Planning and Environment Act 1987

Panel Report

Macedon Ranges Planning Scheme Amendment C118
Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study

18 October 2018
Planning and Environment Act 1987
Panel Report pursuant to section 25 of the Act
Macedon Ranges Planning Scheme Amendment C118
Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study
18 October 2018

Con Tsotsoros, Chair
# Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The Amendment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Issues dealt with in this Report</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning context</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Planning policy framework</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Heritage Overlay provisions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Ministerial Directions and Practice Notes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Relevant studies and amendment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategic justification</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Policy support</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2017 Heritage Study approach</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General issues</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Heritage Overlay mapping</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>MRRA requested changes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Other heritage classifications</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Property owner assistance</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Property value and insurance premium</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heritage places</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne (HO280)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>59 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO281)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>64 Aitken Street, Gisborne (HO282)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>42 Fisher Street, Gisborne (HO284)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>46 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO286)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>60 Prince Street, Gisborne (HO298)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>New Gisborne Avenue of Honour (HO304)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5 Bowen Street, Kyneton (HO305)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton (HO313)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drafting matters</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The issue</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A  Document list

Appendix B  Panel recommended heritage citations
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exhibited heritage places and submissions received</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2017 Study – Part One places removed or added</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2017 Study – Part Two places removed or added</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRRA response to specific heritage places</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MRRA requested changes to heritage places</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Abbreviations


2017 Heritage Study: Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study 2017, Ivar Nelson, December 2017, as adopted by Council

the Act: Planning and Environment Act 1987

DELWP: Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning

HERCON: National Heritage Convention
Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Amendment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Panel process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Panel</th>
<th>Con Tsotsoros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions Hearing</strong></td>
<td>Gisborne, 20 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel Hearing</strong></td>
<td>Gisborne, 18 and 19 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site inspections</strong></td>
<td>Unaccompanied, 20 August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Appearances**     | - Macedon Ranges Shire Council represented by Philip Schier who called expert evidence on heritage from Ivar Nelsen  
                      - 2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne property owner represented by Chris Banon of Banon Consultants Planning and Engineering  
                      - 42 Fisher Street, Gisborne property owner  
                      - Friends of Daly Nature Reserve represented by Amanda Gauci and John Phair  
                      - Helen Kalajdzic  
                      - 46 Howey Street, Gisborne, property owners  
                      - 59 Howey Street, Gisborne property owner  
                      - Macedon Ranges Residents’ Association represented by Christine Pruneau  
                      - 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton property owner represented by Andrea Tomkinson |
| **Citation**        | Macedon Ranges PSA 118 [2018] PPV |
| **Date of this Report** | 18 October 2018 |
Executive summary

(i) Summary

The Panel respectfully acknowledges the traditional land and waters of the Dja Dja Wurrung, Taungurung and Wurundjeri people in the broader Macedon Ranges region.

Macedon Ranges Shire’s high elevation and temperate climate provides it with scenic landscapes, natural features and extensive woodlands. The Shire continues to exhibit some of Victoria’s earliest European settlements, including intact heritage towns, pastoral farms, and historic mansions and gardens.

Historic towns such as Gisborne and Kyneton were established on historic transport and supply corridors between Melbourne and central and northern Victoria. These corridors were strengthened during the gold rush between 1850 and the 1860s. There have been previous heritage studies which have identify many heritage places worthy of further investigation. The Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study 2017, considered and built upon, places identified in previous heritage studies.

Macedon Ranges Planning Scheme Amendment C118 (the Amendment) seeks to implement the Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study 2017 recommendations by applying the Heritage Overlay to the 38 places in Gisborne, New Gisborne and Kyneton. The Amendment was exhibited from 22 March to 2 May 2018 and received 12 submissions.

Key issues raised in submissions included the heritage study approach such as site selection, accuracy and consistency with a previous heritage study. General issues included how the Heritage Overlay was mapped to farming homesteads, property owner assistance, property value, insurance premiums and land ownership. Issues specific to individual heritage places included whether there was sufficient local heritage significance to apply the Heritage Overlay, whether additional Heritage Overlay Schedule controls should be applied, and whether the heritage citation accurately reflected the place.

Planning context and strategic justification

The Panel considers that the 2017 Heritage Study has applied an appropriate methodology for assessing, and making recommendations for, each heritage place. The site selection, recommendations and heritage citations proposed in the Study do not have to be consistent with those in a previous study. The inconsistency between the two studies does not reflect their quality or accuracy.

The 2017 Heritage Study strategically supports the Amendment and will provide a sound basis for assessing future permit applications.

The Amendment is supported by, and implements, the relevant sections of the State and Local Planning Policy Framework consistent with the relevant Ministerial Directions and Practice Notes and is well founded and strategically justified. The Amendment should proceed subject to addressing the more specific issues raised in submissions.
General issues

The Amendment has mapped the Heritage Overlay in accordance with appropriate principles. Applying a circular-shaped Heritage Overlay polygon is an appropriate response to capturing a homestead on a large farm or pastoral property where only the house, outbuildings, or both are important. The extent of curtilage will vary based on individual context.

The Panel considers that there is insufficient evidence to support many of Mount Macedon Residents’ Association Inc requested changes.

Matters such as sites selected for the 2017 Study, property owner assistance, property value, insurance premiums and land ownership are not relevant to whether a heritage places meets local heritage significance or to the Amendment. Any suggestions to nominate a place for another heritage classification is beyond the scope of the Amendment and needs to be considered through a separate process and assessment.

Heritage places

*Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne (HO280)*

The Amendment appropriately maps the Heritage Overlay to relevant land at 2 Cabbage Tree Lane. Changes to the HO280 Heritage Citation requested by the property owner and supported by Council and Mr Nelsen will provide greater guidance and clarity.

*59 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO281)*

The Heritage Overlay (HO281) is justified and has been appropriately mapped. The building’s internal features are sufficiently significant to justify applying the internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule. The HO281 Heritage Citation should be revised to correct a reference, add history information, revise a source comment, replace discussion about the Weeping Chinese Cypress and delete the carport guideline.

*64 Aitken Street, Gisborne (HO282)*

The Heritage Overlay Schedule internal alteration control for HO282 should only progress if the HO282 Heritage Citation is changed to explain what is significant about the interior and why it is important, and the property owner has been notified of the change. The Heritage Overlay Schedule tree controls are not justified.

*42 Fisher Street, Gisborne (HO284)*

The 284 Heritage Citation should be changed to reflect the relevant Heritage Overlay Schedule tree control. Council is best placed to consider whether the Heritage Overlay should be considered for the property neighbouring 42 Fisher Street through a separate process.

