



PLAN HERITAGE
Heritage Planning Consultants

West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 2A Review

May 2021

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	5
Findings.....	5
Local Significance.....	5
Not significant.....	5
Recommendations.....	5
Statutory recommendations.....	5
Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.....	5
Planning Scheme Maps.....	5
Operational Provisions.....	6
Other Recommendations.....	6
1.0 Introduction.....	7
Limitations.....	7
2.0 Approach and Methodology.....	8
2.1 Ground truthing and site visits.....	8
2.1.1 Precincts.....	8
2.1.2 Individual places.....	9
2.2 Place Assessment.....	10
2.3 Thresholds.....	10
Condition Thresholds.....	10
Integrity Thresholds.....	10
Building Fabric.....	10
Additions and Alterations.....	11
Relocated Places.....	11
2.4 Description.....	11
2.5 Comparative analysis.....	11
2.6 Statement of Significance.....	12
2.7 Additional controls.....	12
2.8 Curtilage.....	13
2.9 History.....	14
3.0 Report.....	15
4.0 Review and Reassessment.....	16
4.1 Precinct Review.....	16
4.1.1 Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct Ballan.....	16
4.1.2 Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct Ballan.....	18
4.1.3 Golden Point Road Heritage Precinct.....	19
4.1.4 Martin Street Heritage Precinct Blackwood.....	20
4.1.5 Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct Blackwood.....	22

4.1.6	Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct, Blackwood	24
4.1.7	Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct Blackwood	26
4.1.8	Lal Lal Heritage Precinct, Blackwood	27
4.2	Review of Individual Places.....	30
4.2.1	2018 Desktop Review.....	30
4.2.2	2021 Review	31
	Citation review	32
	Citation updates.....	33
	Fieldwork.....	33
	Mapping of individual places	33
5.0	Amendment C85 Recommendations	35
5.1	Schedule to the Heritage Overlay	35
5.2	Planning Scheme Maps	35
5.3	Local Planning Policy Framework.....	35
5.4	Operational Provisions.....	35
6.0	Other recommendations	36
7.0	References	37
7.1	Local Heritage Studies.....	37
7.2	Other References	37
APPENDIX A – SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2021 REVIEW		38
A. 1	Recommended for the Heritage Overlay.....	38
	Table A.1.1 Precincts recommended for the Heritage Overlay	38
	Table A.1.2 Individual places recommended for the Heritage Overlay.....	38
	Table A.1.3 Individual Heritage Overlay places recommended to be included within new precincts.....	42
A. 2	Not recommended for the Heritage Overlay.....	42
	Table A.2.1 Individual places not recommended for the Heritage Overlay	42
	Table A.2.2 Precincts not recommended for the Heritage Overlay.....	43
A.3	Recommended for inclusion on the Victorian Heritage Register	43
A.3.1	Places recommended for inclusion on the Victorian Heritage Register	43
A.4	Scheduled additional controls - Precincts.....	43
A.4.1	Places within precincts where tree controls are proposed to be applied on a site-specific basis	43
A.4.2	Places within precinct where external paint controls are proposed to be applied on a site-specific basis	44
A.4.3	Places within precincts where prohibited use allowed controls are proposed on a site-specific basis	44
A.4.4	Places within precincts with outbuildings or fences of note	44

A.4.5	Places within precincts where internal controls are proposed to be applied on a site-specific basis	44
A.5	Scheduled additional controls – Individual Places.....	45
A.5.1	Individual places with outbuildings or fences of note	45
A.5.2	Individual places where tree controls are proposed	46
A.5.3	Individual places where external paint controls are proposed	47
A.5.4	Individual places where prohibited use controls are proposed	47
A.5.5	Individual places where internal controls are proposed	48
A.6	Draft Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.....	49
APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF PLACES & PRECINCTS ASSESSED IN 2021 REVIEW		77
Table B.1	Heritage Precincts Assessed by the 2021 Review	77
Table B.2	Individual Heritage Places Assessed by the 2021 Review.....	77
APPENDIX C - ADDITIONAL SITE VISITS UNDERTAKEN FOR 2021 REVIEW		82
Table C.1	Access to the property to undertake a site visit was sought and granted	82
Table C.2	Access to property to undertake a site visit was sought and no response	82
Table C.3	Access to property to undertake a site visit was sought and denied	83
APPENDIX D HERCON CRITERIA.....		84
APPENDIX E – Amended Precinct Citations		
APPENDIX F – Amended Individual Place Citations- Ballan		
APPENDIX G – Amended Individual Place Citations – Blackwood and Bungaree		
APPENDIX H – Amended Individual Place Citations – Gordon, Millbrook, Mount Egerton and Wallace		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report (2021 Review) has been prepared for Moorabool Shire Council. The purpose of this report is to provide a final review of potential heritage places and precincts in the western portion of the municipality to determine whether a Heritage Overlay (HO) should be applied. All places and precincts included in this review were identified and assessed by the *West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 2A 2016* (2016 Study) prepared by Dr. David Rowe and Wendy Jacobs. A desktop review of the study was undertaken in 2018 by Context Pty. Ltd (2018 Review). This report completes the review work started in the 2018 Review.

FINDINGS

Local Significance

There are 7 precincts and 106 individual places confirmed to be of local significance to the Moorabool Shire. Appendices F & G contains the citations for the precincts and places of individual significance.

- 7 precincts assessed by the 2016 Study meet the threshold for local significance and are recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. See Appendix A (Table A.1.1).
- 106 Individual places assessed by the 2016 Study meet the threshold for local significance and are recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. See Appendix A (Table A.1.2).
- 3 individual places already included in the Heritage Overlay are recommended for inclusion in the new precincts, and their individual entries be deleted from the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay. See Appendix A (Table A.1.3).
- 5 of the 106 individual places assessed as meeting the threshold for local significance are also identified as having potential state significance and should be nominated to the Victorian Heritage Register. See Appendix A (Table A.3.1).

Not significant

This review has found that 5 individual places and 1 precinct recommended by the 2016 Study for inclusion within the Heritage Overlay are not considered to have sufficient heritage significance to meet the threshold for inclusion within the Heritage Overlay. See Appendix A (Tables A.2.1 and A.2.2).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Statutory recommendations

All places and precincts confirmed to be of local significance by this review are recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. The extent of the Heritage Overlay for each place or precinct is defined by the curtilage map included in the Heritage Place Citation located in Appendices E, F, G & H.

Schedule to the Heritage Overlay

Amend the existing Schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01s to:

- Create new schedule entries for the 7 new heritage precincts and 106 new individual heritage places of local significance listed in Appendix A (Table A.1.1 & A.1.2).
- Apply additional scheduled controls and Incorporated Documents for each of the 7 heritage precincts and 106 individual heritage places as shown in the draft Schedule to the Heritage Overlay in Appendix A (Table A.6).
- Delete the Schedule entries for the places which are currently included as individual heritage places and will be integrated into the new precincts listed in Appendix A (Table A.1.3)
- Introduce Application Requirements as shown in Appendix A (Table A.6)

Planning Scheme Maps

Amend the existing Planning Scheme Maps for Heritage Overlay (HO Maps) to:

- Add the Heritage Overlay curtilage for each of the 7 precincts and 106 individual places as shown in the citations included in Appendices E, F, G & H.
- Remove the existing Heritage Overlay curtilage for 3 places listed in Table A.1.3 which will be incorporated into new precincts.

Operational Provisions

Amend Clause 72.04 'Schedule to the Documents Incorporated in this Planning Scheme' to add:

- Statement of Significant for each of the 7 heritage precincts and 106 individual heritage places listed in Appendix A (Tables A.1.1 & A.1.2).
- 'Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Incorporated Plan Permit Exemptions, May 2021'

Amend Clause 72.08 'Background Documents' to add the following documents:

- West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 2A Review, May 2021 (Plan Heritage).

Other Recommendations

Undertake further work as recommended by the 2016 Study to complete the study, specifically:

- Undertake additional assessments of all places which were identified in the West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 1 but were not assessed in the 2016 Study.
- Nominate those places recommended by the 2016 Study as being of suitable for inclusion on the Victorian Heritage Register. A list of these places is included at Appendix A (Table A.3.1).
- Upload citations for the heritage precincts and individual heritage place citations recommended for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay into the HERMES database.
- Prepare a set of illustrated Heritage Guidelines to provide guidance on the management, conservation and development of heritage places and precincts across the municipality. The Guidelines are to include information sheets which give practical advice on specific local heritage matters.
- Assess whether another control might be more appropriate for Caledonian Park (such as SLO).

