



Australian cultural built heritage: stakeholders' perceived conservation barriers and motivations

Johari H. N. Amar, Lynne Armitage  and Daniel O'Hare

Faculty of Society and Design, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia

ABSTRACT

Stakeholders are recognised as drivers of effective conservation of cultural built heritage. Yet, as stakeholders have eclectic views in terms of their interest in, knowledge of and perceptions about the management of historic fabric, their practices are often diverse. The objective of this paper is to gain an understanding of the stakeholders' views drawn from relevant professional field on the issues that act as barriers to conservation and identify the factors that motivate built heritage management in Australia. Using a qualitative research design, two focus groups were conducted in Queensland and New South Wales with purposely selected key informants ($N = 14$) working in the Australian heritage sector. The study presents stakeholders' interest in managing built heritage and the perceptions concerning the application of conservation policy and practices in the Australian built heritage sector, as influenced by the interdisciplinary backgrounds of participants. The paper contributes to an in-depth understanding of the conservation barriers and motivators and their implications for policy and practices in the management of Australian built heritage. The study is based on the perceptions of key informants with diverse interests and knowledge about the conservation of cultural built heritage; this makes the research analysis and implications inclusive and influential from both theoretical and practical points of view.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 3 February 2016
Accepted 21 February 2017

KEYWORDS

Australia; community heritage discourse; conservation barriers; conservation motivations; cultural built heritage; stakeholder perception

Conservation of cultural built heritage

The Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Burra Charter) (2000) describes conservation as involving “all the processes of looking after a place as to retain its cultural significance”. The conservation of cultural built heritage is a process that has many components but two key parts, which are identified here. One part focuses on identifying the historic fabric and assessing its significance value as well as ensuring that conservation management is achieved while making built heritage relevant to new development in the built environment. The other part is engaging the aspirations of different stakeholders for the conservation of cultural built heritage, which begins by involving them in a participatory, collaborative and cooperative decision-making process. However, while the two parts of conservation are widely understood to be critical to the planning and implementation of built heritage conservation, there is fragmented knowledge

about how, practically, stakeholders' perceptions of the barriers and motivations of built heritage conservation are addressed in the context of planning and decision-making.

De la Torre (2002) explains that heritage conservation, which involves identifying, assessing and managing the cultural significance of built heritage, is a result of constant negotiations and conflicts between stakeholders. As such, Aas, Ladkin, and Fletcher (2005) and Garden (2011) suggest that these stakeholders' competing interests in heritage conservation have primarily grouped them into the private, the public and the community sectors. From this taxonomy, it becomes clear that heritage management systems need to recognise the perceived issues impacting on the conservation policies and practices of the various stakeholders. According to Grenville (2007), Hoffman (2006), and Jepsen and Eskerod (2009), understanding stakeholders' perceptions in a conservation process is integral to the realisation of sustainable decision-making. As De la Torre (2002) states, this decision-making framework "take[s] a broad view of values as motivations behind conservation, and accept[s] wide participation as an inherent aspect of conservation". This is because the conservation of cultural heritage is based on the value approach conceived by actual groups concerned with the stewardship of actual heritage sites, as the process generates real world outcomes.

Stakeholders have important but different perspectives concerning cultural heritage. This poses a problem for the practice of built heritage conservation, particularly on the level of participation in the decision-making process in the heritage sector. There are, however, two attributes that set apart stakeholders' interests in cultural heritage conservation. The first is that stakeholders' perceptions of conservation are entangled with the self-interest motivation at different levels (De la Torre, 2002), ranging from maintaining a legacy for future generations to building a tourism attraction for sustainable development (Howard, 2003; Zancheti & Jokilehto, 1997). As mentioned by Pickerill and Armitage (2009), other stakeholders' motivations that have appeared in the debates surrounding the drivers for conservation of built heritage include political, cultural, economic, spiritual and/or aesthetic values. In the built environment (Crocker & Lehmann, 2013) and, mostly evidently in the built heritage literature (Howard, 2003), the motivation for conservation is viewed as a primary driver that can provide in-depth understanding of how stakeholders' interests and knowledge can contribute to sustainable conservation practices in the heritage sector.

