

Minutes

Heritage Advisory Committee

Date: Thursday, 17 December 2020 (Microsoft Teams Meeting)

Councillors: Cr. Bridgid O'Brien (BOB)- Chair and Cr. Anab Mohamud (AM)

Attendance: Alexis Arrowsmith (AAr), Greg Chenhall (GC), Ian Wight (IW), Janet Taylor (JT), Jeffrey Atkinson (JA), Laura Campbell (LC), Malcolm MacDonald (MM), Ivan Gilbert (IG) - Group Manager, CEO's Office, Richa Swarup (RS) - Sr. Advisor City Heritage, CoY, Louis Wyatt -Student Placement Heritage.

Guest: Jamie Rachcoff- Communications and Engagement Adviser, CoY

Apologies: Cr. Edward Crossland (EC), Kirsteen Thomson (KT), Ursula Chandler (UC), Terence Nott (TN)

diverse

vibrant

exciting

inclusive

<p>1. <u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>BoB welcomed Cr. Anab Mohamud. All the members introduce themselves.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Confirming the minutes of the previous HAC meeting</u></p> <p>The minutes of the HAC meeting of 6 August 2020 were adopted unanimously.</p>	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <p><i>No specific action needed.</i></p>
<p>3. <u>Actions arising from the previous meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of Heritage Advisory Committee: HAC members were disappointed that no response has been provided to them regarding points raised by them in the June 2020 meeting. AAr and IW were concerned that their role should not be to provide advice only to the councillors but also to council officers whilst the strategic frameworks are under preparation in heritage precincts. • Heritage resourcing: RS informed that based on the Delegates Report and Council resolution budget bids have again been submitted for two new positions in 2021-2022 budget. • Planning applications referred to VCAT (including where there has been a failure to determine a planning application within 60 days): HAC was concerned that there are cases that have been referred to VCAT where the applications have not been advertised by the Council. Such a process does not give proper opportunity to the community, especially the affected neighbours to present their issues to the Council. HAC was of the opinion that Council should initiate a process that allows for proper community input. Examples cited were 84-104 Johnston Street Fitzroy, 14-18 Smith Street Collingwood. 	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That IG and RS discuss the matter about the role of the HAC within the council and with Strategic Planning Department and report back to the HAC.</i> • <i>That IG and RS discuss this matter about the panning application process with the Statutory Planning Department and report back.</i>
<p>4. <u>Heritage Strategy implementation reporting</u></p> <p>RS informed that a copy of the implementation table with an update on the implementation of actions has been emailed to the HAC members. She requested that members email any issues or feedback to her by email.</p>	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That HAC members send their feedback on Heritage Strategy</i>

<p>HAC discussed Action 3 (i). They were concerned that Yarra’s website does not provide any information on the heritage precincts. It is impossible for anyone to know how many heritage precincts there are in Yarra and what is the extent and significance. They desired that a link of the precinct citation be provided urgently on the Heritage page of the Council website</p> <p>AAR enquired about Action 18 regarding increased resourcing for heritage advisory services with a focus on employing in-house heritage advisors. RS advised that to begin with it is intended that a weekly heritage planning advice to the community would be based on the current model once office is back to normal and Covid restrictions are lifted, as in action 17 of the Strategy. Implementing Action 18 would require budgetary consideration and resourcing of a heritage department. HAC reiterated the need for resourcing a heritage department including in-house heritage advisors.</p>	<p><i>implementation via an email to RS.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That RS ensure updating the heritage page of Yarra website to provide precinct information and links.</i> • <i>That HAC Delegate’s Report include priority considerations by the Council for resourcing a heritage department.</i>
<p>5. <u>Methodology for the review of citations -Heritage Strategy Action 1</u></p> <p>LW presented three case study examples. One from Church Street, Richmond; an individually significant property with an individual heritage overlay listing and two from Bridge Road Precinct at Richmond (one individually significant and one contributory within the precinct) with a view to seek HAC feedback on a possible methodology for the review of heritage citations. The case studies were prepared considering citations, heritage significance, heritage advice and development approvals.</p> <p>HAC requested LW to circulate the case study examples. BoB suggested that that case study examples should also be included from other neighbourhoods to have a comprehensive understanding about the issue.</p>	<p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That LW/RS prepare more case study examples and circulate it to the HAC.</i>
<p>6. <u>Public access to photos and records of heritage buildings that are subject to demolition</u></p> <p>RS explained that the Statutory Planning department receives photos and records of heritage buildings where required as a part of a planning permit conditions, triggered by demolition and sends those to Yarra libraries. HAC was of the opinion that it would be good for RS to understand how vigorously such conditions are being pursued and whether the information is being properly catalogued by libraries. HAC deferred the matter for a discussion in detail in the next HAC meeting.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p><i>That RS gather more information on the matter with the Statutory Planning unit and Yarra Library Service.</i></p>
<p>7. <u>Yarra Planning Scheme Amendment 269</u></p> <p>IW explained that a considerable time has lapsed since the HAC had provided their input to the earlier draft heritage policy. Since then the Planning Scheme format has changed and the earlier policy has been converted to a new format. Am 269 is now an omnibus amendment which includes a number of new policies. IW, JT and TN have had another look at the new draft Heritage Policy and other policies that may impact heritage outcomes and have made their submissions to the Amendment 269.</p> <p>Bob suggested that if any member have any further concerns they can discuss those with the HAC councillors or respective ward councillors.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>That HAC members may individually or as a group discuss their concerns with councillors.</p>
<p>8. <u>Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation/recording of theatre interiors 	<p>Actions</p>

