

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

Relevant property	Sub no.	Issue(s) raised	Officer response
<b>Submissions in Support / Not Requesting Changes</b>			
<b>HO7 Review study area</b>	<p><b>1, 27</b> (Residents of Hotham Street, St Kilda East)</p> <p><b>2, 49</b> (Community member)</p> <p><b>69</b> (Visitor)</p>	<p>Multiple submissions supporting the overall recommendations of the Review.</p> <p>(#1) Encourages Council to adopt the proposed HO without changes.</p> <p>(#69) Submits that buildings should be retained to ensure the architectural history and beauty of the area is retained.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>Support is noted.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b></p> <p>No change.</p>
<p><b>62 Hotham Street</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included Group Listing HO - Benshemesh Flats Group Listing 1 with new Citation 2444.</p>	<p><b>3,4,5, 20,28,33, 34,39</b> (Community members)</p> <p><b>22, 24, 25,26, 35,36,37,38, 40,42,44, 46,47,48, 50, 53, 74</b> (Residents of Hotham Street, St Kilda East)</p> <p><b>55,69,71,72</b> (Visitor to the area)</p> <p><b>51</b> (Previous resident of Hotham Street, St Kilda East)</p>	<p>Multiple submissions expressing support for the proposed inclusion of the Benshemesh Flats Group Listing 1.</p> <p>(#22) Submits that the property is a beautiful example of post-war architecture and needs to be preserved.</p> <p>(#25) Submits that 62 Hotham Street protected from demolition given its historical significance and aesthetic contribution to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>(#27) Submits that the property is important for various reasons, including its windows, brick façade and the block's unaltered state.</p> <p>(#53) Submits that the property is a significant Art Deco building and should be projected under a HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>Support is noted.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b></p> <p>No change.</p>
<p><b>53 Sycamore Grove, Balaclava</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in</p>	<p><b>15</b> (Resident of Sycamore Grove, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Supports the recommendations of the report in relation to the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>Support is noted.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b></p> <p>No change.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

Relevant property	Sub no.	Issue(s) raised	Officer response
new Ripponlea Residential Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.			
<b>309 Carlisle Street</b> Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'.	<b>55</b> (Resident of Carlisle Street)	Supports the proposed updates to the Citations to ensure historical significance, clarity, and ongoing recognition and management of the area and its surrounds.	<b>Officer response:</b> Support is noted.  <b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.
<b>27 Balston Street, Balaclava</b>	<b>75</b> (Resident of Balston Street, Balaclava)	Commends Council for responding to the concerns of the residents of Balstron Street and applying heritage protection.	<b>Officer response:</b> Support is noted.  <b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.
<b>3/78 Tennyson Street</b>	<b>79</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street)	Submits that the property contributes to the culture and history of Tennyson Street in aesthetic and spirit.  Submits that the property is a particularly good example of how well the foundational building suits modern but period appropriate renovations	<b>Officer response:</b> Noted.  <b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

Submissions Requesting Changes and/ or Not in Support			
Relevant property	Sub no.	Issue(s) raised	Officer response
<p><b>38 Westbury Street, St Kilda East</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included Group Listing HO - Benshemesh Flats Group Listing 1 with new Citation 2444.</p>	<p><b>6</b> (Resident of Westbury Street, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Does not support the application of the HO to building at 38 Westbury Street.</p> <p>Expresses concern over the impact the HO will have on the ability to do the proposed building maintenance works and the additional financial burden it may pose, as well as the maintenance work required to upkeep the existing green roof.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The HO7 Review report advises that 38 Westbury Street is of historic and aesthetic significance as part of the Benshemesh Flats Group Listing I (1948-1954). The draft Citation 2444 includes a statement of significance that explains how and why the flats are of local heritage significance.</p> <p>The heritage overlay does not impose additional maintenance obligations on landowners. A planning permit would not be required for building maintenance works including upkeep of the green roof.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>HO7 Study Area and numerous specific sites</b></p>	<p><b>7</b> (Community member)</p>	<p>Expresses concern regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the removal of the term 'Heritage' from the area designation / affected land area.</li> <li>List of properties which are proposed to be removed from the HO and the lack of information and justification available on the website.</li> <li>the removal of 32, 34, 40, 42, 44, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 47 Blenheim Street from the HO.</li> <li>54 and 58 – 72 William Street, which are Victorian era houses, not being considered in the Review</li> <li>3-17 Grosvenor Street, 1A-1F Woodstock Street and 2-10 Brunnings Street not being included under a HO, as they are excellent examples of how good community housing can be.</li> <li>Block of terraces in Gourlay Street not being mentioned in the Review, along with other old</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The draft HO7 Stage 2 final report is the second report listed in the Document Library on the Have your Say web page.</p> <p>Table 4 (beginning on p.14) in the draft HO7 Stage 2 final report provides the rationale for the removal of properties, including those in Blenheim, Brunning, Grosvenor and Woodstock streets, from the HO. The recommendation to remove some properties has been made in instances where the breakup of the HO7 precinct has resulted in small pockets becoming isolated from other related places. The places are on the edge of precincts and are either graded 'Non-Contributory' or are of low overall integrity.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<p>buildings in the neighbouring streets which also are not mentioned.</p>	<p>Aberdeen Terrace at 58-72 William Street and the terrace at 4-22 Gourlay Street are currently included within HO7 and are recommended to continue to be included in the HO as part of the proposed new Balaclava Flats Residential Precinct. There are specific references on pp.13-15, 23 of the proposed Precinct Citation and they are identified as Contributory to the Precinct with specific mentions in the statement of significance (Criterion A, D &amp; E).</p> <p>Regarding the reasons why 54 William Street was not included, Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>The house at 54 William Street is a much-altered late Victorian period villa.</p> <p>Comparison with the footprint on the MMBW detail plan 1441 of 1898 shows that there had been an offset verandah (in line with the projecting bay) which has been removed and replaced with a small concrete awning. This was part of a suite of changes which were undertaken, likely during the Postwar period, including enlarging of the front windows with steel-framed types, removal of the cornice, possibly full rendering, etc. The roof was likely clad in slate, but the original roof cladding has been removed to many of the similar villas in the vicinity. Overall, its Victorian period elements have been removed with only the chimneys to provide any indications of the original design.</p> <p>There are several others of this type of alteration to similar late 19<sup>th</sup> century villas which dominated this area in the adjoining streets – scattered along The Avenue and Gourlay Street – which have been similarly compromised.</p> <p>As an isolated, compromised example there was no basis to include it in the adjacent heritage overlay.</p>
--	--	--	---

