

**I OPPOSE the POWERHOUSE ULTIMO REVITALISATION project described in SSD-67588459 and its amendments and urge you to reject the project.**

I am writing in my private capacity as a technology industry professional currently employed in digital design in a commercial context. I am a 12 year resident of Sydney and longstanding supporter of the Powerhouse Museum since the mid-2000s when I was an international and interstate visitor to Sydney.

***There is overwhelming public objection to significant changes to the contents and historical purpose of the museum***

I am adding my voice to the submissions to help make the point that:

- The public was opposed to the original “revitalization” project
- The public was opposed to the recently proposed repurposing of the Ultimo facility
- The public is STILL opposed to the revised proposal after the amendments

Over the past 10 years, there has been overwhelming opposition to government attempts to materially change the function of the Ultimo location of the Powerhouse Museum, from being primarily a museum involved in the display, conservation, and interpretation of industrial and industrial design history and ground-breaking excellence in applied arts, to being a creative artists’ playground and function centre, largely focused solely on artistic aspects of fashion, from many directions:

- The general public (the electorate) in Sydney and greater NSW.
- Museum experts from around the world.
- A renowned architect specializing in conservation and re-use, Alan Croker, who created the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the recent revitalization of the Sydney Opera House.
- Former leadership involved in the establishment and management of the Powerhouse Museum.
- The community around the museum in the Ultimo and Pyrmont area.
- THE LABOR PARTY itself, before it won the election, demonstrating that (1) it understands the value of the Ultimo location’s connection to Sydney’s industrial history, and (2) it understood that the 1980s revitalization itself has value as a resource created for the people of NSW as part of the Bicentenary revitalization of the Darling Harbour area by the Wran Labor government of the day.

This has been chronicled in many petitions, rounds of submissions, and legislative committee hearings related to proposed changes to the museum.

The Museum is a public institution held in trust for the people of NSW. Its collections and real property belong to the people of NSW, not to the government of the day and not to any current museum leaders.

The proposed costly, dramatic alterations to the site to accommodate the change of use are not in line with the will of the people of NSW – including those who voted for a Labor

government based on its promise to save the Powerhouse Museum -- as indicated by the years of objections by those listed above.

This objection document contains both concerns raised by the responses to the last round of submissions as well as concerns about particular aspects of the SEARS.

## Concerns raised by the recent responses to submissions

### Concerns about project team assertions that the development plan should be evaluated in isolation from its connections to the collection

The repeated assertions (made in response to objections) that the connection between the facility, its location, design, and capabilities and the exhibits hosted by the facility, is irrelevant because it concerns collections, which are managed by another entity is highly concerning and will result in a flawed decision-making process. The assertions fail to acknowledge the inherent connection of the two and that is a failure of institution stewardship to consider them only in isolation from each other, rather than considering the meaning inherent in the two together. An institution isn't its buildings. It isn't its collection. It is both of those things, plus curators and more.

These concerns were raised in conjunction with public objections around the retention of the live steam gallery at Ultimo, the retention of other core exhibits at Ultimo beyond the three that museum leadership likes to talk about, a change in the focus of the museum away from the industrial history exhibits, restriction in the public viewing availability of donated objects, etc.

The amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns that the renovations will not appropriately preserve the cultural history of the first 35 years of Powerhouse Museum operations and that they are more oriented to presenting events than museum exhibits

The development appears greatly unsympathetic to the 1988 work done to re-use industrial structures as museum halls and related facilities, in effect denying those 35 years of cultural history. I have seen no indication that the 1988 work has been evaluated for its historical significance, but have read that [the original firm retained to produce a Conservation Management Plan \(CMP\) for the Ultimo site had its contract terminated](#) after the state saw that the draft report recommended that the heritage listing expanded to include the entire Ultimo site ... which would have interfered with the proposed development project's works to demolish much of it down to shells. This is of great concern to me, as the conservation insights of the individual involved, Mr. Alan Croker, are considered so valuable that he was involved with recent renovation efforts for the Sydney Opera House.

It is unreasonable and gobsmacking that the main design detail carried forward in this development seems to be the shape of the roofline of the Wran building, and that so many other improvements made to the facilities are considered incompatible with the future use of the site allegedly as a museum.

