years) with an average increase of 3.5% per annum, this would indicate a total cost of $310k – 332k <strong>assume in kind contribution from DSEWPaC</strong></td>
<td>310-332k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination at state level</td>
<td>Assume a part-time locally based coordinator either internal to DENR*** or outsourced, to work with DSEWPaC, DENR, the Project Management Team and Project Steering Group to assist preparation of the WHS bid at $88,600 + 3.5% per annum for 3 years @ 0.6 fte ($53,200k) with possible “stop/start” spread over 5 years (Assume internal to DENR*** or outsourced)</td>
<td>165-176k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and state government in kind</td>
<td>Assume an average of $90k per annum staff cost and 8 meetings per annum, and using the modal number of 8 partners, gives an average cost in partner time of $20,302 pa @ 3 years. Assume an average of 3.5% pa increase over 3-5 years = c$63k - 68k total (assumes additional state government partners).</td>
<td>63-68k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Adelaide in kind</td>
<td>3 years total (with possible “stop/start” over 5 years) 25,700pa + 3.5% inflation</td>
<td>80-86k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and communications</td>
<td>Communications, stakeholder engagement, website etc. and associated administration over 3 years (with a possible stop/start process over 5 years) 40k pa</td>
<td>120k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Document production and photography for WHS nomination and associated administration</td>
<td>80k</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting studies</td>
<td>Economic, tourism, cultural, environmental and/or international comparison studies @ $20-100k per study</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting projects</td>
<td>Projects undertaken independently by government, partners, industry and community that will support the bid preparation</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce management framework</td>
<td>Assume the management framework is prepared by the coordinator and not outsourced Additional partner time of $20k pa @ 3 years and assume an average of 3.5% pa increase over 3-5 years $62-75k total. Assume the documentation and photography costs come under the overall production budget</td>
<td>62-66k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:**  
The Mount Lofty Ranges Agrarian Landscapes site goes onto the Tentative List and WHS nomination goes forward to the World Heritage Centre

**Stage Two estimated investment over 3-5 years (GST exclusive):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
<th><strong>Total Actual:</strong> $200k</th>
<th><strong>Total In Kind:</strong> $680-$728k</th>
<th><strong>Total:</strong> $880-$928k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ supporting studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ supporting projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WORLD HERITAGE BID DETAILED BUDGET ESTIMATE SUMMARY*

**Combined Budget Stages One and Two**

The total cost (actual + in kind) of producing a bid over the next 10 years might therefore be estimated at between $1285k and $1353k, shared mostly between the state government and federal government, with some local government contribution, plus independent supporting studies and supporting project costs that would be funded by a combination of the public, private and university sectors. It is envisaged that completion of the two stages will require a 6 year full-time effort, which may be spread part-time over 10 years or more.

### Stage One + Two estimated investment (GST exclusive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL ACTUAL: $469-$479k</th>
<th>TOTAL IN KIND: $816-$874k</th>
<th>TOTAL: $1285-$1353k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Total Investment Stages One and Two:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Based on a PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007 analysis of UK World Heritage Sites downloaded at [www.dcms.gov.uk](http://www.dcms.gov.uk) and discussions with Adelaide City Council and DSEWPaC

**DSEWPaC**: Australian government Department for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

***DENR**: South Australian government Department of Environment and Natural Resources
APPENDIX 4. PEER COMMENTARY

4.1 Response from Steven Thomson MA, Former Business Development Manager, UK Heritage Lottery Fund, 26 April 2012

Firstly, I think the concept of developing a World Heritage Site bid for the Mount Lofty Ranges is a good one and a very positive way of improving partnership working across the landscape. Joining up working between a range of partners across any landscape is critical to getting the most, both socially and economically, from that landscape. It can be very difficult to get a range or stakeholders working in partnership, especially across a geographically dispersed site. Any tangible target for stakeholders to work towards should therefore be embraced as a key motivator for partnerships and partnership working. Working towards a World Heritage Site listing certainly provides that target and motivation. As your feasibility study rightly points out, the process necessary when working towards a World Heritage Site bid has significant intrinsic value to those involved, regardless of the ultimate outcome of any bid. With the threat of gradual suburbanisation and the importance to South Australia of a healthy, working, Mount Lofty Ranges, I think the requirements of a WHS listing are well aligned to the current and future needs of the Ranges. Continuing to work on a bid should therefore, in my opinion, be pursued with vigour.

