



MINUTES

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Held on 18 October, 2018 at 5:30pm in Civic Room 2

Present: Alan Perry (AP), Community Representative
Carolyn MacGavin (CM), Community Representative
Deborah Slattery (DS), Community Representative
Erica Walther (EW), Community Representative (arrived 5.43pm)
Benjamin Petkov (BP), Community Representative
Sera Jane Peters (SJP), Heritage Advisor

Chairperson: Kelly Archibald (KA), Coordinator City Strategy

Minute Taker: Georgina Borg (GB), Senior Strategic Planner

1. Welcome

2. Apologies

Bob Turner (BT), Councillor

Nola Dunn (ND), Community Representative

3. Declaration of interests and/or conflict of interests

4. Business Arising

The following matters are business arising from the previous meeting of the Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC) held on 16 August 2018:

- Comments regarding the Committee's Terms of Reference are to be emailed to GB within 2 weeks of the August meeting.

5. General Business

- Update on Djerriwarrh Health building – The demolition of the Djerriwarrh Health building has been put on hold pending a Council decision on the staff accommodation project.
- Conservation desirables review project – KA informed the Committee that Council Officers will prepare a report to Council to recommend that Council seek authorisation to prepare Planning Scheme Amendment place a heritage overlay on properties as recommended by the Heritage Consultants.
- Actions of the Heritage Strategy – This has been deferred to the next Committee meeting.
- Heritage Festival 2019 – This has been deferred to the next Committee meeting.
- Round 7 of the Heritage Assistance Fund – Applicant 12 has completed the work and the paperwork will be concluded shortly.
- Round 8 of the Heritage Assistance Fund – Three eligible applications were considered by the Committee for Round 8 of the Heritage Assistance Fund. An evaluation was

MINUTES

undertaken by staff and their recommendations were reported to and considered by the Committee. The applications have been identified as numbers 15, 16 and 18.

It was agreed that application No. 16 be awarded the full \$14,201.00 requested and No. 18 be awarded the full \$7,400.00 requested. No. 15 will be deferred for further consideration for award of unallocated funds upon receipt of further information.

- Melton History Project – GB thanked the Committee for their attendance at the launch of the Melton District History Book and for their contribution to the book.

Recommendation

D. Slattery/ C. MacGavin

That Council award application No.16 \$14,201.00 and application No.18 \$7,400.00 from Round 8 of the Heritage Assistance Fund. Application No. 15 will be deferred for further consideration for award of unallocated funds upon receipt of further information.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is to be held on Thursday 6 December, 2018 commencing at 5.30pm in Civic Room 2 at the Melton Civic Centre.

8. Close of Business

The meeting closed at 6.28pm.

Community Representative Member Terms

Name	Deborah	Alan	Carolyn	Nola	Erica	Benjamin
Term Ends	Sep 2019	Dec 2019	Dec 2019	May 2019	May 2020	May 2020