The second attribute of the stakeholders' perception is that, due to the conservation barriers driving the management of cultural built heritage, they have been particularly ineffectual in negotiating policy and practices among stakeholders involved in the three-tier heritage administration structure (Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). This is especially the case related to the practices used by stakeholders in built heritage management that often impose barriers to the conservation decision-making process (Worthing & Bond, 2008). Conservation barriers are developed from the criteria used to rank stakeholders' interest and concerns, which tend to reflect differences in individual personalities, physical surroundings and political contexts (Grenville, 2007). In addition to this, heritage stakeholders perceive that conservation barriers are often noticeable in the form of physical and non-physical manifestations. Physical manifestations occur from the integration of historic fabric into the dynamic and contemporary built environment (Aas et al., 2005; Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000; Bullen & Love, 2011; Hussein et al., 2014). Non-physical manifestations arise from the impacts of inadequate expertise, legislative constraints, lack of financial schemes and cultural restrictions on the conservation of cultural built heritage (Grenville, 2007; Mackay & Johnston, 2010; Trimarchi, 2004). As a consequence, there is a need to focus on ways

that conservation barriers can be broken down in order to enhance the decision-making process in the built heritage sector.

Looking at the complexity of the heritage sector, it appears that stakeholders' perceptions of the conservation of cultural built heritage respond variously to the different barriers and motivators faced by stakeholders in the decision-making process. However, researchers worldwide have been increasingly exploring stakeholders' roles and responsibilities in the heritage conservation process (De la Torre, 2002; Garden, 2011; Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009). The research that is being undertaken is limited and fragmented because the stakeholders' perceptions are divergent in terms of interests, attributes and expectations of the management of historic fabric. Thus, the primary focus of this paper is to recognise the barriers and motivations of conservation that affect different groups of stakeholders. This section illustrates the importance of understanding conservation barriers and motivations for the sustainable management of the conservation of cultural built heritage. The next section presents an overview of the development of Australian built heritage and illustrates the need to recognise the conservation barriers and motivations that stakeholders perceive as driving factors for the management of Australian built heritage.

Australian built heritage

To understand the meaning and practice of the conservation of built heritage in Australia, one must understand the history of its development and the milieu for the conservation approach. In Australia, cultural built heritage is not only a significant part of local and state or territorial legislation, but also a part of the national (federal) conservation planning framework. Therefore, Australia has developed statutory frameworks (Productivity Commission, 2006) within which three-tiered heritage management systems have been established for the identification, protection and conservation of Australian built and other cultural heritage (Hoffman, 2006). There are currently three levels of heritage lists operating in Australia, aimed at overseeing the practice of the conservation of historic buildings, monuments and sites of significance values at each tier of heritage management, including aesthetic, historical, scientific or social significance and other special values for future generations (Jones & Shaw, 2007; Lush, 2008).

The notion of built heritage conservation was first adopted by landowning elites who wanted to protect grand buildings and monuments for posterity (Petrie, 2005). In the early 1900s, such historic structures were viewed as symbols of power, places of comfort, artistic preference and architecture, but not a part of national heritage (Hussein et al., 2014). The approach excluded the significant values of many groups which were integral to the identity and culture of local communities, states and territories and Australia as a nation (Boer & Wiffen, 2006). Following this, between 1945 and 1976 National Trust societies were established at the state and national levels (Davison, 1991) in order to preserve the historic fabric, which was thought to be in danger of being lost due to the largely uncontrolled and unregulated development in the Australian built environment that was occurring at that time. This marked the shift from protecting the aesthetic and architectural values of built heritage to protecting the significant values, including the social, cultural and scientific (Petrie, 2005).

The endangerment of Australia's built heritage led communities, professional practitioners and international organisations and researchers from various disciplines to raise

their concerns about the ongoing destruction of the built heritage. Institutions such as the Australian Historical Society and the Institute of Architects adopted the British value-approach to the conservation for protection of colonial built heritage, and this was embedded in the town and country planning models, the state planning authorities and the town planning legislation (Freestone, 2010). The involvement of different groups of stakeholders in conservation decision-making processes resulted in Australia being commended by international organisations as an international leader in cultural heritage management today (DSEWPaC, 2011). However, despite having a heritage system that is able to deliver effective economic, socio-cultural and environmental outcomes in the Australian built environment, the quality of overall built heritage conservation has diminished (Throsby, 2007). This is a result of the different social meanings (Clarke & Johnston, 2003) as well as human and natural processes (DSEWPaC, 2011) attached to the significant historical fabric by different groups in the Australian built environment.

