

# **Guidance on identifying places and objects of state-level social value in Victoria**

## **Document Purpose:**

The purpose of this document is to provide additional information to that provided in the *Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines* to assist in assessing the cultural heritage significance of places and objects for possible inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Register under Criterion G (social value).

## Contact for Enquiries

Please address any queries regarding this document to:

**Heritage Council of Victoria**

**Email: [heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au](mailto:heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au)**

## Acknowledgements

### Traditional Owners

The Heritage Council of Victoria proudly acknowledges Victoria's Aboriginal communities and their rich culture and pays respect to their Elders past and present.

We acknowledge Aboriginal people as Australia's first peoples and as the Traditional Owners and custodians of the land and water on which we rely. We recognise and value the ongoing contribution of Aboriginal people and communities to Victorian life and how this enriches us. We embrace the spirit of reconciliation, working towards the equality of outcomes and ensuring an equal voice.

### Guidance document

The content of this document is taken in whole (Section 3) or in part (Sections 1, 2 and 4) from a report prepared for the Heritage Council of Victoria in June 2018 by Adam Mornement (Lovell Chen) and Dr Cristina Garduño Freeman (The University of Melbourne, Australian Centre for Architectural History, Urban and Cultural Heritage): *Assessing and managing social value: Report and recommendations*. This report can be found on the Heritage Council website ([www.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au](http://www.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au)).

This document is an outcome of a review process commissioned by the Heritage Council and convened by a Project Steering Committee comprising representatives of the Heritage Council and Heritage Victoria. Broader sector engagement in the report process included input from delegates at a community workshop hosted by the National Trust (February 2018) and an internal project workshop (March 2018).

© State of Victoria, Heritage Council of Victoria 2019



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. You are free to re-use the work under that licence, on the condition that you credit the Heritage Council of Victoria as author. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

### Disclaimer

This publication may be of assistance to you but the State of Victoria and its employees do not guarantee that the publication is without flaw of any kind or is wholly appropriate for your particular purposes and therefore disclaims all liability for any error, loss or other consequence which may arise from you relying on any information in this publication

## Accessibility

If you would like to receive this publication in an alternative format, please telephone the Heritage Council of Victoria on 9194 0868, email [heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au](mailto:heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au), or via the National Relay Service on 133 677 [www.relayservice.com.au](http://www.relayservice.com.au). This document is also available on the internet at [www.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au](http://www.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au)

# Contents

---

Contact for Enquiries

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

2. Key terms and concepts

A. Community

B. Attachment

C. Time depth

D. Resonance

3. Suggested methodologies for collecting and assessing the evidence to demonstrate social value

A. Background research

B. Direct engagement with the community – methods and legitimate sources of evidence

C. Observations – methods and legitimate sources of evidence

D. Hybrid approach

E. Describing the evolution of social value of the place

4. Presenting the evidence

Step 1 – Demonstrating social value

Step 2 – Demonstrating social value at the state level

Some examples of places/objects where Criterion G has been satisfied

# 1. Introduction

---

‘Social value’ as understood in contemporary heritage practice is the idea that places and objects are invested with meaning by communities through communal interaction over time. In terms of the *Heritage Act 2017* and state-level significance, these places/objects must align with a theme<sup>1</sup> or story of significance in the state – i.e. broader Victorian – context.

There are no limits to the types of heritage places or objects that can be identified as having social value in the present day. Examples may include (but not be limited to):<sup>2</sup>

- places where people gather for reasons of ritual, ceremony or public meeting/congregation, whether formal or informal – such as public parks, gardens, religious places and town/trades halls; these places are often publicly owned or otherwise publicly accessible
- places or objects that provide a memorial function or are associated with events that continue to have a profound effect on the present-day community/cultural group – these might include shrines, avenues of honour, mission sites and massacre sites
- places or objects that are distinctive or singular, and stand as identifiable symbols (or markers) for a community – these can be both of human construction (e.g. statues, bridges, banners/flags) and natural (e.g. trees or rocky outcrops)
- places associated with recent significant events, as distinct from historic events
- places of public entertainment – including performance venues (such as theatres or halls), showgrounds or sports venues
- places that provide a community function that, over time, become places to which a community/cultural group (or groups) develops an attachment that supersedes its utility value – such as markets or community centres.