In addition, this Review recommends that the following further work should also be undertaken to:

- Prepare a Thematic Environmental History for the whole municipality.
- Undertake further strategic review of heritage gaps across the municipality. This includes the identification of:
 - Places already included in the Heritage Overlay with insufficient documentation to understand significance and guide development.
 - Places which have been identified in previous heritage studies or reviews but have not been assessed.
 - Places which are located in geographical areas which are not well represented in the Heritage Overlay.
 - Places which represent important themes across the municipality which are not well represented in the Heritage Overlay.
- Prepare a new Heritage Strategy to replace the Moorabool Heritage Strategy 2016-2020.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared for Moorabool Shire Council. The purpose is to review potential heritage places and precincts assessed in the West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 2A 2016 (2016 Study) prepared by Dr. David Rowe and Wendy Jacobs to determine whether a Heritage Overlay should be applied. It follows on from an earlier partial review of the 2016 Study undertaken in 2018 by Context Pty. Ltd. The key outcomes of the review are:

- A recommendation for each place or precinct as to whether the Heritage Overlay should or should not be applied.
- A recommendation as to whether additional controls should be applied through the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and if yes, provide a justification consistent with the Planning Practice Note No. 1 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' August 2018 (Planning Practice Note 1).
- Updated heritage citations in a format consistent with the Planning Practice Note 1.

All places and precincts included in this review were identified and assessed by the 2016 Study.

Context Pty. Ltd was appointed in 2018 to assist Council with the review (2018 Review) of the 2016 Study in order to assist with its implementation via a Planning Scheme Amendment. This involved a review of the whole of the 2016 Study and recommendations to determine which places and precincts should have the Heritage Overlay applied. The Review was largely completed in 2018. In 2020, Plan Heritage was engaged to complete the Review, which involved the following tasks:

- Undertake ground truthing for all places and precincts to check extant fabric and curtilage.
- Prepare a document setting out appropriate permit exemptions.
- Prepare final recommendations for places and precincts recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.
- Finalise any matters outstanding in the citations which arose as a result of fieldwork or other.
- Prepare the revised Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.
- Prepare revised curtilage for all places and precincts including maps showing grading of places within precincts.

All precincts were re-inspected for the purposes of ground truthing in the 2021 Review, in recognition of the development which has occurred in the study area since 2016. Individual places were inspected from the public realm and where possible. Where not possible, individual site inspections were sought in 2020. A small number of additional site visits were undertaken to remote and rural properties to confirm fabric, curtilage and intactness of elements. Minor changes to the findings of the 2018 Review were made as a result of this ground truthing.

This review covers the assessments of the 2016 Study and the revised documentation associated with the 2018 Review. It includes an overview of the methodology, findings and recommendations, as well as citations for places and precincts confirmed as being of local significance.

Limitations

This review is limited to a review of those places included in the 2016 Study. It relies on external investigations of places and precincts, largely undertaken from the public realm, other than those specified in Appendix C (Table C.1) which were inspected in further detail accompanied by the property owner. Places in Appendix C (Tables C.2 and C.3) were not able to be inspected.

2.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

This report has been prepared in accordance with the *Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Heritage Significance* (rev. 2013) and the Planning Practice Note No. 1 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' August 2018 (Planning Practice Note 1), including the use of the standard Criteria (HERCON criteria) for assessment, and layout of Statements of Significance.

The methodology and approach to this review and its recommendations were also guided by comments made by relevant Planning Panel reports, in particular:

- The Advisory Committee report for the Review of Heritage Provisions in Planning Schemes (the Advisory Committee Report) completed August 2007.
- Heritage Issues: Summaries from recent Panel Reports prepared by Planning Panels Victoria, 2015 and 2018 (the 2018 PPV Heritage Issues report).
- Guidelines for applying the standard criteria (HERCON criteria) for assessment and significance thresholds, in particular:
 - The Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines prepared by the Heritage Council Victoria 2019 (adapted to the local context).
 - Assessing cultural heritage significance: Using the cultural heritage criteria, Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, 2017.

2.1 Ground truthing and site visits

All places and precincts recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay by the 2016 Study were inspected (either in person or through review of existing citations and materials) and documented as part of this review.

2.1.1 Precincts

All precincts assessed in the 2016 Study were inspected and reviewed on foot as part of the 2018 Review. This was mainly a ground truthing exercise which checked and confirmed the street addresses, extant fabric, gradings of places within precincts and appropriate precinct boundaries. This activity was undertaken again as part of the 2021 Review. Where inconsistencies were identified between the ground truthing and citations and mapping prepared in the 2016 Study and 2018 Review, citations were updated accordingly.

The main issues which were identified by the ground truthing of precincts were related to changed street addresses, alterations, additions and demolition which had occurred since the 2016 Study and the 2020 Review.

Precinct Grading

During the 2021 Review, each precinct was also considered for intactness and integrity, used as a threshold indicator. For precincts, 'intactness' was measured as a percentage of non-contributory places. In this way, a precinct with a total percentage of Non-Contributory places less than 20% would be assessed as having 'high integrity'; a percentage of 20-40% Non-Contributory places would be 'moderate integrity' and more than 40% would be considered 'low integrity'. Generally, a precinct would be expected to have at least 'moderate' intactness, and in some cases 'high' intactness in order to meet the threshold of local significance.

Gradings within precincts

The 2021 Review applied the same grading measurement as was used in the 2016 Study, although the names of gradings were slightly changed, and for Contributory places, further clarification was included (see *italicised text* below).

For instance, the 2016 Study grading 'Local Significance' was changed to 'Significant' in the 2021 Review. The grading 'Conservation Desirable' used in the 2016 Study was not used in the 2021 Review

as per current best practice. Rather each place within a precinct identified as 'Conservation Desirable' was either re-graded as 'Non – Contributory' or 'Contributory' depending on the intactness, integrity and values.

The 2016 Study defined the gradings of places within precincts as follows:

Significant [Local Significance]

Places considered to have a sufficient level of significance in their own right as well as contributing to the significance of the heritage precinct.

Contributory

The place contributes to the aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and/or spiritual significance of the precinct. These places are either substantially intact, moderately intact or altered.

Additional consideration of 'Contributory' threshold applied in the 2021 Review:

For Contributory places within precinct, the 'integrity' rather than the 'intactness' was considered: that is while the Contributory or Significant places may not be entirely 'intact' (i.e. retaining all original fabric) any repairs or maintenance have been carried out using the same or similar materials, details and finishes, or additions and alterations are not obtrusive or detract from the original building, thus ensuring the places is relatively 'whole' and therefore has good integrity.

Non - Contributory

The place does not contribute to the significance of the precinct by virtue of being introduced fabric or the fabric is substantially altered.

Conservation Desirable – not used in the 2021 Review

The place relates to the aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and/or spiritual significance of the precinct, but it has been noticeably altered. Restoration and partial reconstruction may enhance its contribution to the character of the precinct. These places should have no formal significance in Planning Scheme but there are some redeeming qualities of historic and/or aesthetic interest.

Post 2021 Review

Note: Consent was given for the demolition of the dwelling at 410 Clarendon-Lal Lal Road under s29A of the Building Act 1993 on 8 June 2023. As a result changes have been made to the amendment documents to reflect the demolition of this dwelling. These include;

- Changing the property from 'Contributory' to 'Non-Contributory' in the precinct map
- Editing the Statement of Significance, Citation and Precincts and Places Incorporated Plan Permit Exemptions to reflect this change (both the precinct map and in text)

2.1.2 Individual places

All places which were visible from the public realm were inspected and reviewed from the street, either on foot or in a vehicle. The purpose of ground truthing individual places was to confirm the physical fabric of the place, any changes which had occurred since the 2016 Study was undertaken and to resolve any issues or questions noted in the 2018 Review or the 2016 Study.

For those places which could not be viewed from the public realm, access was sought to undertake a site inspection. These places were generally located in rural areas, and the 2016 Study citation identified that further work was required to confirm the presence and/or significance of elements not immediately visible from the public realm such as outbuildings and trees. A list of places where access was sought is included in Appendix C. Of the 22 places where access was sought, a small number of

places did not respond, and one place did not allow access. Site visits to individual places were undertaken by Annabel Neylon accompanied by a Council Officer and property owner.

After site visits and ground truthing, the citations were updated with regard to any significant elements which were confirmed or found not to be extant. In some cases, new photographs were added to the citations.

For potential individual places, the level of intactness was reviewed as an important consideration as to whether the place met the threshold of local significance when compared with other examples both included in the Heritage Overlay or proposed for inclusion in the 2016 Study.