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>93 Chapel Street, St Kilda</b></p> <p>Proposed new Individual HO with new Citation 2433.</p>	<p><b>8</b> (Resident of Chapel Street, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Does not support the inclusion of the property at 93 Chapel Street in the heritage overlay.</p> <p>Expresses concern regarding the developability of the site under a HO.</p> <p>Advises that the property has significant structural defects that make it extremely costly to be able to continue with repairs to ensure the building remains tenatable.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The HO7 Review finds 93 Chapel Street is of local historic and representative significance to Port Phillip for the reasons set out in the draft Citation 2433.</p> <p>The structural condition of a building and potential impacts on future development are not relevant issues when assessing heritage significance. The heritage overlay does not prevent development, rather it aims to ensure development conserves and enhances the significant heritage elements of the place.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>28 Byron Street</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed change in grading from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>9</b> (Resident of Byron Street)</p>	<p>Advises that the property at 28 Byron Street has internal and external modifications, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of all fireplaces</li> <li>• Replacement of all windows and window with aluminium</li> <li>• Replacement of main interior walls with brick archways</li> </ul> <p>Interested to understand the justification behind grading of property as 'Contributory' given the adjoining properties at 26 &amp; 30 Byron Street have either undergone renovations or is due to be demolished (30 Byron Street)</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>The property is proposed to be included as a new place in the <i>St Kilda Botanical Gardens and Environs Precinct</i> with a 'Contributory' grading.</p> <p>The definition of 'Contributory' places is included in Table 2 (end of p.9) in the draft HO7 Stage 2 final report. A 'Contributory' grading applies to 'all places that contribute to the significance of a heritage precinct, but are not of local or State significance.</p> <p>This proposed Heritage Overlay for the <i>St Kilda Botanical Gardens and Environs Precinct</i> would include the houses at 26-30 Byron Street. These houses are specifically mentioned in the citation as a group of houses dating to 1916 and 1917 that have been built the Arts and Crafts and/or bungalow style. While there may have been modifications to the original heritage fabric, it is considered that overall, the original heritage form is still legible and original features still remain. Therefore, it</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>is considered that these houses contribute to the historic and aesthetic significance of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>The citation for the proposed precinct contains specific references to the properties 26-30 Byron Street on pp. 15 and 32.</p> <p>It is noted that 30 Byron Street has an active demolition permit (S29A) in place, which was issued in August 2021, prior to the completion of the recommendations and findings of the Heritage Review by the heritage consultants. Should the dwelling at 30 Byron Street be demolished, it's grading would be amended to 'Non-Contributory'.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>109 Acland Street</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new Village Belle Commercial Precinct. Proposed change in grading from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>10</b> (Representative)</p>	<p>States that the correspondence received from CoPP <i>incorrectly</i> infers that the property is currently included in a Heritage Overlay precinct.</p> <p>Requests explanation as to why 109 Acland Street is being considered as part of the Review.</p> <p>Does not believe that the property should be considered as part of the Review. The submitter will provide consolidated feedback in the event their opinion is not supported.</p> <p>Requests copies of Stage 1 Report, Stage 1 &amp; 2 Citations, and Statement of Significance for the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 109 Acland Street forms part of a row of interwar shops in the Free Classical style that contributes to the historic and aesthetic significance of the proposed Village Belle Commercial Precinct.</p> <p>There are specific references to the shops in the draft Precinct citation including no.109 on pp.14, 15 (history), a description of the Free Classical style on pp.22-23, and a specific description in the table on pp. 28-29.</p> <p>Officers sent an email on 4 July 2022 with information requested.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>159 to 165 Acland Street</b></p>	<p><b>11</b> (Representative)</p>	<p>States that the correspondence received from CoPP <i>incorrectly</i> infers that the property is currently included in a Heritage Overlay precinct.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 159-65 Acland Street are interwar shops in the Free Classical style that contribute to the historic and</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new Village Belle Commercial Precinct. Proposed change in grading from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>		<p>Requests explanation as to why 159 Acland Street is being considered as part of the Review.</p> <p>Does not believe that the property should be considered as part of the Review. The submitter will provide consolidated feedback in the event their opinion is not supported.</p> <p>Requests copies of Stage 1 Report, Stage 1 &amp; 2 Citations, and Statement of Significance for the property.</p>	<p>aesthetic significance of the proposed Village Belle Commercial Precinct.</p> <p>There are specific references to the shops in the Precinct citation including a description of the Free Classical style on pp.22-23, and a specific description in the table on p.29.</p> <p>Officers have provided requested information to submitter.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>40 Chaucer Street</b> Not part of the review area</p>	<p><b>12</b> (Representative of landowner)</p>	<p>States that the correspondence received from CoPP <i>incorrectly</i> infers that the property is currently included in a Heritage Overlay precinct.</p> <p>Requests explanation as to why 40 Chaucer Street is being considered as part of the Review.</p> <p>Does not believe that the property should be considered as part of the Review. The submitter will provide consolidated feedback in the event their opinion is not supported.</p> <p>Requests copies of Stage 1 Report, Stage 1 &amp; 2 Citations, and Statement of Significance for the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The property was included in the mailing list as an error. Officers have spoken with the submitter to confirm this.</p> <p>Officers have provided requested information to submitter.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>30 Chaucer Street</b> Not part of the review area</p>	<p><b>13</b> (Representative of landowner)</p>	<p>States that the correspondence received from CoPP <i>incorrectly</i> infers that the property is currently included in a Heritage Overlay precinct.</p> <p>Requests explanation as to why 30 Chaucer Street is being considered as part of the Review.</p> <p>Does not believe that the property should be considered as part of the Review. The submitter will</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The property was included in the mailing list as an error. Officers have spoken with the submitter to confirm this.</p> <p>Officers have provided requested information to submitter.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response


		<p>provide consolidated feedback in the event their opinion is not supported.</p> <p>Requests copies of Stage 1 Report, Stage 1 &amp; 2 Citations, and Statement of Significance for the property.</p>	
<p><b>101A Hotham Street, Balaclava</b></p> <p>Proposed new Individual HO with new Citation 2420.</p>	<p><b>14</b> (Resident of Hotham Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Provides detailed information to expand on the information included in the draft Citation on the properties History, Structure, Roof, Entrance and gates, Colour scheme, Gardens and gates.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The owner has provided additional information about the place, which would be useful to include in the citation.</p> <p>It is recommended the citation is updated accordingly.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Update Citation 2420 to incorporate additional information provided by the submitter.</p>
<p><b>Gordon Avenue, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed change in grading from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>16 &amp; 17</b> (Residents of Gordon Avenue, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the inclusion of Gordon Avenue in a HO as majority of buildings are not of heritage significance.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Gordon Avenue contains predominantly Federation era houses that contribute to the historic and aesthetic significance of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>The Precinct citation contains specific references to Gordon Avenue on pp. 14, 22, 27, 28, 29 &amp; 48.</p> <p>Of the 22 properties in Gordon Avenue, 17 (or approximately 77%) are recommended to be included as Contributory.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>Lots 1 to 9, 33 Tennyson Street, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs</p>	<p><b>18</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of property within a HO and the proposed 'Non-contributory' grading.</p> <p><u>HO &amp; grading</u></p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Council's heritage consultant has provided the following further assessment and recommendation:</p> <p>Townhouses at 33 Tennyson Street were completed in 1993 and are proposed to be graded non-contributory.</p>



## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Precinct with 'Non-contributory' grading.</p>		<p>Does not believe that the rationale for inclusion of 33 Tennyson Street is consistent with Heritage Overlay PPNs, nor is the principle applied consistently across the revised HO7 precinct.</p> <p>Notes that the individual lots within 33 Tennyson Street are not marked on Council's cadastral plans in the Review documentation.</p> <p>Submits that the argument of precinct continuity appears at odds with the proposed precinct definition, and that continuity does not appear to be important for individual citations immediately south of the precinct.</p> <p>Notes that a number of properties in Tennyson Street have been excluded from the proposed HO7, despite being closer to the St Kilda Botanical Gardens, and immediately adjacent and/or opposite to contributory properties.</p> <p><u>Tree controls</u>          Recommends that Council clarifies the rationale, benefits and potential implications of the proposed tree controls.</p> <p>Recommends that Council clarifies that tree controls are clarified to the kerbside trees as opposed to any defined trees within the HO7 boundary.</p> <p><u>Precinct Citation</u>          Submits that the delineation of post war periods and Late 20th century, and the attributes appropriate for heritage consideration should be better defined and consistency applied.</p>	<p>Whilst the southern edge of the precinct in this area had been no. 35 to the south, it had been possible to exclude no. 33. With the review however, the adjoining sites at 17 to 33 Milton Street are to be included and the precinct is proposed to be extended on both sides of Tennyson Street towards Byron Street (nos 35-71 and 78-90). As such, no. 33 would be surrounded by the heritage overlay and so standard practice is for it to be incorporated into the precinct.</p> <p>Given it is a large site with only a narrow frontage, it is recommended that the rear parts of site can be removed from the precinct, that is to only include the front building (lots 1 + 2). On this basis, it would be appropriate to similarly remove the rear part of the adjacent property at 35 Tennyson Street (currently within the precinct), that only retain the front building in the precinct.</p> <p>The proposed tree controls are for those identified street plantings and some in two public reserves but not any on private land.</p> <p>Regarding 50-52 Southey Street, these are recent buildings outside an edge of the precinct, where no extension of the precinct was possible. The adjacent house at 54 Southey Street has an individual heritage overlay (HO433).</p> <p>The circa 1970s block of 78 Tennyson Street is indicative of the Brutalist style phase evident within the precinct in several blocks. It is a good and intact example of its type with battered piers to the front, a wide, stepped timber fascia to the flat roof, concrete balconies etc. It was appropriately graded 'Contributory' and part of group from nos 78 to 90 consistent with the graded building stock in the precinct (in this case, mainly early 20th century except for no. 78). Six of these seven buildings are graded contributory with no. 84 having</p>
--	--	---	--

