

15 December 2025

The Planning Secretary
Department of Planning



Dear Sir

OBJECTION TO SSDA 96272465 PROPOSED RE-DEVELOPMENT 11-23 RANGERS AVENUE, MOSMAN

This letter sets out a Heritage and Visual Impact Objection to the proposed large scale residential re-development of seven houses at 11-23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman. The project is identified as SSDA 96272465.

This Objection has been prepared by Graham Brooks, Director GBA Heritage, on behalf of the residential properties at 18-36 Holt Avenue, Mosman. Their houses are to the immediate north of the subject, set on rising ground and are only separated by the narrow confines of Bloxsome Lane. Each of these residents are deeply concerned about the impacts on their harbour views from their main entertaining areas and by the overwhelming height, scale, proximity and unrelieved mass of the proposed new building to the Heritage Conservation Area in which they reside.

BASES OF THE OBJECTION

The bases of this Objection are essentially:

- The lack of correct and relevant information across the submitted EIS documentation fails to enable full and complete understanding of the heritage and visual impact assessment tasks .
- Most of the heritage items in the immediate vicinity are completely ignored by the Heritage Impact Assessment.
- The excessive visual and amenity impacts that arise from the overwhelming height, scale, proximity and unrelieved mass of the proposed new building, totally block important southerly views to the Harbour from many main entertaining areas.

The cumulative impacts from poorly and incorrectly prepared SEARS documentation are such that the Secretary must reject this SSDA or call for major modifications to SSDA-96272465 documentation.

GBA Heritage
Heritage Consultants

Level 4, 63 York Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T: +61 2 9299 8600
F: +61 2 9299 8711

gba@gbaheritage.com
www.gbaheritage.com

Nominated Architect
Graham Leslie Brooks
NSW Architects
Registration 3836

GBA Heritage Pty Ltd
Incorporated in NSW

ABN 56 073 802 730
ACN 073 802 730

MAJOR VISUAL IMPACTS

Irrespective of the lack of information in the submitted VIA report, a detailed review of the Visual Impacts can be summarised as follows:

1. The virtually monolithic bulk of the eight-storey building, some 70m long, located on an elevated escarpment is far larger than any other high rise residential flat building in the wider context suburban harbourside landscape.
2. VIA images 05, 06 and 07 clearly illustrate the dominating presence of this enormous block on the sloping topography above the upper reaches of the Reid Park gully.
3. The building is only separated from the Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area by the narrow width of Bloxsome Lane. There is no allowance for deep soil planting along that common boundary to provide some semblance of visual and spatial relief.
4. The height and enormous scale of the proposed building will dominate the visual setting of the south-eastern area within the HCA, including southern views through the street trees and outwards from Holt Avenue and the Scenic Protection Area.
5. The massive presence of the building has been recognised in the VIA as negatively impacting on southward views towards the Harbour and the Sydney Harbour Bridge, from the living and entertainment areas of at least 10 houses within the HCA.



Fig 01 Extract from VIA Image 05



Fig 02 Extract from VIA Image 06, directly in line of sight from Mosman Bay



Fig 03 Extract from VIA image 06 illustrating the massing and scale relationship with the heritage listed residential flat building at 36A Park Avenue

MAJOR HERITAGE IMPACTS

The biggest heritage impact arising from the proposed development is on the adjoining Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area. Fig 04 below destroys the HIS statement that the density of the street trees in Holt Avenue, which are themselves of heritage significance, will block views to the new building. In fact, the new building will have a huge visual presence in the Conservation Area.



The visual settings of the varied collection of LEP listed heritage items located in the “vicinity” of the proposed development, set out below, will all be negatively affected due to the overwhelming presence of this enormous development.

- Item 438 Rangers Avenue
- Item 331 Steps Bloxsome Lane road reserve (between 9A and 11 Rangers Avenue
- Item 201 Flats.36A Park Avenue SP8031
- Item 422 Divided Road Park Avenue Road Reserve Adjacent to 22-38 Park Avenue
- Item 379 Holt Avenue Divided Road, between Cowles Rd and Spofforth St
- Item 380 Holt Avenue Road Reserve (adjacent to 1-9 Holt Avenue
- Item 439 Stone culvert Rangers Ave Road Reserve adjacent to 28 Avenue Road

The HIS demonstrated little concern for the destruction of their visual setting and significance.

DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

The following EIS documentation was reviewed during the formulation of this Objection:

1. Architectural Drawings
2. Architects Design Reports
3. Heritage Impact Statement
4. Visual Impact Assessment

MAJOR OBJECTIONS REGARDING THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS

The two opening CGI Renders provide the essential evidence of the continuous solid six storey wall above street level that has a massive and selfish visual impact on the scale of the surrounding built and topographical environment.

The basement layouts illustrate two level excavations hard up against the northern boundary to Bloxsome Lane, leaving no potential for deep soil high canopy trees along virtually the whole 70m frontage to the adjoining Heritage Conservation Area.

The massive extent of the two-level basement will generate vast amounts of excavation waste material.

The floor plans confirm that the six lower storeys extend completely across the whole of the east west configuration of the building. Only Level 6 provides some relief in the continuous massing, but this is so high, no one outside the property will be able to appreciate the three individual forms.

The unrelieved c70m long massing, with only 3m setbacks to the east and west, is an appalling outcome for all the surrounding residential suburban character areas, and for both the nearby heritage items and the adjacent Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area.

The utter disregard and contempt for the surrounding areas in all directions is amply demonstrated by the total lack of any cross-section lines extending much past the site boundaries. This lack of information makes it impossible for any member of the consent authority, members of the public or any professionals in the project team, or their external Heritage and Visual Impact advisers, to fully understand the impacts that this huge building mass will have beyond its own borders.

MAJOR OBJECTIONS REGARDING ARCHITECTS DESIGN REPORT

The design report is structured to align with the nine SEPP 65 Design Quality Principles. There is no substantial evidence or consideration that the heritage issues have been taken into consideration within the design principles

Principle 01 Site and Context

Site and Context – Local Character North

Random photos of unidentified individual Federation Houses – do we assume they are in the adjacent Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area?

Site and Context – Local Character South

Some photos of residential flat buildings and portions of the excavated rock face, stone block walls stairs, and the long the northern side of Rangers Road

Local Character – Holt Conservation Area

Unidentified photos of four historic houses, presumably in the HCA, two photos of rock formations and a long- distance southern outlook over a landscaped gully that are NOT in the Conservation Area. These images demonstrate aspects of the neighbourhood, but provide scant guidance on how or why to respond to Context

s1.7 Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy

The report notes that the subject site occupies a threshold condition between two very different housing and topographical areas. This section does not provide any demonstration as to the added design challenges of such a location.

S1.8 Residential Flat buildings in the area

The catchment for such an analysis extends from Cremorne Centre to Cremorne Point, with various widespread scatters. None of the tall existing RFBs in the locality have a similar massing. Only those at 30 and 36A Park Street are of mid to high rise relevance.

The Site Analysis, Proposed Site Plan and Planning Setback illustrations have been deliberately drawn to show only the three free-standing upper levels above the barely discernible singular massing of the lower six floor levels

Principle 02 Scale and Built Form

The SSDA proposal fails at its first test, by not taking any notice of its opening quotation:

Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.

The whole design philosophy demonstrated by the drawings and supporting documentation is solely guided and driven by the current State LMR legislation.

The subsequent diagrams and illustrations are configured obliquely thus downplaying the lack of separation for all the lower floors.

MAJOR OBJECTIONS CONCERNING THE VISUAL IMPACT ANALYSIS VIEWPOINTS

Only three of the Visual Impacts Analysis Viewpoints are of any value in providing an understanding of that report's primary purpose. The remainder of the selected images and viewing locations significantly diminish the very function of the VIA report.

1. The image on the Title page is entirely irrelevant.
2. The image on the Executive summary page is also irrelevant, except it reinforces the relatively small footprints and visual scale of four RFBs on the horizon of the Raglan Street ridge, well outside the subject locality.
3. The image on the Introduction page is equally as irrelevant as on the Title page.
4. The image on the Methodology page is also irrelevant.
5. The image on the Baseline visual analysis page hints that perhaps the new building might be hiding in the trees
6. The image on the Regulatory Context page is also irrelevant.
7. The image on the Visual Effects analysis page is the first of relevance to the project.
8. The image on the Visual Impact Assessment page shows an unidentified suburban street.
9. The image on the Private Doman Views is also irrelevant.

