

Maroondah Amendment C148maro- Municipal wide heritage Amendment- Post WWII

Panel Report Summary of Issues and Officer's Response to Panel Recommendation

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
Heritage Precincts			
Ringwood Drive-In Shopping Centre Precinct (Ringwood Shopping Centre) 1-4/86 Maroondah Highway and 1-10 Murray Place, Ringwood (HO172)	<p>The Panel considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some elements of the original concept have changed such as the management of the road, alterations to some shopfronts and not including the car parking in the Heritage Overlay. • The integrity of the place is not clear. • The shops are not of individual significance. <p>The Panel concluded that the Ringwood Drive-in Shopping Centre at 1-4 /86 Maroondah Highway and 1-10 Murray Place Ringwood does not have local heritage significance.</p>	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO172) to the Ringwood Drive-In Shopping Centre at 1-4/86 Maroondah Highway and 1-10 Murray Place, Ringwood</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations and delete the Heritage Overlay HO172.</p> <p><u>ACTION 1:</u></p> <p>1.0 Delete HO172 from the Schedule to 43.01 and map 04, and amend Clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and <i>The City of Maroondah Heritage Study Review Volume 2: Citations for Individual Heritage Places & Heritage Precincts</i> (Heritage Study Vol 2) accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>Heritage Precincts Sunbower Display Village Precinct, 20, 22 & 24 Rawson Court, Ringwood East (HO187)</p>	<p>The Panel was of the opinion that this precinct has local heritage significance and should be included in the heritage overlay. It commented that the significance is derived individually from each of the dwellings and collectively as a display village of the same builder and architect that represents an important theme in the development of project housing in Maroondah. The Panel agreed with Council's heritage expert that the alterations made to the dwelling are generally minor changes. It further indicated that the threshold for local heritage significance has been met.</p> <p>The Panel also noted that Criterion E- aesthetics characteristics has also been met as the diversity on the design by the same architect using Mid-century Modernist forms is an important feature if the precinct.</p> <p>The Panel also noted that it did not consider that the threshold for local heritage significance for Criterion H - invoking a special association that's important in Maroondah's history had been met. Consequently, the Panel recommended that the statement of</p>	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for the Sunbower Display Village Precinct at 20, 22 and 24 Rawson Court, Ringwood East (HO187) to delete references to Criterion H.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations</p> <p><u>ACTION 2:</u></p> <p>2.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for the Sunbower Display Village Precinct at 20, 22 and 24 Rawson Court, Ringwood East (HO187) to delete references to Criterion H, and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>significance be amendment to delete reference to criterion H.</p> <p>The Panel concluded the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria A and E have been met • threshold for local heritage significance for Criterion H has not been met • the place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay 		
<p>Contemporary Homes Group. Heathmont (HO188)</p>	<p>The Panel agreed with two heritage experts that Criterion F has not been met, it noted that the listing is not important in demonstrating a high degree of technical achievement for the municipality.</p> <p>The Panel commented that the remaining four dwellings in the group listing are simply examples and the threshold of importance has not been met.</p> <p>The Panel commented that it is likely that there are more dwelling as outside the group listing with these attributes than in the group listing. It further indicated that the filtering criteria supported by Council to refine the group listing does not support the basis of criterion D's application, in fact it undermines it.</p>	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO188) to the Contemporary Homes group listing.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations and delete the Heritage Overlay HO188.</p> <p><u>ACTION 3:</u></p> <p>3.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO188) to the Contemporary Homes group listing from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>The Panel further noted that the result is a confused application of the Criteria D and Criteria F for that matters, with good intent Council conducted a peer review of the listing, however, the Panel considered the outcome of for Criterion D's application is less than logical.</p> <p>The Panel indicated that the Contemporary Homes group listing does not meet the threshold for local heritage significance for Criterion A, Criteria D and F.</p>		
Individual heritage Places			
22-26 Armstrong Road Heathmont	<p>The Panel noted that Criterion A invokes historical significance not rarity, which is (Criterion B) yet the statement of significance refers to rarity on several occasions. It further noted that it is unsurprising that there are no surviving similar examples referred to in the comparative analysis, particularly those surrounded by residential uses. The Panel considered the threshold for Criterion A has not been met.</p>	<p>Abandon the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO148) to the Humphrey Law and Co. building at 22-26 Armstrong Road, Heathmont.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations and delete the Heritage Overlay HO148.</p> <p>ACTION 4</p> <p>4.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO148) to the Humphrey Law and Co building at 22-26 Armstrong Road, Heathmont from the schedule to clause 43.01</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>It also stated that the documentation does not demonstrate that the building elements noted in the statement of significance are particularly unique or important and instead they represent typical industrial form of the day, so it considered that Criterion E has not been met.</p> <p>The Panel concluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria A and E has not been met • place does not have local heritage significance. 		<p>and map 04-05, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>
