



Submission to the *Transport,
Housing and Local Government
Committee* on the

**QUEENSLAND HERITAGE
AND OTHER LEGISLATION
AMENDMENT BILL 2014**

Prepared by:
Queensland Tourism Industry Council
PO BOX 13162, GEORGE STREET QLD 4003
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

September 2014

QUEENSLAND TOURISM INDUSTRY COUNCIL

As the peak industry body for tourism in Queensland, the Queensland Tourism Industry Council (QTIC) represents the interests of the industry through partnerships with operators, government agencies, industry bodies and tourism stakeholders at a local, state and national level. This includes our formal partnership with the Queensland Government under DestinationQ.

Our membership comprises more than 3,000 regional members (individual and corporate) alongside 13 Regional Tourism Organisations (RTOs) and 18 industry sector associations.

Industry has trusted us for more than a decade to advocate for a business environment that delivers on current and future tourism needs. Similarly, decision makers have sought our industry knowledge and networks to influence policy and budget decisions to create a competitive business environment.

INTRODUCTION

The Queensland Tourism Industry Council (QTIC) welcomes the opportunity by the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee to provide feedback on the Queensland Heritage and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 (the Bill) for public consultation in September 2014.

Earlier this year in June, QTIC responded to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection on the review of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (the Act), showing support for reducing unnecessary regulatory burden on heritage property owners and proponents. We are pleased to see the principles of the Bill align with the review, in that the objectives are to:

- Collaborate with the community in promoting the value of Queensland's places of cultural heritage significance;
- Streamline the statutory processes whereby places are considered for entry in, or removal from, the Queensland heritage register;
- Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden, particularly on owners of heritage places, and further encourage appropriate development of these places;
- Strengthen protections for the state's most important historic heritage places to ensure they can be appreciated by present and future generations of Queenslanders;
- Provide greater flexibility to local government in carrying out its important role of identifying and protecting places of local heritage significance.

Heritage places have long played a significant part in shaping Queensland's tourism industry and our communities, and will remain as a strong force in driving more visitations and continuous interest in our state. Some of today's most well-known and frequented attractions are historical in nature and can often be tourism assets that are the lifeblood of many regional towns.

COMMENTS

Businesses, landowners and land stakeholders can benefit from reduced red tape as long as the process still maintains an adequate level of protection of heritage places. This means that the community and visitors are able to also enjoy the heritage values and high-quality experiences through recreation and tourism.

Recommendations have been provided for the following proposed red tape reduction measures.

Reducing unnecessary regulatory burden and further encouraging appropriate development

- Allowing the Queensland Heritage Council to have regard for whether certain cultural heritage values of a place that are also natural heritage values are effectively protected via other legislation.
 - It is unclear what the process is in determining whether cultural and natural heritage values will be effectively protected by other legislation. Clarification on how the Queensland Heritage Council will consider this needs to be more clearly articulated and follow an approach that satisfies the principles and criteria of heritage protection.
- Increasing the time following a decision of the Queensland Heritage Council from one to five years before which new applications cannot be accepted.
 - The significant increase from one to five years could have substantial effects, particularly where the heritage status of a place is necessary to avoid further possible destruction to the place. Given the current timeframes of development, and furthermore the quick turnaround for new policies and legislation to be introduced, a five year restriction on a new application could mean that there may be no provisions in the Act or any other Act that could prevent detrimental development on the basis of preserving potential cultural or environmental values of a place.
 - An increase in the time following a decision is supported for a lesser period of 2 years instead, which still takes into account the recommendations made by the chief executive and the Queensland Heritage Council. It is to be recognised that the heritage register is a means to protect significant heritage places in Queensland, rather than to be seen as an impediment to development.
- Expanding the scope of work covered by exemption certificates issued to owners and managers of places entered in the Queensland heritage register to include that which will have a minimal detrimental impact on its significance.
 - QTIC supports expanding the scope of work covered by exemption certificates for work that will have minimal detrimental impact on its significance. However, the definition of “minimal detrimental impact” will need to be further articulated and more accurately enforced. As understood, the current use of the term ‘a detrimental impact’ is being omitted and replaced with ‘any impact, or only have a minimal impact’, meaning that the test for detriment is now lost.

FURTHER ENQUIRIES

We thank you for considering this submission and welcome any feedback you may have. For all enquiries, please contact Kim Harrington [REDACTED] or email [REDACTED]