Heritage Assistance Fund Applications		
15	16	18
<p>Applicant Property Information and heritage listing</p> <p>285 Nerowie Road, Parwan</p>	<p>Deanside, 96 Reed Court, Deanside</p>	<p>Pinewood homestead, 829 Blackhill Road, Toolern Vale, 3337</p>
<p>Describe proposed works</p> <p>Complete replacement of corrugated iron roof on a timber farmhouse (1893), belonging to the Staughton property, 'Nerowie' that was relocated to the site in circa 1910. Farmhouse is unoccupied and facing deterioration with water ingress from missing roofing iron, failure of flashings, gutters, downpipes and fascias and vermin. The proposed works include replacing the roof with new corrugated galvanised iron sheeting, with ogee gutters, new flashing, new downpipes. Further carpentry works are required to insert sisalation, replace battens, repair fascias and bargeboards to restrict vermin and allow the hanging of gutters. The roof is a considerable size and a large verandah and skillion to the rear, adds to the quantity of material required for the replacement. The applicant has stated that they might need to do the work in two stages so they can afford it, roof one year and verandah the next.</p>	<p>The works proposed is the replacement of a number of downpipes on the Deanside stables in order to achieve a more even run off and move the water away from the building more efficiently. An engineer's report has stated that mortar loss of the stone walls has led to the walls becoming unstable and liable to movement. This has been caused by water running down the walls and pooling under the walls. The previous plumbing is inadequate for such a large roof area. The existing gutturing will be retained and modified to create new downpipes and better fall. A stormwater pit will be excavated to take the water runoff and a PVC storm water drain to remove the water from around the walls.</p>	<p>Complete replacement of the roof of a circa 1850s woolshed which forms part of Pinewood Homestead. The roofing is falling and has a number of rusted sheets no longer attached to the battens. The applicant wishes to repatch the whole roof with new.</p>
Assessment criteria		
<p>What is the heritage significance of the place?</p> <p>Nerowie is listed on the Heritage Overlay Schedule</p>	<p>Deanside is listed on the Victorian Heritage Register and is of State significance.</p>	<p>Pinewood is listed on the Heritage Overlay Schedule and it includes the woolshed.</p>
<p>HO numbers or VHR</p> <p>HO 107</p>	<p>VHR H0810</p>	<p>HO 37</p>
<p>How urgent is the proposed work?</p> <p>The work is urgent and critical to prevent the structural failure of the house from water ingress. The applicant has tried to raise the money in the past to do the works and has tried to apply to the fund a number of times without success. The roof is at a stage of complete failure with sheets of iron dislodged, fascias fallen off, gutters collapsed and downpipes failed. The house cannot be occupied in its current state.</p>	<p>The work is classified in the Conservation Management Plan as high priority work item NO.3 and NO.4. The CMP provides a works and maintenance plan for all the buildings and a priority rating to those works.</p>	<p>The roof is very deteriorated and is letting water into the shed. The building is not occupied but is used for storage and for shearing once a year.</p>
<p>Will the proposed works make a good contribution to the maintenance, conservation, restoration or repair of the place?</p> <p>The works will make the house watertight and allow it to be used as a residence again. The replacement of the green roof with a galvanised roof will take it back to an earlier appearance, the green paint being a later, possibly inter-war addition (an early pre-1910 photo shows the house with an unpainted galvanised roof). The new roof will have a life span of 25+ years and reduce the maintenance occasioned by water and vermin ingress.</p>	<p>The proposed works will improve conservation outcomes for the stables by removing the water which is undermining the stability of the walls and washing away the mortar between the stonework. The provision of better stormwater drainage will ensure that future storm events does not cause further damage.</p>	<p>The works will contribute to the conservation of the property as the outbuildings are important to be able to read the history of the place and the usage of the farm. The building needs to be maintained as a usable structure or it will fall down.</p>

<p>Has the applicant applied for a planning permit from Council or a Heritage Permit/exemption from Heritage Victoria?</p>	<p>The applicant has spoken to the Melton Statutory Planning department and they have determined that the applicant will be exempt from having to get a permit as they will be replacing the roof with similar materials.</p>	<p>The applicant has contacted Heritage Victoria and spoken to a staff member who directed her to apply for a permit exemption. The applicant has not yet sent us the copy of the exemption.</p>	<p>The applicant will not need a permit as they are replacing like for like.</p>
<p>Has the applicant provided an adequate quote from a reputable tradesman?</p>	<p>The applicant has provided only one quote as they found it very difficult to get a tradesperson to commit to inspecting the property. The initial quote does not include the necessary carpentry component of the project, the repair of fascias, bargeboards, finials and battens. The tradesperson has been willing to revise the quote and has entered into discussion with Council's Heritage Advisor about redoing the quote. As of the 18th October, 2018 the applicant and Advisor has been unable to get a revised quote from any tradesperson after multiple phone calls and appeals.</p>	<p>The applicant has provided only one quote, after contacting four different tradespeople.</p>	<p>The applicant has three quotes. Two which are twice the price of the third. The applicant wishes to go with the lowest price quote. The tradesman doing the quote is the same for the other two applicants. This tradesperson has seemed more keen than any others to do the works and has been quite helpful in terms of altering quotes .</p>
<p>Does the quote provide enough details for a thorough assessment of the proposed works and does it comply with permit requirements?</p>	<p>The roofing quote will require further details to include necessary carpentry works. The quote has not included carpentry works required to secure the roof fascias, bargeboards and rafters, as this requires the use of a sub-contractor or separate contractor with different skills. The roofing plumber and the Heritage Advisor have spoken to the applicant about this. Without a carpenter to do the necessary repairs, the roofing plumber cannot do the roofing works. The plumber is currently seeking separate quotes from another tradesperson but they will not be able to get that to Council before tomorrow.</p>	<p>The quote is detailed and provides adequate information to assess the quote. The tradesperson has pointed out that there might be a large amount of sub-surface rock to be excavated in order to provide deep enough drainage. The applicant has submitted a separate application and quote for this, as the cost was very high. That application was assessed as ineligible.</p>	<p>The quote details the materials and the fixing method, to the specifications of the applicant and these are all in compliance with best practice conservation.</p>
<p>Has the applicant planned the works in a manner which will provide the greatest benefit to the place?</p>	<p>The quote has been broken into two parts, the main roof and the verandah roof so that the applicant has the opportunity to undertake the works in two stages, to reduce the financial outlay required. The applicant has listened to advice provided by Council and prioritised the replacement of the main roof over the verandah. She has also been willing to add other works to the project in order to provide a better conservation outcome for the house. She was reluctant to use galvanised iron but has now come around to galvanised rather than colorbond, due to the requirement to have a planning permit to change the house.</p>	<p>The works were specified in the Conservation Management Plan and a structural engineer has written an assessment of the building which details the changes to the guttering and the stormwater.</p>	<p>The applicant has planned to retain the least rusted sheets of iron and use them to patch the other sheds on the property to achieve a better, more waterproof coverage for all the outbuildings. It is considered to be a good conservation outcome.</p>