2.2 Place Assessment

The current assessment has been limited to a review of information and making updates and revisions as required.

2.3 Thresholds

In considering the significance, condition and integrity thresholds for individual places, the methodology as set out in the 2016 Study was used. This is reproduced below.

Condition Thresholds

- Excellent Condition (no deterioration of fabric noticeable).
- Good Condition (minor deterioration of fabric noticeable).
- Fair Condition (deterioration of fabric noticeable).
- Poor Condition (deterioration of fabric very noticeable, with possible structural deterioration as well).
- Ruins (small elements of original character & appearance only identified through remaining building ruins).

Integrity Thresholds

- Substantially Intact (either completely intact or a small number of minor modifications noticeable).
- Moderately Intact (original character & appearance clearly discernible, but a number of minor modifications noticeable).
- Altered (original character & appearance discernible but alterations to some original fabric such as doors and window openings and verandah noticeable).
- Substantially Altered/Low Integrity (original character & appearance only partly discernible – multiple changes noticeable to the exterior).
- Ruinous (ruinous fabric surviving only).

Building Fabric

The integrity of places (when viewed from the public realm) may include to varying degrees the following such that the place is discernible to its creation date (or creation dates):

- Overall form & composition.
- Construction materials.
- Building details.
- Verandahs.
- Visible windows and doors.
- Front Fencing.
- Outbuildings.

The integrity of landscaped settings, spaces and views may also have been considered.

Additions and Alterations

Places with additions may continue to have significance if:

- The additions have been identified as contributing to the significance of the building or place (the additions being significant).
- The additions and alterations have no significance but are recessive and minor in nature, and do not dominate over the building. There is considered to be sufficient retained fabric to meet the relevant significance threshold/s.

Relocated Places

Relocated places may also have significance if they have direct associations to specific historical themes identified in the Thematic Environmental History.

The review of individual places focused on the following fields of the citations.

2.4 Description

Revision of the description where site visit or ground truthing identified changes to the fabric of the place.

2.5 Comparative analysis

Comparative analysis is an essential step to determining if a place or precinct meets the local (or State) threshold for heritage significance. Planning Practice Note 1 advises that:

To apply a threshold, some comparative analysis will be required to substantiate the significance of each place. The comparative analysis should draw on other similar places within the study area, including those previously included in a heritage register or overlay. Places identified to be of potential state significance should undergo analysis on a broader (state-wide) comparative basis.

Comparative analysis is considered particularly important in deciding if a place is of architectural significance or of rarity value in a given area but can be applied to most place types to determine their relative importance in a locality or wider area.

The 2016 Study included limited comparative analysis for heritage places and precincts. In order to better understand and justify whether places and precincts met the threshold for local significance, the 2018 Review undertook a limited comparative analysis for those places and precincts where this information was lacking. This was reviewed in the 2021 Review. For the purposes of considering comparative analysis, the locality of a place was considered the minimal scope for comparative analysis to establish local significance, but in most cases comparisons were sought more broadly (particularly for heritage precincts) from within the municipality, or even farther afield where pertinent comparisons were not found within the municipality.

In this process, similar places (in terms of build-date, building type, and/or use/theme) already included in the Moorabool Heritage Overlay were used as 'benchmarks' to provide a basis for comparison where possible. Potential heritage places and precincts included in the 2016 Study were also used for comparison according to a range of criteria, including how well they represented a historical theme, their design quality, intactness and rarity.

When the place or precinct under assessment was considered to be of equal or better quality than the 'benchmarks' it was judged to meet the threshold of local significance and considered worthy of inclusion in Amendment C85.

Places that were found to be of a lesser quality than other similar examples (for instance through alterations or additions which had recently taken place and substantially reduced the integrity of the place) were not recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. A list of these is included in Appendix A (Table A.2.1 & A.2.2).

2.6 Statement of Significance

One new statement of significance was prepared for 15 Golden Point Road, Golden Point. This was required as the place was originally part of a small precinct which no longer has sufficient integrity to meet the threshold for local significance. In all other cases the existing statements of significance prepared in the 2016 Study have been revised and re-ordered in accordance with the recommendations provided in Planning Practice Note 1.

Changes are generally limited to re-structuring the 2016 Statements of Significance to:

- Edit the 'What is Significant' to remove historical information and reduce this section to no more than one paragraph, or a series of dot points which clearly identify the significant features of the place. In some cases the Non-Contributory elements are also specified.
- Edit the phrasing of the 'How is it Significant' to comply with the guidance contained in Planning Practice Note 1 – for instance '... [place name] is of local historical and aesthetic significance to the Moorabool Shire.'
- Edit the 'Why is it Significant' to comply with the guidance of Planning Practice Note 1, to break the information in this section into separate points or paragraphs for each criterion satisfied; and to insert in brackets the relevant criteria in brackets after each paragraph or point.

2.7 Additional controls

Additional controls for individual places and precincts proposed in the 2016 Study have, in some cases, been amended as a result of ground truthing and a review of the zone provisions. Additional controls have been applied with regard to the guidance set out in Planning Practice Note 1. Appendix A (Table A.4 and Table A.5) sets out the additional controls for heritage precincts and individual places recommended as a result of the 2021 Review.

External Paint Control

External paint controls have been applied sparingly, where the external paint finish of the building or place clearly contributes to the significance of the place and is articulated in the Statement of Significance. In these cases, the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay has been updated to specify 'Yes' if the control applies to all exterior fabric, or provides specific information to which portion of the place the control applies (i.e. 'Yes - front wing only'). No external paint controls were recommended to be applied to any of the new heritage precincts, or specific places within those precincts. Table A.5.3 in Appendix A provides a full list of the individual places to which it is recommended the additional control 'External Paint' applies.

Tree Control

Tree controls have been applied only where a tree or group of trees is identified as contributing to the significance of the place or is significant in its own right. Tree controls have also been used to provide additional control to hedges, regardless of whether they are maintained at shrub or small tree height. Tables A.4.1 and A.5.2 in Appendix A provides a full list of the places (both within precinct and individual places) to which it is recommended the additional control 'Tree Controls' should apply.

Outbuildings and fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4

For places where an outbuilding or fence was identified in the Statement of Significance as contributing to the heritage place the 'Outbuildings and Fences which are not exempt' control was applied. This was included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay with details as to what the control applied to (i.e. Yes – stone bakehouse only). Table A.5.1 in Appendix A provides a full list of the individual places to which it is recommended the additional control 'Outbuildings and fences which are not exempt' applies. There are no places within precincts to which this control applies.

Internal Alteration Control

Internal alteration controls have been applied sparingly and specifically to special interiors of high significance which make a substantial contribution to the understanding and significance of the place.

The significance of the interior fabric is described and set out clearly in the Statement of Significance. In those instances where internal alteration controls are proposed, the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay specifies carefully to what portion of the interior they apply. For instance 'Yes-Front two rooms only'. Table A.5.5 in Appendix A provides a full list of the individual places to which it is recommended the additional control 'Internal Alteration' applies. There are no places within precincts to which this control applies.

Prohibited Uses Permitted Control

This provision has been applied to specific heritage places, where allowing a use that would otherwise be prohibited would demonstrably assist with the conservation of the significance of the heritage place. This is consistent with the purpose of the heritage overlay. In applying the control, consideration was had to the type of heritage place, whether the normally available range of permissible uses is insufficient to provide for the future conservation of the building, the zone applying to the site, and whether the list of prohibited uses available under that zone was appropriate having regard to the location of the site. This provided a balanced approach of considering the potential benefits for a site, with the sites context, and other provisions applying within the planning scheme.

In many cases whilst a heritage place was considered to benefit from the prohibited uses provision, the list of prohibited uses was considered inappropriate. This applied to properties located in the Commercial 1 Zone and Township Zone. In other cases such as the Public Use Zone, there are no prohibited uses, so it was considered superfluous to 'turn on' the prohibited uses provision.

In many instances, the prohibited uses provision has been applied to heritage places with a specific traditional function (such as churches), as the zone provides for a number of prohibited uses such as office and retail which provide an opportunity for a successful transition and compatible adaptive re-use which is may be appropriate for the zone, but which would not normally be permitted. Table A.5.4 in Appendix A provides a full list of the individual places to which it is recommended the additional control 'Prohibited Uses Permitted' applies. There are no places within precincts to which this control applies.

Solar Energy System Controls

Note: VC226 gazetted on 4 November 2022 made changes to all local planning schemes by amending all schedules to Clause 43.01 (Heritage Overlay) to include the ability to provide exemptions from permit requirements for visible solar energy systems in Clause 43.01. In making this change, the permit requirement was 'turned on' for all existing places within the Heritage Overlay. In reviewing the specific heritage places it is considered appropriate that this permit requirement remains 'turned on' for all places proposed for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.