The community harbours concerns that the revisions are not because the existing design is inappropriate for museum exhibits, but because future use of this site will involve substantial uses such as large functions that are not considered primary purposes of a museum, and that the renovations are to reconfigure the site for these uses rather than for permanently exhibiting the collection of applied arts and sciences objects.

The amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns that the designers are thinking more about IKEA than museums when designing the interior flow of the spaces

They note, “Confusion caused by the lack of separation between visitor circulation and back-of-house operations coupled with the legibility of spaces throughout the museum was a daily source of negative feedback from Powerhouse visitors and audiences.” And that “Establishing one central, intuitive, and accessible visitor circulation system to access exhibition, program, and education spaces to support the visitor experience,” is their response to that.

A single visitor circulation system sounds more like a plan for an IKEA than a museum to me. Part of the magic of a larger museum is that you don’t necessarily see it all in one trip. There’s a lot to see! So you pick out a couple key exhibits that are must-do’s and then let serendipity take care of how you browse a few other areas. That’s how a museum remains fresh even if you don’t change up its exhibits every 6-12 months. This “serendipitous discovery” mechanism is yet another aspect of the museum that underscores its purpose as a museum of applied arts and sciences, providing experiential learning about curiosity and creativity. That very mechanism is part of the creative process that results in advances in arts and sciences.

Granted, the Powerhouse Museum could recently be seen in one day due to the reduction in exhibits, but that wasn’t the case in years past.

The amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns that the Conservation Management Plan does not sufficiently acknowledge and protect the heritage significance of the 1988 adaptive re-use of the site

This can be seen in how the contract to prepare the first CMP was terminated when it produced findings incompatible with the government’s desire to rip out most of the 1988 work, and how vigorously the government defends a later CMP prepared by another organisation that proposes the outcome the government/s plans clearly favour (it’s not important... get rid of it).

Requests to prepare a new CMP in consultation with the 1988 project’s original architect, or Mr. Alan Croker whose firm drafted the initial CMP that was terminated by the government were dismissed as not relevant.

The heritage significance (or lack thereof) of the 1988 updates to the Powerhouse Museum complex in Ultimo does not appear to have been comprehensively evaluated, if two firms can come to two very different conclusions.

The amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns around government seeming to go back on its promise to save the Powerhouse Museum

The proposed development does not reflect the picture painted by the words of Labor prior to the NSW election or in the subsequent months.

Among other things, there was an assertion that the museum would not close. (It's currently closed.)

Another assertion was that the hundreds of millions of dollars of renovations would not be proceeding. (They're currently in progress, with an estimate of \$100 million saved off the LNP's plan, if that; less than 20%.)

This amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns around community consultations that appear to have not been conducted with genuine intent to consult

Talk by project participants at consultations that exhibit space would increase appears to be incorrect, with no explanation offered for that later when different numbers were produced. (The first time, OR the second time this happened.)

Similarly, the author of this communication has attended consultations in which a significant majority of attendees expressed scepticism or outright disagreement with the direction of the project, yet the overwhelming nature of this feedback to the government was not reflected in consultation reports.

This amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

### Concerns that this project will not result in "a better museum"

The community has noticed the lack of evidence around how reconfiguring (demolishing) the existing museum will make it more suited as a museum facility. Many experts claim that the reverse is true – that the renovations will make it less appropriate for many exhibits.

Similarly, people question money spent to provide creative workspaces in a "creative precinct", as part of the remit of a museum of applied arts and sciences given the recent leadership's preference toward visual arts like fashion, which is just one small segment of "applied arts".

The project has not justified why it should proceed and that it will achieve the result of a museum fit for the future.

This amendment does not successfully address these concerns.

## SEARS (2) – Capital investment value and employment

The proposed “investment” **removes value** from the institution in multiple ways and is not a responsible use of funds in NSW today.

### S2 – objection 1: Reduction in connection between the museum’s location, buildings, and its collection reduces capital value of the institution

It is special for a museum’s building to be complementary to its purpose and to the collection objects stored within it. Not all museums have this, and those that do have this don’t throw it away in the name of “let’s do something I think is more on-trend,” because this connection is **priceless**.

