

Amendment C245

Heritage Overlay and Zone Fix Up

Summary of Submissions



No	Name	Interested Property	Summary of Submission	Officer Response
1	Anthony De Luca	200-202 Johnston Street, Collingwood	<p>1.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls Objects to the application of internal heritage controls. Submits that there is inadequate justification to support the proposed changes.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of 200-202 Johnston Street, Collingwood as an 'individually significant' heritage place.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the entire site within an HO.</p>	<p>1.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls The submission objects to key elements of the recommendations in the <i>Theatres Study</i> which is to protect the internal features of the identified theatres. These internal features are a major part of the significance of the places.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>
2	Savino Bernardi	378 Nicholson Street, Fitzroy North & 27 Alexandra Parade, Fitzroy North	<p>2.1 - Heritage Significance Submits that the extension of the HO over the entire church and buildings located at 378C Nicholson Street, Fitzroy is not warranted.</p> <p>Recommends the HO cover the southern buildings of 378A and 378B Nicholson Street and 27 Alexandra Parade, Fitzroy North and be removed from 378C Nicholson Street, Fitzroy North.</p> <p>Submits that the building currently covered by the HO is not of heritage significance, is 'of ordinary brick, simple architectural design, not old for more than 100 years'.</p> <p>Supports the heritage significance of the southern properties of 378 Nicholson Street and 27 Alexandra Parade, Fitzroy North.</p> <p><i>(Note: St Brigid's Church was under the impression that the section of the Church that is currently not covered in the heritage overlay was already covered and the proposed change was to cover the properties on the northern section of the property. The opposite is proposed with the northern buildings currently in HO327 and proposed to be extended to the southern buildings. The submission is then in support of the proposed changes but objects to the existing HO over other buildings on the property.)</i></p>	<p>2.1 - Heritage Significance Council has sought further independent heritage advice on the proposed changes to St. Brigid's Catholic Church that supports the proposed changes and notes that Council should prepare a further citation from the complex.</p> <p>Advice finds that the heritage overlay and 'individually significant' grading should be applied to all the buildings located on the property.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. This submission should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>
3	Morgan Livingstone	365-377 Swan Street, Richmond	<p>3.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls Objects to the application of internal heritage controls, noting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the interior of the building has been substantially altered over the course of many years; • the application for internal heritage controls is unwarranted and an unreasonable burden upon the landowner; • internal heritage controls will unreasonably constrain any future development of the land; • the sale of furniture has been the buildings primary use for a significant period of time (longer than the use as a theatre); and • the buildings location in the Swan Street Major Activity Centre (noting the importance of the commercial zone). <p>Submits that the existing HO already provides sufficient heritage protection over the external fabric of the building.</p>	<p>3.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls The submission objects to key elements of the recommendations in the <i>Theatres Study</i> which is to protect the internal features of the identified theatres. These internal features are a major part of the significance of the places.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>