2.8 Curtilage

Planning Practice Note 1 provides the following direction on applying appropriate curtilage:

The Heritage Overlay applies to both the listed heritage item and its associated land. It is usually important to include land surrounding a building, structure, tree or feature of importance to ensure that any development, including subdivision, does not adversely affect the setting, context or significance of the heritage item. The land surrounding the heritage item is known as a 'curtilage' and will be shown as a polygon on the Heritage Overlay map. In many cases, particularly in urban areas and townships, the extent of the curtilage will be the whole of the property (for example, a suburban dwelling and its allotment).

However, there will be occasions where the curtilage and the Heritage Overlay polygon should be reduced in size as the land is of no significance. Reducing the curtilage and the polygon will have the potential benefit of lessening the number of planning permits that are required with

advantages to both the landowner and the responsible authority. Examples of situations where a reduction in the curtilage and polygon may be appropriate include:

- *A homestead on a large farm or pastoral property where it is only the house and/or outbuildings that is important. In most cases with large rural properties, the inclusion of large areas of surrounding farmland is unlikely to have any positive heritage benefits or outcomes.*
- *A significant tree on an otherwise unimportant property.*
- *A horse trough, fountain or monument in a road reservation.*
- *A grandstand or shelter in a large but otherwise unimportant public park.*

Suggested steps in establishing a curtilage and polygon include:

1. *Review the heritage study documentation and ask the question ‘What is significant?’. The polygon should capture those elements of the place that are significant. If there are multiple elements that are widely dispersed on the property, one option may be to have multiple polygons which share the same Heritage Overlay number.*
2. *In addition to capturing the elements that are significant, it is almost always necessary to include a curtilage (see definition above) to:*
 - *retain the setting or context of the significant building, structure, tree or feature*
 - *regulate development (including subdivision) in proximity to the significant building, tree or feature.*
 - *Where possible, uncomplicated and easily recognised boundaries (such as a fence line) leave little room for potential dispute in terms of the land affected by any future Overlay.*
 - *Use aerial photos where they exist to assist in identifying a reduced curtilage.*
 - *Where access is possible, ‘ground truthing’ may be of assistance.*

2.9 History

In reviewing the significance of places and precincts the information in the 2016 Study was relied upon. No additional historical research was undertaken.

3.0 REPORT

This report provides an overview of the methodology used and records the decisions, findings and statutory recommendations made. The revised citations form an attachment to this report (Appendices E, F, G, and H). A summary of all places and precincts assessed in the 2021 review are listed in Appendix B.

Recommendations for the application of the Heritage Overlay have been made in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning Practice Note 1.

This report has been prepared in a manner that is suitable for inclusion as a Background document in the Moorabool Planning Scheme.

4.0 REVIEW AND REASSESSMENT

4.1 Precinct Review

A preliminary review of the precincts recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay by the 2016 Study found that:

- The contextual and place histories and physical descriptions for each precinct citation was generally satisfactory.
- Statements of Significance were not consistent with the guidance provided by Planning Practice Note 1.
- Criterion G and H were used out of context of the current best practice guidance on applying the HERCON Criteria.
- The precinct citations used the grading 'Local' rather than 'Significant'. The term 'Conservation desirable' was used in some precincts to indicate that the place had values which related to the precinct but had been noticeably altered, and their conservation was desirable. For most of these places, a grading of 'Contributory' has been applied.
- The address details for many places within precincts were incorrect and required amending.
- The precinct boundary maps were generally correct and required only minor modifications to ensure that all places identified in the citation were included within the precinct boundaries.
- None of the precinct maps included gradings for each place (Significant, Contributory or Local significance).
- Most precincts required additional information and analysis to the Comparative Analysis section.
- None of the precinct citations were entered into HERMES.

The specific findings for each precinct are discussed below:

4.1.1 Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct Ballan

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct is affected by one existing HO:

- HO18 Ballan Railway Station, 81-85 Atkinson Street, Ballan

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises the Ballan Railway Station (HO18) and the principal route through Fiskin Street to what is now the main commercial centre. It is primarily residential, although it includes the Railway Station and a small number of other civic and commercial places from the mid nineteenth century through to the current day.

The 2016 Study recommended that the existing HO18 (currently applied to the Ballan Railway Station) should be removed and the site integrated into the broader precinct, although the external paint controls should continue to apply to that site.

A full citation was prepared for the Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct in the 2016 Study, which includes a comprehensive history and description, a statement of significance, a map showing the precinct boundary proposed and brief comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified:

- 1 Local place (Local Significance)
- 20 Contributory places
- 8 Non-Contributory places

The 2016 Study recommended that the following additional controls be applied to the Fisken Street Heritage Precinct:

- Tree controls (whole precinct)
- External Paint Controls (81-85 Atkinson Street [Railway Station] and 27 Fisken Street [Fire Station])
- Prohibited uses may be permitted (22a and 27 Fisken Street and 81 Atkinson Street only)

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- The Locally Significant place (Railway Station) is extant, although it has experienced substantial new development around it since the 2016 Study. The key buildings and features, condition and integrity appear to remain unchanged. The heritage status is therefore unchanged. It is identified as Significant to the precinct.
- 3 of the Contributory places within the precinct identified in the 2016 Study have been demolished, and new Non-Contributory buildings constructed on these lots (22 & 22a Fisken Street and 70 Steiglitz Street). The remainder of the Contributory places remain generally intact and are extant.
- 1 Contributory place which was not listed in the 2016 Study documentation for the precinct, but was within the identified precinct boundaries is added to the documentation and mapping:
 - Dwelling – 1 Fisken Street
- There are a further 3 Non-Contributory places as a result of redevelopment (see above - 22 & 22a Fisken Street and 70 Steiglitz Street).
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is appropriate and requires only minor modifications to the precinct boundaries (such as the inclusion of parts of the public realm).
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The use of a permit exemptions document is recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is considered appropriate.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance, although its intactness is slightly reduced (through demolition) from the 2016 Study.
- The existing individual Heritage Overlay HO18 forms part of the precinct and should have the same Heritage Overlay controls as the remainder of the precinct. The existing External Paint Control applied to HO18 is not considered necessary as the building has largely unpainted surfaces, and the application of the external control would replicate the header clause of 43.01 which states that a permit is required to paint any unpainted surface.
- The precinct gradings are:
 - 1 Significant place
 - 17 Contributory places
 - 12 Non-Contributory places
- The additional controls proposed in the 2016 Study are partially supported:
 - Tree controls are recommended to be applied only to the places identified which have trees which make a contribution to the precinct, namely: Street Trees (Fisken Street), Aleppo Pine in McLean Reserve, Theresa Graham memorial Pin Oak outside 25 Fisken Street.
 - External paint controls proposed for 81-85 Atkinson Street and 27-29 Fisken Street are not supported, as both buildings are predominantly unpainted masonry surfaces as this would duplicate a header clause of 43.01.

- Prohibited Uses permitted as proposed for 81-85 Atkinson Street and 27-29 Fiskin Street are not supported as the existing zoning for these two places (PUZ4 and C1Z respectively) offered either no prohibited uses (PUZ4) or inappropriate prohibited uses (C1Z). The use of an Incorporated Document to set out permit exemptions for minor works is appropriate given the physical fabric and layout of the heritage precinct.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2021 revised precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct.
- Minor revisions to the Description undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correcting street numbering where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.
- Delete HO18 as it will form part of the Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct and have no specific additional controls.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for the Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Tree controls specified to apply to: Street Trees (Fiskin Street), Aleppo Pine in McLean Reserve, Theresa Graham memorial Pin Oak (outside 25 Fiskin Street).
- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021.
- Incorporated Document: Fiskin Street Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

4.1.2 Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct Ballan

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct has no existing HO.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises a small group of 4 residential dwellings located in Steiglitz Street which represent the only nineteenth century speculative development of detached timber residences in Ballan.

A full citation has been prepared for the Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified;

- 3 Contributory places
- 1 'Conservation Desirable' place

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- All 3 of the Contributory places are extant and intact.