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<p>Recommends that Council revisit the apparent inconsistency with other gradings along the Tennyson Street corridor.</p> <p>Recommends that Council review historical aerial photos to ensure that buildings are correctly defined in the application of HO7 and the development era.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>Recommends that Council clarifies implications of HO7 for solar panel and battery installation for different levels of heritage gradings.</p> <p><u>Consultation process</u></p> <p>Recommends that Council reviews its consultation process.</p>	<p>been recently replaced (the original building existed at the time of the initial inspections).</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b></p> <p>Refine proposed HO boundary (red outline below) to only include those parts of 33 and 35 Tennyson Street that could impact the heritage streetscape (shown in blue below).</p> 
<p><b>43 Tennyson Street, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>19</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed extension of the Heritage Precinct, St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>Submits that the property is not largely intact nor is it a rare example of its type and had been extensively modified. Modifications specified in the submission are exterior paint colour and modern fence.</p> <p>Observes that the section of Tennyson Street (properties 37 – 51) included in the proposed extension contains (and is surrounded by) various housing types.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>The bungalow at 43 Tennyson Street, Elwood has been partly altered and on further review by Council's heritage consultant falls below the threshold for a Contributory grading. It is recommended it be regraded to 'non-contributory'.</p> <p>In their further assessment, Council's heritage consultant has advised that:</p> <p>'The principal original features that remain include the broad gable roof form which is clad in terracotta tiles has a finial to the front. The gable end has roughcast render with a tripartite louvred vent, the soffit is timber-lined, and exposed rafter ends survive on north side (but are</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<p>Notes that the recommended extension to the HO, particularly Tennyson Street area, is not included in the recommendations table of the Stage 2 Report (pg 15).</p>	<p>visible not the south, though they may have been boxed-in).</p> <p>Whilst not readily visible from street level because of high fence, it is apparent from GSV that the north walls is red brick such that the more visible walls (east and south) must have been rendered, a change which is usually not reversible. The front porch has wide tapered piers over a low wall, which has probably been truncated (and also rendered). The main entry is recessed to the side and so not visible, as was common during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The front windows and French doors are not original though the openings may be. As such, there has been considerable change to the house and the form, roof cladding and gable end are the only original features.</p> <p>The fact that a high fence partly conceals the house does not diminish its heritage value, although it does reduce the opportunity to interpret it from the public realm'.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Change proposed grading from 'Contributory' to 'Non-Contributory'</p>
<p><b>18 Gordon Avenue, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>21</b> (Resident of Gordon Avenue, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the inclusion of 18 Gordon Avenue in the Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>Submits that the property is not a federation era building.</p> <p>Requests that Council review the inclusion and adjust on a case by case basis as opposed to a whole street approach.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Gordon Avenue contains predominantly Federation era houses that contribute to the historic and aesthetic significance of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>The Precinct citation contains specific references to Gordon Avenue on pp. 14, 22, 27, 28, 29 &amp; 48.</p> <p>Of the 22 properties in Gordon Avenue, 17 (or approximately 77%) are Contributory.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>18 Gordon Avenue is part of an interwar ‘triplex’ (three attached houses) built on an allotment with an historic primary frontage to Mitford Street.</p> <p>Interwar houses and flats (which as a type include duplexes and triplexes) also contribute to the historic and aesthetic significance of the Precinct. 18 &amp; 20 Gordon Ave and 78 Mitford Street have characteristic details of late interwar houses that show the two influences of Moderne and Old English styles including the hipped tile roof, clinker bricks with tapestry brick detailing around the entry porches, as corbelling to the chimneys and gables, and lintels above the windows, brick chimneys with angled shafts, and timber windows with horizontal glazing bars.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
	<p><b>23</b> (Resident of Gordon Avenue, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property in a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the property is not a federation era building, and therefore does not align with the description included in the Statement of Significance. Suggests that it would be more appropriate to apply the HO from where the federation era buildings are location (14 Gordon Avenue).</p> <p>Advises that the property does not have any (original or changed) stainless glass windows or ornate decorative timber work that fronts the street. Invites an independent expert to assess the property to support this.</p> <p>Submits that 80 Mitford Street should not be included in a HO as it is also significantly different to federation era buildings on Gordon Street.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Gordon Avenue contains predominantly Federation era houses that contribute to the historic and aesthetic significance of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>The Precinct citation contains specific references to Gordon Avenue on pp. 14, 22, 27, 28, 29 &amp; 48.</p> <p>Of the 22 properties in Gordon Avenue, 17 (or approximately 77%) are Contributory.</p> <p>18 Gordon Avenue is part of an interwar ‘triplex’ (three attached houses) built on an allotment with an historic primary frontage to Mitford Street.</p> <p>Further assessment by Council’s heritage consultant provides that:</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>These buildings date to the Interwar period and are largely intact and form part of a consistent streetscape with several other buildings from the period at this edge of the precinct.</p> <p>78 Mitford Street (+ 18-20 Gordon Ave) is a mostly intact, late 1930s group of three, which was popular type of development at this time but also included two garages (the garage at the east end is an addition). Original elements include the tile clad hipped roof with one gable end, chimneys and walls of render and clinker including some geometric motifs in Roman (narrow) bricks. Stylistically, it has light inflections of the contemporary Tudor-Moderne such as horizontal glazing bars to the windows to the Gordon Avenue elevation. The windows to the Mitford Street frontage are not original. It has been appropriately graded 'Contributory'</p> <p>80 Mitford Street is a good and intact example of a 1920s bungalow. There is a similar example already included in the precinct, diagonally opposite at no. 85. Whilst the façade is considerably obscured by planting, glimpses of the original detailing are evident including the fence and garage (the latter evident on the 1945 aerial). It has broad gable roof, clad in terracotta tiles, chimneys, shingles to the gable end, walls of roughcast over a clinker brick dado, porch with squat columns, and diamond quarrels (leadlight) to the windows. It has been appropriately graded 'Contributory'.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>15 Balston Street, Balaclava</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new Balston Street</p>	<p><b>29</b> (Resident of Balston Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Believes that the original fence identified in the Review is a replacement as the brick appears to be newer than the house.</p> <p>Advises that the square brick piers have been added to the front porch as part of a 2011 renovation using</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> On review, the sharper arises (corners) of the brickwork to fence suggest a later 20<sup>th</sup> century date. Reference to the fence can be removed.</p> <p>The steel pole is evident on GSV Nov 2007.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>		<p>recycled brick. Prior to the renovation, there were two steel skinny pipes in place.</p>	<p>Further review suggests the outer piers on at no. 13 may have also been reinstated. The original detailing may have been the same as the central pier between nos 13 and 15 (broader and with a clinker brick cap), which is similar to the piers to the adjacent bungalow pairs at nos 9-11 and 17-19.</p> <p>The house is mostly intact and so conforms with the definition of 'Contributory'.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Update the Balston Street Precinct Citation to remove reference to the brickwork fence.</p>
<p><b>31 Erindale Avenue</b></p> <p>Proposed to be included in new Ripponlea Residential Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>30</b> (Resident of Erindale Ave)</p>	<p>Submits that the property does not meet the 'Contributory' standard and should be changed to 'Non-contributory'.</p> <p>Advises that extensive alterations and degrading of both the intactness and the integrity occurred pre-1985 and during approved renovations in 1989. Provides a list of alterations to the property (pre-purchase), including alterations to the front façade and the roof.</p> <p>Advises that all 1989 alterations were made using non-original materials and designs.</p> <p>Provides a detailed list of current visible alterations, additions, and reconstructions to the property, with accompanying photos showing front extensions, non-original verandah as well as 1988/89 approved planning permit drawings.</p> <p>Advises that the remaining elements of the original façade is front door and sidelight (thought to be original), and less than 2 metres of front wall.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Further assessment by Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>Given the additional information and photographs provided by the owner, it would be appropriate to regrade this building as 'non-contributory'. Whilst it appears to be indicative of the period, the owner has outlined the works that were undertaken to create a bungalow-like façade after it had been altered post-WWII.</p> <p>It is now apparent that the extant façade barely contains any original fabric and its form has been altered by the addition of the northern room (left side) and the vertical boards to the bay are not in keeping with early 20<sup>th</sup> century detailing. It was not possible from the boundary to see some of these elements and so it was assumed to be more intact that it is.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Change proposed grading to 'Non-Contributory'</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p><b>1-4/125 Westbury Street, St Kilda East</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed new Group Listing HO - Sheffield Manor and Wansbeck with new Citation 2431.</p>	<p><b>31</b> (Resident of Westbury Street, St Kilda East)</p>	<p>Does not support the inclusion of the property within the proposed HO.</p> <p>Submits that the inclusion of the property in a HO does not align with the purpose / objectives of a heritage overlay due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The property is not significant either on its own or for the area</li> <li>- The property has no feature which attracts or warrants inclusion in the Heritage listing Zone HO7</li> <li>- Building materials are ordinary</li> <li>- There are no unique or unusual characteristics</li> </ul> <p>There is no heritage aspect or nexus with the builder or designer to be included in a Group Listing.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 125 Westbury Street is of local historic and aesthetic significance to Port Phillip for the reasons set out in draft Citation 2431. The statement of significance includes a detailed description of characteristics of the building that contribute to the heritage values of the place.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>23 Grosvenor Street</b></p> <p>Proposed to be included in new Balaclava Flats Residential Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>32</b> (Resident of Grosvenor Street)</p>	<p>Does not support the removal / revision of the HO, particularly in Balaclava / St Kilda area.</p> <p>Submits that the removal of sites such as the Grosvenor Hotel from the HO will result in new developments that will negatively impact the charm &amp; character of the area.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Table 4 on p. 14 of the draft HO7 Precinct review Stage 2 final report explains the reasons for the removal of small areas from the heritage overlay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small physically disassociated group of residences of moderate integrity (Blenheim St)</li> <li>• Non-contributory properties including social housing complex in Brunning, Grosvenor &amp; Woodstock streets, 45 Brunning St, and the railway embankment</li> </ul> <p>The Grosvenor Hotel is not proposed to be removed from the HO and instead, is proposed to be transferred into a new site-specific HO with an updated individual heritage citation.</p> <p>The same applies to the former Melbourne Omnibus Offices (now the Grosvenor Hotel bottle shop) and Yumga Flats.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>80 Mitford Street, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO.</p> <p>Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct.</p> <p>Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>41</b> (Resident of Mitford Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within the HO for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The property is not of the Federation era</li> <li>- Due to its corner location, the primary façade faces Mitford Street. The submission includes photo of the rear interface of the property which faces Gordon Ave.</li> <li>- The property is in SBO1, hence inclusion within a HO would restrict the construction of a new building that responds to flooding (i.e. new building will need to be raised approx. 40cm from the current floor level).</li> </ul> <p>Reiterates that given its inclusion in the SBO1, its location at the edge of the proposed overlay and its differing character to other federation era buildings, the property should be excluded from the proposed HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Interwar houses and flats contribute to the significance of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct as outlined in the draft Citation.</p> <p>80 Mitford Street is a relatively intact interwar bungalow, which retains part of the original rendered front and side fence and an attached garage. The house has characteristic form and detailing including the dominant terracotta tile gabled roof that extends to form the front verandah (which has a central gable), roughcast render walls and chimneys, and shingles to the gable ends and verandah.</p> <p>It is noted that the SBO also applies to this property. In relation to development opportunities to address flood risk, the application of the Heritage Overlay does not preclude nor encourage buildings, works or demolition of a property altogether. Rather, it introduces heritage as a consideration that must be balanced with considerations around flood management at the planning permit stage.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
	<p><b>59</b> (Resident of Mitford Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Given the Site is a different era, style and scale to the Gordon Avenue Federation sites, the Site does not contribute to the Heritage character of Gordon Avenue or align with the reasons for the overlay extension;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> See above.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> See above.</p>



## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Site is located on the corner of Gordon Avenue and Mitford Street. As the Site faces Mitford Street, it should be considered as forming part of Mitford Street;</li> <li>- there have been several heritage assessments in the Port Phillip area with the Site never previously been determined as having Heritage significance; and</li> <li>- the interaction of the Special Building Overlay SBO1 (Flooding) (SBO1) and the proposed HO7, places the Site at significant risk of flooding</li> </ul>	
<p><b>62 Hotham Street, St Kilda East</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included Group Listing HO - Benshemesh Flats Group Listing 1 with new Citation 2444.</p>	43	<p>Does not support the proposed Benshemesh Flats Group Listing 1.</p> <p>Opposes to further development in the area due to negative amenity impacts, particularly lack of parking.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 62 Hotham Street is of historic and aesthetic significance as part of the Benshemesh Flats Group Listing I (1948-1954). Citation 2444 includes the statement of significance that explains how and why the flats are of local heritage significance.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>5 Wando Grove, St Kilda East</b></p> <p>Proposed new Individual HO and new Citation 2423.</p>	45 (Resident of Wando Grove, St Kilda East)	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the landscape of the street does not reflect any historical significance.</p> <p>Advises that the property has undergone a significant renovation, which has severely compromised the original architecture.</p> <p>Does not believe that the future development potential of the property / land should be hindered.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The house at 5 Wando Grove is of local historic and aesthetic significance for the reasons set out in Citation 2423.</p> <p>The renovations have been internal or at the rear of the property, which are concealed from the street (this is noted on p.7 of the citation) and do not impact upon the significance of the place</p> <p>The surrounding streetscape is not a relevant consideration in assessing the significance of a place, which is of individual significance.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>The inclusion of this site in an individual Heritage Overlay not prohibit development. Rather, a planning permit would be required for any works that propose to develop or change the appearance of the heritage place, to ensure that the proposed works would not detract from the heritage significance of 5 Wando Grove.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>14 and 18 Duke Street</b></p> <p>Proposed to be included in new Balaclava Flats Residential Precinct. No grading change (Contributory).</p>	<p><b>52</b> (Resident of Duke Street)</p>	<p>Supports the proposed break up of HO7 into smaller precincts.</p> <p>Requests clarification regarding the recommendation for tree controls to apply to the Canary Island Palms at 18 Duke Street. Advises that a fence locates the trees at 14 Duke Street.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Support is noted.</p> <p>A site inspection and review of Council's property database confirms the three Canary Island palms are now within 12-14 Duke Street, due to a recent re-subdivision. This change should be reflected in the HO7 Review report and recommendations.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Update the Balaclava Flats Residential Precinct citation to reflect the correct location of the palms at 14 Duke Street as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• p.17 – last sentence of last paragraph before Figure 15 replace '18 Duke' with '12-14 Duke'</li> <li>• p.27 – Replace the last sentence of the second paragraph after Figures 42 &amp; 43 with the following:  <i>Both are complemented by mature palms, three Canary Island palms along the side of Alma Court (now situated within the adjoining property at no. 14) and one Washingtonia at the front of 45 Rosamond.</i></li> <li>• p.29 – replace 'The palms at 18 Duke and 45 Rosamond streets' with 'The three Canary Island</li> </ul>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>palms at 14 Duke Street and the Washingtonia palm at 45 Rosamond Street'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>p.30: in section 6.0 'Recommendations' replace 18 Duke Street with 12-14 Duke Street in the first dot point which outlines where tree controls should apply.</li> </ul>
<p><b>79 &amp; 81 Chapel Street, St Kilda</b></p> <p>Proposed new Individual HO and new Citation 2419</p>	<p><b>56</b> (Representative)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the properties within a HO.</p> <p>The submission details a list of alterations made to the properties, including the original rood tiles, front decorative flourishes and the porch.</p> <p>Submits that while the documentation of the properties and the subdivision may warrant historical preservation, the actual dwellings do not reach the standard of significance to be included in a HO.</p> <p>Notes that the properties are neither mentioned nor graded in the 1998 Heritage Review.</p> <p>Submits that other neighbourhoods in the area with group heritage status contain enough Federation architecture to ensure that era is well represented and preserved.</p> <p>Submits that inclusion with a HO would extinguish development potential of the sites, which are suitably located for future higher density redevelopment at close proximity to public transport routes.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The attached houses at 79 &amp; 81 Chapel Street are of local historic and aesthetic significance for the reasons set out in Citation 2419.</p> <p>Further assessment by Council's heritage consultant provides:</p> <p>Whilst terracotta tiles have been removed to the rear parts of the house and replaced with corrugated sheet metal, the front part retains them, and so allows for the ready interpretation of the original detailing to the roof and its contribution to the overall Queen Anne style of the place. This change to the rear roof cladding does not diminish the place's heritage value and is readily reversible. Whilst one of the finials has been damaged, the others are intact. When the site was last inspected in July 2021, the timberwork to the porch of no. 79 was intact and that to no. 81 seemed to be also (though only the upper part is visible from the public realm due to the high fence). On this basis, this semi-detached remain intact and recommended for a heritage overlay.</p> <p>No significance was ascribed to its associations with the earlier Ardleigh but the subdivision of larger holdings for more intensive/suburban development and is indicative of this major phase of development in St Kilda whose population doubled between 1901 and 1921 (as outlined in the contextual history).</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>It is not necessary for notable persons to have lived at a site for it to be significant. Overall few places are attributed with significance based on owners or occupants.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>334 and 336 Carlisle Street, Balaclava</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in existing HO316 with 'Contributory' grading.</p>	<p><b>57</b> (Resident of Carlisle Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the properties within a HO.</p> <p>States that Precinct Citation does not include sufficient evidence to justify the inclusion of the properties within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the location of the properties makes the sites ideal for future higher density redevelopment, hence inclusion within a HO would hinder such opportunity.</p> <p>Notes that the surrounding streets contain a number of additional examples of similar type of dwelling, some of which are included in a HO, therefore the properties at 334 and 336 Carlisle Street do not need to be included as additional examples.</p> <p>Asserts that the urban design opportunities identified in the Carlisle Street Structure Plan (Strategy / Opportunity 3.3.6 and 3.5.3) would not be achieved if a HO is applied.</p> <p>Notes that the properties are identified in the Carlisle Street MAC Structure Plan as part of the 'Activity Centre Primary Entry Point'</p> <p>Submits that the proposed inclusion within a HO would be inconsistent with Plan Melbourne 2017-50, particularly <i>Direction 2.2</i> and <i>Policy 2.2.3</i> as well as the <i>Activity Centre Policy</i>.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 334 and 336 Carlisle Street are relatively intact Federation/Edwardian bungalows, which contribute to the historic and aesthetic values of the HO316 precinct. There are specific references to the houses on pp. 3, 7 and 13 of the precinct citation.</p> <p>These are Contributory places, so the fact of other examples in the surrounding areas (some of which are included in heritage precincts) is not a relevant consideration because it is considered that these properties, while not of individual significance, contribute to the overall significance of the proposed heritage precinct.</p> <p>Impact upon potential future development opportunities is not a relevant consideration.</p> <p>This site is outside the defined Activity Centre boundary for the Carlisle Street Structure Plan (2009). In the Carlisle Street Major Activity Centre local policy (Clause 22.11), this site, as it falls outside of the defined Activity Centre boundary, is defined as being in an 'Established Residential Area'. Therefore, development is limited to that which is consistent with the preferred neighbourhood character. The referenced sections of the Carlisle Street Structure Plan apply to areas within the defined Activity Centre boundary.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>HO7 Review Study area</p>	<p><b>58</b> (Resident of Chapel Street, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Submits that the overall communication is not accessible to / cannot be understood by the general public.</p> <p>Questions why a translation of the heritage map into a simpler form that non-industry persons can understand was not undertaken.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Feedback noted. Various documents were created to assist with understanding the recommendations outlined in the Review including maps, and FAQ document, a written overview of the proposal.</p> <p>Additionally, 2 x drop-in sessions were held for community members to make any enquiries as well as an email address and telephone number being provided for general enquiries.</p> <p>Feedback on mapping noted. Additional detailed mapping is under preparation to aid understanding of the HO7 Review recommendations during Planning Scheme Amendment process.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>86 Tennyson Street Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct with a proposed 'Contributory' grading.</p>	<p><b>60</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO or the proposed 'Contributory' heritage grading.</p> <p>Submitter states that they are in the process of considering the construction of a new dwelling on the property, and that the proposed HO would hinder this opportunity for future development.</p> <p>Demands that Council exclude the property from the proposed HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Further advice from Council's heritage consultant provides the following:</p> <p>Recently the adjacent house in the pair at 84 Tennyson Street has been replaced however the pair to the south at 88-90 Tennyson Street are intact.</p> <p>This place should retain its Contributory grading as it is part of a consistent subdivision by C H Marsham during 1916-17 which included 11 properties, ten of which survive (largely) intact. C H Marsham was possibly also responsible for the group of four houses at 169-175 Brighton Road, Elwood (1918). Marhsam had a preference for employing multi-panes to the upper parts of windows, which was not common at the time and overall this group of buildings, whilst modest in scale, are distinctive. They are all largely intact except for 28 Byron Street, where the original windows have been</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>replaced. All the buildings in this group except for 84 Tennyson Street are appropriately graded 'Contributory'.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>149-151 Argyle Street, East St Kilda</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new Group Listing HO - Joseph Tarry Houses with new Citation 2418.</p>	<p><b>61</b> (Resident of Argyle Street, East St Kilda)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the properties in a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the properties are not in their original states due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The verandahs at the front of the property and the rear extensions are new additions and does not match the original style.</li> <li>- The cladding along the east side of 151 Argyle and along the west side of 149 Argyle is not original. The original weatherboards have been replaced by asbestos cladding.</li> </ul> <p>States that the overall streetscape of Argyle Street East is a poor example of a heritage precinct, hence, to be included in a HO is unwarranted and would be disadvantageous to them as the owner.</p> <p>Submits that being placed in a HO would restrict them from making alterations to the property in the future.</p> <p>Requests that Council reconsider the proposed inclusion of the properties in a HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Further review of this property by Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>The house is not proposed to be part of a precinct and so the context (streetscape of Argyle Street) is not relevant. Whilst it is noted that the context is varied, two other adjacent places are proposed for a heritage overlay (one also dating to the 1870s, 2-4 Queen Street, and another to c1950 at 16A Chapel Street).</p> <p>It was recognised in the Statement of Significance and citation that the place has undergone some change. It was indicated that the verandahs had been replaced but this is also the case generally for the other comparative examples.</p> <p>Some of the changes are readily reversible, for instance, the asbestos sheeting to the east and west gable ends can be readily replaced with weatherboards. Rear parts are often much altered and are generally disregarded when assessing heritage significance.</p> <p>The subject site is unusual for a rare early example from early phase of development in the area, retaining multi-paned windows and being a paired with a continuous roof. It is worthy of a heritage overlay.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>78 Mitford Street, Elwood</b></p>	<p><b>62</b></p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property and the attached properties (18 &amp; 22</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p>(Resident of Mitford Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Gordon Ave) in a HO and requests that the properties be removed.</p> <p>Submits that there is no rationale or evidence provided in the correspondence (letter) to suggest that there is any merit in including the property in a HO. Requests that further clarity be provided regarding this and the process undertaken by the heritage consultants to produce the outcomes of the Review.</p> <p>Asserts that the property has been considerably altered and is in poor condition.</p> <p>Asserts that the property, the adjoining properties (18 &amp; 22 Gordon Ave) and 80 Mitford Street, are of different era, style and type of construction in comparison to the Federation Era buildings in Gordon Avenue.</p> <p>Believes that the consultation process for the project has demonstrated a lack of due process and transparency, and that the timeframes for providing feedback were insufficient.</p>	<p>Letters sent to property owners provided information on where to locate property specific information.</p> <p>The recommendation to include 78 Mitford Street, Elwood in the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs precinct heritage overlay is outlined in the <i>Review of Heritage Precinct HO7 Elwood, St Kilda, Balaclava and Ripponlea Stage Report, 2022 (RBA Architects and Conservation Consultants)</i> on page 15. The methodology is outlined on page 3.</p> <p>The building's condition is not a relevant factor for determining heritage significance, rather it's the buildings intactness and integrity. Should the house be structurally unsound the property owner could still pursue demolition under the heritage overlay - the heritage overlay (if applied) will trigger the need for a planning permit for demolition. Under Council's local heritage policy, a heritage place may be demolished if it is structurally unsound. The owner would need to present evidence of this being the case via a structural engineer's report.</p> <p>Further assessment of the properties at 78 Mitford (including 18-20 Gordon Avenue) and 80 Mitford Street, Elwood by Council's heritage consultant has concluded the following:</p> <p>78 Mitford Street (+ 18-20 Gordon Ave) is a mostly intact, late 1930s group of three, which was popular type of development at this time but also included two garages (the garage at the east end is an addition). Original elements include the tile clad hipped roof with one gable end, chimneys and walls of render and clinker including some geometric motifs in Roman (narrow) bricks. Stylistically, it has light inflections of the contemporary Tudor-Moderne such as horizontal glazing bars to the windows to the Gordon Avenue elevation.</p>
---	---	--	--