Nonetheless, all the issues and challenges in heritage management systems are susceptible to the ambitions of their stakeholders from the government, the private sector and community groups. The DSEWPaC (2011) states: “There have been significant advances in many aspects of environmental management over the past decade, but management approaches and responsibilities are often fragmented across Australian, state and territory, and local governments”. A national survey of 2024 adults conducted by the Allen Consulting Group (2005) showed that the perception of protecting cultural heritage across Australia provides low support for heritage conservation. The reason there is low support for the conservation of historic heritage is because of the perception that existing heritage protection is not effective. As the NSW Department of Environment and Conservation (NSWDEC, 2006) points out: “Despite this increased knowledge [of the danger to the historic fabric], there is continuing loss and damage to state heritage [and] currently no means in place to monitor the rate of change”. This reflects the possibility that future stakeholders will not reach a common ground that puts the importance of Australia’s built heritage for future generations ahead of their own conservation interest. The Productivity Commission report (2006) also indicates that the current issues and challenges facing the conservation of heritage places are the outcome of different stakeholders’ perception pertaining to heritage legislative regulations, confusion about roles and responsibilities and failure to accommodate changing interpretations of heritage values in conservation planning.

In summary, the examination of stakeholders’ perceptions with regard to heritage conservation processes has raised more questions than answers. DSEWPaC (2011) suggests the future of Australia’s built heritage depends on the cooperation and coordination of all state governments and stakeholders as well as the general community. To achieve this goal, it is important to first address the barriers that exist within and among the heritage management systems and to understand the motivation that stimulates the perceptions related to the conservation of built heritage in different states. The following section presents the research method designed to explore stakeholders’ perception of what drives the conservation of cultural built heritage in Australia’s built environment.

Methodology

In order to establish the motivations and barriers for the perceptions that drive the conservation of built heritage, a qualitative method (focus group discussions) was chosen to

allow the explorative nature of the study. The focus group questionnaire was broken down into two key themes: (1) what are the key issues that motivate the transformation of built heritage values? and (2) how do we manage the factors that act as barriers to conservation of cultural built heritage? The rationale for this method was to enable the collection of a thorough picture of the underlying motivators and the complexity of the barriers affecting stakeholders' perception drawn from relevant professional field of conservation of cultural built heritage. As described by Clark (2011) and McDonald (2011), cultural heritage often falls into the gaps between arts, culture, planning and environment, which means some aspects of cultural built heritage are perceived as more important than others in Australian heritage systems. In order to avoid the disconnection of individual interviewees' choices of response, in-depth focus group studies were used to determine the different perceptions regarding key factors that influence the management of multidisciplinary stakeholders in the heritage sector.

Two focus groups were conducted, with the first held in Queensland (QLD) and the second in New South Wales (NSW). Each focus group session consisted of seven purposely selected participants, as shown in Table 1. The focus groups were composed of participants from various disciplines in the conservation of cultural built heritage arena who hold key decision-making positions. The groups contained diversity in gender, experience and level of education. It should be noted that the empirical data analysis presented in this paper is part of a larger PhD study conducted in Australia and Tanzania, which employed qualitative data collection method, analysis and presentation.

Each discussion lasted for about two hours and were audio taped. The recordings were transcribed and the transcriptions were carefully checked against the taped recordings and field notes describing the participants' responses taken by two assistant investigators during the focus group discussions. Where necessary, corrections were made and the final transcription document was exported into NVivo for coding and analysis. NVivo v.10, qualitative software produced by QSR International, facilitated the inductive categorisation of the major concepts and emerging themes in order to underpin stronger analytical and theoretical debates relevant to this research study (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). A discussion of the findings and results for both focus groups is presented in the subsequent section.

Table 1. Composition of focus group participants in Australia.