- The 1 place listed as 'Conservation desirable' has sufficient integrity and intactness to be considered Contributory based on the consideration at Section 1.1 of this report. This is based on its intact form and scale, which is still clearly late Victorian, although the roof and walls have been re-clad, which is reversible.
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is appropriate.
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The use of an Incorporated Document to set out permit exemptions for minor works is appropriate given the physical fabric and layout of the heritage precinct.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance/
- The precinct gradings are:
 - 4 Contributory places.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2021 revised precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has been revised.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for the Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021.
- Incorporated Document: Steiglitz Street Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

4.1.3 Golden Point Road Heritage Precinct

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Golden Point Road Heritage Precinct has no existing HO.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises 3 nineteenth century dwellings which are bounded by a former water race (now filled in) easement. The precinct was identified as important for its associations with the 1860s goldmining period.

A full citation was prepared in the 2016 Study for the Golden Point Road Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation identified:

- 3 Contributory places
- 1 'Conservation Desirable' place

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

A precinct boundary map was prepared which included the full title for each of the dwellings at 13, 15 and 25 Golden Point Road as well as the water race easement.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- One place (13 Golden Point Road) has experienced significant alterations and additions since the 2016 Study. The physical fabric of the place is so altered that it was not identifiable as a Victorian dwelling and makes no contribution to the identified values of the Golden Point Road Precinct.
- Fieldwork confirms that the one place listed as 'Conservation Desirable' (25 Golden Point Road) lacks sufficient intactness to meet the threshold of Contributory significance.
- One of the Contributory places (15 Golden Point Road) has experienced minor alterations to the verandah, but was otherwise relatively intact, and comparable to other similar examples of Victorian cottages identified as being of local significance within the locality.
- The water race which runs along the rear of the 3 buildings has been filled in and is now an archaeological site which could be protected through an alternate mechanism (Heritage Inventory). However, its former use is closely associated with the identified values and themes of the surviving intact building at 15 Golden Point Road.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct as proposed in the 2016 Study does not have sufficient merit or integrity to meet the threshold for local significance.
- The precinct is not recommended for inclusion within the Heritage Overlay.
- The dwelling at 15 Golden Point Road has sufficient integrity and intactness to meet the threshold for local significance.
- A new individual place citation is to be prepared to support the inclusion of the dwelling at 15 Golden Point Road and the water race in the Heritage Overlay.

Amendment C85 recommendations

The water race and dwelling at 15 Golden Point Road is to be added to the Heritage Overlay schedule as an individual place, and the HO Map curtilage applied to the whole of the title of 15 Golden Point Road as well as the water race which runs through 15 Golden Point Road title.

4.1.4 Martin Street Heritage Precinct Blackwood

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Martin Heritage Precinct has no existing HO.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises the historical core of the commercial centre of nineteenth century Blackwood, on both sides of Martin Street.

A full citation was prepared in the 2016 Study for the Martin Street Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identifies:

- 3 Local places (Significant)
- 5 Contributory places
- 4 Non-Contributory places

The 2016 Study recommended that the following additional controls be applied to the Martin Street Heritage Precinct:

- Tree controls (Algerian Oak north of Blackwood Hotel, Martin Street).
- Prohibited uses may be permitted (1 Golden Point Road [Hotel], 15 Martin Street [former National Bank of Australasia], 21 Martin Street [The Blackwood Merchant and Blackwood Antique Merchant stores] and 25 Martin Street [former Post and Telegraph office])

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- The 3 Significant places are extant and appear to remain unchanged from the 2016 study. The heritage status is therefore unchanged.
- 1 Contributory place (21 Martin Street) within the precinct has had substantial alterations to the cladding of the roof and walls but retains sufficient integrity in its built form to retain a Contributory grading.
- 21 Martin Street (which previously comprised two titles) has been subdivided into 21 Martin Street and 23 Martin Street (the current Blackwood General Store).
- One place identified as Non-Contributory in the 2016 Study 'list of places' (30 Martin Street) was not included in the 2016 Study citation or boundary map. The site was inspected and found to not warrant extension of the precinct boundary.
- Gradings for the precinct are:
 - 3 Significant places
 - 6 Contributory places
 - 2 Non-Contributory places
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is largely appropriate and requires only minor modifications (such as some modification at the intersection of Martin Street and Byres Road to accommodate minor changes to the adjacent proposed Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct curtilage, and the inclusion of the entirety of the property at 26-28 Martin Street).
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The place names used within the precinct are refer to previous business names rather than the more general terminology such as 'store'.
- The use of a permit exemptions document as recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is appropriate.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance.
- The additional controls proposed in the 2016 Study are partially supported.
- Tree controls applied to the substantial Algerian Oak located at Allot. 2 Sec. C, PARISH OF BLACKWOOD, Martin Street, are supported.
- The Prohibited uses may be permitted additional control as proposed is not supported as the zoning for these places (TZ) has a limited and inappropriate range of prohibited uses for their location.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2021 revised precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.

- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct.
- Minor revisions to the Description undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correction of street numbering or place address details and names where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Martin Street Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for Martin Street Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Tree controls specified to apply Algerian Oak, at Allot, 2 Sec. C, PARISH OF BLACKWOOD, Martin Street.
- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021.
- Incorporated Document: Martin Street Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

4.1.5 Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct Blackwood

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct is affected by one existing HO:

- HO28 former All Saints Anglican Church and Parsonage, 54 & 60 Byres Road, Blackwood.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises an elevated area of Blackwood where the majority of religious buildings and a number of early residences are located. It also includes former commercial premises and public land.

The 2016 Study recommended that the existing HO28 should be removed and the site integrated into the broader precinct. HO28 currently has external paint controls and tree controls activated through the Schedule.

A full citation was prepared in the 2016 Study for the Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified:

- 2 Local places (Significant)
- 6 Contributory places
- 3 Non-Contributory places
- 3 'Conservation desirable' places

The 2016 Study recommended that the following additional controls be applied to the Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct:

- Tree controls (Bunya Bunya Pines at 10 Prayer Hill Lane, Exotic trees at 54 and 60 Byres Road and trees at 28 Golden Point Road)
- Prohibited uses may be permitted (Church buildings and Mechanic's Institute)

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- The two Significant places are extant.
- One Significant place - former All Saints Anglican Church at 60 Byres Road has recently been sold into private ownership and is being converted to a residence. However, the key external features, condition and integrity and therefore heritage status is unchanged.
- One place identified as being Contributory by the 2016 Study (54 Byres Road) is re-assessed as 'Significant'. 54 Byres Road is an 1860s timber dwelling which was constructed as the Parsonage for the adjacent All Saints Anglican Church until the mid-twentieth century. It is currently part of HO28, and the two sites are considered equally significant.
- The addresses of a number of the Contributory places identified have been corrected based on current VicPlan address. One place identified as 'Conservation Desirable' (former Mechanics Institute) is re-assessed as 'Contributory' as although it has been noticeably altered, it is considered to contribute to the precinct for its historical and social value and long associations with community life from 1869 to the present day.
- One additional place (public amenities at 74 Byres Road) is included as 'Non-Contributory' to the precinct. Although previously mapped it was not listed in the citation.
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is appropriate and required only minor modifications (such as the inclusion of parts of the public realm and minor modifications where it interacts with adjacent heritage precincts, and amending boundary to match property boundaries).
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The use of a permit exemptions document as recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is considered appropriate.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct generally as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance.
- The gradings are as follows:
 - 4 Significant places
 - 8 Contributory places
 - 6 Non-Contributory places
- The two places currently covered by the curtilage of HO28 (All Saints Anglican Church [former] at 60 Byres Road and the Anglican Parsonage [former] at 54 Byres Road) are both considered Significant to the precinct.
- The additional controls proposed in the 2016 Study are partially supported.
- Tree controls are recommended to be applied only to the places identified which have trees which make a contribution to the precinct, namely: Bunya Bunya Pines (*Araucaria bidwillii*) x 2 at 10 Prayer Hill Lane & exotic trees at 28 Golden Point Road.
- The inclusion of exotic trees at 54 and 60 Byres Road is not supported as a site inspection demonstrated that there were no trees which were of Contributory value to the precinct or the place located on this land.
- The application of the additional control to allow uses normally prohibited by the zone 'Prohibited uses may be permitted' proposed by the 2016 Study for 'Church buildings and Mechanics Institute' is not supported by the 2021 Review as the existing zoning for these places (TZ) has a limited range of prohibited uses, most of which are inappropriate for the location and unlikely to be supported by Council.
- The recommendation to remove paint controls from 54 & 60 Byres Road is supported as neither has an important or original external finish which warrants the application of the External Paint Controls.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the new precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct.
- Minor revisions to the Description undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correction of street numbering or place address details and names (such as inserting 'former') where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.
- Delete HO28 as it will form part of the Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct and have no specific additional controls.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Tree controls specified to apply to: Bunya Bunya Trees x2, 10 Prayer Hill Lane & exotic trees, 28 Golden Point Road.
- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021.
- Incorporated Document: Prayer Hill Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

4.1.6 Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct, Blackwood

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct has no existing Heritage Overlay places.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises a small section of both sides of Simmons Reef Road, from the intersection with Greendale-Trentham Road stretching west. The precinct comprises a range of residential and former commercial premises from the mid to late nineteenth century and street tree plantings.