The stores warehouses out at Castle Hill certainly don’t have this inherent connection. The Ultimo facility repurposed to be a cheap workspace for “creatives” and event hire facility won’t have this any longer. Notable museums throughout the ages have featured this connection. Examples include:

- The Louvre Palace that displayed the royal collection during the time of Louis XIV.
- The Franklin Institute in America, now a science museum but originally founded as a scientific and technology research centre and named after early American scientist Ben Franklin who had lived in the area.

At the Powerhouse Museum, much of this connection is in its location and technology facilitating a diverse live Steam Hall with a variety of machinery that is uncommon anywhere in the world, which connects with the building’s original purpose and its location near water. The proposal rips this and other industrial-focused exhibit spaces out and treats the building as *just another heritage shell* that could be anywhere in NSW, and could have any history... say, an old bank building, an old warehouse, and so on. This diminishes the cultural value institution and results in sub-optimal use of resource that was so thoughtfully repurposed for the 1980s adaptive re-use project.

As evidenced by many submissions and consultations over the years, the people want this space to remain a museum whose contents connected to the industrial history of the buildings, the site, and the area of Sydney in which it is located. The latest revisions to the proposal do not change that. The proposed changes still dramatically reduce, even eliminate, the historical connections between the collection and its site, and claiming that is outside the scope of the design proposal ignores a crucial purpose for the facility that the design should take into account.

### S2 – objection 2: Spending considerable funds with a result of reducing available exhibit space represents bad value and increases capital risk to the collection

Exhibiting the museum’s collection is a primary (many consider it THE primary) purpose of a museum. The adaptive re-use design from the 1980s created mezzanine floors with a goal of

maximizing exhibit space while still allowing sight lines that enabled visitors to appreciate the grandeur of large open spaces through overlooks.

Removing this exhibit space reduces the institution's ability to fulfill the purpose of displaying its collection in a curatorially responsible manner. Specifically, I refer to the wisdom of permanent or near-permanent installation of objects so as to minimize the capital risks inherent in movement of the objects, many one of a kind and priceless, to and from storage – particularly storage that is 20km away from the Ultimo site.

## **S2 – objection 3: The project is vague on detail, cannot be fully and properly costed based on that, and significant overruns are likely**

Per [https://www.smh.com.au/culture/art-and-](https://www.smh.com.au/culture/art-and-design/minns-government-blunders-in-costing-of-powerhouse-museum-revamp-20240528-p5jhe6.html)

[design/minns-government-blunders-in-costing-of-powerhouse-museum-revamp-](https://www.smh.com.au/culture/art-and-design/minns-government-blunders-in-costing-of-powerhouse-museum-revamp-20240528-p5jhe6.html)

[20240528-p5jhe6.html](https://www.smh.com.au/culture/art-and-design/minns-government-blunders-in-costing-of-powerhouse-museum-revamp-20240528-p5jhe6.html), an incomplete estimate of the project's cost is \$350 million, and that covers only 85% of the project's expected costs, not including additional costs such as fit-out, removal and replacement of objects, etc.

During a time of economic austerity, this is the wrong project to be committing more than 1/3 of a billion dollars to, because it is not adding value. Not the least of which because we know how significant government projects come in over budget quite frequently ([\\$1B blowout in cost of new NSW passenger trains](#), [Sydney Metro West cost overrun of at least \\$12B](#), and of course there's WestConnex), and that by the time this is done and all expenses are accounted for, it is most likely this will be a \$500M or even \$600M project once overruns and unanticipated expenses related to the opening have been taken into account.

## **S2 - objection 4: The project requires scarce construction resources more responsibly and profitably used by the state for increasing housing supply**

The demolition and construction work will be carried out by construction workers who could be better deployed by NSW this decade in the creation of more housing. This is not job creation as much as it is job reallocation, from the private housing industry (which creates value including sources of stamp duty and rates) to public infrastructure (which costs the state).

High prices for construction work in the current environment are in part due to a [shortage of construction workers, largely in the skilled trades and general labour](#) across Australia – the very sort required on this project and for home-building.

With rental vacancy rates below 1% and rent increases in some parts of Sydney over 30% for the year, it's no secret that we don't have enough housing. We need that much, much more than we need a museum building gutted down to its shell and repurposed to endeavours such as artistic creative workspaces and significantly sized event hire facilities that are not aligned with the primary purpose of a museum institution.

