

CMP ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST – HERITAGE BRANCH

1.1 Introduction

The following has been adapted from the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Assessment Checklist developed by the State Heritage Register Committee of the Heritage Council of NSW.

The purpose of the checklist is to demonstrate consistency of the CMP with Heritage Council requirements for endorsement of CMPs for items of State heritage significance.

1.2 Investigation of Significance

1.2.1 History

Have the <i>historical context(s)</i> been identified and researched?	Section 2 and Appendix B.
Has the pre-contact, contact and/or post-contact <i>Aboriginal history</i> of the item and its curtilage been investigated?	Section 2 and Appendix B.
Has a <i>thematic approach</i> to historical analysis using the NSW and/or Australian historical themes been used, with relevant local historical themes developed?	N/A
If a <i>non-thematic approach</i> has been used, does it still enable the contribution of the item to NSW's history to be understood?	Section 2 and Appendix B.
Can the development of the item <i>over time</i> be clearly understood?	Section 2 and Appendix B.
Has the ability of the item to <i>demonstrate</i> the relevant historical themes been identified?	N/A
Are appropriate primary and secondary <i>documentary resources</i> used?	Yes
Are <i>historical images/maps/plans/drawings</i> adequate and well referenced?	Yes
Are all <i>text-based, oral and physical sources</i> referenced properly?	Yes

1.2.2 Fabric

Has the fabric been <i>investigated</i> ?	Section 3 and Appendix D
Has the fabric been adequately <i>identified</i> (eg materials, repair, alterations, additions, contents, views, spaces, plant/animal; species, manufactured/pre-fab elements, timber species, brick types etc)	Section 3 and Appendix D
Has the fabric been usefully <i>analysed</i> ? (eg phases, ages, styles, techniques (vernacular, trade etc), design, artisanship, etc?)	Section 3 and Appendix D
Have <i>architects/designers</i> and <i>builders/makers</i> been identified with a degree of certainty?	Identified where known.
Have <i>contents/movable</i> elements been investigated and their provenance identified?	A preliminary survey has been undertaken.

Has <i>archaeological fabric</i> been investigated and some degree of potential established?	Section 3
Has the <i>method</i> used for the fabric investigation (eg non-intrusive observation) been identified, and is it acceptable?	Non-intrusive investigation was undertaken only.
Have clear/scale/measured <i>drawings</i> been provided?	Section 3
Do any elements or areas need <i>further analysis</i> ?	Physical condition of each element was not part of scope. Some potential archaeological features need further investigation.

1.3 Contributory Matters

Has <i>natural</i> heritage potential been identified and investigated?	Sections 2 and 3.
Has the Heritage Council's policy on <i>natural</i> heritage been acknowledged or used?	Section 4.
Have the relevant <i>Aboriginal</i> group or groups, and/or individual knowledge holders, associated with the place been identified and consulted?	The Aboriginal Heritage Assessment was undertaken in consultation with the MLALC. No advertising was undertaken.
Has the heritage potential for any <i>ethnic or cultural</i> community been considered?	The Australian Red Cross Society, RSL and Shore School—Section 4.
Have any Aboriginal, or other earlier, <i>place name(s)</i> associated with the place been identified and investigated?	None identified through consultation with MLALC.
Has the relationship between the item and its broader <i>landscape</i> setting been identified and investigated?	Section 3.
Are there any <i>other</i> relevant issues and have they been addressed? (eg industrial archaeology, gardens and plantings, particular materials, social values, maritime issues, public accessibility, ruinisation)	Gardens and plantings and social values addressed throughout.

1.4 Assessment of Significance

Is there sufficient information and analysis to enable the significance to be assessed?	Yes
Is there a single, concise <i>statement of significance</i> that clearly addresses the question of 'why is this item significant'?	Section 4.
Is the statement of significance <i>supported</i> by the research?	It is based entirely on the research.
Has the statement of significance been prepared with <i>input from all authors</i> of the Plan?	Yes
Are there <i>sub-statements</i> of significance for each of the relevant SHR criteria?—a State significant item must meet one or more of these criteria under s.4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act</i> and in accordance with the gazetted criteria of 23 April 1999 to be considered of state significance.	Section 4.
Has a <i>comparative analysis</i> been undertaken with the basis for the comparison made clear, and the comparators clearly identified?	Section 4.
Does the comparative analysis identify <i>state/regional/local levels</i> of significance?	Where applicable.
Has a <i>hierarchy</i> of significance been identified for the elements of the item?	Section 4.
If a <i>complex</i> site, has the significance of the site as a whole been assessed as well as the significance of its constituent elements?	Section 4.
Has the interaction of natural and cultural heritage values with Aboriginal heritage values been assessed in the statement of significance?	N/A—no Aboriginal significance identified.
Has <i>natural</i> heritage significance been addressed in the statement of significance?	N/A—no natural heritage values identified.
Has <i>Aboriginal</i> heritage significance been addressed in the statement of significance?	N/A—no Aboriginal significance identified.
Has heritage significance to any <i>ethnic or cultural</i> community been addressed in the statement of significance?	Section 4.
Has <i>archaeological</i> significance been addressed in the statement of significance?	Section 4.
Has the significance of any <i>contents</i> or movables been addressed in the statement of significance, either individually or as contributory elements?	Preliminary Assessment undertaken.
Has an appropriate <i>curtilage</i> been established based on the statement of significance? (if appropriate)	Existing SHR boundaries confirmed as appropriate curtilage.