<p>254 Canterbury Road, Bayswater North (HO152)\ Former Fibremakers factory</p>	<p>The Panel considered that the former Fibremakers factory meets the threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria A and D. It commented that the key difference to be resolved is the extent of the reduced heritage overlay and changes to the statement of significance and heritage guidelines.</p> <p>The Panel considered that the integrity of the Fibremaker factory and its associated buildings has a high level of intactness and integrity.</p> <p>The Panel was of the view that there is heritage value in the construction of the later administration building, the Modernist design, its presentation to Canterbury Road and being a</p>	<p>Amend the extent of the Heritage Overlay for 254 Canterbury Road, Bayswater (HO152) to reflect Mr Reeves 'barest minimum' Option 2.</p> <p>Amend the Statement of Significance as set out in Appendix E.</p> <p>Amend the Heritage Design Guidelines as set out in Appendix F.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION 5:</u></p> <p>5.1 Amend the extent of the Heritage Overlay for 254 Canterbury Road, Bayswater (HO152) to reflect Mr Reeves 'barest minimum' Option 2 (as presented in Mr Reeves' evidence report to the Panel) in the HO map 05, statement of significance and Citation.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>post war building that contributes to and reflects the strong post war economic conditions that were experienced with Maroondah at the time.</p> <p>The Panel further supported the changes proposed to reduce the extent of the Heritage overlay from covering that entire site to focusing on the important elements of the site. The Panel supported Council's heritage expert, Mr Reeves option 2.</p> <p>Appendix E includes the Panel's preferred version of the Statement of the Statement of significance which includes the changes based on the concessions of Mr Reeves and many of the changes from Ms Knehans. Its also deletes reference to the factory in Wales, reference to providing a large number of jobs to British migrants, and landscape works by Emily Gibson.</p> <p>The Panel concluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has been met for Criteria A and E • place has local heritage significance • extent of HO152 should be reduced to reflect Mr Reeves 'barest minimum' Option 2 		<p>5.2 Amend the Statement of Significance for 254 Canterbury Road, Bayswater North (HO152) as set out in Appendix E to the Panel Report and amend the Citation accordingly. Also noting a minor edit to the site diagram in the Statement of Significance and citation which inserts #1 to an unlabelled part of this building for clarification and avoid ambiguity as Building 1 comprises two components.</p> <p>5.3 Amend the Heritage Design Guidelines for 254 Canterbury Road, Bayswater North (HO152) as set out in Appendix F to the Panel Report.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Significance should be amended as set out in the Panel's preferred version at Appendix E • Heritage Design Guidelines should be amended as set out in the Panel's preferred option at Appendix F 		
<p>129 and 131-133 Dorset Road Croydon (HO153)</p>	<p>The Panel in considering the merits of the proposed listing addressed the two submissions received in relation to this property. This included review of submissions from the owners of 129 Dorset Road and 131 Dorset Road.</p> <p>In particular the Panel addressed the submission from the landowner of 129 Dorset Road that noted that there had been significant modifications to the dwelling since it was constructed and there were several structural issues with the building so it would require demolition.</p> <p>The Panel considered these grounds of objection including the discussion on the issue of structural soundness and accepted Council's heritage expert evidence that the building meets the threshold for Criterion E.</p>	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for 129 and 131-133 Dorset Road, Croydon (HO153) to delete references to Criteria F and H</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's Recommendations</p> <p><u>ACTION 6:</u></p> <p>6.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 129 and 131-133 Dorset Road, Croydon (HO153) to delete references to Criteria F and H and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>The Panel indicated that the buildings are unusual and have a repetitive of architectural elements that is a key characteristic of the postwar era.</p> <p>It further noted that the issues of structural soundness were addressed in the Panel report common issues which indicated that the building condition of a place is not part of the criteria for assessing the heritage value and these can be addressed at the planning permit stage renovations, additions or improvements.</p> <p>The Panel did not agree that the property meets Criterion F and H.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance for Criterion E has been met • threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria F and H have not been met • place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO153). 		