More specifically, I think there are a few strategic issues that it would be beneficial to think a bit further about.

Whilst I think the case put forward around the universal value of a planned landscape in South Australia is convincing, the fact that the Adelaide Parklands and City Layout has already been accepted onto the National Heritage List for presumably similar reasons may be problematic should the two sites end up competing for a WHS listing. My concern would be that the case for listing the Mount Lofty Ranges will essentially be a rural version of the same case put forward by the Adelaide Parklands and City Layout bid. I would think it unlikely for UNESCO to award two very similar WHS listings, especially when the rationale for the universal value of both sites is so intrinsically linked (section 2.2.1 makes this historic link explicit by citing the ‘one pound for a city acre and one pound for a rural acre’ idea that ensured rapid settlement and certainty of title). That issue may not crop until much further down the track, but I think it is worth flagging up now. I would have thought that any joint listing or joint bid, whilst potentially appealing on the UNESCO front, would dilute any potential Mount Lofty Ranges branding and fail to really put the Ranges on the map. Such a broad area could well be perceived by punters as ‘just South Australia’ so there are difficulties there. The integrity and coherence of the Mount Lofty Ranges (more on what that may be later) must be protected if the listing is to have a significant impact on tourism, planning and the all round competitiveness of the Ranges.

Following on, I think there is (understandably) still a bit to do on defining the likely scope of the WHS. Whilst UNESCO have a pretty flexible approach to the scale of any potential sites, I think tourism, state investment and branding all work best when based around a relatively small and coherent site. The offer to the public needs to be clear, concise and coherent. I think this is particularly true when dealing with tourists and the branding of products. Anecdotally I have heard that visitors to Australian World Heritage Sites often get a kind of ‘National Park fatigue’. Whilst this could be down to the individuals and the nature (no pun intended!) of National Park sites, I think there is something about the dispersed nature of Australian World Heritage Sites that can make tourism relatively problematic. With a geographically dispersed site, where does a visitor focus? Where do you build the visitor centre? What in particular do you promote? I don’t have
answers to those questions, but I think the case studies cited - Shark Bay and Naracoorte - lend themselves to relatively straightforward benefits. You build a visitor centre, knock out some souvenir stuff and hope some entrepreneurial activity takes place. Over a dispersed site, you have to work much harder to ensure those obvious benefits are realised. So, essentially I think it is worth paying particular attention to which elements of the Mount Lofty Ranges could be focussed upon when developing the bid further. I know I am biased given my interests, but the wine trade is an obvious focus. Some of (if not all of) the world’s oldest vines are found in South Australia. If vineyard plantings were covered in the original colonisation plan, the fact that vines dating from the 19th century still exist in the Mount Lofty Ranges gives a very concise and coherent offer to the public. This brings me onto another point around the potential benefits for produce coming out of a WHS. In general, I think that an existing recognised product (Cheddar Cheese, or Champagne for example) can benefit from WHS listing quite a bit. I think the case is less convincing when you are charged with building brand recognition around a product that no one has paid any attention to in the past e.g. Mount Lofty Ranges Apples. So, while I think there are branding/premium reputation benefits to be had following WHS listing, I wouldn’t over egg them as I think they are dependant on the product already occupying a niche in the market.

So, to summarise the two key strategic issues I think need to be addressed:

1. The relationship (or lack of) with the Adelaide Parks and City Layout would benefit from being considered and addressed.

2. The definition of the Mount Lofty Ranges WHS would benefit from being be tightened up, with particular focus on specific sites of historic interest that may facilitate increased tourism and existing products that can benefit from WHS association.