*46 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO286)*

Amending the HO286 Heritage Citation to add history information about the property name, delete guidelines about the entry, new buildings and subdivision, and to add a new built form guideline regarding new built form would better inform any future permit application.
60 Prince Street, Gisborne (HO298)

The Heritage Overlay is justified for 60 Prince Street, Gisborne, however, the HO298 Heritage Citation should be modified to remove any comment that can be interpreted as judgement.

New Gisborne Avenue of Honour (HO304)

The Heritage Overlay should not apply to the Station Street trees because there is insignificant evidence to justify its local heritage significance.

5 Bowen Street, Kyneton (HO305)

The internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule (HO305) should not apply and the Heritage Overlay should not apply beyond 5 Bowen Street, Kyneton. Prohibited land uses should be enabled through the Heritage Overlay Schedule.

101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton (HO313)

The Heritage Overlay and associated fence control for the dry-stone wall are justified for 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton. The HO313 Heritage Citation should be revised to remove any reference to how the building should be used.

Drafting matters

There are several drafting changes which would provide greater clarity, align with intended outcomes, and improve the operation of the proposed provisions. Deleting the author from the Macedon Ranges Pre-contact Pilot Study in Clause 21.08 would make it consistent with other document references in that clause. The Heritage Overlay Schedule (HO285) should be corrected to reflect the intention to not exempt the underground well. Council’s drafting post-exhibition changes to existing property listings in the Heritage Overlay Schedule should be applied because they will improve its clarity and operation. Each heritage citation should be reformatted to align with Planning Practice Note 1 and changes introduced through Amendment VC148.

The AK1 Heritage Citation should be deleted because the heritage fabric was demolished before the Amendment process commenced. The G25 Heritage Citation should be changed to delete obsolete references to Dumbarton and the Gisborne Cemetery.

(ii) Recommendations

Based on the reasons set out in this Report, the Panel recommends that Macedon Ranges Planning Scheme Amendment C118 be adopted as exhibited subject to the following:

1. Amend Clause 21.08 to change the relevant document reference to ‘Macedon Ranges Pre-contact Pilot Study Victoria, 1996’.

2. Amend the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:
   a) specify ‘mature trees’ in the HO284 tree controls
   b) delete HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour)
   c) remove the HO305 internal alteration control by changing ‘yes’ to ‘no’ and deleting ‘timber floor’
   d) enable prohibited uses for HO305 by changing ‘yes’ to ‘no’ in ‘Prohibited uses may be permitted?’
e) change the HO285 ‘Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt’ control from ‘No’ to ‘Yes’
f) make drafting changes which improve its clarity and operation.

3. Amend Clause 72.04 to incorporate 37 statements of significance and 37 heritage design guideline documents.

4. Amend the Heritage Overlay mapping to delete HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour).

5. Amend each heritage citation to:
   a) reformat each statement of significance consistent with the example appended to Planning Practice Note 1
   b) ensure that it includes information and guidance without emotive comments
   c) change the guidelines language, so it is expressed as discretionary advice
   d) transfer the guidelines into a separate document.

6. Amend the following Heritage Citations, as shown in Appendix B:
   a) HO280 (2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne) to delete part of the discussion, clarify a statement in ‘What is significant?’ and replace the subdivision guideline.
   b) HO281 (59 Howey Street, Gisborne) to correct a reference, add history information provided by Ms Perkin, revise a source comment, replace discussion about the Weeping Chinese Cypress and delete the carport guideline.
   c) HO284 (42 Fisher Street, Gisborne) to revise tree and landscape guidelines.
   d) HO286 (46 Howey Street, Gisborne) to add history information about the property name, delete unneeded discussion about the fence, delete guidelines about the entry, new buildings and subdivision, and to add a new built form guideline.
   e) HO295 (426 Hamilton Road, New Gisborne) to delete obsolete references to Dumbarton and the Gisborne Cemetery.
   f) HO298 (60 Princes Street, Gisborne) to delete the word ‘surprisingly’ in the Statement of significance.
   g) HO313 (101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton) to replace “The Dwelling must be retained and adapted as a residence” in the guidelines with “The Dwelling should be retained”.

7. Delete the following Heritage Citations:
   a) HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour)
   b) AK1 (Sawdust Kiln, 39 Lauriston Reservoir Road, Kyneton).
1 Introduction

1.1 The Amendment

The Amendment proposes to:

- implement the *Gisborne and Kyneton Heritage Study 2017* (2017 Heritage Study) recommendations by applying the Heritage Overlay to the 38 places shown in Table 1
- revise the Heritage Overlay schedule format.

### Table 1: Exhibited heritage places and submissions received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>HO Ref</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gisborne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne Park, 2 Cabbage Tree Lane</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO280</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Eblana), 59 Howey Street &amp; part UL Daly Reserve, 63 Howey Street</td>
<td>A, E, H</td>
<td>HO281</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Brigid’s Church, 64 Aitken Street</td>
<td>A, D, G, H</td>
<td>HO282</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Anglican Church, 32 Fisher Street</td>
<td>A, D, G, H</td>
<td>HO283</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Presbyterian Manse (former), 42 Fisher Street</td>
<td>A, D, F, H</td>
<td>HO284</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyabun Park, 29 Melbourne Road</td>
<td>A, D, E, H</td>
<td>HO285</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Annandale), 46 Howey Street</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO286</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Dixon’s Office), 41 Hamilton Street</td>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>HO287</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics Institute, 18 Hamilton Street</td>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>HO288</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Precinct (Howey Reserve), Hamilton Street</td>
<td>A, D, G, H</td>
<td>HO289</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Hall, 60 Aitken Street</td>
<td>A, D, G, H</td>
<td>HO290</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyell House, 35 Aitken Street</td>
<td>A, D, E, H</td>
<td>HO291</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne State School, 35 Fisher Street</td>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>HO292</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresters Hall, 52 Aitken Street</td>
<td>A, E, G</td>
<td>HO293</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Presbyterian Church and hall, 43-49 Fisher Street</td>
<td>A, D, G, H</td>
<td>HO294</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop (former Commonwealth Bank of Australia), 20 Hamilton Street</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO297</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence, 60 Prince Street</td>
<td>A, D</td>
<td>HO298</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Gisborne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead (Hay Hill), 426 Hamilton Road</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO295</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooling Private Cemetery (Robertson Family Pioneer Cemetery), 372 Barringo Road</td>
<td>A, E, H</td>
<td>HO296</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Watt Children’s Hall, 252 Station Road</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO299</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251A Station Road, New Gisborne</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>HO300</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Place Criteria^*^ HO Ref IC Sub