A full citation was prepared in the 2016 Study for the Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified:

- 10 Contributory places

The 2016 Study recommended that the following additional controls be applied to the Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct:

- Tree controls (Pin Oak and American Oak or Golden Elm Street Trees)
- Prohibited uses may be permitted (1071 & 1077 Greendale-Trentham Road)

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- All 10 Contributory places are extant.
- The mature Pin Oak and Golden Elm street trees on Simmons Reef Road are added as a Contributory element, bringing the total number of Contributory places to 11.
- The street trees which contribute to the heritage precinct are confirmed as the mature specimens of Pin Oak (*Quercus palustris*) and Golden Elm (*Ulmus glabra*). The immature and semi mature plantings of Liquidambar and Chinese Elm are considered Non-Contributory.
- The immature Liquidambar and Chinese Elm street trees are added as a Non-Contributory element of the precinct.
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is appropriate and requires only minor modifications to match title boundaries and inclusion of parts of the public realm.
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The use of a permit exemptions document as recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is considered appropriate.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct generally as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance.
- There are 11 Contributory places within the precinct.
- The additional controls proposed in the 2016 Study are partially supported.
- Tree controls are recommended to be applied only to the mature street trees in Simmons Reef Road, namely the specimens of Pin Oak and Golden Elm. Other species of street tree (which have been recently planted) are not considered to contribute.
- The application of the additional control to allow uses normally prohibited by the zone 'Prohibited uses may be permitted' proposed by the 2016 Study for 1071 & 1077 Greendale-Trentham Road is not supported by the 2021 Review as the existing zoning for these places (TZ) has a limited range of prohibited uses, none of which are considered appropriate for the location or likely to be supported by Council.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2016 revised precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct.
- Minor revisions to the Description undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correction of street numbering or place address details and names (such as inserting 'former') where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Tree controls specified to apply to: Street trees – Pin Oak and Golden Elms, Simmons Reef Road.

- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021
- Incorporated Document: Simmons Reef Road Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

4.1.7 Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct Blackwood

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct has no existing Heritage Overlay places.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises an area of residential development north east of the Martin Street commercial area of Blackwood, which has a number of vernacular log cabins constructed on separate titles. Although there are now a range of more modern dwellings throughout the area, the concentration of this building type and its associated themes are unique within the municipality.

A full citation was prepared in the 2016 Study for the Whalebone Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified:

- 5 Contributory places
- 3 Non-Contributory places

The 2016 Study did not recommend that any additional controls be applied to the Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct. However, an Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- The 5 places identified as Contributory in the 2016 Study are extant. The 2021 Review found however that there were 7 Contributory places for the following reasons:
 - The 2 log huts at 22 Whalebone Road listed as Contributory in the 2016 Study have been found to be log huts located on separate titles. The first is located at 22 Whalebone Road, the second is located at 10 Richards Road and is been added as a separate Contributory element.
 - 1 additional log hut (not previously identified) was located during the precinct ground truthing. This hut is located at 40 Whalebone Road. The hut is added as an additional Contributory element.
- The grading of the 3 Non-Contributory places identified in the 2016 Study was confirmed. These 3 addresses also held the Contributory log huts.
- 2 additional Non-Contributory places were identified at 26-30 Whalebone Road and 32 Whalebone Road to support the extension of the precinct boundary to include 40 Whalebone Road.
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study has been extended to include the following places:
 - 10 Richards Road (Contributory)
 - 26-30 Whalebone Road (Non-Contributory)
 - 32 Whalebone Road (Non-Contributory)
 - 40 Whalebone Road (Contributory)
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.

- The use of a permit exemptions document as recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is not considered appropriate, given the unique arrangement of these log huts, which have had later dwellings built to the side, front or rear, making the standard permit exemptions document inappropriate in this instance. Rather, specific guidelines for the precinct should be developed to assist in decision making or preparation of permit exemptions.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct as proposed in 2016 met the threshold of local significance. However, the proposed extension to include the huts at 40 Whalebone Road and 10 Richards Road is warranted.
- The gradings within the precinct are as follows:
 - 7 Contributory places
 - 2 Non-Contributory places
- The option of including the 7 Contributory places as a serial listing is also considered appropriate but beyond the scope of this study.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2021 Revised precinct citation):

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct, and extending the precinct boundary to include 10 Richards Road and 40 Whalebone Road (both Contributory) and the places between (26-30 and 32 Whalebone Road) as non-contributory.
- Minor revisions to the Description have been undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correction of street numbering where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for the Whalebone Road Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Incorporated Document: Whalebone Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021

4.1.8 Lal Lal Heritage Precinct, Blackwood

Existing Heritage Overlay Status

The proposed Lal Lal Heritage Precinct has one existing Heritage Overlay place, the Lal Lal Railway Station (HO41). HO41 has external paint controls applied.

2016 Study

The precinct identified by the 2016 Study comprises the central core of the Lal Lal Township including a former hotel site, the Railway Station and a number of commercial, civic and residential places, as well as the Avenue of Honour which runs through the town.

A full citation was prepared for the Lal Lal Heritage Precinct, which includes a comprehensive history, description, statement of significance, precinct boundary outline map and comparative analysis. The 2016 Study citation provides a list titled 'Significance of Components' which identified:

- 7 Significant places
- 5 Contributory places

The 2016 Study recommended that the Lal Lal Railway Station (HO48) be included in the Heritage Precinct and the individual HO be removed. The following additional controls were recommended to be applied to the Lal Lal Heritage Precinct:

- External Paint Controls (Railway Station Complex, Water Tower, Lal Lal Falls Hotel and old Lal Lal Falls Hotel)
- Tree controls (Avenue of Honour, Memorial Trees 424 Clarendon-Lal Lal Road)
- Prohibited uses may be permitted (Railway Station Site and Lal Lal Falls Hotel)

An Incorporated Plan to provide specific works which were permit exempt was also proposed for the precinct.

2021 Review

The findings of the 2021 Review for this precinct are as follows:

- All 5 Significant places and 7 Contributory places identified in the 2016 Study are extant.
- One place, the Avenue of Honour along Clarendon-Lal Lal Road is re-graded as Contributory rather than Significant for its low intactness, due to the loss of a number of original trees.
- The Avenue of Honour along Clarendon-Lal Lal Road is comprised of Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress trees. The citation is been amended accordingly.
- The memorial trees located at 424 Clarendon-Lal Lal Road are identified as 2 individual specimens of Monterey Cypress trees. The citation is amended accordingly.
- The address for a number of places within the precinct are incorrect are amended to reflect current VicPlan address.
- The precinct boundary map prepared in the 2016 Study is appropriate and requires only minor modifications to accommodate current title boundaries, exclude some land to the north of Parkers Road where the water tower was previously thought to be located, and reduce the extent on 10 Lal Lal Falls Road and 391 Clarendon- Lal Lal Road.
- A map which shows the grading of each place within the precinct is required.
- The use of a permit exemptions document as recommended for incorporation in the Planning Scheme to exempt minor works is considered appropriate.

On the basis of the citation, ground truthing and extant physical fabric, it is concluded that:

- The precinct, generally as proposed in the 2016 Study meets the threshold for local significance.
- The gradings for the precinct are:
 - 5 Significant places
 - 7 Contributory places
- The additional controls proposed in the 2016 Study are partially supported.
- External paint controls proposed for the Lal Lal Railway Station Complex, Lal Lal Falls Hotel, former Lal Lal Falls Hotel kitchen (which is partially ruinous) and the former Railway Water Tower are not supported as these structures are all largely unpainted masonry (although there are rendered bands on the brick buildings [unpainted]). To apply a paint control to these buildings would be duplicating one of the header Clause at 43.01.

- Tree controls are supported as proposed, and will apply to: Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress trees, Clarendon-Lal Lal Road & Monterey Cypress trees, 424 Clarendon-Lal-Lal Road.
- The application of the additional control to allow uses normally prohibited by the zone 'Prohibited uses may be permitted' proposed by the 2016 Study for the Railway Station site and Lal Lal Falls Hotel site is not supported by the 2021 Review as the existing zoning for these places (PUZ4 and TZ respectively) have either no prohibited uses (PUZ4) or a limited range of prohibited uses, inappropriate for the location and unlikely to be supported by Council.