4	Annabel Paul	311-317 Bridge Road, Richmond	<p>4.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls Submits that internal heritage controls are unwarranted and create a significant implication for a retail building and that internal heritage controls have significant implications on commercial buildings, such as the identified theatre.</p> <p>Submits that the following internal features (as identified in the Context report) could be protected if other internal works could continue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The metal lattice ceiling relating to the rear part of the building, together with the decorative plaster panels in a geometric design to the edges of the ceiling; • Decorative mezzanine level balcony supported on slender steel columns; and • The interior volume associated with its former use as a skating rink and picture theatre. <p>Submits that an incorporated plan could be prepared to identify works to the heritage place that are exempt from the need of a planning permit.</p> <p>Submits that if internal controls are applied to the site a site specific incorporated document would allow for the commercially operating building to better define what is exempt at this heritage place.</p> <p>Recognises the buildings location in DDO21 the Bridge Road Activity Centre and within a Commercial 1 Zone.</p> <p>Submits that the building has undergone various alterations to the external façade due to the continuous change of tenants.4.5 Submits that there also must be a balance with other considerations - i.e. the location in a Major Activity Centre and the economic benefit to the city.</p> <p>Notes the likelihood for further updates and changes probable to the building over time to serve its economic functions.</p> <p>Notes that the building may have some heritage values associated with the former use as the Richmond Theatre and skating rink.</p> <p>Submits that the identified places is not of very high heritage significance.</p> <p>Notes that the building is not on the Victorian Heritage Register or a significant public building.</p> <p>Notes that the property owner reserves the right to seek and independent heritage review of the building and to review the heritage assessment undertaken by Context.</p> <p>Notes that the land is currently in HO310 (Bridge Road Precinct, Richmond).</p> <p>Notes that the mapping changes do not show the removal of HO310 - Requests clarification on the removal.</p>	<p>4.1 - Justification and impact of internal controls The submission objects to key elements of the recommendations in the <i>Theatres Study</i> which is to protect the internal features of the identified theatres. These internal features are a major part of the significance of the places.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>
5	Karen Cummings	Collingwood and Abbotsford addresses (22 places)	<p>5.1 - Heritage significance Notes that a number of the anomalies included in Amendment C245 are the result of total demolition of a number of buildings graded 'contributory'.</p> <p>Does not support the removal of 14 Glasgow Street, Collingwood from the HO until heritage significance is assessed.</p> <p>5.2 - Support for the amendment Supports the following changes proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the site-specific heritage overlay and internal controls for 200-202 Johnston Street, Collingwood. • Supports the 'not contributory' grading of 120 Campbell Street, Collingwood. • Supports the 'not contributory' gradings of 24-30 Waterloo, 93-91 Rokeby & 23-29 Robert Street, Collingwood. • Supports the 'not contributory' grading of 4 Eddy Court, Abbotsford. • Supports the 'not contributory' grading of 4-6 Derby Street, Collingwood. • Supports the 'not contributory' grading of 7 Langridge Street, Collingwood. • Supports the extension of the HO over 655 Victoria Street, Abbotsford. • Supports the removal of 21-23 Lithgow Street, Abbotsford from the HO. • Supports the extension of the HO over 18-22 Derby Street, Collingwood. • Supports the extension of the HO over 33-45 Derby Street, Collingwood. • Supports the correction of mapping and address for the Collingwood College Dolls House, Collingwood (notes that the Dolls House is in poor condition and needs repair). • Supports the removal of the HO from 181 Langridge Street, Abbotsford. • Supports the extension of the HO over 19 Cambridge Street, Collingwood. • Supports the extension of the HO over 120 Cambridge Street Collingwood. • Supports the extension of the HO over 61-63 Oxford Street, Collingwood. • Supports the extension of the HO over 37 Oxford Street, Collingwood. 	<p>5.1 - Heritage significance Council officers have investigated the circumstances around the demolition of the five buildings identified in the submission.</p> <p>Of these buildings, three properties were graded 'contributory' prior to demolition, with the remaining two properties being ungraded or graded 'unknown'.</p> <p>In the Yarra Planning Scheme, properties are graded 'unknown' where insufficient information is available to allow an assessment from the public domain.</p> <p>The Yarra Planning Scheme and the Yarra City Council policy generally encourage the retention of a heritage place, unless</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building is identified as not contributory; • If the building is identified as a contributory building; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New evidence has become available to demonstrate that the building does not possess the level of heritage significance attributed to it in the incorporated document, <i>Database of Heritage Significant Areas</i> (formerly, <i>City of Yarra Review of Heritage Areas 2007 Appendix 8</i> [as updated from time to time]); and ○ The building does not form part of a group of similar buildings. <p>Council has received independent heritage advice on the proposed changes to 14 Glasgow Street, Collingwood. After considering this heritage advice Council officers recommend abandoning the changes to 51 Langridge Street and 14 Glasgow Street, Collingwood and not including them in Part 1 or Part 2 of the Amendment.</p> <p>5.2 - Support for the amendment Council notes the support and acceptance for the proposed changes.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the address correction for 61-75 Langridge Street, Collingwood. Supports the mapping change to 34-44 Cromwell Street, Collingwood (noting that documents locate as Richmond incorrectly, instead of as Collingwood). <p>Accepts the following changes proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepts the 'not contributory' grading of 160 Gold Street, 1 & 1A South Terrace, Clifton Hill (noting that the previous contributory building was demolished). Accepts the 'not contributory' grading of 55 Park Street, Abbotsford (noting that the previous contributory building was demolished). Accepts the 'not contributory' grading of 18 Peel Street, Collingwood (noting that the previous contributory building was demolished). Accepts the 'not contributory' grading of 133 Keele Street, Collingwood (noting that the previous contributory building was demolished). 	