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>HO Ref</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Ivy Leigh), 268 Station Road</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO301</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell’s Bridge Railway Overpass, Pierce Road (between Hamilton Road and Payne Road)</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO302</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (former Post Office), 274 Station Road</td>
<td>A, D, E, G</td>
<td>HO303</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Gisborne Avenue of Honour, Station Road (between Saunders Road and Early Street)</td>
<td>A, D, E, G</td>
<td>HO304</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kyneton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>HO Ref</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Salvation Army Barracks/Citadel, 5 Bowen Street</td>
<td>A, D, E, G, H</td>
<td>HO305</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 82 High Street</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO306</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart College (Chapel, Convent and Annex), 94 High Street</td>
<td>A, D, E, G, H</td>
<td>HO307</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Ailsa Craig/Rath Hill), 24 Mollison Street</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO308</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showgrounds Grandstand (Lewers Stand), Mollison Street</td>
<td>A, D, E, G</td>
<td>HO309</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Hollywood), 1829 Trentham Road</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO310</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Minerva), 24 Market Street</td>
<td>A, D, E, G</td>
<td>HO311</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Meadowbank), 48 Mitchell Street</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO312</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead (Jarrett’s Farm), 101 Pleasant Hill Road</td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td>HO313</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Railway Bridge, Pleasant Hill Road</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO314</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Railway Bridge, Greenway Lane</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO315</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Railway Bridge, Flynn’s Lane</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO316</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Railway Bridge, Boggy Creek</td>
<td>A, D, E, F</td>
<td>HO317</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^*^ Model criteria specified in Planning Practice Note 1 (see Chapter 2.3)

### 1.2 Issues dealt with in this Report

The Panel considered all written submissions made in response to the exhibition of the Amendment, observations from site visits, and submissions, evidence and other material presented to it during the Hearing.

The Panel has reviewed a large volume of material. The Panel has had to be selective in referring to the more relevant or determinative material in the Report. All submissions and materials have been considered by the Panel in reaching its conclusions, regardless of whether they are specifically mentioned in the Report.

This Report deals with the issues under the following headings:

- Planning context
- Strategic justification
- General issues
- Heritage places
- Drafting matters.
2 Planning context

Council provided a response to the Strategic Assessment Guidelines as part of the Explanatory Report.

The Panel has reviewed Council’s response and the policy context of the Amendment, and has made a brief appraisal of the relevant zone and overlay controls and other relevant planning strategies in Chapter 3.

2.1 Planning policy framework

Council submitted that the Amendment is supported by the following clauses:

- 11.01-1 (Settlement networks) by supporting sustainable development in the regional centres of Gisborne and Kyneton, building on the strengths of these centres in terms of historic character and identity
- 11.07-1 (Regional planning) by supporting the growth and development of distinctive and diverse regional settlements and encouraging high-quality urban and architectural design which respects the heritage, character and identity of each settlement, consistent with the Loddon Mallee North Regional Growth Plan
- 11.07-2 (Peri-urban areas) by strengthening and enhancing the character, identity attractiveness, amenity and tourism potential of the peri-urban towns of Gisborne and Kyneton, consistent with Plan Melbourne 2017-2050
- 11.14-5 (Natural and built environment) by facilitating tourism opportunities in appropriate locations near heritage places, consistent with the Loddon Mallee North Regional Growth Plan
- 15.03-1 (Heritage conservation) by ensuring that development appropriately responds to its landscape, valued built form and cultural context, and that places and sites with significant heritage, architectural, aesthetic, scientific and cultural value are protected.

Council submitted that the Amendment also supports the following local planning objectives:

- Clause 21.08 that “regulation and protection of the heritage features and values is critical in achieving sustainable development outcomes and decision making”
- Clause 21.08-1 objective “to protect and enhance important heritage features and values for residents, visitors and future generations”.

Council submitted that applying the Heritage Overlay to 38 places complies with this objective.

2.2 Heritage Overlay provisions

The Heritage Overlay purposes are:

- To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.
- To conserve and enhance heritage places of natural or cultural significance.
• To conserve and enhance those elements which contribute to the significance of heritage places.
• To ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places.
• To conserve specifically identified heritage places by allowing a use that would otherwise be prohibited if this will demonstrably assist with the conservation of the significance of the heritage place.

The Heritage Overlay requires a planning permit to undertake demolition, subdivision, buildings and works. The Heritage Overlay enables the Schedule to specify additional controls for specified trees, painting previously unpainted surfaces, internal alterations and an incorporated plan which may exempt buildings and works and other changes from requiring a planning permit. The Schedule may also identify if a place can be considered for uses that are otherwise prohibited, subject to a planning permit.

2.3 Ministerial Directions and Practice Notes

The following Ministerial Directions are relevant to the Amendment:
• Ministerial Direction 11 (Strategic Assessment of Amendments)
• Ministerial Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes under section 7(5) of the Act.

The following planning practice notes are relevant to the Amendment:
• Planning Practice Note 1 (PPN1) Applying the Heritage Overlay, August 2018
• Planning Practice Note 8 (PPN8) Writing a local planning policy, June 2015
• Planning Practice Note 46 (PPN46) Strategic Assessment Guidelines, August 2018.

Planning Practice Note 1

Planning Practice Note 1 provides guidance about using the Heritage Overlay. It states that the Heritage Overlay should be applied to, among other places:

Places identified in a local heritage study, provided the significance of the place can be shown to justify the application of the overlay.

Planning Practice Note 1 specifies that documentation for each heritage place needs to include a statement of significance that clearly establishes the importance of the place and addresses the heritage criteria. It recognises the following model criteria (referred to as PPN01 criteria in this report) that have been adopted for assessing the value of a heritage place:

Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
Criterion B: Possession of uncommon rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history (rarity).
Criterion C: Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of our cultural or natural history (research potential).
Criterion D: Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments (representativeness).
Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic significance).

Criterion F: Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period (technical significance).

Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions (social significance).

Criterion H: Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history (associative significance).

Criteria A to H was developed at the National Heritage Convention (HERCON) in Canberra in 1998 and is often referred to as the HERCON criteria.

Planning Practice Note 1 advises:

- thresholds to be applied in the assessment of significance are ‘State Significance’ and ‘Local Significance’
- letter gradings (for example, ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’ should not be used).

The Planning Practice provides guidance on mapping places of heritage significance, including consideration of adequate curtilages.

### 2.4 Relevant studies and amendment

(i) **Macedon Ranges Heritage Strategy 2014-2018**

Macedon Ranges Heritage Study was prepared in June 2014 to assist Council to:

- identify positive heritage measures already in place
- assess and prioritise work that still needs to be done
- manage and monitor the heritage assets in its municipality
- report on and celebrate achievements.