Just as the people of NSW overwhelmingly DON'T consider this project to offer cultural value for money, they DO overwhelmingly agree that we need to do something about the housing crisis. By taking resources away from the private sector, this project will further increase the cost of providing needed housing for the residents of NSW.

Wouldn't "creatives" be better served by and government funds be better spent on a bunch of satellite studios around NSW, closer to where they can afford to live, particularly if they're renters, than by workspaces located in one of the most expensive cities on the planet, to live in?

## SEARS (3) Design quality

### S3 – objection 1: Uncertainty around the quality of the design review and selection processes

The proposed design raising concerns about the quality of the design review and selection process, the Design Excellence criteria used for it, and the manner in which those criteria have been applied.

At best, it is yet another example of leaders failing to make a distinction between creative arts in general, and applied arts. The latter involves more than the self-expression inherent in creative arts "for the sake of art" activities.

### S3 – objection 2: Proposed extensive renovations do not demonstrate a high standard of architectural design and detailing appropriate to the role and function of the Powerhouse Museum

Design excellence clause 6.21 (a) concerns, "whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved". The claim is that the proposed design, "demonstrate(s) a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing that is appropriate to the function and role of the Powerhouse Museum Ultimo within the site and locality,"

The proposed design is not particularly architecturally distinctive nor does it seem to particularly honour the historical nature of the institution and site.

I find the overall impression from the Harris Street side to resemble [a 1970s-era American art school building named after Jackson Pollak, a prominent modern painter known for his abstract, almost graffiti-like paint-splotch technique](#), and the impression looking into the courtyard to resemble some high schools.

This is a puzzling design choice for an internationally-known museum of *applied* arts and sciences.

Similarly, it would be "appropriate" to preserve the full metal-framed vaulted glass façade of the Wran building, added in the 1980s, as it has been for years an iconic symbol of the museum that has been part of logos, key photographs, etc. However, the proposed design



obscures most of it and bricks in the front of the top-most portion of it, keeping only the very top of the roofline visible. This is not acceptable. (The City of Sydney noted this in CoS3.)

The Heritage Council also noted the unacceptability of changing the Wran building exteriors to brickwork in HC4, based on “the Wran building reflects the distinct 1988 adaptive reuse development of the site as the PHM and the design should recognise this in terms of its external treatment/materiality.”

The Amended HIS inadequately attempts to justify their chopping off the Wran building entrance, obscuring the sight lines to it, and bricking over the vaulted roof lines based on:

- “the use of brick, whilst sympathetic, does not seek to replicate the original brick work but instead will provide a contemporary response which combines modern brick and recycled brick;”
- “the current 'lightweight' structure of the Wran Building is not of itself considered to be significant fabric;” and
- “accordingly, notwithstanding the concept of a lightweight building amongst industrial heritage buildings, the external fabric of the Wran Building would not be replaced with like for like glazed and metal fabric because the existing contemporary fabric of the Wran Building competes, both in colour and materiality, with the heritage significance of the North Annex, Post Office and the Switch House;”

**The Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo is not intended to be a museum of Old Sydney brick building architecture. It is intended to be a museum of applied arts and sciences, showcasing the evolution of industrial design and related pursuits across the decades and centuries.** The Wran building is intentionally different from its surroundings because it creates that contrast that highlights both and illustrates the evolution of design based on available technology. That isn't a deficiency... it's part of the point of why it was designed the way it was. It exists in harmony with those other buildings as part of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences.

**The plan to substantially destroy and obscure the modern façade sends a message of not valuing design history, and instead asserting that it is not worthy of preservation – a message that is directly in conflict with the museum's mission.**

### **S3 – objection 3: Proposed development will not improve the quality and amenity of the Harris Street experience of the facility**

Design excellence clause 6.21 (b) concerns, “whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,” The claim is that, “the external form and appearance of the development will significantly enhance the quality and amenity of the public domain”, including that there is “enhanced activation of Harris Street”.

More shopfront offices (aka cheap workspaces for “creatives”), adding to the small shopfront offices along Harris Street, are not “enhanced activation” over the museum entrance and gathering area that exists there today.



This actually reduces Harris Street activation by relocating the main entrance away from Harris Street and reducing visibility into a courtyard that has hosted various community and other events over the years.

A lower entrance to the Powerhouse Museum already exists on the Goods Line side. It is not currently used, for whatever reason, but has existed for years.

