

Minutes

Heritage Advisory Committee

Date: Monday 25 September 2017, Labour Room Collingwood Town Hall

Time: 6pm – 8pm

Chair: Councillor Stephen Jolly

Attendance: Cr Stephen Jolly (SJ), Lucinda Owen (LO), Angela Zivkovic (AZ), Fiona Bell (FB), Margaret O'Brien (MO'B), Greg Spark (GS), Janet Taylor (JT), Amanda Haycox (AH), Fiona van der Hoeven (FV) (standing in for David Walmsley) Ivan Gilbert, Group Manager, CEO's Office (IG), Paul Beekman (PB), Laurance Abou Khater (LAK) Paul Beekman (PB)

Apologies: Richa Swarup, Anne Holmes, , Jill Anwyll, David Langdon, Cr Searle, Caitlin Mitropolous, David Walmsley, Cr Fristacky

diverse

vibrant

exciting

inclusive

<p>1. <u>Declarations of conflicts of interest</u></p> <p>There were none.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Adoption of previous minutes – 24 July 2017</u></p> <p>JF had requested minor changes to the previous minutes. AH had circulated the changes. Revised minutes were adopted.</p>	
<p>3. <u>Introducing Senior Heritage Advisor</u></p> <p>IG advised that Council's CEO had appointed Richa Swarup as the Senior Heritage Advisor which will give heritage a higher profile at Yarra.</p> <p>IG apologised that Richa wasn't at the meeting – she had suffered a bereavement in her family.</p> <p>IG advised that Committee unable to direct the work of the advisor but the Committee will be able to work with Council to prioritise actions.</p> <p>JT - implementing the heritage strategy should be the priority.</p> <p>SJ - the position had arisen as a result of community activism.</p> <p>MO'B - HAC pleased with the position being established + IG attending. Important for the position to focus on Heritage strategy, promotion, cooperation across council. Important that the CEO has taken this on personally.</p> <p>LAK - asked if Richa had commenced work in her position and could HAC see the position description (PD).</p> <p>IG – Richa will commence shortly when PD is finalised. IG agreed to circulate PD when available.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Ivan to circulate the position description to HAC members when finalised.</p>
<p>4. <u>HAC Review</u></p> <p>MO'B – Time lines for detailed consideration of HAC review too tight to allow full</p>	

<p>debate.</p> <p>JT tabled two motions based on papers she had circulated on Sunday night (24 Sept) and spoke in support of them.</p> <p><u>Motion 1</u> - <i>That HAC accept the Officer's recommendation with changes by HAC, as indicated at Attachment 1, and that this be referred to Council for its consideration.</i></p> <p>In relation to changing the officer report SJ confirmed AH's point that the Committee cannot direct an officer to change their report. IG agreed. SJ said that the motion can be referred to Council for consideration.</p> <p>AH advised that Beverley Kliger had been engaged by Council to undertake an independent review of the HAC and the recommendations in the officer report are from that independent review.</p> <p>There was a vote in relation to Motion 1: 9 in favour 1 against (AH as officer who had prepared report)</p> <p><u>Motion 2</u>: <i>That the HAC Terms of Reference with changes identified by HAC, as indicated at Attachment 2, be referred to Council for its consideration.</i></p> <p>JT outlined TOR drafted by her, JF and Louise Elliot (not a HAC member).</p> <p>IG: From a governance perspective, there is some wording proposed that is beyond the scope of an advisory committee. Need to be careful about the TOR. This needs to be reviewed closely. The Committee needs to be clear about its role in providing advice and not making decisions.</p> <p>AH / FV: Noted that the amended version of the TOR is based on the existing TOR and not a revised one prepared as a result of the independent review. Officers have not had the opportunity to review the TOR tabled by JT and want an opportunity to do that before Council considers the second motion.</p> <p>GS: rich and diverse group of people and just wanting to put suggestions forward. Enjoyed what has been put in front of us. What is important is dialogue.</p> <p>MO'B – The draft TOR has taken into account into existing TOR and improved them.</p> <p>There was a vote in relation to Motion 2 - 6 in favour 5 against 1 abstention. Carried.</p> <p>Motions to be included in Delegate Report</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>Ensure the motions are included in the Delegate Report and are reported to Council</p>
<p>5. <u>Heritage Policy</u></p> <p>AH advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a policy neutral translation of existing policy is being completed to eliminate repetition between policy and other sections of the planning scheme • a thorough analysis and recommendations for policy on former industrial buildings was undertaken by GJM Heritage • Consultants will be appointed shortly to review aspects of residential heritage work. Work is programmed to be completed at the end of the year • Heritage work in our commercial centres is occurring through our built form analysis work for the activity centres - heritage is a fundamental driver in forming future planning controls. <p>AH had prepared a document for discussion at the meeting which incorporated points raised in email from JF as a starting point for consultation with HAC. Some discussion about whether the Burra Charter should be incorporated. AH advised more appropriate as a reference document.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>AH to work with JT to establish a workshop on the Heritage Policy.</p>