<p>HAC was of the opinion that documentation of theatre interiors is urgent. Owner of Austral Theatre had agreed to document the interior and can be contacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic safety works at the Canning and Richardson Street <p>RS updated HAC that discussions on the design concepts for the above crossing were organised between TN, UC and JA and Council's traffic engineers. The project is funded by the Federal Government and has time constraints. The approach adopted for this corner is somewhat similar to the approach City of Melbourne has for the blue stone kerbs and channels for the street corners. JA reiterated his concern that the design would allow removal of bluestone channels and old drainage pit and is not the most ideal solution from heritage perspective. MM informed that re-shaping (making smooth surface for movement) or removal and re-use of the bluestones removed from channels, where necessary for improving safe movement, is a common practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bike safety project at the inner circle rail line crossing with Brunswick Street North and Rae Street, North Carlton. <p>RS informed that discussions have been held between TN, UC and JA and Council's traffic engineers to discuss the design concepts for safer bike movement at the above crossings. The discussions have resulted in an agreement over the approach adopted by the Traffic unit for Brunswick Street North crossing and to delay the works on the Rae Street crossing and resolve that design as a part of preparation of a masterplan for inner circle- city trail. HAC was pleased that early discussions with the above HAC members' have resulted in a good heritage outcome. MM was of the opinions that the old rail tracks are fast disappearing from many other parts of Melbourne and therefore are worth watching for in Yarra.</p> <p>MM also raised the matter of the impact of rail projects on heritage infrastructure in general and suggested that the area near Clifton Hill Station is worth watching for future Clifton Hill- Parkville rail project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cast iron gas-light base at the corner of Scotchmer Street <p>RS informed that the Urban Design team of the Council is still working on the design solution and that RS is constantly in touch with them regarding reinstallation of the gas light base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage guidelines <p>RS explained that this work will be progressed further after the Amendment 269 has been resolved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework for managing Council's heritage asset <p>RS explained that a draft framework has been prepared and that it will be circulated to the HAC in coming months.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>That RS/LW pursue documentation of old theatre interiors on priority.</i> <i>That RS organise workshops with traffic engineers and a heritage landscape architect to develop standard approaches for heritage infrastructure.</i>
<p>9. <u>World Heritage Environs update</u></p> <p>GC circulated a paper providing a brief update on the review of the World Heritage Management Plan and outlining a number of community concerns. In this context, he also raised matters related to Yarra's proposed landmarks policy. Refer Attachment 1.</p>	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>That RS provide an update on the review of the WHMP and community</i>

<p>HAC was of the opinion that policies in the Am269 should be reviewed so that detrimental impact of proposals such as 1-9 Gertrude Street, 34–36 Nicholson Street and Salisbury Place (at 34-36 Nicholson Street) can be avoided. They also suggested that council’s response to World Heritage Management plan especially the Strategy Plan should address issues that are arising through these proposals.</p> <p>BoB suggested that GC and other interested members can also discuss the matter related to the development applications and policies with the ward Councillors.</p> <p>She also suggested that RS provide an update on the review of the WHMP and the community matters to the councillors.</p>	<p><i>matters to Council.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That HAC delegates report include the issues raised in GC’s paper.</i>
<p>10. <u>Other matters</u></p> <p><u>Yarra’s community vision</u></p> <p>Jamie Rachcoff- Communications and Engagement Adviser, CoY presented the consultation approach by the Council for Yarra Community Vision and the opportunity for the HAC members to undertake the survey, attend the community session and provide any response.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>That HAC provide their response to Council by email through HAC delegates.</i></p>
<p>11. <u>Dates for forward meetings</u></p> <p>RS informed that she will confirm the schedule of HAC meetings in 2021 by an email, after consulting with the Councillor’s support unit.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p><i>That RS confirms the HAC meeting schedule for 2021.</i></p>