(ii) **Macedon Ranges Cultural Heritage and Landscape Study 1994**

Macedon Ranges Cultural Heritage and Landscape Study was prepared by Trevor Budge & Associates Planners and other consultants in June 1994 (1994 Heritage Study) and comprises:

- Volume 1: Recommendations and Guidelines
- Volume 2: Environmental History
- Volume 3: Landscape Assessment

The combined 2,170-page document identifies 1,051 sites, documents 148 landscape sites and 219 historic buildings in detail, and states:

*Due to the large number of sites, in some cases physical inspections could not be made.*

*The findings of the study are not intended to be conclusive for all sites, but provide a basis for further research.*
The Study applies 14 criteria to assess each site in the study area which differs from the HERCON Criteria developed in 1998 and found in Planning Practice Note 1.

(iii) Amendment VC148

Amendment VC148, was introduced into the Victoria Planning Provisions and all planning schemes on 31 July 2018. Among other changes, a statement of significance for each heritage place must now be incorporated in the planning scheme. A three-month transition period applies.
3 Strategic justification

3.1 Policy support

No submitter considered there was insufficient State and local planning policy to support the Amendment. The Panel considers that the State, regional and local planning policy outlined in Chapter 2 provides a solid strategic basis for the Amendment.

3.2 2017 Heritage Study approach

(i) Background

The 2017 Heritage Study explains its two-part methodology as:

- Part One (initial assessments)
- Part Two (subsequent assessments).

Part One (initial assessments)

The 2017 Heritage Study reviewed 44 places identified by Council from the 1990 and 1994 Heritage Studies. It found 15 of the places not worthy of further investigation. The 2017 Study consultant recommended an additional 14 places for further investigation. These places are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: 2017 Study – Part One places removed or added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places not worthy of further investigation</th>
<th>Additional places recommended by heritage consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Gisborne / New Gisborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Parish Hall, 3O Fisher Street</td>
<td>Shop, 20 Hamilton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 79 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 48 Brantome Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarage, Fisher Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 69 Aitken Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 52 Goode Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 60 Prince Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Hotel, Aitken Street</td>
<td>Ross Watt Children’s Hall, 252 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 50 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Ravenstone, 238 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everest, 40 Stephens Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 251A Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 3 Early Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 254 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyneton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 55 Beauchamp Street</td>
<td>Cottage, 257 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence, 26 Mollison Street</td>
<td>Cottage 298 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 187 Mollison Street</td>
<td>Railway Overpass, Pierce Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, 24 Sturt Street</td>
<td>Memorial Precinct, Hamilton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barongarook, Trio Road</td>
<td>Kyneton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, Tower Street</td>
<td>Sawdust Kiln, Lauriston Reservoir Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Works, 93 Harts Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two (subsequent assessments)

Table 3: 2017 Study – Part Two places removed or added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places which did not merit heritage protection</th>
<th>Additional places recommended by consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Vale, Gisborne/Kilmore Road</td>
<td>Residence (former Post Office), 274 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Gates, Hamilton Street</td>
<td>New Gisborne Avenue of Honour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 48 Brantome Street</td>
<td>Kyneton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 69 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Homestead, 101 Pleasant Hill Road 4 Railway Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenstone, 238 Station Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 254 Station Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 257 Station Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 298 Station Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyneton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nook, Harts Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilldene, Wedge Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowsett Farm, Lauriston Reservoir Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Study applied Criteria A to H in Planning Practice Note 1 to assess the significance of individual places.

Consultation

Study consultation comprised:

- consultation with affected property owners including direct mail, site visits where permitted, mailed copy of the citation and an opportunity for a meeting
- broader communication through local newspapers, community newsletters, Council’s webpage and newsletter (received by all households)
- consultation with Macedon Ranges Heritage Council
- internal Council consultation including an internal technical advisory group.

(ii) The issue

The issue is whether the 2017 Heritage Study applies an appropriate methodology and achieves sufficient quality to support its recommendations and the Amendment.

Macedon Ranges Residents Association (MRRA) was critical of the 2017 Heritage Study’s approach, including its consistency with the 1994 Heritage Study and heritage place selection and assessments.

3.2.1 Consistency with the 1994 Heritage Study

(i) The issue

The issue is whether site selection, recommendations and heritage citations proposed in the 2017 Heritage Study need to be consistent with those in the 1994 Heritage Study.
(ii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA submitted that there were major differences in the assessments of significance and recommendations between the 1994 and 2017 Heritage Studies. An example was trees and driveways previously noted as significant, not being considered significant in the 2017 Study. It added that the 1994 Heritage Study’s recommendations for including specific sites in the Victorian Heritage Register were not recognised, discussed or acted on in the 2017 Study.

Council responded that the consultant who prepared the 2017 Heritage Study reviewed the 1994 Heritage Study. It added that the 1994 Heritage Study considered different criteria for assessing each heritage place.

During the Hearing and in response to cross-examination, Mr Nelsen stated that, while Heritage Victoria and a local planning authority use the same HERCON criteria to assess a heritage place, there are no guidelines on how to establish whether a place is of State or local significance. He explained that assessing each heritage place is not a science and whether a place meets the heritage threshold is subject to considerable debate.

(iii) Discussion

The 1994 Heritage Study is a comprehensive document which provides useful research. However, it acknowledges that its findings are not conclusive for all sites. Caution must be taken when selecting information from a previous heritage study because additional or different information may be found, especially over a 24-year timeframe. The Panel accepts Mr Nelsen’s approach to drafting each heritage citation. It is often not possible and practical to include all information related to a heritage place therefore information should be succinct but sufficient to understand the heritage place when assessing future permit applications.

The 1994 Heritage Study predates the current HERCON criteria used to assess heritage places. This means that the 2017 Heritage Study viewed each place through a different lens. The 24-year old citations do not include the minimum information specified for a modern heritage citation. It is therefore unlikely that heritage citations between the two studies will be consistent. However, this does not mean that the 2014 Study was inaccurate at the time it was prepared, nor does it mean that 2017 Heritage Study is inaccurate or deficient.

(iv) Conclusion

The Panel concludes:

- The site selection, recommendations and heritage citations proposed in the 2017 Heritage Study does not have to be consistent with those in the 1994 Heritage Study, Heritage place selection and assessments
- The inconsistency between the two studies does not reflect their quality or accuracy.
3.2.2 Heritage site selection and assessments

(i) The issues

The issues are:

- whether the selection of heritage places is relevant to a heritage place achieving sufficient local heritage significance to be recommended for the Heritage Overlay
- whether the 2017 Heritage Study has applied an appropriate methodology for assessing, and making recommendations for, each heritage place.