10. The image on the Conclusion page shows a portion of Mosman Bay but not the proposed development.
11. The image on the Appendix page shows a lovely group of trees.
12. Photomontage 01 is taken from such a long distance away on Cremorne Point that the proposed building sits below the horizon and is visually absorbed by surrounding buildings.
13. Photomontage 02 is taken from a private jetty at such close proximity that the new building is completely obscured by several large trees.
14. Photomontage 03 is also carefully selected to show a small amount of the top western corner over the major tree line in Reid Park, with no sense of place.
15. Photomontage 04 is taken from an elevated location at some distance to the west, being carefully located to keep the whole of the new building below the horizon.
16. Photomontage 05, taken from Park Road finally shows some useful information, but only for the top four floors of the building. What is dramatically illustrated is the enormous unbroken length of the building mass, some 70m long (Nearmap).
17. Photomontage 06, taken from the old Cremorne Wharf, also only shows the upper floors of the singular building mass above an almost continuous line of trees in the foreground.
18. Photomontage 07 shows only the part of the eastern elevation and none of the main southern elevation and its relationship with Rangers Avenue.
19. All of the images in the section about private views are taken from www.realestate.com, or similar website and are technically irrelevant and make no attempt to illustrate the presence and visual impact of the proposed development from a series of affected Holt Avenue houses.

There are no photomontages from the anywhere to the north of the subject site. Consequently, there is no attempt to reveal the visual exposure of the proposed building from within Holt Avenue, the Holt Estate Heritage Conservation nor the Scenic Protection Area.

MAJOR OBJECTIONS CONCERNING THE HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

Misrepresentation of the statutory heritage context

s4.2 of The Heritage Impact Statement identified a total of three MLEP Schedule 5 Heritage Items that are “in the vicinity” of the subject development in addition to the Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area

The HIS did not identify the following Heritage Items:

- Item 201 Flats.36A Park Avenue SP8031
- Item 422 Divided Road Park Avenue Road Reserve Adjacent to 22-38 Park Avenue
- Item 379 Holt Avenue Divided Road, between Cowles Rd and Spofforth St
- Item 380 Holt Avenue Road Reserve (adjacent to 1-9 Holt Avenue
- Item 439 Stone culvert Rangers Ave Road Reserve adjacent to 28 Avenue Road.

Accordingly, the assessment of heritage impact that is demanded by SEARS 22 Environmental Heritage is severely compromised and cannot be regarded as providing a full understanding and appreciation of the Heritage Management issues of the SSDA.

The HIS description, in s4.2.2 Holt Estate Conservation Area has selectively quoted from p147 of the Mosman Residential DCP 2012 in an attempt to reduce the significance and therefore the sensitivity of the HCA:

The area comprises houses generally of similar scale and form, most of which would have been erected soon after subdivision in 1902. However, many of the houses in this conservation area have been modified. The modifications are chiefly the painting of face brickwork never intended to be treated this way, the erection of intrusive garages or carports mostly in front of houses, the concealment of the houses by high, opaque front fences, and the building of severe first-floor additions.

The character of the area is now greatly dependent upon the efficacy of the street plantings of plane and brush box trees in both roads, which to some degree conceal or ameliorate the effects of alterations and additions.

This shameful attempt fails to recognise that the “intrusive garages” are located on the northern side of Holt Avenue, that the houses on the southern side of Holt Avenue access garages from Bloxsome Lane and finally that the houses in Holt Avenue that are in close proximity to the subject site, have generally escaped much of the visible alterations and extensions when viewed from the public realm in Holt Avenue. The significance and sensitivity of the Holt Estate HCA cannot but suffer from the inevitable visibility of the excessive SSDA massing that must be visible over and between the houses between 18 and 34 Holt Avenue.

s4.3 Significance Assessment adopts the typical mechanism used in URBIS HIA reports to make their own heritage assessment of irrelevant properties. In the case of SSDA 96272465, an assessment of the houses to be demolished is irrelevant and unnecessary. None of the houses on the subject site are heritage listed, located in or contributing to a heritage conservation area.

The subsequent Site Statement of Significance at a4.4.1 has no purpose other than to try and reinforce the lack of statutory heritage sensitivity within the locality of the subject site. The remainder of the Statements of Significance of the three items, the HCA and the excavated rock faces and retaining walls are simply taken from readily available public sources.

There are no Statements of Significance for the other heritage items in the vicinity of the subject site:

- Item 201 Flats.36A Park Avenue SP8031
- Item 422 Divided Road Park Avenue Road Reserve Adjacent to 22-38 Park Avenue
- Item 379 Holt Avenue Divided Road, between Cowles Rd and Spofforth St
- Item 380 Holt Avenue Road Reserve (adjacent to 1-9 Holt Avenue
- Item 439 Stone culvert Rangers Ave Road Reserve adjacent to 28 Avenue Road.