<p>Has the applicant successfully applied for funds from the HAF before? Did they carry out previous works to a satisfactory standard and in a manner that complied with the requirements of Council?</p>	<p>The applicant has tried to apply for funds on two previous occasions and in each case has failed to get quotes within the timeframe required. Tradespeople seem reluctant to quote on the job as it is large and complicated.</p>	<p>The applicant has received funds on two separate occasions. Once to have roofing and plumbing works done on the woolshed and once to get a Conservation Management Plan done. Both projects were successfully carried out and completed to Council's satisfaction.</p>	<p>The applicant successfully applied for funds in Round 7 for the repair of the dry stone walls around the farm buildings. The project took almost 18 months to be completed to Council's satisfaction.</p>
<p>Has the applicant demonstrated financial responsibility and understanding of the fund guidelines?</p>	<p>The applicant has been made aware of the terms of the granting of funds and has made preparations so that they can better afford the cost of the roof replacement, by planning to do the works in two stages.</p>	<p>The applicant has been made aware of the operation of the funds and as she has received funds twice before and is aware of the necessary inspection schedule. The applicant put in a separate application for rock removal which might be needed to achieve the drainage. This was a separate in order to not prejudice the drainage application, but as it was a contingency application was deemed not applicable.</p>	<p>The applicant has demonstrated financial responsibility in previous dealings with the fund and has a clear understanding of the guidelines.</p>
<p>Is their any local support for the project? Does the project have any social benefit to the community?</p>	<p>The house is located close to a public road, but in an isolated situation within the Green Wedge Zone. The property will continue to be used as a residence for the property which is share farmed. There is little chance that the place will be redeveloped or have a different use in the future.</p>	<p>The project will occur on private land and in the short term will have no public benefit. In the long term the homestead may revert to public space and so any works to maintain the buildings will have a future public benefit.</p>	<p>The project will occur on private land on a farming property in the Green Wedge Zone.</p>
<p>Is the property visible to the public, or will it be visible in the future?</p>	<p>The house is visible on a local road.</p>	<p>The property will be visible from the future Kororoit Creek Trail.</p>	<p>The property is not at all visible from a road or even any other properties. The owner is however hosting a number of visitors from the Dry Stone Wall Association of Australia when they do a visit to Melton in November to promote Melton's heritage.</p>
<p>Amount requested</p>	<p>\$23,000.00</p>	<p>\$14,201.00</p>	<p>\$7,400.00</p>
<p>Applicants contribution</p>	<p>\$23,000.00</p>	<p>\$14,201.00</p>	<p>\$7,400.00</p>
<p>Evaluation score</p>	<p>57</p>	<p>69</p>	<p>65</p>
<p>Recommendation of evaluation panel to Committee</p>	<p>That the applicant be asked to seek further quotes for the carpentry works required on the roof. Once a revised quote has been received the application will need to be reconsidered by the HAC.</p>	<p>That the applicant be awarded \$14,201.00</p>	<p>That the applicant be awarded \$7,400.00</p>