6	Chris Goodman	Queens Parade Street Trees	<p>6.1 - Heritage Overlay 93 & Amendment C231</p> <p>Submits that the heritage overlay extension of HO93 should be extended further. Submits the overlay should also be extended further to include Napier Reserve and the substation.</p> <p>Submits that 'Turkey Oak' is not a suitable replacement species for the elm boulevard.</p> <p>Submits that the statement of significance does not distinguish between the 19th century plantings and the interwar plantings.</p> <p>Notes this submission was made to Amendment C231 but deemed out of scope.</p> <p>Notes that a further more detailed submission will be sent to Council.</p> <p><i>(Note: Council has not received any further submission from the submitter.)</i></p>	<p>6.1 - Heritage Overlay 93 & Amendment C231</p> <p>HO93 was introduced, based on a 1998 heritage citation prepared by Allom Lovell and John Patrick Pty Ltd. A recent internal assessment identified an anomaly in the extent of HO93, which the C245 changes propose to address. The scope of those changes is based on the original 1998 assessment and a review carried out by John Patrick Landscape Architects Pty Ltd in November 2018. The 2018 review recommends the extension of HO93 so it applies to all the road reserve between Alexandra Parade and Delbridge Street, Clifton Hill. The 2018 review did not consider or propose any extension beyond this section of Queens Parade.</p> <p>The 2018 review report includes Figure 20 illustrating the extent of the current Heritage Overlays in the area and the gaps adjoining HO93. This shows the anomaly which excludes street trees and associated median strips and landscape features as detailed in Attachment 6.</p> <p>The revised HO93 extent and the revised citation are based on expert advice. The submission in part questions some aspects of that advice and the revised citation. The submission also suggests extending protection to other areas such as Napier Reserve (which is bounded by Napier Street, Queens Parade and Alexandra Parade) and other parts of Queens Parade.</p> <p>Given the nature of a Planning Scheme amendment process, it is generally not possible to extend the geographic extent of the proposals after exhibition. This is for reasons which include potential impacts on other parties who might for example object to revised proposals.</p> <p>Council can investigate some of these issues. Some aspects have also been assessed as part of the related Queens Parade Amendment C231. This included assessment of the HO330 which applies to the Queens Parade, boulevard / roadway east of HO93. The significance of the sub-station at Napier Reserve was considered and dismissed by the Council heritage expert.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review. Council should consider whether further work is required after a panel report has been received.</p>
7	Con Mydaras	204 Church Street, Richmond	<p>7.1 - Heritage Significance</p> <p>Submits that the heritage controls proposed would be a burden on the commercial zoning of the buildings.</p> <p>Notes that a significant development is occurring near the site and that this development will have a significant impact on the area and the property. Notes that given this development the building does not contribute to the heritage or character of the area.</p> <p>Submits that the integrity of the buildings has been diminished and the heritage is low quality.</p> <p>Submits that the building has had significant redevelopment to further diminish the heritage integrity.</p> <p>Notes that the heritage that remains is in poor condition and is of poor quality and workmanship.</p>	<p>7.1 - Heritage Significance</p> <p>The property is currently covered by interim HO509 as 'individually significant'.</p> <p>The interim heritage overlay covers a row of three properties, the 'Halls Buildings', identified by GJM in the Victoria Street and Bridge Road Built Form Review: Heritage Assessment.</p> <p>GJM Heritage identified the shops and residences as being constructed in 1886, noting a number of elements that contributed to the significance of the place. The buildings retain a high degree of integrity to the Victorian period in fabric, form and detail. Whilst the building has undergone some alterations, these have not diminished the ability to understand and appreciate the place as an example of a Victorian shop and residence.</p> <p>The Amendment proposes a new HO526 to cover the three properties so the buildings are protected.</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>
8	Irene Tran	202 Church Street, Richmond	<p>8.1 - Heritage Significance</p> <p>Submits that the heritage controls proposed would be a burden on the commercial zoning of the buildings.</p> <p>Notes that a significant development is occurring near the site and that this development will have a significant impact on the area and the property. Notes that given this development the building does not contribute to the heritage or character of the area.</p> <p>Submits that the integrity of the buildings has been diminished and the heritage is low quality.</p> <p>Submits that the building has had significant redevelopment to further diminish the heritage integrity.</p> <p>Notes that the heritage that remains is in poor condition and is of poor quality and workmanship.</p>	<p>8.1 - Heritage Significance</p> <p>Refer to Officer response at 7.1</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>

8	Thao Tran	202 Church Street, Richmond	<p><u>8.1 - Heritage Significance</u> Submits that the heritage controls proposed would be a burden on the commercial zoning of the buildings.</p> <p>Notes that a significant development is occurring near the site and that this development will have a significant impact on the area and the property. Notes that given this development the building does not contribute to the heritage or character of the area.</p> <p>Submits that the integrity of the buildings has been diminished and the heritage is low quality.</p> <p>Submits that the building has had significant redevelopment to further diminish the heritage integrity.</p> <p>Notes that the heritage that remains is in poor condition and is of poor quality and workmanship.</p>	<p><u>8.1 - Heritage Significance</u> Refer to Officer response at 7.1</p> <p>The Amendment should not be changed to meet the submitter objections. These submissions should be referred to a Panel for review.</p>
---	-----------	-----------------------------	---	--