The architectural drawings selected to present “The Proposal” in Section 5 are provided without any discussion or comment about potential heritage management issues.

The Impact Assessment set out in Section 6 begins by stating that the proposed development is in line with the LMR Housing Policy Zoning and Affordable Housing SEPP. It comments that the proposed development can capture the maximum bonus allowances available to the designated FSR and heights established by the LMR zoning policy that applies.

The passive acceptance of the maximum allowable development capacity for the site exposes the deep flaw in the independent heritage impact assessment for which the HIA was required to undertake by SEARS 22.

The assessment of the SSA proposal against the Clause 5.10 Heritage Management Objectives of the Mosman LEP 2012 continues to meekly accept the overall power it gives to the LMR legislation:

Its recognition that the nearby Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area will be affected by the noticeably contemporary and higher than the residential houses, it simply comments that these impacts are *mitigated through architectural design, which follows the existing topography of the area??*

The HIA seems to rely on its conclusion that the proposal will have a minor impact on the HCA as the site is located to the rear of the large HCA, outside the principal view lines. This is a novel but worthless conclusion.

The HIA, at p43, makes no attempt to comment on any potential heritage impacts on the three heritage items in the vicinity that it does recognise and also makes no reference to the other items that have been ignored.

In short, the VIA and HIA fail to provide adequate evidence, analysis and assessment required by MLEP Clause 5.10 and accordingly also fails to meet the requirements of SEARS 22.

They also fail to provide any adequate impact assessment against the relevant Objectives of Mosman Residential DCP 2012 (amended December 2024)

RECOMMENDATIONS

SSDA 96272465 must be refused on the basis that the architectural and heritage documentation inadequately and incorrectly describe the proposal and have major flaws by not considering the broad range of heritage, planning, view loss and urban character criteria.

It does not make any effort to recognise that the Visual and Heritage Impacts on the locality and the Heritage Items plus HCA generated by this proposal will be drastic and utterly unjustified in terms of SEARS item 22. No aspect of these overwhelming impacts can or will be mitigated by the HIS suggestions.

The simple reliance by the HIS on the LMR legislation to justify the maximum Height and FSR has resulted in an extreme massing outcome that shows no regard for the surrounding context.

Yours faithfully
GBA HERITAGE PTY LTD



Graham Brooks
Director
grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com



GRAHAM BROOKS
Managing Director, GBA Heritage
Heritage Consultants, Sydney

President Emeritus
ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Committee

CAREER SUMMARY

Graham Brooks is widely respected, nationally and internationally, as a specialist in Cultural Heritage and Cultural Tourism Management.

Graham is an architect with over 50 years post graduate professional experience, gained from working in Australia, the United Kingdom and Asia. Much of his career has been centred on the conservation and heritage management of historic buildings, urban areas and cultural landscapes. He has been actively involved in conservation planning, heritage asset management and the re-use of historic buildings for sites throughout Australia. His work in cultural tourism has included extensive site investigations and policy formulation over many decades on the relationship of tourism with World Heritage Sites throughout Europe, South East Asia, the Pacific, the Americas and North Africa.

Graham has lectured widely to business, heritage, professional and student groups on heritage assessments, heritage management, conservation practice, preparing heritage sites for cultural tourism and the methodologies of heritage asset management.

Since the mid-1980s, he has participated in many appeals before the Land & Environment Court, acting on behalf of both Respondents and Applicants, including as a Court Appointed Heritage Expert. He has also completed a wide range of Peer Review assignments.

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

- Bachelor of Architecture (Hons), Sydney, 1972
- Master of Built Environment (B Cons), UNSW, 1983
- Associate, Australian Institute of Architects (AIA), 1975
- Associate, Royal Institute of British Architects, 1975
- Member, ICOMOS, International Council on Monuments and Sites, (1980)

EMPLOYMENT

- Managing Director, GBA Heritage Pty Ltd, 2015 -
- Managing Director, Graham Brooks & Associates Pty Ltd, 1996 – 2015
- Director, Schwager Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd, 1984 – 1996
- Associate Director, Travis Partners, 1977 – 1984
- Architect for the conservation of 40 Georgian terraced houses, Pollard Thomas & Edwards, London, 1975 – 1977
- Architect, Commonwealth Department of Works, 1972 – 1975