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>161 Dorset Road, Croydon (HO154)</p>	<p>The Panel commented that its observations of the site differed with the citation's analysis of integrity, noting the ground floor alterations are more significant than outlined in the citation. It further commented that these changes have altered the integrity of the building from the original design and it agrees that there is a discrepancy with the original design.</p> <p>The Heritage Study review applies Criterion H as the only criterion to the site for its association as being the only independent architectural project that can be attributed to Ruth Alsop, the first woman to become qualified as an architect in Victoria.</p> <p>The Panel was of the view that the wider role of Ruth Alsop in Maroondah and more broadly Victoria, and the only substantial building credited to her work in the Panel's view establishes a reasonable level of threshold being met under criterion H.</p> <p>The Panel concludes that 161 Dorset Road, Croydon has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO154).</p>	<p>Retain in Heritage Overlay</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's Recommendations.</p> <p>Action</p> <p>No changes required to exhibited amendment documentation.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>52 Loughnan Road, Ringwood (HO156)</p>	<p>The Panel commented that the importance placed on the property for exhibiting particular aesthetic is problematic, noting that there is little comparison or discussion in the comparative analysis regarding the aesthetics of the property. The Panel was persuaded that the building meets the threshold necessary to satisfy Criterion E.</p> <p>Further in relation to meeting the threshold for Criterion F relating to technical achievement, the Panel did not consider that the building met this threshold. It noted that the reference to the early experiment in the use of steel framed construction to the design of an individual property dwelling was setting a low bar for this criterion.</p> <p>The Panel concludes that 52 Loughnan Road, Ringwood North does not have local heritage significance and Heritage Overlay (HO156) should be deleted from the Amendment</p>	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO156) to the former Bennett Residence at 52 Loughnan Road, Ringwood North</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's Recommendations</p> <p><u>ACTION 7:</u></p> <p>7.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO156) to the former Bennett Residence at 52 Loughnan Road, Ringwood North from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>67 Loughnan Road, Ringwood (HO157)</p>	<p>The Panel accepted that the threshold for Criterion A has been met. The Panel accepted Mr Reeves evidence that although there have been alterations to the building the significant unique features are not undermined by these changes in this instance. The Panel considered that the threshold has been met for Criterion E.</p> <p>In relation to Criterion F, the Panel considered this as problematic. It noted that although the dwelling has an unusual circular design it did not consider as having a high degree of creative achievement.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has been met for Criteria A and E • threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criterion F • place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO157) 	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for 67 Loughnan Road, Ringwood (HO157) to delete references to Criterion F.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION 8:</u> 8.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 67 Loughnan Road, Ringwood (HO157) to delete references to Criterion F and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p> <p>Noting Officers recommend minor additional text to the citation for 67 Loughnan Road to document changes that were made to the exterior of the building between the time that we first assessed it in 2018, and the Panel hearing. Further replacement the citation's photographs with a more current one (p 95) and relocation to earlier pre-renovation photograph to the end of the citation (p 98 Vol 2 report)</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>17 Malcolm Court, Ringwood East (HO160)</p>	<p>In the assessment for the proposed listing the Panel accepted the description of the building in the statement of significance as fair. It further considered that the dwelling is legible as a post war Modernist residential building. The Panel further indicated that it did not accept that the changes have diminished the significance of the dwelling, to a level where the heritage overlay has not been justified. It considered that the property met the local significance threshold.</p> <p>In relation to Criterion F, the Panel considered that this has been met as it was the first dwelling in Maroondah and one of the earliest one is Melbourne that demonstrated key modernist design features, shortly after Harry Seidler had popularised this in Sydney.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has been met for Criteria E and F • threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criterion H • place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO157). 	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for 17 Malcolm Court, Ringwood East (HO160) to delete references to Criterion H.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>9.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 17 Malcolm Court, Ringwood East (HO160) to delete references to Criterion H and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>50 Maroondah Highway, Ringwood (HO161)</p>	<p>The Panel noted that it was broadly accepted by the parties that the industrial buildings that mounts the sign, is not itself a significant building. It indicated that the context of this structure is an unusual feature with the heritage elements being the neon sign is sought to be protected above a building (not of local heritage significance) within an Activity Centre zone. It further commented that subject to approval there might be an opportunity for relocation or retention of the sign that is sympathetic to its heritage significance.</p> <p>The Panel indicated that the citation includes a satisfactory assessment against the heritage criteria and comparative analysis. In relation to Criteria A- relating to historical significance it accepted that the neon sign is reflective of a post war boom in commercial activity that occurred along this stretch of the Maroondah Highway. Further the Panel accepted that the sign is a unique survivor in Maroondah of vintage neon signage and agree that the threshold for Criterion B has been met.</p> <p>In relation to Criterion E, it accepted that the sign has important characteristics and is a</p>	<p>Should be included within the Heritage Overlay (HO161).</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations. No changes required to the exhibited amendment documentation.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>landmark with a vernacular style of 1960 commercial art.</p> <p>The Panel concludes that the Yarra Valley Tyre Neon Sign at 50 Maroondah Highway, Ringwood has local heritage significance.</p>		