The aim of this document is:

1. to provide additional information about the key terms and concepts that relate to Criterion G (see Section 2)
2. to give examples of methodologies to be considered for gathering appropriate evidence and analysing whether a place or object may be of state-level social value (see Section 3)
3. to give examples of the different types of evidence that may be used to substantiate or demonstrate a case for social value at the state level (see Section 4).

Applications to the Executive Director to nominate a place or object for inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) under Criterion G should include this evidence as attachments to their nomination.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Victoria's Framework of Historical Themes*, <https://www.heritage.vic.gov.au/research-and-publications/framework-of-historical-themes>

<sup>2</sup> The examples of place typologies that may be of social value draws on Chris Johnston, *What is Social Value?*, Australian Heritage Commission, Technical Publication Series no. 3, 1992, pp. 7–13.

## 2. Key terms and concepts

---

Any nomination of a place/object to be included in the VHR under Criterion G for state-level social value must demonstrate, through the provision of evidence:

- The existence of a present-day community group (or groups) by whom the place/object is valued.
- The existence of a strong attachment of the community or cultural group to the place/object.
- The existence of a time depth to that attachment.
- The reasons why the above characteristics exert an influence that resonates across the broader Victorian community as part of a story that contributes to Victoria's identity.

The following section may be of assistance in understanding some of the key terms and concepts that apply when considering a place/object for social value under Criterion G. For a fuller discussion of the history and evolution of these terms and social value in general, see *Appendix C: Assessing and Managing Social Significance: A Scoping Paper* (in the report to the Heritage Council of Victoria: *Assessing and managing social value: Report and recommendations* by Adam Mornement and Dr Cristina Garduño Freeman, 2018).

### A. Community

The concept of community is central to social value. Accepted understandings of the term have evolved considerably over time in response to the rise of social media, increased population mobility and the internet, and it is important to understand this when collecting evidence to satisfy the test of the existence of a present-day community.

A community is traditionally understood as a group (social unit) who share a common interest or purpose, such as religion, cultural interests, ethnicity or values. In a heritage context, communities have historically been united by location/geography. They now also form and interact virtually through shared cultural interests. Communities that are not geographically located may have no direct physical interaction with a heritage place or with each other – e.g. they may be socially constructed and their members may have shared affinities but may never actually meet in person or they may be formed online by people who identify with common issues. This, however, may not diminish their sense of social connection or joint sense of identity. Communities are also dynamic and people may identify as being part of many different and at times conflicting communities. A community may also comprise vertical or horizontal social hierarchies, some with a clearly identifiable leader or leadership group, others with a more dispersed representation and others again with competing spokespersons.

A related concept is that of 'community readiness'. In some cases – often related to sites associated with a challenging or socially stigmatising episode – a community group may require some time to have passed before it is ready to present itself as a 'community'.

The nature of communities varies considerably, in terms of scale, sense of identity/cohesion and intensity of attachment to a place/object and kinds of values (see Table 1). Some communities are formal with registered members or may be comprised of committed adherents to a particular creed or manifesto. In these circumstances, there is typically a degree of formality to the community, and an ability to identify the group may be uncontroversial. Other communities may be large and broadly constituted – the 'Melbourne community' or the 'people of Victoria' for instance. These communities are more informal but similarly

significant. Identifying the members of such communities and their extent can be more complex and may be based on a self-identified sense of belonging.