(ii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA submitted that:

- the exhibited heritage places were selected with insufficient rationale and consistency
- the recommendations in heritage citations may have been influenced by development potential
- Heritage Overlay controls are recommended inconsistently and, in some cases, deficiently. MRRA requested detailed changes to individual heritage places
- the “nominal post-World War 1” threshold to exclude features after that time is arbitrary
- the Comparative Threshold Comments inappropriately relies on existing heritage protection at heritage precincts to justify the Heritage Overlay.

MRRA provided its responses to specific heritage places, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: MRRA response to specific heritage places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Heritage place</th>
<th>MRRA response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HO280</td>
<td>Gisborne Park, 2 Cabbage Tree Lane</td>
<td>Not supported – review and refer to Heritage Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO283</td>
<td>St Paul’s Anglican Church, 32 Fisher Street</td>
<td>Not supported – review and refer to Heritage Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO297</td>
<td>Shop, 20 Hamilton Street</td>
<td>Request clarification on priority to include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO298</td>
<td>Residence, 60 Prince Street</td>
<td>Request clarification on priority to include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO302</td>
<td>Mitchell’s Bridge Railway Overpass, Pierce Road</td>
<td>Request clarification on priority to include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO303</td>
<td>Residence (former Post Office), 274 Station Road</td>
<td>Questioned priority to include, lack of precinct Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO299</td>
<td>Ross Watt Children’s Hall, 252 Station Road</td>
<td>Request clarification on priority to include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO285</td>
<td>Wyabun Park, 29 Melbourne Road</td>
<td>Not supported – comprehensive review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO295</td>
<td>Hay Hill, 426 Hamilton Road</td>
<td>Not supported – comprehensive review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO300</td>
<td>251A Station Road</td>
<td>Questioned priority to include, lack of precinct Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO313</td>
<td>Jarrett’s Farm, 101 Pleasant Hill Road</td>
<td>Not supported – comprehensive review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council responded that the 2017 Heritage Study provides strategic basis for the 38 places proposed for the Heritage Overlay. The site selection rationale does not diminish each place’s justification.

Council submitted that the 2017 Heritage Study assessed towns which were prioritised because they have more development activity than other locations. The Guidelines in each heritage citation advise property owners and statutory planners on how to retain heritage values if development is proposed.

Council submitted that MRRA made erroneous assumptions. Expecting more stringent controls than is justified would result in excessive control, contrary to Planning Practice Note 1. It added that reviewing existing precinct-level Heritage Overlays is outside the scope of the Amendment.

Regarding 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton, Ms Tomkinson noted that the property was considered through a third round of finding suitable sites ‘in lieu of’ places that were deemed unsuitable from the original study list. She questioned whether it was valid to apply the Heritage Overlay by means of a quota rather than whether an individual place is genuinely appropriate for inclusion.

Mr Nelsen stated that Council provided him with selected heritage places to assess and recommend for a further review, including the preparation of a heritage citation. He explained that Council provided him with the ability to recommend places in addition to those referred to him.

At the Hearing, Council and Mr Nelsen explained that any heritage place which did not meet the necessary local heritage significance threshold was removed from the list places recommended for further investigation and a heritage citation. One submitter considered that there should have been a more detail explanation why each heritage place was no longer pursued. Council responded that heritage study scope was to explain details regarding why each heritage place was recommended for the Heritage Overlay and not to detail why they were excluded.

(iii) Discussion

While the Panel considers using the term ‘in lieu of’ is an unfortunate choice of words, it does not agree that there is any correlation between seeking a minimum number of places and the heritage citations that were subsequently prepared. Each citation aligns with current advice on how to assess a heritage place. There is no evidence that how the heritage places were selected influenced how each citation was prepared and assessed.
The Panel accepts that any heritage place which was considered to not achieve sufficient local heritage significance was removed from the list of places recommended for the Heritage Overlay. No further explanation is needed to assist the Amendment because the deleted properties are not relevant.

(iv) Conclusions
The Panel concludes:
- The heritage places selection process is irrelevant to whether each heritage place achieve sufficient local heritage significance to be recommended for the Heritage Overlay
- The 2017 Heritage Study has applied an appropriate methodology for assessing, and making recommendations for, each heritage place.

3.2.3 Building interiors

(i) Background
The Heritage Overlay enables its Schedule to require a permit to internally alter a building by applying the internal alternation control to the relevant heritage place. The Amendment proposes to apply the internal alternation control to 11 heritage places: HO280, HO281, HO283, HO284, HO288, HO294, HO299, HO305, HO308, HO309 and HO312.

Planning Practice Note 1 states:

*Internal alteration controls over specified buildings can be applied in the schedule by including a ‘yes’ in the Internal Alteration Controls Apply? column.*

*This provision should be applied sparingly and on a selective basis to special interiors of high significance. The statement of significance for the heritage place should explain what is significant about the interior and why it is important.*

(ii) The issue
The issue is whether the internal alteration control proposed for heritage places through the Heritage Overlay Schedule have been appropriately assessed.

(iii) Evidence and submissions
At the Hearing, Mr Nelsen explained that some of the property owners did not permit an internal building inspection. He relied on undated photographic evidence, such as sales advertising, to view room interiors. Mr Nelsen stated that activating the internal alteration control would enable a previously refused internal inspection and that this would help commence discussion with the property owners. He added that where the inspection found no heritage fabric, the *Internal alteration controls apply?* (internal alteration control) could be deactivated through a subsequent planning scheme amendment.

Council submitted that if property owners became aware that refusing an internal inspection would result in the internal alteration control not being applied, they may use it as a means of avoiding the controls.
Chapter 0 identifies properties which MRRA considers should be further investigated to determine whether the additional controls, such as internal alteration, should be applied.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel agrees with Council that a property owner should not use refusing building interior inspection as a means of avoiding the internal control being applied. However, applying the internal control solely to enable a future inspection through a permit process is insufficient justification, especially if there is no heritage fabric to protect. For heritage the places where the property owner did not agree to an inspection, Council should be confident through secondary evidence that there is sufficient internal heritage fabric to warrant the internal alteration control.

The Panel considers that the Heritage Overlay Schedule internal alteration control has, generally, been appropriately assessed. The Panel supports the exhibited and post-exhibition changes to this control unless specified otherwise in this report.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes that the internal alteration control for each place has, generally, been assessed appropriately, unless specified otherwise in this report.