HERITAGE POSITIONS HELD - AUSTRALIA

- Foundation Board Member (1995), Deputy Chairman (1996-1999) and Chairman (1999-2001) of *AusHeritage Ltd*, Australia's International Network for Cultural Heritage Services
- Chairman, National Trust of Australia (NSW) Historic Buildings Committee, 1996-1999
- Former Heritage Adviser, Liverpool City Council c1995-2005
- Executive Committee Member, Australia ICOMOS, 1990-1992
- Former Member Heritage Council Technical Advisory Committee on Materials Conservation, RAlA Heritage Committee and RAHS Historic Buildings Committee

HERITAGE POSITIONS HELD - INTERNATIONAL

- President of ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Committee, 2001 - 2011
- Member, Senior Advisory Board, Global Heritage Fund, 2009 -
- Member, UNESCO *World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Initiative 2008 – 2010*
- Member of International Panel of Experts for Ajanta Ellora World Heritage Sites Conservation and Tourism Development Project, Maharashtra, India, 2004-2010.
- Contributor, UN Foundation *Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria Project*, 2008
- Member UNESCO/ICOMOS Monitoring Missions to Borobudur, 2003, 2006, 2009.
- Member, External Advisory Board, PICTURE Project, Sustainable Tourism Management in small - medium sized European Cities. LEMA - University of Liege, Belgium, 2005
- International Advisory Panel to UNESCO Bangkok for *LEAP* cultural tourism project in relation to 10 World Heritage listed urban centres in the Asia Pacific Region, 1999-2001
- Visiting Professor, Graduate Building Conservation Program, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, 1998
- Former Member Culture Advisory Network Australian National Commission for UNESCO
- Former Member Asia and West Pacific Network for Urban Conservation (AWPNUC)
- Former Chairman, Historic Buildings Committee, National Trust of Australia (NSW)

SELECTED HERITAGE PROJECTS - AUSTRALIA

- North Head Quarantine Station;
- The conservation and continuing use of the shipyard on Goat Island;
- Army facilities at Chowder Bay,
- Re-use and rejuvenation of the finger wharves and shore sheds along Walsh Bay
- The heritage values and adaptive re-use of the former Royal Australian Navy Armaments Depot (RANAD) at Homebush to a publicly accessible heritage site (1996 – 2023);
- Adaptive re-use 1920s Substation and Warehouse to commercial offices;
- Heritage Impact management for large housing complex in the vicinity of three State Listed early 19th century historic houses in Harris Park, Parramatta;
- Heritage Impact management for medium rise commercial building in close proximity to an historic cottage, Parramatta;
- Conservation works for Dawn Fraser Harbour Swimming Pool, Balmain;
- Commercial adaptive re-use of the former Royal Edward Victualling Yard complex, Pyrmont;
- Residential adaptive re-use of several major historic warehouses in central Sydney;
- Restaurant adaptive re-use of the historic warehouses at Campbells Cove, Sydney;
- Adaptive re-use of the former Sydney Water Headquarters to an Inner Sydney Hotel;
- Adaptive re-use of the 1920s Dymocks Store to an Inner Sydney Hotel;
- Adaptive Re-use CMP of NSW Major redundant Light Houses
- Refurbishment of 1960s former Qantas House, Chifley Square
- Residential redevelopment of the former Lever and Kitchen industrial site at Balmain;
- New public housing on the site of the former Mort's Dock at Balmain;
- Heritage Impact management for hundreds of private residential projects across Sydney;
- Heritage Inventory Garden Island Dockyard;
- Heritage management North Head Coastal Artillery Fortress;
- Upgrade of 1960s Perth Council House;
- Conservation Management Plan for 1930s Westpac Bank, Adelaide;
- Conservation Management Plan for former 19th century Priory, Hunters Hill
- NSW Historic Lighthouses, Conservation and Cultural Tourism Plan, 1998
- Master Plan for Goat Island Historic Site, 1996 – 1998