**Table 1 Community typologies**

Community type	Some examples of places	Collecting evidence of social value
<p><b>Self-identified community:</b> Groups of people who feel strongly connected with each other through common experiences, interests and/or beliefs that are a substantial part of their personal identity. Self-identified communities may be large or small and may be latent and only emerge in response to threat.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Migrant hostels</li> <li>• institutions (e.g. orphanage)</li> <li>• places of religious worship or practice</li> <li>• sites where people have experienced significant events (may be positive or negative)</li> <li>• historic pubs</li> <li>• community halls and other public facilities</li> </ul>	<p>It may be ethically inappropriate for people outside of the community group to speculate about meanings and management of values on their behalf. As a consequence, evidence through direct engagement should be sought to assess social value. Self-identified communities may have a spokesperson, or an internal hierarchy that identifies a figurehead.</p>
<p><b>Informal community:</b> Groups of people whose activities, practices and associations unite them around common interests. They may participate in widespread cultural activities and/or spread over broad geographic areas. Informal communities may be large or small. Members of informal communities may not specifically identify the community, instead they participate through common activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports venues</li> <li>• performance venues</li> <li>• public buildings and halls</li> <li>• iconic pubs</li> </ul>	<p>Typically, very large communities; difficult to define and lacking obvious figureheads or spokespeople. It may be reasonable for heritage practitioners to collect evidence through observation.</p>

Both formal and informal types of communities may come together online and offline and their activities may operate across both realms. Online presences may take the form of webpages, groups (Facebook, Flickr, Google), list servers, newsletters, as well as other types of online communication. Communities may meet formally or simply participate in a joint activity where there is a sense of connection imbued through an event.

## B. Attachment

‘Attachment’ is one layer, or facet, of social value. It describes people’s connection to place, including feelings, memories and associations that are important to a community’s sense of identity, as well as practices, expressions and representations. The reason(s) for a community’s attachment may be related to a common cause, experience, ideal, belief or cultural practice. For the attachment to be valid in relation to how Criterion G is assessed, it is important to provide evidence first that attachment exists and then its intensity must be demonstrated to be ‘strong’ or ‘special’. All levels of intensity of attachment must also be understood in relation to the nature of the community and the time depth (duration) of attachment.

It is important to recognise that the intensity and nature of attachment are dynamic and may vary over time – they can ebb and flow, increase in intensity and become obsolete. This is particularly pronounced in places where there is attachment of long standing, and so when analysing the intensity of community attachment, the nature of and reasons for those variations should be understood and explained.

It is also important to understand that places/objects may hold a range of values for individuals and groups, and these values may not be homogeneous. That is to say, social values for a single place may be conflicting – e.g. celebratory and traumatic – between communities and within a community itself.

Attachment to a place/object as a response to proposed change should not in and of itself necessarily be accepted as evidence of social value. The emotionally charged sentiment, and heightened sense of community that is generated when change is proposed to a place valued by a community needs to be balanced with other factors, such as the nature of the community and time depth, to understand its true relevance. However, it is also important to acknowledge that people are sometimes unaware of their attachment – or their depth of attachment – to a place/object until it is under threat.

### C. Time depth

'Time depth' is the length of time for which a community's connection to place can be demonstrated to have endured. In relation to how Criterion G is assessed this connection will typically be of long standing (at least a generation, or 25–30 years, may be accepted as a rough guide), but community attachment can also be of more recent origin (over months or years), perhaps provoked by a sense of loss or change, including change of use. To account for these two distinct contexts of time depth, evidence for each should be collected separately. Where community sentiment for a place is of more recent origin there is a requirement for the great intensity of attachment and the large size of the community to be clearly demonstrated as balancing the short time depth.

It is also important to recognise that the time depth may not be continuous, or uninterrupted. However, the community and its attachment does need to be current at the time of nomination – otherwise the heritage significance of the place/object may be more relevant for consideration under a different Criterion, such as Criterion A.

### D. Resonance

In the context of Criterion G, the term 'to resonate' means to 'exert an influence'.

Resonance is a key threshold test – its primary intent is to distinguish places of **local** social significance from those of **state** social significance. 'Resonance' means the extent to which the cultural heritage values of a place/object to a community can be demonstrated to exert an influence at the state level, that is across the broader Victorian community. For a place or object to satisfy Criterion G it also needs to be part of an event or story that contributes to Victoria's identity. Recognising that identity is fluid, new or emergent themes also have the potential to satisfy this definition.

War memorials provide a useful example of this distinction.

The Shrine of Remembrance – the state's principal war memorial – has social values for the Victorian community which are strong and special (as evidenced by attendance at televised Anzac Day rituals, visitor numbers to the eternal flame etc) and have a time depth extending back into the 1930s. These social values:

- **exert an influence** across the 'broader Victorian community' who live across the state and/or those who share a common geographical connection to Victoria; and
- **are part of a story that contributes to Victoria's identity**, that is the state's military history and communal experiences of loss, mourning and commemoration.