3.3 Overall conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The 2017 Heritage Study strategically supports the Amendment and will provide a sound basis for assessing future permit applications.
- The Amendment is:
  - supported by, and implements, the relevant sections of the State and Local Planning Policy Framework
  - consistent with the relevant Ministerial Directions and Practice Notes
  - well founded and strategically justified.
- The Amendment should proceed subject to addressing the more specific issues raised in submissions as discussed in the following chapters.
4 General issues

4.1 Heritage Overlay mapping

(i) Background

The Amendment proposes to apply the Heritage Overlay to define a radial curtilage around the homestead and outbuildings of the following rural properties:

- 2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne (HO280)
- 29 Melbourne Road, Gisborne (HO285)
- 426 Hamilton Road, Gisborne (HO295)
- 1829 Trentham Road, Kyneton (HO310)
- 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton (HO313).

(ii) The issue

The issue is whether the Heritage Overlay has been mapped in accordance with appropriate principles. The issue of whether sufficient curtilage has been enabled for a specific place is discussed in Chapter 5.

(iii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA submitted that the extent of Heritage Overlay proposed for several heritage places do not include the listed item and its associated land. It referred to advice in Planning Practice Note 1:

> 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.

MRRA also referred to the second step of the suggested seven steps for establishing a curtilage and polygon:

> In addition to capturing the elements that are significant, it is almost always necessary to include some surrounding land (a “curtilage”) in order to:

- retain the setting or context of the significant building, structure, tree or feature
- regulate development (including subdivision) in close proximity to the significant building, tree or feature.

It was concerned that the circular Heritage Overlay mapping proposed for larger rural properties did not “retain the setting or context of the significant [feature], or regulate development (including a subdivision) in close proximity.”

Council responded that the Heritage Overlay mapping aligns with advice on circumstances when it should be applied to the entire property or to a reduced curtilage area around the heritage elements. Council referred to the balance of the advice in Planning Practice Note 1 which MRRA did not reference:
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.

Mr Nelsen gave evidence that a curtilage provides a place with identity and individuality, therefore its extent requires professional judgement. He explained that there is no set measure for curtilages and that they varied from place to place based on several factors including whether a building or feature on a hill or in a valley, its surrounding context, and its view from the street.

Mr Nelsen stated that the Heritage Overlay enables a suite of polygons, including a circle. He considered a circular shaped Heritage Overlay a simpler means of identifying the relevant area without excluding anything. Mr Nelson stated that circular Heritage Overlay polygons were applied in Planning Schemes throughout regional Victoria including Mansfield and Alpine. He explained that the Heritage Overlay shape may be reviewed if the property was subdivided.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel accepts Mr Nelsen’s evidence on this matter and agrees with Council that Planning Practice Note 1 advice on curtilages and Heritage Overlay polygons needs to be read in its entirety. The practice advice uses a homestead on a large farm as an example to explain why applying the Heritage Overlay to only part of a large farm is appropriate. There is no issue with applying a circular-shaped polygon if it sufficiently captures the required curtilage.

Applying a Heritage Overlay beyond what is required is not appropriate because it would introduce unnecessary permit requirements.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- Applying a circular-shaped Heritage Overlay polygon is an appropriate response to capturing a homestead on a large farm or pastoral property where only the house, outbuildings, or both are important.
- The extent of curtilage will vary based on individual context.
- The Amendment has mapped the Heritage Overlay in accordance with appropriate principles.
4.2 MRRA requested changes

(i) The issues

The issues are:

- whether the Heritage Overlay Schedule is being applied appropriately
- whether the Heritage Overlay Schedule controls are appropriate and justified.

(ii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA requested changes for all heritage places except for HO288, HO299, HO306, HO308 and HO312.

Table 5: MRRA requested changes to heritage places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage place</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gisborne</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO281 Residence (Eblana), 59 Howey Street &amp; part UL Daly Reserve, 63 Howey Street</td>
<td>Separate Heritage Overlay schedule listing for orchard area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO282 St Brigid’s Church, 64 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Changes to the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO284 St Andrew’s Presbyterian Manse (former), 42 Fisher Street</td>
<td>Change to resolve conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO286 Residence (Annandale), 46 Howey Street</td>
<td>Review Heritage Overlay Schedule controls for garden and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO287 Residence (Dixon’s Office), 41 Hamilton Street</td>
<td>Review the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO289 Memorial Precinct (Howey Reserve), Hamilton Street</td>
<td>Separate Heritage Overlay schedule listing and apply paint control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO290 Masonic Hall, 60 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Apply paint control and apply Heritage Overlay to the entire land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO291 Lyell House, 35 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Review the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO292 Gisborne State School, 35 Fisher Street</td>
<td>Review exclusion of the 1924 addition from the Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO293 Foresters Hall, 52 Aitken Street</td>
<td>Change the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO294 St Andrew’s Presbyterian Church and hall, 43-49 Fisher Street</td>
<td>Change the Heritage Overlay Schedule to apply tree and paint controls to the hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Gisborne</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO296 Wooling Private Cemetery, 372 Barringo Road</td>
<td>Include the home site and apply tree controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO301 Residence (Ivy Leigh), 268 Station Road</td>
<td>Change the Heritage Overlay Schedule and apply precinct Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyneton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO304 New Gisborne Avenue of Honour, Station Road</td>
<td>Include entire Avenue in Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage place</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO305 Former Salvation Army Barracks/Citadel, 5 Bowen Street</td>
<td>Delete prohibited uses and change the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO307 Sacred Heart College (Chapel, Convent and Annex), 94 High Street</td>
<td>Review Heritage Overlay Schedule controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO309 Showgrounds Grandstand (Lewers Stand), Mollison Street</td>
<td>Change the Heritage Overlay Schedule to apply tree controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO310 Hollywood, 1829 Trentham Road</td>
<td>Review the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO311 Residence (Minerva), 24 Market Street</td>
<td>Change the Heritage Overlay Schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council submitted that, in line with its heritage consultant, the requests for all but four heritage places would result in more restrictive controls than what is justified by the evidence. It added that this to be contrary to Planning Practice Note 1. At the Hearing, Mr Nelsen did not state that he supported any of these requests.

Council considered that the requests for HO282, HO284, HO285 and HO305 had merit. These are discussed in later chapters.

(iii) Discussion

The Panel considers that available evidence does not support Heritage Overlay controls for most of the requested heritage place beyond what is justified through the Heritage Citation. While MRRA presented considerable and interesting information, they do not necessarily translate to sufficient basis to justify additional controls. The Panel agrees with Council that applying controls beyond what is required is contrary to Planning Practice Note 1.

The Panel discusses other heritage classifications such as the Victorian Heritage Register in Chapter 4.3. It also considers some of the heritage places further in Chapter 5.