4.2 Initial Response to Mount Lofty Ranges WHS report from Associate Professor John Spoehr, Executive Director, Australian Centre for Workplace Innovation and Social Research, The University of Adelaide, 26 April 2012.

The case for WHS listing of the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape is a strong one. A dynamic and symbiotic relationship exists between the magnificent landscape of the Mount Lofty Ranges and those that live and work in it. Many thousands enjoy its beauty and are sustained by its world-class produce but those benefits cannot be taken for granted in the face of growth pressures. They are a function of a balance between social, economic, cultural and environmental objectives which WHS listing has the gravity to remind and reinforce to all if it is conferred.

It is the generation of enduring economic, social, cultural and environmental value for generations to come that makes the case for WHS listing such a compelling one. Listing confirms the global value of the landscape, creating momentum for the application of integrated approaches to planning and development in the Mount Lofty Ranges. It is reasonable to expect, as the WHS preliminary case demonstrates, that medium to longer term economic benefits will be generated by WHS listing. This is crucial, as the commitment of key stakeholders will be closely tied to whether their wellbeing will be enhanced by listing. Economic benefits however are not the only attraction, as the report makes clear.

The application of non-market valuation methods would be beneficial in further development of the case to help quantify the value of eco-systems services in the Mt Lofty Ranges. This might also be applied to educational, cultural and other benefits.
4.3 Response from Dr. Ann Herraman “Springfields”, 313 Mills Road, Kanmantoo, SA 5252, 4 May 2012.

I have read the Draft Report May 2012 with interest in a spirit of optimism. I agree with the broad economic potential of this project and recognise the social and cultural benefits which would also follow a project which outlines and confirms the particular qualities of the Mt. Lofty Region and which provides a constructive and broader framework for future planning and sustainable agricultural, cultural and social development.

From my experience as a regional historian, having completed a PhD Thesis which focused upon the impact and implementation of the Wakefield systematic colonisation scheme in the broadly defined Mt Barker region of rural South Australia – namely the Special Surveys outlined in the 1840 Map – I recommend that the intention to base the heritage argument upon the Wakefield scheme will need to be approached with caution. My research showed that the Special Surveys which were implemented in the Mount Lofty Ranges were a deviation from the Wakefield ‘systematic’ and ‘concentrated’ model and were strongly criticised and resisted by Wakefield himself.

Wakefield based his concept upon the 80 acre sustainable farm model. The Special Surveys were of 3000 acres selected from 15,000 surveyed acres. A provision for Special Surveys had been included in preliminary legislation on the recommendation of George Fyfe Angas. This land division strategy was implemented in South Australia by Governor Gawler in 1839 in response to the survey crisis. The Surveys taken up by Angas in what became the Barossa, by Dutton, Finnis and McFarlane around Mount Barker, by a Scottish consortium around Strathalbyn, by the Quaker investor John Barton Hack at Echunga and by the Davenport family around Maccelsfield, for example, did not follow the Wakefield model. These were the large-scale capitalist investors whom Wakefield resisted. They did take up the best land and the best resources as Wakefield anticipated. However they were not the exploiting ‘absentee’ land owners who were anathema to Wakefield.

My research did show that, in reality, these deviations from the ‘concentrated’ 80 acres model did achieve the ideals which Wakefield had intended because the large-scale 3000 acre opportunity attracted investors with a commitment to their place and their people in the longer term. Their ideas, their actions, their interests and their influences are still recognisable in the Mount Lofty region. These visionary settlers provided the economic and cultural framework for the region. They were the practical and idealistic creators of the cultural and agricultural landscape which will forms the basis for the application.

The practical implementation of the Wakefield ‘concentrated’ colonisation scheme in the Mount Lofty Ranges defines the region. Equally important is the implementation of the ‘voluntary principle’ which framed the religious development of the colony and which was critical to the settlements in the Barossa and Hahndorf.

NB The working group also sought commentary on an early draft of this report from Shaun Berg, legal representative of the Ngarrindjeri, and from Lyn Leader-Elliot, a heritage tourism expert and teacher at Flinders University. The former expressed fundamental concerns about the whole proposition to inscribe an agricultural landscape, and the latter was unable to provide a formal commentary in a timely fashion.