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>The windows to the Mitford Street frontage are not original. It has been appropriately graded 'Contributory'.</p> <p>Feedback on the consultation process is noted. There will be further opportunity to make a submission as part of the formal notification process - part of the planning scheme amendment process to implement the HO7 Review recommendations. The process also allows for formal review of submissions by an independent planning panel, should Council be unable to resolve any of the issues raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>50 Westbury Street, St Kilda</b></p> <p>Proposed to be included in new Individual HO with new Citation 2422.</p>	<p><b>63</b> (Representative on behalf of landowner)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property in a HO or in an interim HO, and requests that the property be excluded from any interim heritage controls.</p> <p>Detailed plans are provided for the planned extensions to the property as part of submission.</p> <p>Submits that the introduction of a HO at the point would add time, uncertainty and considerable costs to the works.</p> <p>Submits that the property does not possess the level of heritage significance that would warrant the inclusion in a HO, and that the wording in the existing Citation would significantly hinder the plans for the extension.</p> <p>Does not support the following in regard to the Citation (no. 2422):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the identification of the 'rear skillion roof' as a notable heritage feature.</li> <li>- the heritage value of the rear section of the dwelling</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <p>The house at 50 Westbury Street is of local historic and aesthetic significance for the reasons set out in Citation 2422.</p> <p>A planning confirmation letter has been issued by the Statutory Planning team, confirming that the submitted plans showing the proposed additions at the rear of the house do not require a planning permit.</p> <p>Council's heritage advisor has reviewed the plans and advised that they will not impact upon the heritage values of the place and are acceptable.</p> <p>Given the timeframes associated with the preparation, exhibition and approval of an Amendment to implement the HO7 review (approximately 1-2 years) it is possible the additions will be completed before the HO is applied to the property. If the changes proposed by the current planning application are completed before the Amendment is approved the citation can be updated, as required.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> No change</p>



## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the emphasis placed on the value of the North and East elevations of the dwelling</li> <li>- lack of differentiation between the value of the three chimneys at the site</li> </ul> <p>Request that in the event a final HO is deemed appropriate for the site (following a more detailed review), the Citation Report be amended to limit its primary focus to the dwelling's main volume and principal façade, being to Westbury Street.</p>	
<p><b>42 Tennyson Street, Elwood</b></p> <p>Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. No change in grading.</p>	<p><b>64</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of property within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the two Reports do not explicitly assess or report in detail about 40,42 &amp; 46 Tennyson Street.</p> <p>Notes that Council has made changes to 46 Tennyson Street contrary to the HO inclusion construction of a high solid brick wall.</p> <p>Does not support the proposed grading change for 40 Tennyson Street, submits that the property should remain 'significant'.</p> <p>Requests that Council regrade 42 Tennyson Street as 'non-contributory' and consider removal from the HO. Provides additional detail regarding the alterations that have been made to the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 40, 42 &amp; 46 are currently included within the HO7 Precinct and are proposed to be retained within the HO the new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. The gradings will change as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 – Change from Significant to Contributory</li> <li>• 42 – No change, remains as Contributory</li> <li>• 46 – Change from Significant to Contributory</li> </ul> <p>The change in grading from Significant to Contributory for nos. 40 and 46 is required to ensure the new gradings are applied consistently to places of individual local or State significance (Significant places) or places that contribute to heritage precincts but are not significant on their own (Contributory places).</p> <p>The house at 40 and former house at 46 are representative examples of their style, but are not of individual significance, and so a Contributory grading is appropriate.</p> <p>The Contributory grading for no.42 is also appropriate. While there are some visible alterations (enclosure of front porch, carport addition, replacement of windows) it retains the characteristic gable-fronted tiled roof forms (with details including bracketed eaves, timber shingles to the minor gable and a louvred vent to the main roof</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>gable), brick and render chimneys (now overpainted), which identify it as an interwar bungalow, and the level of integrity is consistent with other Contributory buildings.</p> <p>Further, the integrity of no.42 has not changed since 1998 when it was originally assessed as Contributory as part of the Port Phillip Heritage Review.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>20 Gordon Avenue, Elwood</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside the HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>65</b> (Resident of Gordon Avenue, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that property was built outside the Federation era.</p> <p>Contends that the property is at the edge of the overlay boundary and is separated from older buildings by a new apartment block.</p> <p>Submits that being included in a HO would hinder ability to protect the property from future flooding events (property is in SBO1).</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Further assessment of the properties at 78 Mitford (including 18-20 Gordon Avenue) and 80 Mitford Street, Elwood by Council's heritage consultant has concluded the following:</p> <p>The buildings at 78 Mitford Street (including 18-20 Gordon Ave) and 80 Mitford Street, date to the Interwar period and are largely intact and form part of a consistent streetscape with several other buildings from the period at this edge of the precinct.</p> <p>78 Mitford Street (+ 18-20 Gordon Ave) is a mostly intact, late 1930s group of three, which was popular type of development at this time but also included two garages (the garage at the east end is an addition). Original elements include the tile clad hipped roof with one gable end, chimneys and walls of render and clinker including some geometric motifs in Roman (narrow) bricks. Stylistically, it has light inflections of the contemporary Tudor-Moderne such as horizontal glazing bars to the windows to the Gordon Avenue elevation. The windows to the Mitford Street frontage are not original. It has been appropriately graded 'Contributory'</p> <p>It is noted that the SBO also applies to this property. In relation to development opportunities to address flood risk, the application of the Heritage Overlay does not</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>preclude nor encourage buildings, works or demolition of a property altogether. Rather, it introduces heritage as a consideration that must be balanced with considerations around flood management at the planning permit stage.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>374 St Kilda Road, St Kilda (former Duke of Edinburgh Hotel)</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included within an Individual HO with new Citation 2446.</p>	<p><b>66</b> (Representative)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within an Individual HO.</p> <p>Provides detailed information rebutting some of the information included in proposed Citation 2446. Submitting that the descriptions provided in the Citation do not justify the application of an Individual HO.</p> <p>Submits that the existing property is not reminiscent of the history of the land on which it sits.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Further assessment by Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>The location of the pilasters evident in the 1868 photograph (figure 2), about a decade after it was constructed, corresponds with the detail of the footprint outlined (with only one minor change) on the 1897 MMBW plan 1371 (figure 4) in the Citation no. 2446. No information has come to light to suggest that the building was replaced between 1897 and 1924, when tenders for additions were sought.</p> <p>The particular footprint of the building along its northern boundary, with a narrow setback to the front part is evident on the 1897 MMBW plan, early and late 20th century drainage plans, and building permits. This suggests that the much of the ground floor survives from 1897 and as previously outlined the façade is consistent with that seen on the 1868 photograph. The façade has however been extensively remodelled, in multiple phases, but largely dates to the 1930s phase and reflects the Moderne style.</p> <p>In 1971, a permit application was approved to make considerable changes to the openings of the ground floor level on both elevations. St Kilda Road and Martin Street. Whilst these changes are evident to the single storey section of the Martin Street elevation, they are not to the two-storey section of the building. The 1971</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>proposal was for a near continuous band of windows to be introduced to the ground floor of the St Kilda Road elevation. It is known the windows were changed to aluminium types and some have been replaced by the current owners in the 1990s. No mention was made of changing the location and size, etc. of the openings back to what had likely been the original location (as seen on the c.1925 aerial) and is currently the case. As such, it seems most of the external changes proposed in 1971 to the two-storey section were not undertaken.</p> <p>At ground floor, the corner opening was incorrectly described as an entrance, as it has been filled into act as a window. It had previously been an entrance as indicted on the 1925 aerial and the 1971 drawings. This minor issue can be corrected in the citation.</p> <p>The correct information about the leadlight to the first floor of the Martin Street elevation can be changed in the citation but this is another minor issue and does not impact on its heritage significance.</p> <p>As nothing has come to light to suggest that the exterior of the two-storey section is not largely intact to the late 1930s Moderne phase and that the building does not have continuity with the original single storey shop, it is recommended that this place continue to be recommended for a heritage overlay.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Proposed citation 2446 to be updated to include detail of past permits.</p>
<p><b>34 Chapel Street, St Kilda (Dick Whittington)</b></p> <p>New addition to the HO.</p>	<p><b>67</b> (Representative)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within an Individual HO for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To align the property's current use as a hotel as a reason for the inclusion in a HO is not</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The Dick Whittington Hotel is proposed for inclusion in an individual HO as a place of local historical, aesthetic, and social significance to the City of Port Phillip.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Proposed to be included within an Individual HO with new Citation 2447.</p>		<p>credible and lacks substance, particularly given the changing nature of hospitality venues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less than 10 per cent of the participants in the Social Values survey identified 'façade / appearance from street' as important with less than 3 per cent identifying 'architectural style' as important.</li> <li>- The HO would limit future change of use and development.</li> <li>- The drive-in bottle shop is a later addition to the property and therefore should not merit application of a HO to that section of the property.</li> </ul>	<p>Further advice from Council's heritage consultant provides the following:</p> <p>It is appreciated that there is no guarantee that the Dick Whittington Hotel will function as a hotel in the future and the introduction of a heritage overlay cannot prescribe the use of a place. However according to the current circumstance and the history of the site, a hotel has operated there continuously since 1860, with the extant building being constructed nearly a century ago.</p> <p>The fact that in the Social Values assessment only a small percentage nominated the façade or architectural style as important does not mean the place cannot be of aesthetic significance. Whilst inter-related they are separate assessment exercises – social significance relates to the particular group/s of regular users of the site, whereas assessment of aesthetic or architectural significance is undertaken on a municipal wide basis.</p> <p>In regards to future development, there would be considerable potential as only the original 1924 two storey section has been identified in the Statement of Significance and citation as being significant, although the heritage overlay would apply to the whole site which consists of a consolidation of smaller parcels. The single storey additions to the north (that is, the drive-in bottle shop) and others to the rear (east) are identified as not being significant. As such, change can readily occur to these areas though would need to be in keeping with the heritage policy.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>33 Milton Street, Elwood</b> New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in St Kilda Botanical Gardens</p>	<p><b>70</b> (Resident of Milton Street, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 33 Milton Street is a Federation era semi-detached house. While there have been some changes (modification of the side verandah/porch to form a</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>&amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside HO' to 'Contributory'</p>		<p>Advises that that property has undergone many changes including a rear extension, which has altered its significance.</p> <p>Would like to understand whether there'd be further opportunity to reconsider the inclusion of the property within a HO.</p>	<p>carport, high front fence) the house overall has good integrity and forms part of a consistent streetscape of Federation houses along the south side of Milton Street.</p> <p>Inclusion of this property within the HO as a Contributory place is therefore considered to be appropriate.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>305 Carlisle Street, Balaclava</b> Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>75</b> (Resident of Carlisle Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Advises that the property has been developed to maintain the facade and front interior, (staircase and stained-glass windows etc) of the original building</p> <p>Would like to see more solar panels especially on industrial buildings and multi dwellings.</p> <p>Recognises opportunity for Council to watch for all opportunities to maintain heritage sites and also to improve Melbourne's status on climate change.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Noted.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>43 Mason Avenue, Elwood</b> New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside HO' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>76</b> (Resident of Mason Avenue, Elwood)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that the property does not contribute to the heritage significance of the area and is not a unique or important example of the architectural style.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> This is one of 11 bungalows with Arts &amp; Crafts detailing constructed by builder C.H. Marsham in 1916 and 1917 that form a distinctive group around the intersections of Tennyson Street with Mason Avenue and Byron Street. There are specific references to these houses on pp. 15 and 32 of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct citation.</p> <p>Houses of this era contribute to the historic, representative and aesthetic values of the precinct.</p> <p>Inclusion in the HO as a Contributory place within the proposed new precinct is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>11 Mozart Street, St Kilda</b></p>	<p><b>77</b></p>	<p>Seeks further clarification regarding the following:</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b></p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p>(Resident of Mozart Street, St Kilda)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reasons as to why new development on non-contributory sites are not required to consider the heritage characteristics of any adjoining heritage place and the streetscape.</li> <li>- Heritage ramifications for the neighbouring buildings and streets where properties have been downgraded from Significant to Contributory.</li> </ul>	<p>In accordance with Council's local heritage policy new development 'Non-contributory' properties must consider the heritage characteristics of the surrounding heritage precinct. This is not proposed to change.</p> <p>The change in grading from Significant to Contributory is not a 'downgrading', but rather ensures that new heritage gradings proposed by Council are being applied consistently to places of individual local or State significance (Significant places) or places that contribute to heritage precincts but are not significant on their own (Contributory places). The broad heritage policy objectives and requirements for Significant and Contributory places are the same.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>131 Westbury Close, Balaclava</b> Proposed to be included in new Westbury Close Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>78</b> (Resident of Westbury Close, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Requests clarity regarding how the change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory' grading impact future work that is likely to occur along William Street and Carlisle Avenue.</p> <p>Expresses concern about the quality of development that will be approved within the new precinct under the reduced heritage protections.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The proposed changes in gradings within Westbury Close will not change the type of development permitted within the area included within the HO, as the properties will still be subject to the HO and Council's local policy. The broad heritage policy objectives and requirements for Significant and Contributory places are the same.</p> <p>For the purposes of development in areas outside the HO, Westbury Close will still be regarded as a heritage precinct and the specific Statement of Significance, supported by a detailed history and description will provide better understanding of the significance of the precinct than the current HO7 citation.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>86 Tennyson Street</b> New addition to the HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs</p>	<p><b>80</b> (Resident of Tennyson Street)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of property within a HO, demands that the property be removed.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> This is one of 11 bungalows with Arts &amp; Crafts detailing constructed by builder C.H. Marsham in 1916 and 1917 that form a distinctive group around the intersections of Tennyson Street with Mason Avenue and Byron Street.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Precinct with 'Contributory' grading.</p>			<p>There are specific references to these houses on pp. 15 and 32 of the St Kilda Botanical Gardens &amp; Environs Precinct citation.</p> <p>Houses of this era contribute to the historic, representative and aesthetic values of the precinct.</p> <p>Inclusion in the HO as a Contributory place within the proposed new precinct is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>1 Erindale Avenue, Ripponlea</b> Proposed to be included in new Ripponlea Residential Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>81</b> (Local resident)</p>	<p>Objects to inclusion of 'and Hedge' in reference to entry 16 – Bon Jours on the basis that the hedge on the property has not been maintained properly and negatively impacts the pedestrian amenity.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The 1992 <i>City of St Kilda Twentieth Century Architectural Study</i> assessed the hedge at 1 Erindale Avenue, Ripponlea to be of individual significance and prepared a brief heritage citation (no.906) for the property.</p> <p>In 1998 the citation was incorporated into the Port Phillip Heritage Review, but the significance was not reviewed at that time.</p> <p>The HO7 Review recommends the inclusion of 1 Erindale Avenue within the proposed new Ripponlea Residential precinct as a Contributory place. That is, it is not of individual significance, but contributes to the significance of the precinct.</p> <p>As the hedge is no longer considered to be of individual significance there is no specific reference to it in the Ripponlea Residential precinct Statement of Significance and tree controls are not proposed to apply to the hedge.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>



## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p><b>St Kilda Library 150 Carlisle Street</b> Proposed to be included in new Carlisle Street Commercial and Public Precinct. No grading change (Significant).</p>	<p><b>82</b></p>	<p>Questions as to why the repair and preservation of the St Kilda Library is not being prioritised.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The St Kilda Library is retained in the HO as a Significant place within the proposed <i>Carlisle Street Commercial and Public Precinct</i>.</p> <p>Council recently commissioned Lovell Chen to prepare a new Conservation Management Plan (CMP) to guide the future conservation and management of the St Kilda Library. The research for the CMP included an interview with the architect, Enrico Taglietti, just prior to his death and reviewed the significance of the additions by ARM architects. It now provides a comprehensive understanding of the heritage significance of the place and includes detailed guidelines to ensure that future works do not adversely impact upon its significance.</p> <p>As a future update through Council's Heritage Program, it is proposed to update the heritage citation for the Library as part of a comprehensive review of the citations that apply to the library and the St Kilda Town Hall complex.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>279 &amp; 281 Inkerman Street, Balaclava</b> Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory' for both properties.</p>	<p><b>83</b> (Resident of Inkerman Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Provides detailed comments and corrections to the <i>HO7 Review - Citations Update - Final Report 2022</i> and the <i>Updated Precinct Citation for HO315 – Inkerman Street (East)</i>.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The submission has identified address errors in the history and description of the HO315 Inkerman Street (East) precinct citation in relation to the terrace row of four buildings at 275-281 Inkerman Street.</p> <p>Specifically, the citation and report incorrectly refer to this group as nos. 275-279 instead of the correct nos. 275-281.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> 1. Change the <i>HO7 Elwood St Kilda Balaclava Precinct Heritage Review Stage 2: Review of existing heritage citations 2022 final report</i>, as follows:</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