(iv) Conclusion

The Panel concludes that there is insufficient evidence to support MRRA’s requested changes, unless considered otherwise in later chapters.

4.3 Other heritage classifications

(i) The issue

The issue is whether an assessment to determine if a heritage place achieves sufficient local heritage significance can be applied to nominate them for another heritage classification.

(ii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA requested that several heritage places be referred to Heritage Victoria, National Trust or Federal Department of Energy and Environment so that they could be considered for State and National heritage registers. It referred to the Macedon Ranges Cultural Heritage and Landscape Study 1994 which recommended such referrals.

Ms Kalajdzic, a Mount Macedon resident, questioned why 2 Cabbage Tree Lane was not nominated to Heritage Victoria for State level heritage protection. She noted that the
Macedon Ranges Cultural Heritage and Landscape Study 1994 recommended State level protection. Council responded that the 1994 Heritage Study did not recommend State level protection and applying a Heritage Overlay for local significance does not preclude the place being considered for State level protection. It noted that this is a separate process.

(iii) Discussion
A place proposed for the Heritage Overlay (Local) or Victorian Heritage Register (State) use the same criteria categories to determine whether they achieve the threshold. While they apply the same criteria categories, a place proposed for the Victorian Heritage Register is assessed to determine if it meets State significance while one proposed for the Heritage Overlay I assess for local significance. They are two distinctly different assessments made through different processes.

The Amendment seeks to implement 38 places because the 2017 Heritage Study considered that they achieve sufficient local heritage significance. Any suggestions to nominate a place for another register or classification is beyond the scope of the Amendment and need to be considered through a separate process.

(iv) Conclusion
The Panel concludes that any suggestions to nominate a place for another heritage classification:

- needs to be considered through a separate process and assessment
- is beyond the scope of the Amendment.

4.4 Property owner assistance

(i) The issue
The issue is whether property owner assistance is relevant to local heritage significance or to the Amendment.

(ii) Submissions
A submitter requested that Council consider assisting property owners affected by the Amendment by:

- reducing their property rates or reimbursing the cost of restoration and rectification works
- advising on structural building challenges such as building cracks and movement
- advising on installing energy and water saving technology
- advising on design issues, given visual impacts and climate change
- advising on how to maintain and retain old and significant European trees
- supporting long term residents to form a community support group.

Council submitted that it provides a free heritage advisory service for owners of properties with a Heritage Overlay. It added that the submitter’s requests relate to matters outside the Amendment can be considered through a separate process.
(iii) Discussion and conclusion

The Panel agrees with Council’s submission on this matter.

The Panel concludes that property owner assistance is not relevant to local heritage significance or to the Amendment.

4.5 Property value and insurance premium

There were submitters opposed the Heritage Overlay being applied to their property because of the impact it may devalue their property and increase their insurance premium. Council responded that these matters are irrelevant to whether the place has sufficient significance to justify the Heritage Overlay.

The Panel was not provided with information which showed a direct correlation between applying the Heritage Overlay and property value or insurance premiums. There are different variables which determine property value and it is often difficult to identify which individual variable is the contributing factor. The Panel considers that the net community benefit of applying the Heritage Overlay is likely to outweigh any financial impact on the individual property owners.

The Panel agrees with Council that property value and insurance premiums are not relevant to whether a heritage place has sufficient local heritage significance to be considered for the Heritage Overlay.

The Panel concludes that property value and insurance premiums are not relevant to the Amendment.
## 5 Heritage places

### 5.1 2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne (HO280)

#### (i) The Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image of the property" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is significant?**

Gisborne Park is significant to the extent of ‘built-up’ portion of the property, that is the main house (with interiors), the ‘coach house’ and bluestone skillion buildings. It does not include any post-WWI buildings or developments.

**How is it significant?**

Gisborne Park is significant historically, representatively, aesthetically and technically.

**Why is it significant?**

Gisborne Park is significant historically and representatively for its association with the early agricultural and residential development of the Gisborne district, and in particular the establishment of large quality properties for wealth families.

Gisborne Park is significant aesthetically and technically for the classic Italianate style main house and complementary outbuildings. The bluestone buildings illustrate a homestead complex of considerable merit.

#### (ii) The issues

The issues are:

- whether the Heritage Overlay has been appropriately mapped
• whether HO280 Heritage Citation should be changed to clarify statements in ‘Discussion’, ‘What is Significant’ and ‘Guidelines’.

5.1.1 Heritage Overlay mapping

(i) Evidence and submissions
The property owner of 2 Cabbage Tree Lane did not object to the Heritage Overlay being applied to the Gisborne Park homestead and the outbuildings. MRRA requested that the Heritage Overlay be extended to include the tree-lined driveway or the entire property. It considered that this would ensure that any future development is consistent with protecting its heritage significance.

At the Hearing, Mr Nelsen gave evidence that tree lined driveways were features of homesteads. In this instance, he said that the tree-lined driveway was not a refined avenue and presented itself more like a collection of unevenly spaced, and poorly located, trees. He considered the trees to be of poor condition and beyond retention.

(ii) Discussion
Regarding this property, the Panel acknowledges that the 1994 Report states:

*Its landscape setting is also made impressive by the long and individually notable avenue of conifers which lines its driveway.*

However, having inspected the driveway from the public realm, the Panel agrees with Council’s submission and accepts Mr Nelsen’s evidence that the tree-lined driveway is not significant enough to warrant the Heritage Overlay. The Heritage Overlay’s 100-metre radial mapping provides sufficient curtilage to protect the homestead and outbuildings. It would be unnecessary and inappropriate to apply the Heritage Overlay beyond this area, especially considering the property’s significant size.

(iii) Conclusion
The Panel concludes that the Amendment appropriately maps the Heritage Overlay to relevant land at 2 Cabbage Tree Lane.

5.1.2 Heritage Citation

(i) Submission
The property owner requested changes that the HO280 Heritage Citation be changed to:

- in ‘Discussion’, delete unclear parts of the eighth point: “The heritage value of the vegetation or landscape to the property is difficult .... Experience indicates this is unlikely.”

- in ‘What is Significant’, replace “including” with “that is” to clarify its intent

- in ‘Guidelines’, replace the fifth point with:

  Subdivision may be possible for the overall property but the pre-WW1 buildings must be protected and provided with a significant area within which to be appreciated. The minimal area is indicated by the 100 metre boundary.
New built development must not intrude upon the pre-WW1 buildings in their siting, designs or fencing.

The property owner noted that Council’s heritage adviser, Mr Nelson, supported these changes. At its 25 July 2018 meeting, Council resolved to accept all the requested changes.