<p>6 The Outlook, Heathmont (HO164)</p>	<p>The Panel commented that it remains unclear how the dwelling is significant and not another example of the mid century residential dwelling design with an unusual approach to design and geometric approach, typical of this era. The Panel was not persuaded that the dwelling meets the requisite threshold necessary to satisfy Criterion E.</p> <p>In relation to Criterion F, technical achievement, the Panel did not consider that a suitable threshold has been met,</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criteria E and F • place does not have local heritage significance and should not be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO157). 	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO164) to 6 The Outlook, Heathmont</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTIONS</u></p> <p>10.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO164) to 6 The Outlook, Heathmont from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04-05, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>25-27 Exeter Road, Croydon North (HO168)</p>	<p>The Panel agreed that the building meets Criterion A as it was important as a community oriented public building constructed by the local progress association.</p> <p>The Panel considered that the citation and comparative analysis do not adequately demonstrate rarity (Criterion B)</p> <p>The Panel further accepted that there have been sympathetic changes to the building but with its presentation to Exeter Road still intact, and as such it considered that the threshold for criterion E has been met.</p> <p>Furthermore, in relation to the building association with Dame Nellie Melba it considered that the place meets the required threshold for Criterion H associative significance.</p> <p>In relation to the extent of the heritage overlay the Panel accepted that the heritage overlay should be mapped to the property boundary, this will ensure that the heritage significance of the building can be considered in the future at the planning permit stage of the balance of the site.</p>	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for 25-27 Exeter Road, Croydon (HO168) to delete references to Criterion B.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>11.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 25-27 Exeter Road, Croydon (HO168) to delete references to Criterion B and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has been met for Criteria A, E and H • threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criterion B • place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO168) 		
<p>4 Swain Court, Heathmont (HO174)</p>	<p>The Panel considered that the importance placed on the property for exhibiting aesthetic characteristics has been established. The Panel accepted that the dwelling meets the requisite threshold necessary to satisfy criterion E. In relation to Criterion F invoking technical achievement. The Panel considered that this does not meet the required threshold for local heritage significance for technical achievement.</p> <p>Further the Panel considered that invoking Criterion H for an architect's own dwelling should have an onerous test so only buildings that truly have a special association are considered significant.</p> <p>The Panel concluded that:</p>	<p>Amend the Statement of Significance for 4 Swain Court, Heathmont (HO174) to delete reference to Criteria F and H.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>12.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 4 Swain Court, Heathmont (HO174) to delete reference to Criteria F and H , and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance has been met for Criteria E • threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criterion H and F * (as stated in discussion) • place has local heritage significance and should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO174). 		
61 Wicklow Avenue, Croydon (HO175)	<p>The Panel accepted that the building meets Criterion A as it demonstrates importance as a community-oriented building for its contribution to the provision of early health care to the local community.</p> <p>The Panel commented that in relation to Criterion E aesthetic significance, the Panel accepted that the building is a prominent building which can be clearly identified as an intact example of interwar construction. Even though the building has been repurposed as private dwelling, this does not detract from aesthetic significance.</p> <p>The Panel concludes that 61 Wicklow Avenue, Croydon has local heritage significance.</p>	<p>Should be included in the Heritage Overlay (HO175) on a permanent basis.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION:</u></p> <p>No changes required to the exhibited amendment documentation.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>9-11 Wonga Road, Ringwood North (HO177)</p>	<p>In relation to the impact of the proposed heritage listing on housing, the Panel stated it does not agree that the property's zone and location convey significant development opportunities that should outweigh the need for heritage controls.</p> <p>The Panel was not satisfied that the proposed listing met the threshold for Criterion A or Criterion B.</p> <p>Further the Panel agreed with the submitter that the dwelling is not in its original form with the added carport and the individual features of the dwelling, so found that the place did not meet Criterion E invoking aesthetic significance.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria A, B and E have not been met • property does not have local heritage significance. 	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO177) to 9-11 Wonga Road, Ringwood North.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>13.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO177) to 9-11 Wonga Road, Ringwood North from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 01, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