APPENDIX 5. VAL D’ORCIA WORLD HERITAGE SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND JUSTIFICATIONS

Val d’Orcia
Brief Description
The landscape of Val d’Orcia is part of the agricultural hinterland of Siena, redrawn and developed when it was integrated in the territory of the city-state in the 14th and 15th centuries to reflect an idealized model of good governance and to create an aesthetically pleasing picture. The landscape’s distinctive aesthetics, flat chalk plains out of which rise almost conical hills with fortified settlements on top, inspired many artists. Their images have come to exemplify the beauty of well-managed Renaissance agricultural landscapes. The inscription covers: an agrarian and pastoral landscape reflecting innovative land-management systems; towns and villages; farmhouses; and the Roman Via Francigena and its associated abbeys, inns, shrines, bridges, etc.

Justification for Inscription

Criterion (iv): The Val d’Orcia is an exceptional reflection of the way the landscape was re-written in Renaissance times to reflect the ideals of good governance and to create an aesthetically pleasing pictures.

Criterion (vi): The landscape of the Val d’Orcia was celebrated by painters from the Siennese School, which flourished during the Renaissance. Images of the Val d’Orcia, and particularly depictions of

Source: UNESCO website
Exploring UNESCO World Heritage Site listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges agrarian landscape

landscapes where people are depicted as living in harmony with nature, have come to be seen as icons of the Renaissance and have profoundly influenced the development of landscape thinking.

Long Description

Val d'Orcia is an exceptional reflection of the way the landscape was rewritten in Renaissance times to reflect the ideals of good governance and to create an aesthetically pleasing picture. It lies to the south-east of Siena, its northern boundary approximately 25 km from the city centre. The landscape reflects colonization by the merchants of Siena in the 14th and 15th centuries. They aimed to create a landscape of efficient agricultural units but also one that was pleasing to the eye. The landscape that resulted was one of careful and conscious planning and design and led to the beginning of the concept of 'landscape' as a man-made creation. The landscape was thus created to be efficient, functional, equitable and aesthetically pleasing. It was based on innovative tenure systems whereby the estates owned by merchants were divided into small properties and cultivated by families who lived on the land. Half of the produce was paid to the merchants as rent - sufficient to allow the merchants to reinvest in further agricultural improvements. The farms were mixed farms cultivating grain, vines, olives, fruit and vegetables and with hay meadows and pastures for livestock interspersed between the farms. Farmers practised transhumance with routes to Meremma and l'Amiata. An illustration of the aim for the farming landscape to create pleasing pictures is the persistent tradition of planting roses to embellish vineyards. Cypresses form a striking addition to the landscape planted along routes and around settlements, their regular form punctuating the rounded shapes of the hills and their dark colour contrasting strikingly with the pale landscape. The colonization of the landscape involved creating new settlements for farmers and their families and labourers needed to work the land. It also involved greatly enlarging and improving existing villages. The most dramatic example of a planned new town is Pienza, named after its founder Pope Pius II who commissioned in 1459 Bernardo Rossellino to enlarge his village to create an ideal city with cathedral, palaces and civic buildings surrounding a central piazza, thus bringing together civil and religious authorities. Larger fortified settlements on hills include Montalcino, originally a 13th-century frontier post, Radicofani, Castiglion d'Orcia, Rocca d'Orcia and Monticchello. Elsewhere the landscape is studded with smaller villages on smaller hills, some also fortified. In many cases these settlements include remains of 13th-century buildings when Siena first gained control of the area, buildings from the great period of expansion in the 14th and 15th centuries, and also later buildings constructed under Florentine control in the 16th centuries.

The World Heritage site is significant in that the large farmhouses assume a dominant position in the landscape and are enriched by prominent architectural elements such as loggias, belvederes, porches and avenues of trees bordering the approach roads.