GRAHAM BROOKS' CULTURAL TOURISM ENGAGEMENT

INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS

- Personal visits and inspections of more than 320 World Heritage Sites since 1975
- Contributing author **2015 Siem Reap Declaration, first joint UNESCO/UNWTO World Conference on Tourism and Culture – Building a New Partnership, 2015**
- Author, **Handbook, Communicating Heritage for the Tourism Sector**, UNWTO, 2011
- Principal Author for **Handbook on Tourism Congestion Management at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites**, for the UNWTO, 2005
- Author and Co-ordinator **ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter**, 1999
- Key Note Presentation: **Protecting the Quality of Life of Residents in Historic Cities with Excessive Tourism**, Organisation of World Heritage Cities, Cusco, 2005
- Key Note Presentation: **Cultural Tourism in Asia and the Pacific, Opportunities and Challenges**, US/ICOMOS Cultural Tourism Conference, San Francisco, April 2007
- Key Note Presentation: **Practical Strategies for Cultural Tourism Management**, Korean Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Seoul, Korea, May 2007
- Presentation: **Tourism Congestion Management at Cultural Sites**, ICOMOS Xian, 2005
- Presentation: **The Role of the ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter in Conservation Practice**, Lima Peru and Siem Reap Cambodia, 2005
- Presentation: **The Indigenous Tourism Experience of Tourism in Australia**, ICOMOS France and Reseau des Grand Sites, Baie de Somme, France, June 2004
- Presentation: **Cultural Tourism Plan for Borobudur**, International Experts' Meeting, 2003.
- **ICOMOS Site Managers Handbook for Cultural Tourism at World Heritage Sites**, 1993
- Chair of ICOMOS Workshop Canterbury World Heritage Site Management Plan, UK, 2007
- Chair of ICOMOS Workshop: Tourism Impact on Small Historic Towns, Korea, 2006
- Participation in Mid Term Review meeting of PICTURE Project, Brussels, July 2005
- Review of European Heritage Days Festivals, Hungary and Czech Republic, 2004
- Review of cultural tourism management in WH listed City of Rhodes, Greece, 2003
- Liaison with local Heritage Authorities for waterfront redevelopment, New Zealand, 1998
- Preparation of a Conservation Plan for an historic villa in Hanoi, 1996
- Research into the urban history and development of historic Dutch City precinct of Batavia (Jakarta) as a basis for planning and cultural tourism guidelines, 1997-2001
- Conservation Plan for historic Army Navy Club building, Manila, 1998
- Contributing organiser and author **2015 Siem Reap Declaration, first UNESCO/UNWTO World Conference on Tourism and Culture – Building a New Partnership, 2015**
- **UNWTO Regional Conferences on Tourism and World Heritage**, Izmir, Bahrain and Siem Reap, 2013, Presentations and final Conference Reports preparation
- **UNESCO Principles for Tourism Management at World Heritage Sites 2008 – 2010**
- **UNESCO World Heritage Tourism Conference**, Magao, China, 2009
- **UNWTO Sustainable Tourism Management at WH Sites**, Huangshan China 2008
- **UNESCO Post Earthquake Experts Meeting for Prambanan Monuments, Indonesia**, 2007
- **UNESCO/UNWTO Tourism Training Workshop for the Managers of China's 31 World Heritage Sites, Lushan, China** 2006
- **UNESCO Post Earthquake Cultural Tourism Assessment Project, Nias, Indonesia**, 2006
- UNWTO Visiting Lecturer, Cultural Tourism Summer School, IFT, Macao 2006
- UNESCO - ICOMOS Monitoring Missions to Borobudur WH Site, Indonesia, 2003, 2006
- Cultural Tourism Strategy Workshop with the Indian Minister for Tourism, February 2005
- Keynote Speaker at Organisation of World Heritage Cities Conference, Cuzco, Peru, 2005
- ICOMOS General Assemblies, Lausanne (1990), Colombo (1993), Sofia (1996), Mexico (1999), Madrid (2002), Xi'an (2005), Quebec (2008), Paris (2011), Florence (2014).
- Liaison meetings with Heritage Authorities, St Petersburg, Moscow and Prague, 1997
- International Review Panel for project applications to the Getty Grant Program, 1994-96
- Presentations to Cultural Tourism symposia, Basel (1985), Colombo (1993), Hanoi (1993, 1994) Sofia (1996), Yogyakarta (1996), Evora, Manila (1997, 1998) Roros (1998), Penang (1992, 1999) Nepal, Bali (2000), Lijiang (2001), Madrid (2002), Rhodes (2003), Prague, Louvain, Budapest (2004), Angkor Wat, Lima (2005), Korea (2006), San Francisco (2007), Canterbury, UK (2007), Quebec (2008), Paris (2011), Izmir, Bahrain (2013), Luxor (2016) |