Role	Position	Gender	Experience	Qualification
<i>Queensland (QLD)</i>				
Landscape architect	Director	F	25	Masters
Conservator	Director	M	23	Masters
Architect	Director	F	30	Masters
Heritage manager	Senior	M	10	PhD
Policy planner	Senior	M	20	Masters
Historian	Senior	M	9	Masters
Architect	Senior	M	35	Masters
<i>New South Wales (NSW)</i>				
Archaeologist	Senior	M	25	Masters
Conservator	Director	F	20	Masters
Consultant	Director	M	27	Masters
Heritage planner	Director	M	40	Masters
Historian	Director	F	26	PhD
Heritage adviser	Senior	F	25	Masters
Architect	Director	F	20	Masters

Discussion of focus groups' findings

This section focuses on presenting the results obtained from the QLD and NSW focus groups. The findings about what drives the conservation of cultural built heritage are presented in two overarching categories: conservation barriers and conservation motivators.

Barriers to conservation

The key informants discussed a number of impediments that act as barriers to the conservation management of Australian cultural built heritage. The perceived barriers include a laissez-faire economy, bureaucratic legislative framework, biased political influences, green building schemes, modern technologies and materials, lack of heritage education and training, and concerns about new heritage discourses. Each of these barriers is discussed below.

Value assessment in a laissez-faire economy

Although Australia has been commended for its efforts in protecting its cultural built heritage, its laissez-faire economy has caused heritage conservation processes to become increasingly relaxed. The reason for this happening is that 90% of Australia's cultural built heritage is privately owned by people and companies, many of whom are strongly motivated by financial and economic values. The private sector exercises its ownership rights by altering the physical fabric of heritage buildings, monuments and sites to match the needs of the real estate market. Several participants held the opinion that this is the key barrier to Australian built heritage conservation, as it is often encouraged by the private and community stakeholders, who tend to direct heritage conservation plans in a way that fits their clients' commercial interests. That is, the heritage sector seeks to implement a conservation plan for the historic fabric based on the idea of its being either a public good or private asset. The former adopts a discourse that cultural built heritage is a common good that provides different groups in the community with ability to create significance values such as a sense of place, sense of belonging and ecological sustainability. Through this, individuals and groups are able to flourish and shape their wellbeing on the built environment. However, the majority of the survey participants stated that it is hard to assess the monetary equivalent of such significant cultural values. As a result of this, stakeholders involved in the conservation process retreat to the private discourse which views historic fabric as a private asset as indicated by study participants. Of course, as presented by Mason (2005), the conservation of historic fabric is determined by its continued use, financial incentives and alternative investments. This in turn, as agreed by participants, has often resulted in the destruction of cultural built heritage by way of neglect. Thus, it has become very much harder for Australia's heritage system to retain the authenticity and integrity of many fine examples of cultural built heritage because economic values have triumphed over the less tangible significant heritage values.

Legislative framework

In addressing the reasons underlying this barrier, participants said that Australian heritage legislation and management systems are very bureaucratic. The slowness, complexity and sometimes the expense of the bureaucratic process delay the conservation process. This means that by the time communities and governments realise something is worth

conserving, it might be too late to protect it. Additionally, participants noted the current assessment procedures are not cost-effective, with the expenditure mostly being made up of the cost and time spent obtaining information as well as consultation with government organisations. Participants also pointed out the three-tier heritage system provides a loophole of biased assessment and, as a result, some policy-makers do not support having heritage consultants submitting heritage assessment reports. Collectively, these factors have put potentially listable built heritage in danger of disappearing before they are appreciated because of the pace of change. This is evident in heritage management systems, where most of the properties registered in heritage lists represent the conservation of colonial heritage, while the twentieth-century heritage that has changed or influenced the course of history in the current built environment is not protected.

Political influences

Elected political representatives were reported to have a great influence on what is and is not listed. Participants discussed the politicisation of heritage, stating that politicians have always seen built heritage conservation as an add-on to their campaigns. Participants stated that most of the time the politicians tend not to list the significant structures of private owners, since they did not want step on supporters' toes and lose their political support. An example was given of the Environmental Consultant Association (ECA) that did not assess the "sacrosanct" family homes of the owners. Moreover, the last 30 years have seen federal and state governments directing resources to the expansion of international trade and business. This has had a resultant impact on built heritage conservation, due to the construction of new structures in the built environment. In one of the focus group discussions, participants stated that changes of government also affect conservation decision-making i.e. often changes are made to the conservation planning process in relation to the perceived significant values placed on the authenticity and integrity of heritage buildings, monuments and sites.