### S3 – objection 4: Presentation volumes created by this development are unnecessarily large and remove the flexibility of more, smaller spaces

Design excellence clause 6.21 (d) (v) concerns, “(how the proposal addresses) the bulk, massing and modulation of buildings.” The claim is, “The bulk, massing and modulation of the building forms represents a high quality response to the functional requirements of the Powerhouse to deliver presentation volumes that are flexible and adaptable to the requirements of an international-standard museum.”

The proposed development removes the open space running from Harris Street to the area of the museum housing the café and shop area, and adds considerably more bulk to the streetscape by virtue of the use of dark-ish brick material.

The claim appears to be that the added bulk is necessary to “deliver presentation volumes that are flexible and adaptable” at international museum standards. What exists today within the museum’s curtilage area already accommodates that. The added bulk along the Harris Street edge of the property appears to even **replace some existing exhibit space** with “creative workspaces”, etc.

### S3 – objection 5: Extensive demolition and construction works are not the most sustainable approach to readying this complex for its next 50 years

Design excellence clause 6.21 (d) (viii) concerns, “(how the proposal addresses) (viii) the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development.” The claim is that the project ticks a lot of boxes for sustainable building standards.

And that might be the main relevant criteria for ecological sustainability if it were a greenfield development. However, it is not.

- One of the cornerstones of sustainability is to not use resources when it’s not necessary to use them; that’s considered unnecessarily wasteful.
- Another is to employ things for their “highest and best use”.

This museum demolition and repurposing project fails on both of those accounts.

- By virtue of destroying something that is fit for purpose that is not yet even at the halfway point in its useful life, this project is being wasteful of both those resources and any new resources that will be employed to reconstruct the repurposed facility that would not be needed if the existing configuration was kept.
- Similarly, repurposing museum spaces as creatives workspaces and large event hire halls is not the highest and best use of this property, which is purpose-built to be a

museum and requires some updating, but not the massive demolition and rebuilding (to a smaller amount of exhibit space) that is proposed.

The proposal notes that, “To maintain the museum as a time capsule of itself, by keeping the Wran Building current exact form and materiality does not allow for the creation of the operational space required for a revitalised Powerhouse Museum.” The same could be said of the intention to rip out fit-for-purpose modifications to older buildings that are part of the Ultimo facility: in so doing, the designers and developers propose to return THOSE to being “time capsules of themselves,” returning them to their pre-1988 exact form and materiality.

Why only object to keeping the original form of the regarding the Wran building that was purpose-built to be part of a museum, and enthusiastically support the return to original form of other buildings, removing the 1988 updates? It’s difficult not to see this as an attempt to eradicate the impact of the 1988 architectural design work on the museum.

The fact that museum design has advanced since the 1980s does not negate the significance of the 1988 work nor does it require that such comprehensive redesign and reconstruction in order for the facility to continue to be used as a museum. Far, far older facilities around the world, including some that are multiple centuries older, safely and responsibly host popular exhibits without the massive amounts of renovations that the proposal claims the Powerhouse Museum requires.

## SEARS (4) Built form and urban design

### S4 – objection 1: The proposed built form will reduce exhibition space by well over 50%

When talking about museums, it’s much more common to talk about increasing exhibit space than reducing it, since displaying the museum’s collections in carefully curated exhibits that can take years to plan is considered to be a primary purpose of a museum, but that’s what’s planned here.

Why doesn’t exhibit space occupy a position of overwhelming primacy in the built form, which instead prominently touts its “green space”, auditorium (a heading in section 3.5.1 is, “Exhibit spaces and auditorium”) and large open halls with soaring ceilings(well suited for events), artists’ workspaces, and food spaces?

The government has been repeatedly non-specific about the details of exhibit space being retained in Ultimo. Irrespective of what this says about the transparency of the strip-out-and-repurpose project, museum leadership and others related to the project have repeatedly failed to produce facts and figures that refute experts’ well-documented assertions that up to 75% of exhibit space will be removed from the Ultimo facility by this project.

- A series of block diagrams without measurements furnished by project staff, which do not match up with other historical diagrams of the site held by experts, do not constitute proof of museum leadership’s claims regarding retained exhibit space.