Has this curtilage been clearly <i>defined</i> by map or diagram?	Shown on site plan in Section 4 and on map in Section 5.
Has the listed (or proposed to be listed) curtilage been clearly distinguished from the broader <i>setting</i> ?	Section 4.
Has the significance of the place as a contributory element to a broader <i>landscape</i> been assessed?	Yes.

1.5 Opportunities and Constraints

Are Opportunities and Constraints identified?	Yes—Section 5.
Do they appear to cover the <i>range</i> (statutory/non-statutory listings, owner's requirements, continuing/re-use options etc)?	Yes—as currently known.
Is the item listed on the SHR, an REP, LEP or other <i>statutory</i> list?	SHR and North Sydney LEP 2001.
Has the impact of any other <i>legislative or policy</i> requirements been identified (such as SEPPs or BCA)?	Yes—Section 5.
Is the item listed on the National Trust Register, RAIA List of 20C Buildings, IEA Engineering Heritage Register or other <i>community</i> list?	Graythwaite is included on the National Trust Register and RNE.
Have any requirements of the <i>owner/manager/trustee/custodian</i> been clearly identified?	Section 5.4.
Have any proposals for <i>future uses</i> and change been identified?	Section 5.4.
Have the requirements of any relevant <i>local council, State agency, Aboriginal Land Council</i> or other statutory body or community organisation been identified during the preparation of the Plan?	North Sydney Council—Section 5.6.3. MLALC—Section 6.3.2 (and <i>Policy 28</i>).
Have the requirements of relevant individual knowledge holders been identified during the preparation of the Plan?	Individual knowledge holders were not identified. The requirements of the MLALC are identified in Section 6.3.2 (and <i>Policy 28</i>).
Are the requirements for any <i>archaeological permits</i> and approvals clearly identified?	Section 5.6 (and <i>Policy 64</i>).
If the CMP is for an item which includes <i>Aboriginal</i> heritage values, does it address issues of cultural confidentiality, community protocols, site access and other relevant matters?	Graythwaite has no known Aboriginal heritage values.

1.6 Conservation Policies

Does the Plan include a conservation policy or guidelines section?	Yes—Section 6.
Are the policies clearly <i>derived from the statement of significance</i> and investigation sections?	The policies have been based on the heritage significance of the place, which in turn has been determined via thorough investigation of the place.
Do the policies take account of the identified Constraints and Opportunities?	The policies aim to address each issue identified in Section 5.
Are the policies presented in a <i>useful manner</i> (ie are they in plain English, with a logical layout and a coherent numbering or other identification system), supported by relevant graphic and illustrative materials?	Yes.
Do the policies providing for future work on an item (including within its curtilage) provide clear guidance for <i>assessing proposals for change</i> (or preservation) to the item or its elements?	Yes.
Is there evidence of a <i>predetermined outcome</i> (eg demolition, subdivision or a particular development proposal; or regular maintenance, change of ownership, etc)?	The CMP has been prepared cognisant that new changes of use will occur and has aimed to ensure that new development, regular maintenance etc are appropriately addressed.
Do the policies specifically identify conservation works and/or new development that is to be exempted from further Heritage Act approvals under <i>Standard Exemption No.6</i> ?	Yes—Section 6 and Appendix E.
Do the conservation policies provide for the conservation of the elements of the item identified as being <i>significant</i> ?	Yes—Section 6.
If the policies provide for change to significant elements, do they also provide for <i>mitigation</i> measures?	Yes—Section 6.
Do the policies identify a <i>potential for further development</i> , and if so, where and how could it occur?	Yes—Section 6 and Figures 6.1 and 6.2 in particular.
Do the policies for new development provide guidance on <i>new design and physical characteristics</i> that are appropriate to the item's significance?	Yes.
Should any of the policies for new development be excluded from endorsement, and <i>remain subject to approvals under s60</i> of the Heritage Act?—if yes, why?	N/A

Is there a <i>schedule of conservation works</i> for the short, medium and long terms?	Not part of current scope.
Are there policies for works to meet the <i>minimum standards of maintenance</i> and repair identified (if relevant—for purposes of s118 Regulation)?	Yes—Section 6.
Is there any policy proposal to <i>vary</i> the existing listed curtilage boundaries?	No—existing SHR Listing boundary proposed to be retained as curtilage.
Is there a distinction between policies within the <i>listed curtilage</i> area, and policies for the <i>unlisted setting</i> ?	N/A—policies for areas beyond heritage curtilage not included. These areas are not in the ownership of the Shore School.
Do the policies provide for any <i>changes in existing statutory listings or planning instruments</i> ?—if so, do they provide guidance on how this can be achieved?	No changes proposed. Changes to the SHR listing may eventuate based on updated heritage significance assessment.
Has the potential for reinstating an <i>Aboriginal place name</i> , or other <i>earlier place name</i> , been considered, and/or has the appropriateness of using a <i>dual-name</i> for the place been considered?	N/A—none identified.
Is there a policy statement to prompt <i>future reviews</i> of the CMP?	Yes—Section 6.
Is there a policy/guideline about the <i>public accessibility</i> of the CMP?	Yes—Section 6.
Does the Plan include <i>inventory sheets</i> for elements of the item—if so, are the policies in the sheets consistent with those for the whole item?	Yes—Section 3 and Appendix D.