The following changes have been made to the citation (Appendix E contains a copy of the 2021 revised precinct citation).

- The Statement of Significance has been revised to reflect physical changes and to bring the arrangement into line with Planning Practice Note 1.
- The List of Contributory elements has had minor revisions to correct place names and street addresses.
- A new precinct map has been prepared, showing the gradings for each place within the precinct, and reducing the precinct slightly exclude some land to the north of Parkers Road where the water tower was previously thought to be located, and reduce the extent on 10 Lal Lal Falls Road and 391 Clarendon- Lal Lal Road.
- Minor revisions to the Description have been undertaken to reflect changes as set out above.
- Correction of street numbering where necessary throughout the citation.

Amendment C85 recommendations

It is recommended that the relevant HO Map is amended by:

- Applying the Heritage Overlay to the Lal Lal Road Heritage Precinct as shown in the precinct map in Appendix E.

It is recommended that the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended by adding a new Schedule entry for Lal Lal Heritage Precinct. This entry will include:

- Tree controls specified to apply to: Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress trees, Clarendon-Lal Lal Road & Monterey Cypress trees, 424 Clarendon-Lal-Lal Road.
- Incorporated Plan: Moorabool Shire Council Heritage Precincts and Places Permit Exemptions, May 2021.
- Incorporated Document: Lal Lal Heritage Precinct Statement of Significance, May 2021.

Note: Consent was given for the demolition of the dwelling at 410 Clarendon-Lal Lal Road under s29A of the Building Act 1993 on 8 June 2023. As a result changes have been made to the amendment documents to reflect the demolition of this dwelling. These include;

- Changing the property from 'Contributory' to 'Non-Contributory' in the precinct map
- Editing the Statement of Significance, Citation and Precincts and Places Incorporated Plan Permit Exemptions to reflect this change (both the precinct map and in text)

4.2 Review of Individual Places

The 2018 Review of individual places in the 2016 study included a 'desktop' review of all individual places (i.e., a review based on the information contained in the 2016 Study with no additional research or fieldwork) to determine:

- whether the citation indicated they were likely to meet the threshold for local significance;
- whether there were any weaknesses or inconsistencies in the manner of assessment;
- whether the curtilage mapping appeared to be correct, or needed revision;
- if any places required further site visits to confirm fabric, integrity etc.;
- whether the additional controls proposed by the citations were justified.

The 2021 Review built upon the 2018 Review work to address the issues identified with places and citations to:

- ground truth each site which was visible from the public realm, and;
- to undertake a 'limited field review' to a select number of individual places which included on-site inspections.
- Revise place citations;
- Revise additional controls proposed based on physical fabric, significance or justification.

4.2.1 2018 Desktop Review

A preliminary review of all places recommended by the 2016 Study for individual inclusion in the Heritage Overlay was undertaken in the 2018 Review. The purpose of the preliminary review was to establish the completeness of the citations and whether there was further work required to finalise the content or layout of the citations and curtilage. The review found that:

- Most places had sufficient information included in the history and description and statement of significance.
- Most places located outside of townships required a review of the proposed curtilage against the elements set out in the description and/or statement of significance.
- Very few places had comparative analysis. Where comparative analysis was included it varied in the level of detail provided.
- Most places had images which were dated variously 2009, 2014 and/or 2016.
- No citations had been uploaded in the HERMES database.
- No GIS layer was included in Council's mapping software.
- Most places had the correct street address, but several required minor amendments to ensure correct street addresses were listed. In some cases title descriptions were required in the absence of a street address.
- Some complex places included a list of elements which were of Local Significance (Significant), Contributory or Non-Contributory to the place.
- Citations all used the HERCON Criteria for assessment in the Statement of Significance, but the manner in which the Criteria was referenced was not always consistent (sometimes at the end of a paragraph, sometimes several criteria together and sometimes in the middle of a paragraph).
- Many citations for places which were largely unpainted included a recommendation for External Paint Controls, which would duplicate the header clause of 43.01 which states that a permit is required to externally paint an unpainted surface.
- Tree controls were proposed for a large number of sites, some of which did not warrant tree controls as the trees were of amenity rather than heritage value.
- Prohibited use allowed controls were proposed for a number of buildings where the prohibited uses allowed by the zone were considered inappropriate for the location.

- Some places were found to have had building permits, or demolition permits issued since the 2016 study. For these places, a windscreen survey was undertaken to check the building integrity or whether it had been demolished.
- Many citations stated that the property had not been physically visited in Stage 1 or Stage 2 of the study, and that further work was required to complete the citation in the form of a site inspection.
- The citations varied in the level of detail and information contained in the description and statement of significance.
- The statements of significance varied in approach, layout and application of criteria. The Statements of Significance were prepared in a manner which was consistent with the previous 2012 Planning Practice Note No. 1 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (which were the current at the time of the 2016 study) but did not comply with the most recent 2018 Planning Practice Note No. 1 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (Planning Practice Note 1).
- Many places had ambiguous statements or reference to further work which needed to be done to undertake an assessment of significance (for instance, 'this may be the ...' or '...further research is required...').
- Additional Scheduled controls were proposed for a number of individual places but the additional control was not always clearly justified in the Statement of Significance.
- An Incorporated Plan setting out permit exemptions proposed was recommended for most individual places. The permit exemptions were not always consistent, and were recommended for application to a range of residential, commercial, civic and religious heritage places.
- The curtilage for all individual places was included in the citation, but there were often questions as to whether the curtilage picked up all Contributory elements of the place, or whether it should be amended.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2018 REVIEW

On the basis of the above findings, the 2018 Review recommended that further work was required to bring the 2016 Study forward for implementation through a Planning Scheme Amendment. The further work recommended by the 2018 review included:

- Review of all individual place citations, with a particular focus to ensure that the Statement of Significance, proposed HO curtilage and additional controls were revised, checked and amended as necessary.
- Comparative Analysis be prepared or amended as necessary for all individual places.
- An Incorporated Plan to guide permit exemptions be prepared (as recommended by the 2016 Study). Consideration as to which places this is appropriate for also to be undertaken.
- Review of the physical fabric of all individual places to ensure no major changes had occurred since the 2016 Study was completed. This was to be undertaken from the public realm where possible.
- Site Inspection of the 21 places unable to be visited in Stage 1 or Stage 2 of the 2016 Study should be sought to confirm fabric, integrity, curtilage etc.

4.2.2 2021 Review

On the basis of the recommendations of the 2018 Review, Council commenced the 2021 Review, which undertook further work to determine which places should be included in Amendment C85, was then undertaken. The first task undertook more desktop work to consider the following matters:

- Whether the place has sufficient documentation.
- Is the place and/or elements still extant? Has any fabric been demolished or removed?
- Whether the place meets the threshold for local significance.
- What further work is required to justify the inclusion of the place in the Heritage Overlay?
- Is another control more appropriate?

Citation review

Insufficient documentation

The 2021 Review undertook thorough re-examination of the 2016 Study citations as per the recommendations of the 2018 Review. This was aimed to test the strength of the citations and statements of significance and ultimately, to determine whether sufficient documentation had been provided to meet the threshold of local significance.

It was found that while all places had sufficient documentation to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay, the manner in which this was set out was not always compliant with the Planning Practice Note 1, or missed minor elements (such as comparative analysis). For those places which had not been visited, the manner in which the citation had been prepared was ambiguous and would not be able to stand the rigour of a panel hearing and was considered insufficient to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay, although these included some of the most significant places within the study area.

In most cases, the existing Statement of Significance was re-written in accordance with the current Planning Practice Note 1. The new Statement of Significance relied heavily on the material from the 2016 citation. The Comparative Analysis section of almost all citations required revision or completion.

Demolition and or removal

In the course of preparing the 2018 Review, it was noted that one individual heritage place, Dwelling at 37 Main Street Gordon had been demolished. This place has been withdrawn from Amendment C85.

Does not meet the threshold

Places which were noted to have been altered through building permit review in the 2018 Review were inspected along with other individually significant places to determine what level of integrity the buildings had. In addition to a visual inspection of the place, the citations were re-considered to determine if other values were present which would override the lack of integrity and/or intactness (such as a particularly early date, or a singular representative example, or a particularly strong association with a certain criterion). In the 2021 Review, it was confirmed that a very small number of places had been altered so substantially (or demolished) that they no longer met the threshold of local significance. A list of these places is included in Appendix A (Table A.2.1).