The strategic importance of the area, its connection with Siena, and its development, are all intertwined with the Via Francigena which has traversed the area north-south since Roman times (when it was known as the Via Cassia) linking Rome with the north of Italy and France. Since late medieval times, the route has been used an ecclesiastical route, linking the Church of Rome with its dioceses. It also facilitated a flow of pilgrims and merchants and generally allowed the transmission of people and ideas to enter the region. The route fostered the development of fine churches and monasteries such as the Collegiata di San Quirico in the Abbey of Sant'Antimo.

In the Val d'Orcia (and also in Siena) the landscape is strongly associated with utopian ideals. Siena was a sort of 'commune' and the Val d'Orcia a model of sustainable rural development, and both manifested the highest aesthetic qualities. The ideal landscape was painted by Lorenzetti in the Town Hall in Siena in 1338-40; it became reality in the Val d'Orcia and was then immortalized in paintings by artists such as Giovanni di Paolo, and Sano di Petri, who in turn helped to strengthen the ideals.

Source: UNESCO/CLT Commission/World Heritage Committee
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Historical Description

The Val d’Orcia bears testimony from archaeological remains to prehistoric settlement, to an important role during the Etruscan period and to further development during the Roman Empire. The area seems to have been largely abandoned agriculturally in the Middle Ages. A revival in the economy and a certain stability in the 10th and 11th centuries led to the establishment of monasteries, greater use of the Via Francigena and the development of villages under a feudal system.

Sienna’s dramatic growth as a trading state in the 13th and 14th centuries, led it to expand its agricultural base outwards from the periphery of Sienna. The Val d’Orcia was colonised together with other outlying areas such as the Maremma along the coast. The wealth of Siennese merchants was invested in turning the landscape into productive farmland within an innovative land tenure framework. So far from being at the edge of the state, the valley became a focus for display. Merchants supported the development of settlements, built palaces and churches and commissioned paintings that depicted the life of ordinary people in the landscape.

Sienna’s rivalry with Florence, the seat of aristocratic power, lasted for more than two centuries. The weakening of Sienna at the end of the 16th century was followed by a Florentine victory after which the Val d’Orcia gradually declined in economic importance and the Via Francigena became a secondary route for local traffic.

The comparative poverty and marginalisation of the area over the following four centuries has had the effect of sustaining traditional land-use patterns and structures. In the 1960s the new laws on land management in Italy which translated tenancies into contracts, and which have led to the abandonment of land in many regions, seem to have had less effect in the Val d’Orcia.

In the past thirty-five years or so the farmland has undergone some improvements such as an extension of the cultivated land and better control mechanisms for water management. A few areas of intensive change have been put into the buffer zone.

In 1999 the area was protected as an Artistic, Natural and Cultural Park. This was the initiative of the five municipalities who established a common management body, which was then integrated within the provincial administration.

Source: UNESCO Advisory Body Evaluation
APPENDIX 6. ADELAIDE PARK LANDS AND CITY LAYOUT NATIONAL HERITAGE LISTING GAZETTE NOTICE
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

INCLUSION OF A PLACE IN THE NATIONAL HERITAGE LIST

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout

I, Peter Robert Garrett AM, Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts having considered, in relation to the place specified in the Schedule of this instrument:

(a) the Australian Heritage Council’s assessment whether the place meets any of the National Heritage criteria; and

(b) the comments given to the Council under sections 324JG and 324JH of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999; and

being satisfied that the place described in the Schedule has the National Heritage values specified in the Schedule, pursuant to section 324JJ of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, include it in the National Heritage List.

Dated 4/11/2008

[Signed]

Peter Robert Garrett AM
Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts
SCHEDULE

