



Minutes

Heritage Advisory Committee

Date: Tuesday, 11.10.2022 (Microsoft Teams Meeting)

Councillors: Cr Anab Mohamud (AM)-Chair

Attendance: Alexis Arrowsmith (AAr), Graeme Butler (GB), Felicity Watson (FW), Greg Chenhall (GC), Ian Wight (IW), Jeffrey Atkinson (JA), Kirsteen Thomson (KT), Kristianna Scheffel (KS), Leo John Showell (LS), Malcolm MacDonald (MM), Robert Crawford (RC), Ursula Chandler (UC); Ivan Gilbert (IG) - Group Manager, CEO's Office, City of Yarra (CoY), Richa Swarup (RS) - Principal Advisor City Heritage, CoY).

Apologies: Cr Bridgid O'Brien (BOB), Cr Edward Crossland (EC)

diverse

vibrant

exciting

inclusive

<p>1. <u>Acknowledgement, Welcome and Apologies</u></p> <p>AM started the meeting with the Statement of Recognition of Wurundjeri Land and welcomed all attendees. Apologies stated above were noted.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p><i>No specific action required.</i></p>
<p>2. <u>Minutes of the previous HAC meeting 14.06.2022 and actions arising</u></p> <p>The minutes of the HAC meeting of 31.10.2022 were adopted unanimously with inclusion of the introduction text for all the members present in the 31 August meeting.</p> <p>GC noted that it is important that the Delegates' reports are regularly presented to the Council.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p><i>That a Delegates reports for the meeting of 31.08.2022 and this meeting be presented to the next Council meeting.</i></p>
<p>3. <u>Review of statements of significance for individually significant places within HO areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB informed that there are over 1800 individually significant places within Heritage Overlay areas in Yarra that do not have a statement of significance (as identified in a 2007 review). This poses constraints in the management and protection of its heritage values. What needs to be retained should be clearly expressed in a Statement of Significance. • FW suggested to contact City of Melbourne to understand their approach for the recent reviews of their precincts and the statements of significance. • AA noted that reviewing and updating statements of significance is listed as a key priority action in the Council's Heritage Strategy. <p>HAC agreed that there is a need to prepare a program for the review of statements of significance for coming years and identify resources required to do so.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p><i>That HAC subgroup for the implementation of the Heritage Strategy also looks into the approach and a programme for preparing statements of significance.</i></p>

<p><u>4. Exhibited documents for Am C271</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HAC discussed the response submitted by IW to the Strategic Planning unit on behalf of the HAC, for its adoption as HAC's response. This generated further discussions in relation to the response to HAC's points by Strategic Planning unit and Cr Crossland. <p>HAC considered that the issues raised in their submission are fundamental to protecting the heritage qualities of a heritage place and the character of the heritage precinct.</p> <p>HAC agreed that they should maintain their independent advice to the Council and decided to confirm their earlier submission as HAC's advice in relation to the exhibited documents. (Refer Attachment 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HAC further discussed that DDOs with a control of 6/8-meter setback are resulting in facadism as majority of the heritage fabric from heritage buildings is being removed. <p>HAC was of the view that in formulation of such controls basic heritage principles are not being followed. It is important that all heritage qualities of a heritage place are protected, and conflicting policies/controls should not be formed.</p> <p>HAC agreed to take the earlier offer from RS to organise a meeting with the Strategic Planning lead (Joerg Langeloh) and suggested for a specific discussion on the 3D modelling and criteria that have resulted in the 6-8m setback. HAC requested that RS organise this meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GC informed that the FRA along with a broader group has inspected various areas of the Brunswick Street, Gertrude Street and South Fitzroy precincts. He noted that the group has identified a few gaps and anomalies and enquired about the process for addressing the gaps and anomalies in heritage documentation. <p>RS informed that GC could submit the details of the gaps by email to her. Once received officers will assess the information, undertake further research if required; and include it as a part of a future fixup amendment or a new amendment as the case may be.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>That</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The HAC Delegates' report provide HAC's advice to the Council.</i> <i>RS organise a meeting of interested HAC members with Strategic Planning team members to discuss 3D Modelling of proposed building envelopes and considerations that have resulted in 6/8m setbacks.</i> <i>RS prepare a budget bid for the review of the Statements of Significance.</i>
<p><u>5. Heritage Overlay Status in Fitzroy</u></p> <p>GC asked a question about how the heritage status Fitzroy properties have been reassessed and documented in the past.</p> <p>RS informed the committee about the various heritage studies undertaken in Fitzroy for past 30 – 40 years that have resulted in the precinct heritage overlays and individual heritage overlays.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>That RS send a link of Yarra's website that lists heritage studies to the HAC Members.</i></p>

<p>GB noted there are some 630 significant places in Heritage Overlays in South Fitzroy that need Statements of Significance.</p>	
<p><u>6. WHEA and REBCG Strategy Plan</u></p> <p>RS provided an update about the changes in the recently updated World Heritage Strategy Plan for the Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens' WHEA. She mentioned that since the changes in the updated version only relate to the formalising the proposed boundary extension in earlier draft it may not require a change to Council's earlier submission.</p> <p>HAC agreed to not make any further response to their earlier advice until an overall REBCG Management Plan is available for comment. HAC members who would then be interest to meet as an REBCG subgroup nominated themselves, these are FW, GC, IW, LS and KT.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>No specific action suggested.</i></p>
<p><u>7. Heritage Articles in the Yarra News</u></p> <p>GC appreciated Council's inclusion of heritage articles in the Yarra News in its past few issues. HAC agreed with him.</p> <p>It was agreed that the HAC members would prepare the articles and send it to RS so that she can forward it to the Communications team for its inclusion in the Yarra News.</p> <p>LS offered to take photos if required for the article by HAC members.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That HAC Delegates report conveys HAC's appreciation to Council for its efforts in publishing regular heritage articles in the Yarra News in its past few issues.</i> • <i>That HAC members progressively send their articles for Yarra News to RS and contact LS if any specific help is required in relation to photos.</i>
<p><u>8. Process for the review and response to the Heritage Victoria permit applications' referrals</u></p> <p>RS outlined the process confirmed by Stat Planning Unit as below:</p> <p><i>"When a referral is received from Heritage Victoria the plans are forwarded to heritage adviser (on contract with Stat Planning department) for consideration, and the referral response as well as the original documents from Heritage Victoria are emailed to all Councillors for information.</i></p> <p><i>Should any Councillor wish, the matter to be called up to a PDC meeting, there must be two or more ward Councillors who must include a brief written explanation as to why the item is being called up.</i></p> <p><i>Otherwise, officers forward the referral response to Heritage Victoria as is"</i></p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>No further action required.</i></p>

<p>9. Any other matters</p> <p>GC suggested that he would provide a few options to the members for the HAC subgroup meeting on the Heritage Strategy implementation priorities.</p>	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <p><i>That RS organise a HAC subgroup meeting on a mutually convenient date to the subgroup members.</i></p>
<p>10. Future meeting dates</p> <p>HAC agreed that the 13 December is the preferred date for the next HAC meeting.</p> <p>RS requested that members provide agenda items at least a month in advance.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>That RS circulate the agenda closer to the meeting date to the committee members.</i></p>