This is not the case for the majority of war memorials in Victoria which have social significance at the local level. For example, the Colac War Memorial has social values which:

- **do not exert an influence** across the 'broader Victorian community'.
- The social values only resonate in Colac and part of the Western District of Victoria, even though these values **are part of a story that contributes to Victoria's identity**, that is the state's military history and communal experiences of loss, mourning and commemoration.

There are many places (such as churches, schools and halls) in Victoria that have strong local social values but which do not *resonate* across the state.

### **State and communities of identity**

Some places are of social significance to a particular community in Victoria that is based on identity rather than geography. Examples include the Aboriginal community, the Chinese community, the LGBTIQ+ community, the Catholic community, the Jewish community, the postwar migrant community. For a place associated with a particular community to reach state-level significance, these tests still need to be met.

For example, Dodgshun House (the birthplace of Catholic Saint Mary Mary McKillop) has social values which:

- ***exert an influence*** across the ‘broader Victorian community’. Catholics come from all over Victoria to make pilgrimages to Dodgshun House to visit the birthplace of Mary McKillop.
- ***are part of a story that contributes to Victoria’s identity***, that is Victoria’s history of religion and the shaping of society by Catholicism.

There are many places (such as churches, schools and halls) in Victoria that have social values within communities of identity, but these do not *resonate* across the state. For example, postwar Victorian society was shaped economically and socially by migrants. There are thousands of places across the state which tell this story. A number have social values which exert an influence across the broader Victorian community, but most do not.

# 3. Suggested methodologies for collecting and assessing the evidence to demonstrate social value

---

A nomination of a place/object to be included in the VHR under Criterion G should establish the state-level social value through the collection, analysis and presentation of evidence that establishes:

- The existence of a present-day community group (or groups) by whom a place is valued, including the nature and size of the relevant community group/s.
- The length of time that the community (communities) have retained an attachment to the place/object (time depth).
- The intensity of their attachment to the place/object is strong or special.
- The reasons why the above characteristics exert an influence that resonates across the broader Victorian community.

Intrinsic to all of these points is showing how this 'social value' is evident or expressed in the place/or the object (i.e. there has to be some basis for the connection between the place/object and values).

In most cases, methods for collecting evidence will include some combination of background research, observation and direct engagement with the relevant community groups (see Figure A).


**Place:** *means a geographically defined area. It may be of any size and may include built or natural elements. Cultural heritage significance may be embodied in a place: for example in its fabric, setting, association or community attachments (phrases in italic are taken from The Burra Charter).*

If the investigation and collection of evidence is being undertaken by someone outside the community group (e.g. a heritage practitioner) it will typically begin with background (desktop) research into the origins, composition and motivations of the community group (or groups) and the place that is valued by the group(s) to inform the approach to assessment, and the weighting of a direct engagement approach with the community versus observation.

The decision about the approach to take will be followed by a process of observing interactions (online and in situ) and communicating with the community to understand how the place holds meaning for them. This allows for practices to be documented and for the heritage practitioner, ethnographer, historian, community leader/member or nominator to acknowledge how their own perspectives may frame their observations. This approach does not differ whether it is carried out wholly in person or online and allows for these to be combined. If the investigations are being carried out by a member of the community group then the approaches to gathering evidence listed below, while still relevant, may be less formal.

As a general rule, the broader the range of sources and techniques applied, the better to enable a rich and nuanced understanding of the place, the community and the relationship between the two.

**Figure A Suggested process for collecting evidence of social value**



### A. Background research

Research into the history and current uses of the place, with an emphasis on its cultural and community setting/milieu, should be the first step. This may include accessing websites and reviewing relevant academic research, news coverage and social media activity relating to the place/site. A key consideration as part of this step is to determine whether the place is proposed for change or perceived by the community group to be under threat. This will inform how the evidence is analysed and interpreted. The weighting between direct engagement with the community versus observation, as well as the tools and methods for collecting evidence, should be decided based on the background research.

Broad typologies of communities, identified earlier at Table 1, may be used as a mechanism to assist in the assessment of appropriate community engagement in the processes of identifying and assessing social value.