STATE / TERRITORY
Local Government
Name
Location / Boundary
Criteria / Values

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adelaide City

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout:
About 900ha in Adelaide and North Adelaide, defined as follows:
1. an area with an outer boundary defined by the boundary of the City of Adelaide local government area.
2. Within 1. above, the following areas are excluded. Areas 1. and 2. have boundaries that are defined by the road reserve boundaries of the named streets, such that each road reserve is included in the place:
   Area 1: North Terrace, East Terrace, South Terrace and West Terrace
   Area 2: Three smaller grid areas located in North Adelaide bounded by the following streets: Barton Terrace West, O'Connell Street, Barton Terrace East, Lefevre Terrace, Kingston Terrace, Kingston Terrace East, Mann Terrace, MacKinnon Parade, Brougham Place, Sir Edwin Smith Avenue (originally named Roberts Place), Pennington Terrace, Montefiore Hill, Strangways Terrace, Mills Terrace.
   Area 3: Railway land owned by Rail Track Corp Ltd, Australian National Railways or SA Minister for Transport comprising the following Lots: (D34345 A5, D15497 A29, D30327 A53, F22072 A23, A24 and A25, D46426 Q5, F14185 A22, F14184 A19, A20, D56872, A58 and A59, F1485, A16 and A17, D58245 A20, F11089 A23, and portion of closed road marked X3 on GRO127/2006).
   Area 4: University of Adelaide North Terrace campus comprising the following Lots: Lots H105100 S1205, S1206, S1207, S737, S694, S693, S695, S592, D51367 A11.
   Area 5: University of South Australia City East Campus comprising Lot D28393 A1 and Lot H105100 S593.
   Area 6: Royal Adelaide Hospital precinct comprising Lots D51367 A12, A13 and A14; H105100 S614 and S762.
   Area 7: State Library (H105100 S510), Museum (H105100 S561), Art Gallery of South Australia (H105100 S562) and Lots H105100 S610 and S745.
   Area 8: Government House and grounds (H105100 S755 and S757), Old and New Parliament Houses and grounds (H105100 S747 and S748).
   Area 9: The Festival Theatre, Adelaide Casino, Convention Centre and Adelaide Railway Station Area comprising the following Lots: D46426 Q3, D46426 A9, D59055 A100, D59055 Q101 and Q102, D46426 Q1, D46426 Q2 and Q6, D38136 A104.
   Area 10: Lots H105100 S1015, S549, S1203, S1204, that part of S6027 between D46426 Q5 and North Terrace/Port Road, Port Road railway bridge; that part of Montefiore Road and road reserve extending from its intersection with North Terrace in the south and its intersection with the northern loop of Festival Drive in the north, and Lot H105100 (Tramway).
3. Notwithstanding the areas excluded in 2. above, the following areas are included in the place:
   (a) six squares and three gardens being: In North Adelaide - Wellington Square, Palmer Gardens and Brougham Gardens and in Adelaide - Victoria Square, Hindmarsh Square, Hurtle Square, Whitmore Square, Light Square and East Terrace Gardens (comprising F217542 A50 and F39233 Q1), and
   (b) the grid of major roads (including the whole of each road reserve) consisting of the City centre grid defined by four major roads: East Terrace, North Terrace, West Terrace and South Terrace; the following streets traversing the City east-west: Hindley, Currie, Waymouth, Franklin, Grote, Gouger, Wright, Sturt, Gilbert, Rundle (Street and Mall), Grenfell, Pirie, Flinders, Wakefield, Angas, Carrington, Halifax and Gilles, the following streets running north-south: Morphett, King William, Pulteney and Hutt; and
   (c) three smaller grids in North Adelaide including the following major streets (including the whole of each road reserve): Barton Terrace East, Barton Terrace West, Mills Terrace, Strangways Terrace, Montefiore Hill, Lefevre Terrace, Hill, Jeffcott, O'Connell, Childers, Buxton, Gover, Molesworth, Tynte, Barnard, Archer, Ward, Brougham Place, Palmer Place, Kermdoe, Pennington Terrace, King William Road, Sir Edwin Smith Avenue, Kingston Terrace, Kingston Terrace East, Mann Terrace, MacKinnon Parade, Jerningham, Stanley, Melbourne and Finniss.
Criterion

(a) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history.

Values

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is the physical expression of the 1837 Adelaide Plan designed and laid out by Colonel William Light. It has endured as a recognisable historical layout for over 170 years retaining the key elements of the plan; encompassing the layout of the two major city areas separated by the Torrens River, the encircling Park Lands, the six town squares, and the grid pattern of major and minor roads. It is substantially intact and reflects Light's design intentions with high integrity.