Green building schemes

Discussion of the application of green rating systems on the historic fabric indicated stakeholders' general distaste for green buildings schemes, despite their ability to prolong the functions of heritage structures in a dynamic built environment. Some of the participants said that adaptive and reuse approaches not only minimised the risk of significant fabric crumbling but also shaped the economic value derived from built heritage. However, most participants found it hard to see how the conservation of built heritage fits with the standards and guidelines of the Green Building Council. For instance, in Queensland, participants questioned the benefit of embodied energy when significant heritage values are being overlooked. In NSW, the general concern stemmed from high cost of adaptation, the overuse of historic structures and green consultants' lack of heritage expertise. For this reason, participants were not in favour of the application of green rating systems to cultural built heritage.

Modern technologies and materials

Participants in the focus groups perceived modern technologies and materials as obstacles to maintaining the heritage structures rather than as an opportunity to ensure the credible application of conservation approaches and practice. The subjectivity of carbon dating and archiving technologies has made authenticity and integrity almost unattainable, so

the heritage sector no longer seeks expert opinion and, as a result, unskilled individuals manipulate the heritage impact assessment results, which may cause serious destruction to heritage structures. Nonetheless, the invention of cheaper and, in some cases, better construction materials is contributing to the loss of traditional materials and practices, such as stonemasons. One participant mentioned that the private sector is tempted to replace old materials with newer ones due to the availability of elegantly designed construction materials. Consequently, such a market does not demonstrate the significance of retaining authenticity and integrity of the built fabric; this suggests that heritage conservation is not necessary once the original characteristics of historic built fabrics are replaced in Australia.

Education and training

Another barrier to heritage conservation is the lack of dedicated tertiary courses on heritage material conservation. Most of the people with knowledge of traditional construction methods in the conservation field are retired or eventually will retire. At the same time, new generations are not being trained to take over the conservation of historical buildings and structures. So, in the near future, there will be no one who is capable of fixing or retaining the authenticity and integrity of the built heritage. A few participants expressed their grief that even the history of architecture courses that used to be a core part of studying architecture at university are not compulsory subjects anymore. As a result, the sector is now struggling to find heritage practitioners with the qualified experience and necessary skills in conservation, a situation that is made worse by the non-availability of built heritage courses in the Australian education sector. As such, the effective practice of the conservation of cultural built heritage has been weakened in Australia.

New heritage discourse

Heritage was viewed as an elemental part of politically driven evolutions of culture, known as the revision of cultural identity in the authorised heritage discourse (AHD). To an extent, current AHD discussions were built upon Eurocentric heritage and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage along with their consequences to heritage conservation in Australia. In conjunction, emergent heritage and digital heritage were discussed as two new forms of heritage discourse. The former is created based on the imagination of cultural significance related to a new built environment for future generations. Key informants were worried that emergent heritage is negatively impairing stakeholders' perceptions, since a place becomes cultural heritage only when it is deemed significant by the community and is provided legal protection at the time as its identification. The latter is created through documentaries and photos narrating significant histories and provides unique evidence about the historic built environment to the community. While a few participants were accepting of this discourse, others were cautious, stating that it provides a loophole for developers to accept this requirement because they know that at the end of the day they are able to replace built heritage fabric with new development.

Motivation for conservation

The conservation of cultural heritage requires the involvement of multiple actors from across the public, private and community sectors, not only to initiate and carry out conservation but also to sustain the place of heritage after the intervention (Macdonald & Cheong, 2014).

Motivation for conservation should go beyond the heritage values (economic, environmental and social) to partnerships among stakeholders defined by a common goal. The analysis of the barriers for stakeholders involved in the conservation of cultural built heritage reveals that many of the issues are distinct to particular groups of stakeholders. Therefore, the following discussion of these is framed in terms of three key motivations, namely: public (government) motivation, private incentives and community participation.

Public (government) motivation

There was a general agreement amongst participants that the conservation of cultural built heritage occurs only if the government sector feels that its heritage legislation is perceived as important, particularly by the private sector and the community. A totalitarian approach was proposed as motivation that could enhance government interest in built heritage conservation. Heritage totalitarianism is where the office of heritage employs only selected heritage practitioners through a “reserve fund” on behalf of property developers. This approach would help increase the participation of private and community groups from local, regional and community sectors in the management of built heritage. The benefit of involving different groups of stakeholders with different mindsets in the decision-making is predisposed on moving the management approach towards an holistic conservation system. The process for heritage conservation will not favour any one group since the decision-making is telegraphed to the rest of the stakeholders in the Australian heritage sector.