### B. Direct engagement with the community – methods and legitimate sources of evidence

Valid approaches to gathering evidence directly from the community group(s) for whom the place is of value may include:

- interviews
- workshops
- walks / mapping exercises
- email correspondence
- discussion with online groups (i.e. Facebook, Yammer and Skype)
- face-to-face or online discussion of photographs
- paper or online surveys.

Direct engagement should be sensitive to the potential issues that may arise; seek to understand the memories, meanings and associations held for the place; understand the uses, both physical and visual; and determine the extent to which the place is central to the community's sense of identity.

### C. Observations – methods and legitimate sources of evidence

These approaches seek to gather evidence by respectfully observing the community group(s) for whom the place is valued. This can include observations of how the community uses the place; seeking examples of events at the place; observing websites connected to the place; observing whether the place is widely photographed/videoed and shared or tagged on social media (Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Flickr, Pinterest, YouTube); researching how many online groups exist; and collecting photographs and representations of the place from publications and news media. Analysis and interpretation of this evidence needs to take account of the context within which the observations were made in order to be able to understand the memories, meanings and associations held by the community for the place. It must go beyond a listing of statistical results (e.g. in a social media context beyond the number of 'likes', number of members a group, etc) in order to interpret this 'evidence'. This means thinking about online interactions, posts and websites from an ethnographic perspective, including:

- Who is posting – are they the author?
- How was the post was created – i.e. is it a photograph taken by the author at the site or was it a text post to a Facebook group?
- What is the context of the post? Is it a proprietary website or social media site?
- Was the place under threat at the time of posting?
- Who is the post intended for?
- What does the post say or represent?
- How has the post been shared afterwards – i.e. did it go viral or was it a single instance?<sup>3</sup>

### D. Hybrid approach

This involves mediating direct engagement through a community representative. The key to this approach is the identification of community 'leaders' – i.e. organisations or individuals that are accepted as representing the community or communities. In typical circumstances, this will occur at the background research stage. In the event that such an individual/organisation is identified, a joint plan for engagement (within the resources available) should be prepared. The hybrid approach will include aspects of observation, as well as direct engagement.

---

<sup>3</sup> The research on the social value of the Sydney Opera House provides a good example of how online interactions, images, and websites can be interpreted to understand the meanings people hold for this place. Cristina Garduño Freeman, *Participatory Culture and the Social Value of an Architectural Icon: Sydney Opera House*, UK, Routledge, 2018.

## **E. Describing the evolution of social value of the place**

Understanding that social value is dynamic, a description of social value over time is essential. This approach captures:

- social value which has been intermittent (i.e. periods where it is not evident)
- social value under distinct conditions, such as when the place/object is not threatened and threatened
- significant changes in value due to unexpected events
- previous assessments of social value.

This analysis should be carried out after all evidence has been gathered and analysed, and forms part of the interpretation and substantiation of social value, with a particular emphasis on time depth.

# 4. Presenting the evidence


The outcome of the research process should be a summary of social value at the state level which substantiates, via the presentation of evidence (that includes any difficulties or omissions in the collection process), how each of the Criterion G tests have been met.

## Step 1 – Demonstrating social value

The first stage is focussed on:

1. describing the evidence that demonstrates the existence of a current community or cultural group(s), including describing the community's core/distinguishing characteristics – i.e. united/ dissonant, large/small, contracting/growing, geographical/virtual, etc
2. presenting the evidence that demonstrates the social value of a place/object to the community/cultural group(s) through the facets of time depth, intensity of attachment/association and the nature of the community, ensuring that the connection between the place/object and the social value is clear.

**Figure B Recommended approach for demonstrating whether a place/object demonstrates social value**



The following are some indicative examples of the kinds of evidence that – depending on the place/object in question – might be appropriate for substantiating the three facets of social value for different place or

object types. Applicable to all, however, is the importance of demonstrating some sort of direct engagement with the present-day community (or groups) to validate not only that it exists but to ensure that assertions that the intensity of the attachment to the place and object is 'strong' or 'special' are accurate and not assumptions.

