
Feedback received from the Friends of Pattemore House: 18 November 2014

Thanks for giving us the opportunity to assist Council in determining the future management options for Fairview's. We believe the direction that the draft options paper is taking (commercial return as a priority) is at odds with the work done since 2010 by Council, FOPH, the community and the consultants.

We note that 5 Year Management Plan and Garden Plan have already been approved by DEHP.

We have now read the details of the options presented, and bearing in mind Cr McKay's suggestions, we make the following points:

OPTIONS

* Options 2, 4 and 5 are not supported by FOPH, as they are not consistent with the recommendations of the 5 Year Management Plan.

* We'd prefer to see elements of Option 1 and 3 combined, as this would allow the FOPH and Council to use the 5 Year Management Plan and Garden Restoration Plans as guiding documents. It would also allow for a sound funding arrangement.

FUNDING

* Funding has already been allocated for 2014/15:

"The Sunshine Coast Heritage Reference Group this year recommended an allocation of \$20,000 to deliver recommendations from the draft plan in the 2014/15 Cultural Heritage Levy Program.

A further \$20,000 was allocated for the ongoing maintenance of the house on the site. This is for routine and minor emergent maintenance."

* From costings included in our Activities Proposal, this amount is adequate for FOPH and Council to achieve the 2014/15 objectives from the Management Plan. (The savings from not appointing a consultant to prepare a Business Plan represent additional financial benefits).

* FOPH recommend that a funding stream from the Heritage Levy be considered in the budget process for the 5 years covered by the MP.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNCIL AND FOPH

* We would prefer to see the agreement between FOPH and Council take place under a revised MOU, as per the 16th Oct officer's report, to *"formalise the roles and responsibilities of both Council and the Friends of Pattemore House Group"*. We are concerned that a lease might place onerous requirements and obligations on our group. However if you feel that a lease or licence to use agreement could better serve this project, we would be happy to be guided by that.

* The FOPH would like to continue the current suitable arrangement whereby Debbie Angell serves as the point of contact with Council, as well as providing us with advice and assistance in implementation of displays and interpretive programs.

RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN HERITAGE LISTED AREA

* We would see the agreement as covering the entire Heritage listed area, but for council management reasons, any areas within it such as the car-park, road, and soon to be built amenities block, be excluded from FOPH responsibilities.

* The current arrangements with Parks & Gardens for mowing and maintenance should remain unchanged, and they should be responsible for new beds and large element construction (as per the Garden Plans).

STATUS OF FAIRVIEW MANAGEMENT AND GARDEN PLANS

* Both plans were 'received and noted' by SCC on 16th Oct, as per the Officers' Report recommendation. We see this as potentially presenting future difficulties with implementation and funding unless rectified at the December meeting by an additional recommendation to endorse both as plans as guiding documents.