			<p>In Table A.1 Precincts in Appendix A for item 1 Inkerman Street East (HO315) precinct, under the 'Recommendations' column, second dot point change 279 Inkerman Street to 281 Inkerman Street.</p> <p>2. Change the HO315 Inkerman Street (East) precinct citation, as follows (deleted text indicated by strikethrough, new text highlighted yellow):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citation page 3, first paragraph:  "Modest single storey timber cottages lined Linton and Camden streets and by 1888 two groups of two-storey shops had been built in Inkerman Street: a row of four (now nos. 275-<del>279</del> 281) to the east of Linton Street..."</li> <li>• Citation page 5, paragraph directly above the photo:  "The shopfronts to nos. 275, <del>277</del> 279 and 281 have been sympathetically reconstructed..."</li> <li>• Citation page 8 under point 4 (Statement of Significance) the report states  "The Contributory places are 184 to 208, 243, 245, 251, 253, 271, and 275 to <del>279</del> 281 Inkerman Street."</li> <li>• Citation page 9 under section 5 Recommendations, second sub-dot point:  "The Contributory places are 184 to 208, 243, 245, 251 to 271, and 275 to <del>279</del> 281 Inkerman Street."</li> </ul>
<p><b>81 Acland Street, St Kilda</b> Proposed to be included in new Village Belle Commercial Precinct.</p>	<p><b>84</b> (Resident of Acland Street, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed HO on Acland Street, St Kilda.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 81 Acland Street is already included in the heritage overlay, and the change in grading status will not change the heritage controls that apply to the property.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>		<p>Submits that a HO would decimate the property value as owners will no longer be able to develop the sites.</p>	<p>The extension of the Heritage Overlay in Acland Street would not prohibit development. Rather, a planning permit would be required for any works that propose to develop or change the appearance of heritage places, to ensure that the proposed works are in keeping with the heritage character of the heritage place and precinct.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>27 Nightingale Street, Balaclava</b> Proposed to be included in new Balaclava Flats Residential Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Significant' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>85</b> (Resident of Nightingale Street, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Supports the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>Submits that some of the restrictions and allowance under a HO are inappropriate or unnecessary and should be reconsidered by Council. Provides property specific alterations that the submitter would like to make to the property that are currently not supported under a HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Submission is noted.</p> <p>Regarding, Council officers will reach out to the property to discuss the proposed development intentions for the property.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>52/ 6-8 Glen Eira Road, Ripponlea</b> Proposed to be included in new Ripponlea Residential Precinct. No grading change (Non-contributory)</p>	<p><b>86</b> (Resident of Glen Eira Road, Ripponlea)</p>	<p>Notes that the property is not listed among the HO properties, hopes that there is no HO on the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> This property is currently within the heritage overlay as a Non-contributory property and it is proposed to remain as Non-Contributory within the proposed new <i>Ripponlea Residential Precinct</i>.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>15/ 6-8 Glen Eira Road, Ripponlea</b> Proposed to be included in new Ripponlea Residential Precinct. No grading change (Non-contributory)</p>	<p><b>87</b> (Resident of Glen Eira Road, Ripponlea)</p>	<p>Notes that the property is not listed among the HO properties, hopes that there is no HO on the property.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> This property is currently within the heritage overlay as a Non-contributory property and it is proposed to remain as Non-Contributory within the proposed new <i>Ripponlea Residential Precinct</i>.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p>84 Chapel Street, St Kilda</p>	<p>88 (Resident of Chapel Street, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Unclear on the recommendations for the property, requests response clarifying the recommendations.</p> <p>Submits that the property should be included in a HO due to architectural and cultural significance.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Officers provided follow-up information to submitter to clarify recommendations.</p> <p>Further advice from Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>Consideration was given to the potential heritage value of 84 Chapel Street.</p> <p>A permit (no. 10573) was issued for the brick flats in July 1940 to the builder J R &amp; E Seccull.</p> <p>The building is however isolated from the Carlisle Street Commercial and Public Precinct by the large carpark area of the adjacent police station on the east side of Chapel Street (no. 92). The police station forms the precinct boundary on the east side. On the west side, the precinct boundary is also further south – finishing at no. 149.</p> <p>Whilst 84 Chapel Street is a good and intact Moderne style example from the late Interwar period, there is a lot of building stock in the municipality of the style, so the threshold is very high for it. It was considered that as an individual place it was unlikely to meet the threshold as it was not sufficiently distinguished from other examples included in the heritage overlay.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p>HO7 Review Study area</p>	<p>89 (Former resident of Brighton Road, St Kilda)</p>	<p>Submits that this level of care should've been given to the Greyhound Hotel prior to its demolition.</p> <p>Submits that the new development in front of 6 Tennyson Street does not align with the 'heritage feel'.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Noted.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

<p><b>322 Carlisle Street</b> New addition to HO. Proposed to be included in new Carlisle Street Commercial and Public Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside HO' to 'Contributory'</p>	<p><b>90</b> (Resident of Carlisle Street)</p>	<p>Does not support the 'Contributory' grading of the property, will make a formal submission if the proposal is progressed.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> 322 Carlisle Street is part of an interwar row of nine two-storey shops and residences in a hybrid Moderne/Tudor Revival style, which is proposed to be included in the HO as part of the proposed new Carlisle Street Commercial &amp; Public Precinct.</p> <p>The building was designed in 1936 by the noted architect Leslie M. Perrot and featured in a 1936 newspaper article. It contributes to the historic, representative and aesthetic significance of the precinct.</p> <p>The proposed inclusion in the HO with a Contributory grading is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change.</p>
<p><b>1 Penny Lane, Balaclava</b> Proposed to be included in new Westbury Close Precinct. No grading change (non-contributory)</p>	<p><b>91</b> (Resident of Penny Lane, Balaclava)</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>Advises that the property faces William Street (provides photos to support point).</p> <p>Notes that from the HO map, it appears that the properties proposed to be included are facing Westbury Close and William Street properties are excluded. Advises that the original address for the property was 34A William Street before the naming of Penny Lane was introduced.</p> <p>Submits that there are no heritage featured within the property to be protected (references the photos provided).</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> This property is currently included in the HO7 Precinct and would be retained within the HO as part of proposed new Westbury Close precinct.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that it has no heritage value and given its location at the rear of a property on the precinct boundary it could be easily removed without impacting upon the integrity of the precinct.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Remove 1 Penny Lane from the proposed new Westbury Close precinct.</p>
<p><b>99 Westbury Street, Balaclava</b></p>	<p><b>92</b></p>	<p>Does not support the proposed inclusion of the property within a HO.</p> <p>The property is not unique and there are numerous other examples of similar buildings throughout the municipality.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The HO7 Review report advises that 99 Westbury Street is of historic and aesthetic significance as part of the Feldhagen Flats Group Listing I (1961-1968). The draft Citation 2445 includes a statement of significance that</p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<p>The Owners Corporation has already shown themselves to be fastidious about the condition and look of the block and any additional controls are simply not justifiable.</p>	<p>explains how and why the flats are of local heritage significance.</p> <p>The heritage overlay does not impose additional maintenance obligations on landowners. A planning permit would not be required for building maintenance works.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>39 Tennyson Street, Elwood</b> New addition to HO. Proposed to be included in new St Kilda Botanical Gardens and Environs Precinct. Proposed grading change from 'Contributory outside HO' to 'Contributory'.</p>	<p><b>93</b> (MP on behalf of landowner)</p>	<p>Requests that Council proactively contact the landowner, who does not support the inclusion of the property within a HO.</p>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> Council's heritage consultant provides that:</p> <p>This 1930s house is intact and appropriately graded 'Contributory'. It has a hip roof clad in Roman tiles and exposed rafter ends, walls largely finished with roughcast render with contrasting diamond motifs in brick (tuck-pointed and overpainted), a group of three, double hung sash timber windows, and an original garage.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> No change</p>
<p><b>12 Hotham Grove, Ripponlea</b> New addition to HO. Proposed to be included in Group listing with 2 Hotham Grove, Ripponlea (already in Heritage Overlay).</p>	<p><b>94</b> Port Phillip Property Owner</p>	<p>Does not support inclusion of property in HO for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dwelling does not meet the threshold of significance required for the introduction of a heritage overlay and is not strategically justified. Submission relies on evidence submitted from Urbis planning consultants stating the property has been significantly altered over time including replacement of the original verandah, that the building is typical for its era and not of sufficient significance to warrant an individual HO (referring to proposal for group listing), the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer response:</b> The Review recommends this property for the heritage overlay with a 'Significant' grading and be included as part of a group listing (ie grouped with another, similar property) as one of several surviving late Victorian timber houses in an isolated pocket of Ripponlea.</p> <p>In relation specifically to this property, the draft citation identifies:</p> <p><i>The houses at 2 and 12 Hotham Grove, Ripponlea are of local historical and representative significance to the City of Port Phillip.</i></p>

## Attachment 4: Summary of Submissions and Officer response

		<p>Hotham Grove streetscape is not intact and does not constitute a heritage streetscape. Other modifications to the building include front door, windows, chimney (no longer in existence due to Council's emergency demolition order), eastern side of the wall having been rebuilt, and entire back of the house no longer in existence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance and preservation of this house is unachievable as there is no access to the western side of the dwelling to maintain and preserve this side of the house, or to make it fire safe. The eaves on that side of the house also overhang the neighbour's property.</li> <li>• Submits the dwelling is structural unsound (provides engineers report in support) and has had a history of posing danger to the public (refers to Council emergency order issued July 2018 requiring works to the masonry chimney due to instability).</li> <li>• Advises that this process has caused the property owners significant stress at a time of particular hardship for them. Medical assistance has had to be sought.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The houses are historically significant for their association with an early phase of development in Ripponlea. They are of representative significance as largely intact examples of modest late Victorian timber housing in Ripponlea.</i></p> <p>It is noted that there is maintenance required to the building however to date, there is no evidence suggesting it is structurally unsound. Further it is noted that condition is not a relevant factor for determining heritage significance, rather it's the buildings intactness and integrity. Should the house be structurally unsound the property owner could pursue demolition under the heritage overlay - the heritage overlay (if applied) will trigger the need for a planning permit for demolition. Under Council's local heritage policy, a heritage place may be demolished if it is structurally unsound. The owner would need to present evidence of this being the case via a structural engineer's report.</p> <p>It's noted that in response to the emergency order in 2018, that a chimney has been removed. Despite this, advice from Council's heritage consultant advises the place remains of sufficient integrity to warrant the heritage overlay however that this change should be captured in the Citation.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Update Citation to note removal of chimney.</p>
--	--	---	--