Private motivation

Three motivations were derived from the qualitative data analysis: (i) financial schemes involving subsidisation of restoration and maintenance costs; (ii) tax incentives including reduction of land and property taxes; and (iii) recognising the personal and/or individual values that are attached to places. Private owners and property developers are characterised by the desire to portray their sense of self through the protection of their grand buildings and monuments. When individuals and group owners feel that the government will allow their self-efficacy as part of built heritage, they will engage with the conservation of cultural built heritage. Participants stressed that this factor should be perceived as important for motivating the private sector since it has worked before; as described by Petrie (2005), the conservation movement for Australian built heritage was initiated by the upper socio-economic class in the 1900s. Addressing private motivation involves combining financial schemes and tax incentives so that private sector stakeholders are driven to adapt and reuse historic buildings and sites. If this is done, the Australian heritage system might eventually achieve the goal of sustainability in the conservation of cultural built heritage.

Community motivation

A sense of place for new cultures and built heritage's continuous use was identified as drivers of community participation in built heritage conservation. It was noted that new migrants sometimes fail to transition their culture into this country's built heritage, let alone the general built environment. The primary factor to motivate communities to get involved in built heritage conservation was the creation of a sense of place that goes beyond the normal sociocultural, economic and architectural values. Most participants felt that people from different cultures should be given an opportunity to build upon the current heritage environment but with the condition of conserving what was previously built by the people

who lived in an area in previous generations. For some, this continuity of use will facilitate the restoration, rehabilitation and maintenance of significant historic buildings and sites. Through this system, the current and new generations can get sufficient clarity and perspective to build community values into the historic fabric. For others, this shift cannot occur unless different cultures in a community truly understand that their collective values can lead to a true sense of place. Once heritage is viewed as a community asset, different groups within a community are more likely to commit themselves to heritage conservation and educating and involving their younger generations.

Implications for the Australian heritage sector

The purpose of this paper is to explore what drives the conservation of cultural built heritage with a specific focus on understanding stakeholders' perceived barriers to and motivations for built heritage conservation in Australia. The paper reports on an original empirical investigation using qualitative data from focus group discussions conducted in Queensland and NSW. It provides empirical support for the long-held and often-stated view that built heritage conservation is strongly affected by stakeholders' diverse perceptions (Crocker & Lehmann, 2013), particularly the values and interest placed on heritage sites (De la Torre, 2002) and the impediments (physical and non-physical factors) affecting the conservation decision-making process (Hussein et al., 2014).

Data analysis has demonstrated there are distinct limitations in the Australian heritage sector: its decision-making process is explicitly based on the economic value attached to heritage places, ignoring not only other important heritage values identified by stakeholders but also the barriers to and motivations for effective management of Australian cultural built heritage. The need to develop a sustainable system for built heritage conservation at the country's local, state, territory and national levels is apparent and is steadily growing. Although stakeholders' perceptions of factors that act as barriers to the motivation for the conservation of cultural built heritage are known, the integration of these two drivers in the decision-making process is complex and difficult.

During the focus group discussions, stakeholders mentioned various constraints perceived as conservation barriers to sustainability in the conservation of built heritage. These included financial survival, modernisation, political interference, poor implementation of heritage legislation, the non-alignment of green buildings schemes and rigid conservation goals as well as new heritage discourse and the lack of adequate education and training. Based on such barriers, heritage stakeholders have found themselves supporting alterations and demolition of heritage buildings, monuments and sites. This occurs despite the Australian heritage sector's understanding of the importance of following the existing legislation, principles and guidelines related to the conservation of cultural built heritage. As such, perceived conservation barriers are seen as factors affecting the management of cultural built heritage and, most importantly, the conservation decision-making process. That being the case, if the sector wants to achieve sustainability in the conservation of cultural built heritage, the Australian heritage sector needs to address the diverse interests of stakeholders and pay attention to the factors that motivate heritage stakeholders.