For instance, in the case of 14 Victoria Street Blackwood, although the cottage is very early, and the additions are clearly new work, the fabric of the existing building is substantially altered, and the building integrity has been altered (when compared to other example of a similar type and period within the locality) to the point where it lacks sufficient integrity to demonstrate the historical and or aesthetic values present in other buildings. Other places, including 55 Boundary Road Gordon 'Summerhill' and 53-55 Inglis Street Ballan were found to have been altered and now had insufficient intactness to allow them to meet the threshold of local significance.

An alternate control is more appropriate

Consideration was made as to whether or not the Heritage Overlay was the most appropriate tool to conserve the values and fabric of each place recommended for an individual HO. In particular, this applied to places with primarily natural values, such as reserves, plantings or landscapes which did not exhibit a built heritage component or heritage fabric in the citation.

There is one place, Caledonian Park in Ballan where another control may be more appropriate. This place is a large public open space, which was established as a public park in the nineteenth century, and contains a range of trees, mainly dating from the mid twentieth century, with some earlier examples. There is not sufficient built fabric to consider the Heritage Overlay to be the most appropriate tool to manage the values of the parkland, which is largely identified as being related to the early historical establishment of the park, its plantings and the social significance of the place's

use. Another control, such as the Significant Landscape Overlay could be considered to protect the values of the place.

Summary of findings

In total, there were 7 places proposed as Individually Significant in the 2016 Study which were recommended not to be included in the Heritage Overlay by the 2021 Review. Table A.2.1 in Appendix A provides a list of these individual places.

Citation updates

The 2021 Review has prepared a full revised set of citations for places confirmed to be of local significance, including mapping and other elements as discussed below. The revised individual citations are included in Appendix F, G and H.

Some property owners provided new information or provided corrections to the citation prepared as part of the 2016 study. Where new information came to light in the course of the fieldwork, relevant fields of the citation were updated (primarily the description).

A small number of places had additional significant elements on the property which were not mentioned in the 2016 Study description or statement of significance. Where the additional elements were within the general area of the rest of the significant fabric (e.g., significant trees adjacent to the homestead complex) the citation description and statement of significance has been updated, and the curtilage includes these elements.

The statements of significance were updated into the current format recommended by Planning Practice Note 1 (i.e., 'What', 'How', 'Why') to ensure all significant elements of the place are clearly articulated in the 'What is Significant?', and to clearly state why and how the relevant criteria are met or demonstrated.

Fieldwork

In order to ensure that all places to be included were extant and that the places still met the threshold for local significance, a site inspection of all individual places able to be viewed from the public realm was undertaken. There were 22 individual places which could not be adequately assessed from the public realm (see Appendix C for a full list). The owner of each of these properties was asked to allow Council officers to undertake an onsite inspection. 13 owners granted access to undertake a site visit, and 8 owners did not respond. Only one place, 'The Pines' 52 Sullivans Road, Millbrook refused access.

Site visits were undertaken by Annabel Neylon accompanied by a Council Officer. Detailed notes and photographs were taken to assist with any required revisions to the citation.

For the small number of places where site visits were not possible and the place could not readily be seen from the public realm, the citation was reviewed to ensure it contained sufficient documentation and photographs to be relied upon to provide the information for assessment.

Mapping of individual places

The 2016 Study prepared curtilage mapping for all individual places. These maps were included in the place citation as a red line superimposed on either a Base Map or Aerial Map obtained from the State Government Land Services website (no longer active) indicating the proposed curtilage for the Heritage Overlay.

One of the tasks undertaken in the 2021 Review was to cross check the place citation addresses with aerial images (Nearmap), VicPlan, Google Street view (where possible) and the current GIS layer to confirm place addresses and correct legal descriptions of land. The location was then confirmed by site visit where the place was visible from the public realm, by cross-checking against aerial images and planning maps. A number of addresses were found to be incorrect or inconsistent, although many were accurately mapped.

Once places were accurately located, Council's GIS layers were used to map curtilage, using an aerial base layer. The curtilage prepared was based on the information in the 2016 citation (particularly the statement of significance and the description), the fieldwork undertaken in the 2021 and as far as possible, sought to include all elements mentioned in the citation as well as allowing for an appropriate setting and context of the place to be retained.

5.0 AMENDMENT C85 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the following be undertaken as part of the Amendment C85:

5.1 Schedule to the Heritage Overlay

Amend the existing Schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01s to:

- Create new schedule entries for the 7 new heritage precincts and 106 new individual heritage places of local significance listed in Appendix A (Table A.1.1 & A.1.2).
- Apply additional scheduled controls and Incorporated Documents for each of the 7 heritage precincts and 106 individual heritage places as shown in the draft Schedule to the Heritage Overlay in Appendix A (Table A.6).
- Delete the Schedule entries for the places which are currently included as individual heritage places and will be integrated into the new precincts listed in Appendix A (Table A.1.3)
- Introduce Application Requirements as shown in Appendix A (Table A.6)

5.2 Planning Scheme Maps

Amend the existing Planning Scheme Maps for Heritage Overlay (HO maps) to:

- Add the Heritage Overlay curtilage for each of the 7 precincts and 106 individual places as shown in the citations included in Appendix E, F, G and H.
- Remove the existing Heritage Overlay curtilage for 3 places listed in Appendix A (Table A.1.3) which will be incorporated into new precincts.

5.3 Local Planning Policy Framework

No changes to the Local Planning Policy Framework are recommended as part of this review. It is noted that Planning Policy Framework translation of the Moorabool Planning Scheme is currently being undertaken, and that Council is also preparing a new Heritage Strategy. It is considered appropriate that any changes to local heritage policy be undertaken in conjunction with, and as a result of these two strategic projects.

5.4 Operational Provisions

Amend Clause 72.04 'Schedule to the Documents Incorporated in this Planning Scheme' to add:

- A Statement of Significance for each of the 7 heritage precincts and 107 individual heritage places listed in Appendix A (Tables A.1.1 & A.1.2)
- 'Moorabool Shire Heritage Precincts and Places Incorporated Plan Permit Exemptions, May 2021'.

Amend Clause 72.08 'Background Documents' to add the following documents:

- West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 2A review, May 2021 (Plan Heritage, 2021).

6.0 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Undertake further work as recommended by the 2016 Study to complete the study, specifically:

- Undertake additional assessments of all places which were identified in the West Moorabool Heritage Study Stage 1 but were not assessed in the 2016 Study.
- Nominate those places recommended by the 2021 Review as being of suitable for inclusion on the Victorian Heritage Register. A list of these places is included at Appendix C (Table C.3).
- Upload citations for the heritage precincts and individual heritage place citations recommended for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay into the HERMES database.
- Prepare a set of illustrated Heritage Guidelines to provide guidance on the management, conservation and development of heritage places and precincts across the municipality. The Guidelines are to include information sheets which give practical advice on specific local heritage matters.
- Assess whether another control might be more appropriate for Caledonian Park (such as SLO).

In addition, this Review recommends that the following further work should also be undertaken:

- Undertake to prepare a Thematic Environmental History for the whole municipality, incorporating the material in Volume 2 of the 2016 Study.
- Undertake further strategic review of heritage gaps across the municipality. This includes the identification of:
 - Places already included in the Heritage Overlay with insufficient documentation to understand significance and guide development;
 - Places which have already been identified in previous heritage studies or reviews but have not been assessed;
 - Places which are located in geographical areas which are not well represented in the Heritage Overlay;
 - Places which represent important themes across the municipality which are not well represented in the Heritage Overlay.
- Undertake to revise the existing Moorabool Heritage Strategy 2016-2020 for a further period.

7.0 REFERENCES

7.1 Local Heritage Studies

Jacobs, Wendy & Rowe, David, West Moorabool Heritage Study 2A – Volumes 1-5 prepared for Moorabool Shire Council, 2016.

7.2 Other References

Assessing the cultural heritage significance of places and objects for possible state heritage listing: The Victoria Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines, Heritage Victoria 4 April 2019.

Heritage Issues: Summaries from recent Panel Reports, Planning Panels Victoria, 2015 & 2018.

Melbourne Planning Scheme, Amendment C198 Panel Report, July 2014, Lucinda Peterson, Chair.

Melbourne Planning Scheme, Amendment C207 Panel Report, January 2014, Jennifer Moles, Chair.

Boroondara Planning Scheme, Amendment C177 Panel Report, July 2016, Cathie McRobert, Chair

Review of Heritage Provisions in Planning Schemes: Advisory Committee Report. The way forward for heritage, August 2007.

Using the Criteria: a methodology, Queensland Heritage Council, 2006

Victoria Planning Provisions Practice Note: Applying the Heritage Overlay (August 2018)