

Minutes

Heritage Advisory Committee

Date: Monday 27 March 2017, Richmond Town Hall

Time: 6pm – 8pm

Chair: Councillor Jackie Fristacky

Attendance: Councillor Jackie Fristacky (JF), Councillor Stephen Jolly (SJ) for part of the meeting, Ian Wight (IW), Angela Zivkovic (AZ), Jill Anwyl (JA), Fiona Bell (FB), David Langdon (DL), Caitlin Mitropoulos (CM), Paul Beekman (PB), Margaret O'Brien (MO'B), David Walmsley (DW), Claire Baker (CB), Amanda Haycox (AH), Adeline Lane (AL)(Maddocks Lawyers), Natica Schmeder (NS) (Context Heritage Consultants), Bev Kliger (BK) (Bev Kliger and Associates),

Apologies: Councillor James Searle, Anne Holmes, Lucinda Owen, Greg Spark

diverse

vibrant

exciting

inclusive

<p>1. <u>Introductions</u></p> <p>Caitlin Mitropoulos has replaced Alix Hill as the National Trust representative. Caitlin introduced herself and was welcomed to the Committee.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Declarations of conflicts of interest</u></p> <p>There were none.</p>	
<p>3. <u>Adoption of previous minutes – 27 March 2016</u></p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>JF advised that Ivan Gilbert reported to Council on Tuesday 21 March recommending that a position description of the proposed Heritage Coordinator position. The motion wasn't supported but the position would be referred to the budget process for consideration.</p> <p>JT asked that the delegate's report be circulated with the minutes.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>AH to circulate delegate's report with the minutes.</p>
<p>4. <u>Presentations from Natica Schmeder, Context Heritage Consultants and Adeline Lane, Maddocks Lawyers</u></p> <p>DW introduced the speakers and explained that in order for the Committee to have an influence over the policy, members need to understand the planning framework within which the policy operates. They need to understand how a heritage policy actually works so that their aspirations are realistic. Over the coming months, we will fill in the details.</p> <p>Natica outlined how a heritage study is progressed to illustrate how individually significant and contributory places are arrived at. She spoke about heritage precincts how they are defined and how places are managed within a precinct. She also spoke about the influence of the Burra Charter.</p> <p>There was discussion about building alterations that occur within a precinct and their effect on the precinct. PB asked whether it was possible to have discreet precincts within a larger overall precinct (eg inner Melbourne). NS advised that Planning Panels set a high bar for serial listings and a larger precinct across inner Melbourne would not get support at Panel.</p> <p>MO'B asked who makes the decision to demolish when the citation isn't right which</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>AH to circulate the slides from the presentations with the minutes.</p>

<p>led to a discussion about the importance of the citations.</p> <p>JF asked if there are things a policy can say to better protect heritage? NS advised that the policy should avoid facadism. The demolition of the Greek Theatre was discussed and the developer argued that while it was graded as individually significant, its façade had been significantly altered which meant its original form couldn't be understood. The citation wasn't good enough.</p> <p>Adeline discussed Council's dual roles under the Planning and Environment Act as a planning authority and responsible authority. She spoke about the emphasis on integrated decision making and explained the National Trust legal principle. She outlined the case of <i>Boroondara CC v 1045 Burke Road Pty Ltd</i>, Court of Appeal, 2015 where the National Trust principle was superseded by this case which has meant that when deciding applications triggered by a heritage overlay, the Council must consider all planning considerations and is not confined just to heritage matters.</p> <p>JF asked if we want a policy to give primacy to heritage, can we do it? AL advised no; if we want that, we need the state parliament to change the legislation. JT said that we would enhance potential heritage outcomes by meeting with developers prior to them lodging applications.</p> <p>There was discussion around new fabric being distinguishable – we deleted references to contemporary additions from the current heritage policy. JF noted that Boroondara encourages replication of the heritage fabric in new additions.</p> <p>PB expressed concern about the mixed use zone and said it presented the biggest threat to heritage and the lack of control in the shopping centres. AL advised that the MUZ also provided the greatest opportunity and the planning scheme set directions for land in commercial zones. PB asked about our structure plans and AL advised that our current plans had insufficient weight as they were not incorporated into the planning scheme.</p> <p>MO'B said that there is no evidence of the weight attributed to the various planning considerations. AL replied that the Court of Appeal had determined that weight was an issue that is determined by the planning officer. MO'B also expressed concern that heritage is devalued when there is academic work that points to its true value. AL advised that Panels Victoria had written about heritage in the Arden McCauley decision and the findings were worth reading.</p> <p>http://dsewebapps.dse.vic.gov.au/Shared/ats.nsf/(attachmentopen)/560814F4EE310ECFCA257EEE001273E1/\$File/Melbourne+C190+Panel+Report.pdf?OpenElement Pages 68 and 69.</p>	
<p>5. <u>HAC review</u></p> <p>BK thanked participants for their time in responding to the interview questions and provided a summary of the consultation so far, noting that the Councillors are yet to be interviewed.</p> <p>She advised that there are three possible options for the future of the HAC – continue as is, continue with changes/improvements or dissolve.</p> <p>She asked if members could discuss options for improving the current HAC. She advised that the consultation so far had highlighted the following six areas for potential improvement and wanted ideas under each heading. Three groups were formed and each group considered two items. Suggestions were then reported back to the group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chairing 2. Membership of Committee – numbers of resident/professional members 3. Agenda setting 4. How to improve the focus on cultural and natural heritage 	

<p>5. How to better engage in the promotion of heritage 6. Link between Committee and the implementation of the Heritage Strategy</p> <p>Bev's report will be finalised by the May meeting and will be reported at that meeting,</p>	
<p>6. <u>Progress on implementation of Year 2 Heritage Strategy</u></p> <p>There was no time for discussion of this item in the meeting. It was agreed that AH should circulate the information by email after the meeting.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>AH to send email re Heritage Strategy implementation</p>
<p>7. <u>Restoration of WWI Soldiers' and Sailors' honour board</u></p> <p>There was no time for discussion of this item in the meeting. It was agreed that AH should circulate the information by email after the meeting.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>AH to send email re memorial restoration</p>
<p>8. <u>Items for future meeting</u> (from previous meetings)</p> <p>MO'B has previously asked about subcommittees</p> <p>GS has previously asked that at a future meeting it would be useful to understand how Council deals with its own heritage properties.</p>	
<p>9. <u>Date of next meeting</u></p> <p>Monday 22 May 2017</p> <p>6pm-8pm</p> <p>Labour Room, Collingwood Town Hall</p> <p><u>Dates of HAC meetings for 2017</u></p> <p>All meetings 6pm-8pm_Labour Room, Collingwood Town Hall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 30 January • Monday 27 March • Monday 22 May • Monday 24 July • Monday 25 September 	