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is of outstanding importance because it signifies a turning point in the settlement of Australia. It was the first place in Australia to be planned and developed by free settlers, not as a penal settlement or military outpost. The colony of South Australia was established by incorporation as a commercial venture supported by the British Government, based on Edward Wakefield's theory of systematic colonisation. To be commercially successful, there needed to be contained settlement to avoid speculative land sales and this settlement needed to be designed and planned to attract free settlers and to provide them with security of land tenure. The city layout with its grid plan expedited the process of land survey enabling both rapid settlement of land and certainty of title. The wide streets, public squares and generous open spaces provided amenity and the surrounding park lands ensured a defined town boundary while still allowing for public institutional domains. These elements are discernable today.

The Adelaide Park Lands is also significant for the longevity of its protection and conservation. The Adelaide Municipal Corporation Act (1840) established the city council as the ‘conservators’ of the city and park lands. The establishment of the Park Lands Preservation Society in 1903, along with successive community organisations marks a continuing pattern in community support for safeguarding the significance of the Park Lands for the Adelaide community.

The Adelaide Plan was highly influential as a model for planning other towns in Australia and overseas. It is acknowledged by town planners and historians as a major influence on the Garden City Planning movement, one of the most important urban planning initiatives.

(b) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history.

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is rare as the most complete example of nineteenth-century colonial planning where planning and survey were undertaken prior to settlement. The historical layout as conceived in the 1837 Adelaide Plan remains clearly legible today. The place is also the only Australian capital city to be completely enclosed by park lands and is the most extensive and substantially intact nineteenth-century park lands in Australia.
The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is an exemplar of a nineteenth-century planned urban centre. It demonstrates the principal characteristics of a nineteenth century city including a defined boundary, streets in a grid pattern, wide streets, public squares, spacious rectangular blocks and expansive open public space for commons and public domains. The expression of these features with their generous open space reflects the early theories and ideas of the Garden City movement of an urban area set in publicly accessible open space with plantings, gardens, designed areas and open bushland.

Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is regarded throughout Australia and the world as a masterwork of urban design. Elements of the Adelaide Plan that contribute to the design excellence are the use of the encircling park lands to define the boundary of the development of the city and to provide for health, public access, sport, recreation and public institutional domains, thereby meeting both economic and social requirements. Designing the city layout to respond to the topography was highly innovative for its time with the northern sections of the city located and angled to take advantage of the rising ground while retaining the Torrens River as a feature within the Park Lands. The judicious siting and wide streets maximised views and vistas through the city and Park Lands and from some locations to the Adelaide Hills. The plan features a hierarchy of road widths with a wide dimension to principal routes and terraces and alternating narrow and wide streets in the east-west direction. Light's planning innovation is supported by substantial historical documentation.

The formal organisation, delineation and dedication of the Park Lands space was a pioneering technical achievement of William Light in the Adelaide Plan.

The overall landscape planting design implemented by several successive landscape designers/managers incorporated designed vistas, formal avenues, plantations, gardens, use of specimen trees, botanically important living plant collections particularly at the Adelaide Botanic Garden and the strategic placement of buildings and statuary in their settings.

The creativity of the city and parkland design is clearly legible in the contemporary landscape viewed from the air or from the Adelaide Hills. The civic design of Adelaide was used as a model for founding many other towns in Australia and New Zealand and it is cited in later seminal Garden City planning texts including Garden Cities of Tomorrow by Ebenezer Howard.
(g) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place’s strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.

The Adelaide Park Lands has outstanding social value to South Australians who see it as fundamental to the character and ambience of the city. The Park Lands with their recreation areas, sports grounds, gardens and public facilities provide venues for individual and group activities and events, meetings and passive and active recreation. The Park Lands also have significant social value due to the range of important civic, public, and cultural assets and institutions within it.

The present Adelaide Parklands Preservation Society is the latest in a long history of community groups dedicated to protecting the Adelaide Park Lands. These have included the Park Lands Defence Association (1869-87), the Park Lands Preservation League (1903, 1948) and the National Trust of South Australia. The longevity of the involvement of community groups in campaigning for the protection and safeguarding of the Park Lands is exceptional.