<p>MO'B: would like expert body of knowledge represented at HAC to be fed into Heritage Policy re-write. Frustration with the timing of the re-write of the YPS. She suggested a workshop on the policy. Workshop will be during business hours. AH and JT to arrange. Also seeking additional HAC meeting this year. SJ advised would need Council approval for this. It was suggested that IG could seek to make arrangements for an additional meeting.</p> <p>PB – questioned the role of CMPs in DDO or demolition delay clause with CMP AH: we are constrained and need to work within the VPP LO: CMP needed for State heritage buildings</p> <p>LAK: Heritage impact – some developers can “buy” the right advice from heritage consultants</p> <p>JT: requested that officers be able to circulate GJM industrial heritage report.</p> <p>LO: Need to think about the impact of new and taller development on precincts, particularly at the edge of precincts. New development built at the edge of a precinct can have a significant impact. Residential precincts live together with former industrial buildings. Social significance is important.</p> <p>GS: heritage is about a sense of place or a sense a space. What is being looked for is a respect for that space. Information sheets required about heritage areas. Industrial sites – we are squandering opportunities in our mixed use.</p> <p>LAK – Moreland Sydney Road. How does it respond to NRZ. Interface is an issue.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Heritage Training</u></p> <p>JT: had prepared a heritage training proposal. She said it's about enhancing heritage training and knowledge</p> <p>AH: Showed diagram identifying areas of Council with heritage responsibilities. Agreed that heritage training will only be offered to these groups to avoid offering heritage training to child care workers and lifeguards etc.</p> <p>IG agreed that Richa will look at implementing the programme when she commences in her position.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Richa to be responsible for implementing training programme</p>
<p>7. <u>Heritage Implementation Strategy</u></p> <p>AH: oral history work underway. Seems that there is a lot of oral history around and the question is how to identify where it is and access it. Consultant work helpful in that regard.</p> <p>Walking maps – AH has investigated apps but they require a lot of set up and are labour intensive – more than she understood initially. Simple plans on the website where we engage a graphic designer to update what we have is better for now.</p>	
<p>8. <u>Free Thought Hall</u></p> <p>PB is aware of the updated citation prepared by Context but wants to know if it has been included in the planning scheme.</p> <p>AH advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building is already covered by a HO with a contributory grading • The same controls apply to individually significant and contributory buildings • St Vincent's could still apply for its demolition at permit stage and Council could choose to defend a decision against demolition at VCAT which would also require further significant expenditure • The cost involved in changing grading could be substantial and while there would be a change in grading and the difference it makes is limited • St Vincent's would most likely oppose the amendment as they did the 	

<p>attempt to include the building on the VHR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timing of the amendment process could take a minimum of 6 months • Pursuing an amendment would detract resources from progressing the heritage policy 	
<p>9. <u>Date of next meeting</u></p> <p>Workshop to be organised on Heritage Policy prior to meeting.</p> <p>HAC members keen for another meeting this year to meet Richa. Next meeting will be next year unless it goes through the Council meeting.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>IG to organise a meeting when Richa returns</p>