<p>2A Dirkala Avenue, Heathmont (HO179)</p>	<p>The Panel considered that the proposed listing did not meet the threshold for Criterion B relating to rarity. It considered that the fact that an architect designed a renovation is not significant and it being a rare residential property in a career dominated by large commercial projects is noted but not so notable that it meets the threshold for local significance for criterion B.</p> <p>With reference to criterion F invoking technical or creative achievement this focused on the glass stairwell. The Panel considered that this sets a very low bar and fell short of demonstrating how important it was for Maroondah. It also commented that the renovation in 1983 falls well outside of how post war or Modernism should be interpreted.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold for local heritage significance for Criteria B and E have not been met • property does not have local heritage significance. 	<p>Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO179) to 2A Dirkala Avenue, Heathmont</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>14.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO179) to 2A Dirkala Avenue, Heathmont from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04 and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
22 Lucille Avenue, Croydon South (HO181)	<p>The Panel considered that the characteristics of the building exhibit particular aesthetic characteristics. The Panel further indicated that the dwelling's significance has been diminished, is not adequately intact and does not meet the threshold required for individual significance.</p> <p>The Panel concludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the threshold for local heritage significance has not been met for Criterion E • the property does not have local heritage significance. 	Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO181) to 22 Lucille Avenue, Croydon South	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>15.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO181) to 22 Lucille Avenue, Croydon South from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 02-05, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>
4 Wendy Court, Heathmont (HO182)	<p>The Panel stated that the changes that occurred between the exhibition of the amendment and the hearing had a substantive impact on the level of intactness of the dwelling and those elements considered to be of significance. It noted that most, if not all of the significant features have been impacted and altered beyond cosmetic changes.</p> <p>The Panel concludes that 4 Wendy Court, Heathmont does not have local heritage</p>	Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO182) to 4 Wendy Court, Heathmont	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>16.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO182) to 4 Wendy Court, Heathmont from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04-05, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	significance and should be deleted from the Heritage Overlay (HO182).		explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.
3 The Boulevard, Heathmont (HO183)	<p>The Panel found that the dwelling did not meet the threshold demonstrating important aesthetic significance. It noted the dwelling is not in its original form, and its significant characteristics while extant, do not indicate that this dwelling is highly unusual. It noted that Council has not demonstrated that it is important for its aesthetic significance.</p> <p>The Panel concludes 3 The Boulevard, Heathmont does not meet the threshold for Criterion E and does not have local heritage significance</p>	Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO183) to 3 The Boulevard, Heathmont.	<p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Support the Panel's recommendations.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>17.0 Delete the application of the Heritage Overlay (HO183) to 3 The Boulevard, Heathmont from the schedule to clause 43.01 and map 04-05, and amend clause 72.04 (incorporated documents), the explanatory report and the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>
30-32 Station Street, Ringwood (HO184)	The Panel noted that the significance of the church building is not in contention. The Panel did not consider that the Sunday School Hall, even though it predates the church building, has local heritage significance. It noted that the Sunday school Hall should be identified a non-contributory building.	Amend the Statement of Significance for 30-32 Station Street, Ringwood (HO184) to identify the Sunday School Hall as a non-contributory building.	<u>Recommendation:</u> Support the Panel's recommendations.

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>The Panel did not support the retraction of the heritage overlay to cover the church building noting that i) the curtilage to the remainder of the site would be just beyond the church building itself and this is inadequate for managing heritage values of the place. ii) as the site is large and is within an activity centre where the planning controls allow for significant redevelopment potential and this is an important consideration to ensure the strategic objectives of a locality can be delivered while managing the heritage values of the place. iii) the usual approach supported by PPN 01 is to apply the heritage overlay to property boundaries unless there is adequate justification to reduce the extent.</p> <p>It concluded that the retention of the heritage overlay mapping as exhibited will allow a more comprehensive approach to its redevelopment potential and ensure the local significance of the church building is maintained.</p> <p>The Panel commented that Council should consider adding the additional comments made in the version of the statement of significance from the Uniting Church of Australia regarding</p>		<p><u>ACTION</u></p> <p>18.0 Amend the Statement of Significance for 30-32 Station Street, Ringwood (HO184) to identify the Sunday School Hall as a non-contributory building and amend the Citation in the Heritage Study Vol 2 accordingly.</p>

Issues Considered	Panel Comments	Panel Recommendations	Officer's Response
	<p>the paved area to the northwest of the church building and the stone retaining wall.</p> <p>The Panel concludes the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • application of the Heritage Overlay to the whole site is appropriate • a reduction of the Heritage Overlay will diminish the ability of Council to appropriately consider the sites redevelopment • Sunday School Hall should be identified as a non-contributory building. 		