(h) the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place’s special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia’s natural or cultural history.

Colonel William Light is most famously associated with the plan of Adelaide. He bore the ultimate responsibility, as recorded in his surviving publications and letters.

For a description of any references quoted above, and more information on the place please search the Australian Heritage Database at http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl using the name of the place.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Australian Convict Sites* is the name of the nominated property and comprises 11 sites across the continent of Australia. The sites are representative of the global phenomenon of convictism and its association with global developments in the punishment of crime in the modern era. The 11 sites are the pre-eminent examples of Australia’s rich convict history with more than 3,000 convict sites remaining around Australia. This is unique in the world today.

The nominated sites are: Kingston and Arthur’s Vale Historic Area (Norfolk Island); Old Government House and Domain (New South Wales); Hyde Park Barracks (New South Wales); Brickendon–Woolmers Estates (Tasmania); Darlington Probation Station, (Tasmania); Old Great North Road (New South Wales); Cascades Female Factory (Tasmania); Port Arthur Historic Site (Tasmania); Coal Mines Historic Site (Tasmania); Cockatoo Island Convict Site (New South Wales); and Fremantle Prison (Western Australia).

The property is nominated under criteria (iv) and (vi) for its outstanding universal significance as:

- an exceptional example of the forced migration of convicts - an important stage of human history (criterion iv); and
- an extraordinary example of global ideas and developments associated with the punishment and reform of the criminal elements of humanity during the Age of Enlightenment and the modern era (criterion vi).

In 2007 the importance of the Australian convict memory to all humankind was recognised when some of Australia’s convict records were included in UNESCO’s *Memory of the World Register*.

The *Australian Convict Sites* have a high level of integrity and authenticity and fully meet the requirements of the UNESCO *Operational Guidelines to the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. A world class management system, entitled the *Australian Convict Sites strategic management framework* (2008), will ensure the full protection and conservation of the property. The framework comprises a ministerial agreement which incorporates legislation, conservation management plans, community engagement and a range of policies covering each of the convict sites across three levels of government. Each of the 11 sites is listed on national and State or Territory heritage registers which ensure their protection under the various laws and policies. The framework will ensure the preservation, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the heritage significance of the *Australian Convict Sites*. 
KEY TERMS
For full glossary see Appendix A.

**Assignment**
A system that allocated or ‘assigned’ convicts to work for colonial authorities or free settlers.

**Colonial authorities**
The civil administration of a penal colony.

**Convict**
A person subjected to transportation after being convicted of a crime by a judicial authority and those who re-offended before completing their sentence.

**Convictism**
The system of penal transportation and systems to manage and control convicts in the colonies.

**Convict gangs**
A form of secondary punishment where convicts laboured on public works such as roads, prisons and churches.

**Convict ‘stain’**
Hostility to, embarrassment about or rejection of a country’s convict past.

**Emancipist** (commonly known as an ‘ex-convict’)
A convict freed by absolute or conditional pardon after serving all or part of their sentence.

**Exile**
A person banished from their country or location of residence, usually as a result of their political or religious activities or for crimes or acts against the state.

**Forced migration**
All forms of involuntary movement of people from their home country. The main types include slavery, indentured labour and convictism.

**Panopticon**
A model prison designed by Jeremy Bentham based on a circular architectural design to maximise surveillance and control of prisoners.

**Penal colony**
A place where convicts were transported to serve out their sentences for a crime committed in their home state.

**Penal transportation**
The forced removal of convicts from their country of origin to a different country or place, usually a penal colony, in order to serve out their sentences.

**Secondary punishment**
A sentence given to punish convicts for offences committed during the journey to or after arrival in a penal colony. Punishments could include being sent to a road gang, penal station or female factory.

**Ticket-of-leave**
A form of parole available to well-behaved convicts before their original sentence expired. A ticket-of-leave allowed convicts to work for themselves until the end of their sentences.