### **Places where people gather for reasons of ritual, ceremony or public meeting/congregation or important objects associated with these**

Demonstrating that social value exists at these types of places is often aided by the fact that the communities/cultural groups who value them are frequently formal in nature, with an official point of contact or spokesperson, making it easier to collect evidence. Evidence such as official membership records or role books may exist to help substantiate the existence and nature of the present-day community or group and the longevity of their association with the place. Evidence of their attachment and its intensity and duration may be readily demonstrated through documentary and oral sources that show the activity associated with the place, including things such as meeting/ceremonial records, photos of activities and testimonies or interviews with current community/group members.

### **Places or objects that provide a memorial function or are associated with events that have a profound effect on the present-day community/cultural group**

A challenge that sometimes occurs when investigating social values associated with this type of place, especially those that relate to the two World Wars and the early phases of European settlement, is that the places can be on private property (therefore restricting access) and that the values associated with the place for the community have at times been negative or conflicted. Both factors can make finding evidence to demonstrate an ongoing or deep attachment to the place/object more complex. Examples of the types of evidence that can be used to substantiate social value to this type of place are similar to the first listed place-type but could also consist of things such as diary entries, oral histories/interviews from the first-generation community members and their descendants and records of things such regular official or unofficial present-day community visits to the place.

### **Places of public entertainment**

Places of public entertainment can often provide challenges when collecting evidence to demonstrate the existence of a community and the strength of their attachment as the groups who value these places are frequently large, diverse and dispersed. While in many cases strong attachment to a place might be considered self-evident by virtue of the community's attendance at a regular event at the place, this should not be assumed and evidence in the form of some sort of commentary from the relevant community/s needs to be provided to show that it is the place and its association with the event and not just the event itself that the community values. The other types of evidence that can be presented to build the case that these types of places demonstrate the three facets of social value could consist of newspaper articles (both archival and contemporary), event programs and attendance records, interviews with organisers and communities who attend the relevant events, oral histories and/or social media surveys or transcripts.

### **Places or objects associated with recent significant events, as distinct from historic events**

The challenge with demonstrating social value at these types of places/objects relates to showing how the relatively short time depth is balanced by the size of the community and the intensity of the attachment.

### **Places that provide a community function that, over time, become places to which a community/cultural group (or groups) develops an attachment that supersedes its utility value**

One of the challenges that sometimes arises when proposing a state-level listing under this Criterion for these types of places can be that the places can be so iconic that their community can only be described as the 'people of Victoria', which ironically can be challenging to demonstrate. A good example of this is the Myer Emporium (VHR H2100) which is recognised as being of 'social significance as a Melbourne

institution, a social, retailing and geographical landmark in the city. The entire complex is connected with these social associations, in particular the wide Bourke Street facade, evoked in the colloquial phrase "more front than Myer's" and the Bourke Street Myer Christmas window displays visited by generations of children as part of the annual Christmas holiday ritual.' In instances such as this it is still important to provide evidence – for example in this case it might be in the form of documentary or oral interviews with people who visited the windows themselves as children and are now taking their children or grandchildren to do the same – to show that this dispersed community does indeed exist.


**Places or objects that are distinctive or singular, and stand as identifiable symbols (or markers/landmarks) for a community**

The types of evidence that can be used to demonstrate social value at these types of places – and some of the associated challenges that may arise – are similar to those listed for the previous three place-types, in particular those associated with places of public entertainment and those for which the community develops an attachment that supersedes its utility value.

**Step 2 – Demonstrating social value at the state level**

This is a distinct phase to determining social value. In situations where social value is determined to exist, the next challenge is to establish the level of that value (local or state). For a place or object to be included in the VHR under Criterion G, a further analysis of the place's/object's connection to the identity of Victoria should be carried out and evidence must be provided to establish that the social value can be demonstrated to exert an influence that resonates in the state context. This may require different evidence to that gathered to determine the existence of social value. It should show how and to what level the evidence put forward for social value is connected to the state either by demonstrating that it represents an established story or theme (potentially by comparative means) or is a new or emergent story or theme (by describing how it is emerging as part of Victoria's identity).