This study revealed that providing financial incentives as motivation for stakeholders is justifiable, as they specifically reduce the burden of the high costs of maintenance and property taxes associated with the ownership of heritage places. However, recognising both

the personal and individual values of private sector stakeholders in combination with promoting a sense of place for stakeholders in the community would make heritage conservation worthwhile for those stakeholders who are not motivated by economic and financial benefits. The acknowledgement of stakeholders' interests, such as aesthetic taste, sense of history and attachment to the built environment, creates a powerful tool for the protection of Australian built heritage. In order to operationalise the outcomes which stakeholders consider to be factors motivating the effective management of cultural built heritage, the Australian heritage sector needs to adopt a more structured approach. Participants termed it "heritage totalitarianism" or – more appropriately as defined by Amar ([forthcoming](#))–community heritage discourse (CHD), an approach that could frame a mainstream conservation policy and reinforce its decision-making processes. CHD leads to the establishment of an holistic management system that enhances the heritage value-based approach and achieves sustainable development whilst maintaining stakeholders' collaboration in the conservation of cultural built heritage.

It is evident from the discussion that CHD is achieved only when the individual interests of all stakeholders are met regardless of their impact on built heritage conservation. The Australian three-tier heritage management system for the conservation of cultural built heritage was designed to incorporate the personal meanings and values of stakeholders from the private, government and community sectors. In CHD, decision-makers enact heritage legislation that upholds development interests that enable private owners to achieve economic benefits from their cultural built heritage. However, this conservation motivation is often halted by planning controls imposed by the government or third party appeals/rights (community) when proposed new works have potential impacts on the conservation of the authenticity and integrity of significant heritage values. It is clear that the implementation of CHD is difficult. The histories of heritage movements in Australia have consistently shown that when stakeholders are informed about new conservation approach they become supportive of it. In this regard, the outcomes of this empirical investigation help to identify and understand the factors that act as barriers to and motivators for the conservation of cultural built heritage. This may enable the decision-making process to balance the perceptions of private, public and community stakeholders, which may be a step toward achieving effective CHD.

Conclusion

This paper has addressed a knowledge gap relating to the barriers and motivation factors that significantly affect both the perceptions of stakeholders in built heritage management and the type of approach they adopt in the conservation process. Understanding stakeholders' perceived conservation barriers and motivation for conservation might enable the heritage sector to establish the effective and efficient management and conservation of Australian cultural built heritage. The data analysis suggests that this can be achieved by first conducting an in-depth study investigation of the internal and/or external clusters that lead to the classification of certain factors as being conservation barriers and conservation motivations by stakeholders. This is important because some of the factors discussed in this paper may be difficult to classify as true drivers for the conservation of cultural built heritage. For instance, there is not enough research to determine whether cultural built heritage will survive without green building schemes or new heritage discourses, which are

currently identified as conservation barriers. As another example, promoting individual or personal values as a motivating factor could also be a conservation barrier, especially in a world driven by modernisation and a throwaway culture. Therefore, before the Australian heritage sector decides whether or not to adopt change based on the discussion provided by these stakeholders, it would be beneficial to first analyse how drivers for the conservation of cultural built heritage would be perceived in different scenarios in a decision-making process – a discussion which suggests investigation by further research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Lynne Armitage  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9273-9392>