- It is concerning that, over time, the amounts of exhibit space in the current and proposed versions of the Powerhouse Museum cited by project leadership have varied. The answers seem to change every time they're asked. How can an accurate budget be prepared if there isn't a firm, accurate statement accompanied by drawings that back up the totals, the amount of exhibit space in that museum? How sure are you that the latest responses are accurate given that they've given different numbers before that they've said are accurate?

#### S4 – objection 2: Destruction of award-winning adaptive re-use elements of the Powerhouse Museum is inappropriate and unnecessary

The 1980s additions to the Powerhouse Museum elegantly juxtaposed distinctive new design and new materials with old, to highlight the form of the brick heritage structures and demonstrate, complementary to the museum's purpose, how design evolves over time, leveraging new materials that allow for new construction techniques. The complex won a Sulman Medal for adaptive re-use.

The Wran building's current roofline and modern exterior calls attention to the museum as a crossroads at which old and new meet.

#### S4 – objection 3: It is not valid to assert that the relationship between the constructed facility and the character of the collection displayed within it is not relevant

The built form of the current Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo is more than just a container for museum activities. It's a reflection of what's inside.

In contrast, a visitor would be hard-pressed to see the proposed new exterior and conclude anything about what's inside other than maybe "offices, maybe a community centre (and depending on how obvious it is, a café)."

The Heritage Council makes the point in HC8 that "The inter-relationship of the purpose-built Museum and its permanent displays is relevant. The application should clearly demonstrate the ability to adequately accommodate the Museum's operations and curatorial display including all the permanent displays". The amended proposal's response to this concern was to say that the relationship of the built environment to the collection is not relevant because a separate entity manages the collection."

**It is not valid to dismiss the relationship between the Museum's buildings and the collection objects displayed within it.** As noted in my S2 – objection 1: Reduction in connection between the museum's location, buildings, and its collection reduces capital value of the institution, it is exactly this relationship that is part of the core **value proposition** of the museum as an institution. It is an attribute of the museum that many world-leading museums have, that others do not. Disregarding the value of this, with the intent of severing this connection, removes part of the value of the institution.

This statement that the facility's relationship to the collection doesn't matter is akin to saying that the Louvre would still be just as fantastic housed in an airplane hanger at Orly or an old cheese factory, rather than a palace used since the days of Louis XIV to display the royal collection, and it's demonstrably false.

#### **S4 – objection 4: Removal of mezzanine floors to facilitate use of halls as multi-floor-height exhibition spaces is unnecessary and a bad investment**

The cost of installing (and de-installing) huge exhibits related to the museum's mission, of the type that would require exhibit halls larger than what exists today at the Ultimo facility, would be significant? These would not be floor-to-ceiling art tapestries or streamers, if they're integral to exhibits inline with the museum's mission of applied arts and sciences. They'd be objects. Very large, often heavy, objects. Things that are prohibitively difficult to transport to Sydney, Australia from whatever country these international exhibits would be coming from.

Practically speaking, there just wouldn't be many international exhibits requiring that volume of empty vertical space because it would be prohibitively expensive to move those objects around... a cost far offsetting anything that might be earned through separately ticketing the exhibits.

It is unwise to design for those one or two temporary exhibit edge cases, when the current spaces have proven acceptable to accommodate many international standard exhibitions like the blockbuster Star Wars and Diana's Dresses exhibits hosted by the Powerhouse Museum in recent decades. Even the recent 1001 Remarkable Objects exhibition, which drew many people to the museum, could be accommodated in the existing exhibit space (with space left to spare).

Converting many smaller exhibit spaces, each one of which has been right-sized for exhibits in the past, to fewer huge exhibit spaces will leave fewer opportunities for exhibits, rather than more. It's easier to split an exhibit across multiple spaces than it is to combine a huge multi-story hall into numerous spaces for multiple separate concurrent temporary exhibits.

Heritage consultants' claims that this has a positive impact on heritage disregards the heritage of this property as a Sulman award-winning museum facility, because it disregards that use of the facility despite that being its purpose for 35+ years.

institution and its property holdings) have been replaced over the past 10 years with property developers, fashion creatives, hospitality managers, and Western Sydney business

development boosters, all of whom have vested interests in the change-of-use and a curious lack of vested interest in the idea of a museum displaying artefacts related to the applied arts and sciences.