**Figure C Recommended approach to demonstrating whether there is resonance to the State of Victoria**



The social value of places that are identified with the contemporary culture and identity of Victoria, but which are not related to recognised themes/stories are considered to be 'emergent'.<sup>4</sup> In order to establish emergent resonance at the state level, evidence would need to be provided that demonstrates a strong connection with the community of Victoria as a whole or with the contemporary identity of Victoria as a geopolitical entity.

The following are some indicative examples of the kinds of evidence that – depending on the place/object in question – might be appropriate for substantiating resonance at the state level for Criterion G:

### **Evidence that the social value exerts an influence across the broader Victorian community**

Evidence should demonstrate that the social value exerts an influence across the broader Victorian community. This may include written, oral, visual or online documentation about the extent to which the place:

- is commonly recognised by the Victorian community
- is renowned or famous
- is a landmark recognisable by more than just the local community
- has been written about in books or online for a broad audience
- has been visited in person by Victorians
- has been visited virtually online by Victorians
- has become part of Victoria's cultural representation of itself in film, literature, or the visual arts
- has a strong community that has developed around it that has ensured the social values have exerted an influence over time.

The evidence needs to be weighed up and considered in the context of each place. Some people may feel that the social values of a place exerts an influence on them and within their community. That is likely to indicate local significance. Some people may feel that a place exerts an influence across Victoria, but for this to be sustained, the evidence must show that an influence has actually been 'effected', that is it must be known by or strike a chord with the broader Victorian community.

### **Evidence that the social value is part of an event or story that contributes to Victoria's identity**

The *Framework of Victoria's Historical Themes* is a useful place to conceptualise the events and stories that shape Victoria's history. All historical events and stories are part of Victoria's history – no matter how big or small. For social value to reach the state-level threshold, however, the event or story associated with the place needs to be pivotal or have shaped the social history or fabric of Victoria in a significant, impactful or lasting way. There are many important events and stories that are part of local histories which contribute to communities' sense of identity. While these contribute to the richness of Victoria's history, their local or regional focus may mean that they do not contribute to Victoria's present-day identity. For example, Traralgon is part of Victoria, but many events that occurred there will contribute more to the identity of Traralgon residents than Victorians.

### **Some examples of places/objects where Criterion G has been satisfied**

Additional examples can be found in the *Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines*. More information about the cultural heritage significance of the places/objects in the following list can be found at <https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/>.

---

<sup>4</sup> A relevant reference for themes/stories that have previously been recognised is *Victoria's Framework of Historical Themes*, <https://www.heritage.vic.gov.au/research-and-publications/framework-of-historical-themes>

- **Festival Hall** (H2386) is included in the VHR on the basis of Criterion A and Criterion G. It is included for Criterion G (social value) for its long and strong association with Victoria's live music and boxing and wrestling communities and its roles as Victoria's principal boxing, wrestling and live music venue in the second half of the twentieth century.
- **Nylex sign** (H2049) is included in the VHR on the basis of Criterion A and Criterion G. It is included for Criterion G (social value) for its iconic landmark qualities as an unofficial gateway into Melbourne, a landmark for motorists, as well as its mention in the Paul Kelly song Leaps and Bounds which has given the sign an identity that extends beyond Melbourne.
- **Victorian Artists Society** (H0634) is included in the VHR on the basis of Criterion D and Criterion G. It is included for Criterion G (social value) for its continuing role as an academy for Victorian painters and sculptors for over 120 years.
- **The Great Ocean Road** (H2261) is included in the VHR on the basis of Criteria A, C, E, G and H. It is included for Criterion G (social value) for its provision of access to popular places of recreation and leisure. The Victorian community continues to demonstrate its attachment to the Great Ocean Road by using it to access these places.
- **The Hanging Rock Reserve** (H2339) is included in the VHR on the basis of Criteria A, E and G. It is included for Criterion G (social value) for its continuous use and appreciation by the wider Victorian community as a popular gathering place for recreational purposes since the mid-1860s. This enduring association with tourists was reinforced by the production of the book (1967) and the film (1975) of Picnic at Hanging Rock, which resulted in an increase in the popularity of the Hanging Rock Reserve as a destination for local, Australian and overseas visitors.

[heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au](mailto:heritage.council@delwp.vic.gov.au)