References

- Aas, C., Ladkin, A., & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 28–48.
- Allen Consulting Group. (2005). *Valuing the priceless: The value of historic heritage in Australia*. Sydney: Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand.
- Amar, J. H. N. (forthcoming). *Conservation of cultural built heritage: An investigation of professional stakeholder attitudes in Australia and Tanzania* (PhD Thesis). Bond University, Gold Coast.
- Ashworth, G. J., & Tunbridge, J. (2000). *The tourist-historic city: Retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Australia ICOMOS. (2000). *The burra charter: The Australia ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance, 1999 – with associated guidelines and code on the ethics of co-existence*. Canberra: Australia ICOMOS.
- Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. London: Sage Publications.
- Boer, B., & Wiffen, G. (2006). *Heritage law in Australia*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Bullen, P. A., & Love, P. E. (2011). Adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. *Structural Survey*, 29, 411–421.
- Clark, K. (2011). 'Only connect' – *The social, economic and environmental benefits*. Canberra: Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Retrieved November 15, 2015, from www.environment.gov.au/heritage/strategy/documents.html
- Clarke, A., & Johnston, C. (2003, October). Time, memory, place and land: Social meaning and heritage conservation in Australia' In *14th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium, Place, memory, meaning: Preserving intangible values in monuments and sites* (pp. 27–31). Victoria Falls: Zimbabwe.
- Crocker, R., & Lehmann, S. (2013). *Motivating change: Sustainable design and behaviour in the built environment*. England: Abingdon.
- Davison, G. (1991). A brief history of the Australian heritage movement. In G. Davison & C. McConville (Eds.), *A heritage handbook, Allen and Unwin* (pp. 14–27). North Sydney: NSW.
- De la Torre, M. (2002). *Assessing the values of cultural heritage: Research report*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute.
- DSEWPac. (2011). *Australia state of the environment report 2011 – in brief independent report to the Australian government minister for sustainability, environment, water, population and communities*. Canberra: DSEWPac (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities). Retrieved April 10, 2015, from <http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/pages/743e805c-4a49-42a0-88c1-0b6f06eac0e/files/soe2011-report-complete.pdf>

- Freestone, R. (2010). *Urban nation: Australia's planning heritage*. Australia: Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage, and the Arts.
- Garden, D. (2011). *Who are the players in heritage and what roles do they play?* Canberra: Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. Retrieved November 15, 2015, from www.environment.gov.au/heritage/strategy/documents.html
- Grenville, J. (2007). Conservation as psychology: Ontological security and the built environment. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 13, 447–461.
- Hoffman, B. T. (2006). *Art and cultural heritage: Law, policy, and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, P. (2003). *Heritage: Management, interpretation, identity*. London: Continuum.
- Hussein, J., Armitage, L., & Too, L. (2014, January). An historical perspective of the evolution of Australian built heritage and its management. In *Paper presented at the 20th Annual Pacific-Rim Real Estate Society Conference* (pp. 19–22). Christchurch.
- Jepsen, A. L., & Eskerod, P. (2009). Stakeholder analysis in projects: Challenges in using current guidelines in the real world. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27, 335–343.
- Jones, R., & Shaw, B. J. (2007). *Geographies of Australian heritages: Loving a sunburnt country?* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Lush, M. (2008). Built heritage management: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 15, 65–86.
- Macdonald, S., & Cheong, C. (2014). *The role of public-private partnerships and the third sector in conserving heritage buildings, sites, and historic urban areas*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute.
- Mackay, R., & Johnston, C. (2010). Heritage management and community connections – On the rocks. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 16, 55–74.
- Mason, R. (2005). *Economics and historic preservation: A guide and review of the literature*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- McDonald, H. (2011). *What are the community expectations for heritage protection?* Canberra: Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. Retrieved November 15, 2015, from www.environment.gov.au/heritage/strategy/documents.html
- NSWDEC. (2006). *New South Wales State of the Environment Report 2006*. Sydney: State of New South Wales and Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water. Retrieved April 10, 2015, from http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/soe/soe2006/chapter2/chp_2.6.htm#2.6.33
- Pearson, M., & Sullivan, S. (1995). *Looking after heritage places: The basics of heritage planning for managers, landowners and administrators*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Petrie, L. (2005). An inherently exclusionary regime: Heritage law – The South Australian experience. *Macquarie Law Journal*, 5, 177–199.
- Pickerill, T., & Armitage, L. (2009, January). The management of built heritage: A comparative review of policies and practice in Western Europe, North America and Australia. In *Paper presented at the 15th Annual Pacific Rim Real Estate Society Conference* (pp. 18–21). Sydney.
- Productivity Commission. (2006). *Conservation of Australia's historic heritage places*. Canberra: Productivity Commission, Government of Australia.
- Throsby, D. (2007). Regional aspects of heritage economics: Analytical and policy issues. *Australasian Journal of Regional Studies*, 13, 21–30.
- Trimarchi, M. (2004). Regulation, integration and sustainability in the cultural sector. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10, 401–415.
- Worthing, D., & Bond, S. (2008). *Managing built heritage: The role of cultural significance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Zancheti, S. M., & Jokilehto, J. (1997). Values and urban conservation planning: Some reflections on principles and definitions. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 3, 37–51.