(ii) Discussion

The 1994 Heritage Study states:

In the State context, it is among the best examples of medium-sized farm complexes, being of different scale and origin to other generally larger basalt farm complexes in Western Victoria.

Accordingly, it is important that any future permit application to subdivide the land is guided through clear information and relevant heritage guidelines. Like Council, the Panel supports all requested changes.

(iii) Conclusion

The Panel concludes that changes to the HO280 Heritage Citation requested by the property owner and supported by Council and Mr Nelsen will provide greater guidance and clarity.

(iv) Recommendation

The Panel recommends:

1. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:
   HO280 (2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne) to delete part of the discussion, clarify a statement in ‘What is significant?’ and replace the subdivision guideline.
5.2 59 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO281)

(i) The Place
Statement of significance

What is significant?
The Residence is significant to the extent of the house and interior, plus a portion of the UL Daly Reserve to include the remnant fruit trees and Italian Cypresses only. The significance does not include the subsequent carport or garden development (except as noted above) nor the previously subdivided land on Howey Street or the remainder to the UL Daly Reserve.

How is it significant?
The Residence is significant architecturally and historically.

Why is it significant?
The Residence is significant architecturally as an intact and ornate example of the Federation Queen Anne architectural style, befitting a home of the local physician and community figure and representing the optimism of the turn of the century era. The building is believed to be intact internally as well with features equalling the quality of the exterior.
The Residence is significant historically for its association with Dr Ulick Daly, a significant community figure and physician in Gisborne. It is also historically significant for the remaining fruit trees and Italian Cypresses only which are rare remnants of an urban kitchen garden.

5.2.1 Heritage Overlay mapping

(i) The issue
The issues are:
- whether the Heritage Overlay (HO281) is justified and has been appropriately mapped
- whether land ownership is relevant to the Amendment.
(ii) **Evidence and submissions**

The 59 Howey Street property owner questioned the usefulness of the Heritage Overlay and sought to delete internal alteration control proposed through the Heritage Overlay Schedule, to reduce the land to which the Heritage Overlay applied, and to change the HO281 Heritage Citation.

The owner acknowledged that the property has some architectural and cultural significance, however, she considered the Heritage Overlay would have been more useful before the property experienced changes. The owner explained that original property was subdivided in 1978 to create a public reserve and further subdivided in 1995 to create six new lots. She added that the house is now flanked by a contemporary house and the Scout Hall. Council responded that the consultant’s expert assessment was that 59 Howey Street continued to have heritage values which warranted the Heritage Overlay. It added that the building is largely intact and reflected its architectural and historical associations.

The owner, Ms Perkin and Ms Kalajdzic each noted that Heritage Overlay (HO281) is proposed for 59 Howey Street and the orchard area of UL Daly Reserve. Their responses are summarised as:

- Owner: Apply the Heritage Overlay, as exhibited, but have Council sell the orchard area to the 59 Howey Street owner so that it applies to one property title.
- Ms Perkin: Create a new Heritage Overlay place listing for the orchard area, and the land should remain in public ownership.
- Ms Kalajdzic: Do not apply the Heritage Overlay to the orchard area because Heritage Victoria has accepted a nomination for UL Daly Reserve, 86 Aitken Street and 63 Howey Street to the Victorian Heritage Register.

Council responded that having a single Heritage Overlay for the dwelling and garden is appropriate because it recognises the shared heritage values between the two. It added that it is not uncommon for a Heritage Overlay to across property title boundaries.

Council submitted that the Heritage Overlay reflects heritage values and not current ownership. It said that having the orchard and house in single ownership is not required for their conservation and the request to sell the land is not relevant to the Amendment. Council explained that it did not propose to sell the orchard garden area.

(iii) **Discussion**

The Panel acknowledges the divergent views on how the Heritage Overlay should be mapped.

Heritage Victoria accepting a nomination to consider the heritage place for the Victorian Heritage Register is irrelevant to whether the place has sufficient local significance to justify the Heritage Overlay.

Whether land should be in public or private ownership is not relevant to whether the Heritage Overlay is justified, how it should be mapped, or to the Amendment.

(iv) **Conclusion**

The Panel concludes:

- The Heritage Overlay (HO281) is justified and has been appropriately mapped.
• Land ownership is not relevant to the Amendment.

5.2.2 Building interior

(i) The issue
The issue is whether the 59 Howey Street building interior is sufficiently significant to justify applying the Internal Alternations control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule.

(ii) Evidence and submissions
Mr Nelsen gave evidence that relied on evidence referencing to the building interior to recommend the Internal Alteration control. He explained that he had not inspected the interior. Council submitted that had not granted access to inspect the interior and noted that a previous heritage report considered the building interior to be important. Council accepted Mr Nelsen’s recommendation to apply the control.

The property owner considered the proposed HO281 internal alteration control to be unwarranted. The control is based on a heritage report prepared in 2009. She explained that the internal layout of the house has been altered since that report. The owner referred to other heritage places which had the internal alteration control applied through a Heritage Overlay schedule.

(iii) Discussion
As stated earlier, the Panel does not support applying the internal alteration control solely to inspect the building interior during the planning permit process. It must have sufficient evidence that the interior is significant enough to require a planning permit for future internal alterations. The Panel is conscious that nine years have lapsed since the previous study and that subsequent changes may have affected the interior. However, it is also conscious that not applying additional control may result in a significant interior being further altered without being assessed through a permit process.

Based on best available information regarding the significance of the building interior, the Panel supports the internal alteration control being applied.

(iv) Conclusion
The Panel concludes that the 59 Howey Street building’s internal features are sufficiently significant to justify applying the internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule.

5.2.3 Heritage citation

(i) The issue
The issue is whether the HO281 Heritage Citation accurately captures the place.

(ii) Submissions
The property owner requested that the Heritage Citation be reviewed for errors and inconsistencies and changed to:
• remove reference to a Weeping Chinese Cypress because this tree does not exist on the property
• not refer to ‘appropriate colour scheme’ because different early photographs are grayscale and show different schemes
• delete the recommendation to remove the carport because it is not visible from the street.

The owner presented a photograph at the Hearing which showed the car port out of site when the dwelling was viewed from the front. She added that a proposed dwelling on the abutting Howie Street property would block any view from that street. Council responded that it did not propose to delete the guideline because removal is only encouraged and not mandatory.

Ms Perkin provided additional research for the Heritage Citation. Council responded to her submission by adding the following to the Heritage Citation:

The following information was provided by local resident, Irene Perkin:

Doctor Ulick Arthur William Daly, M.B., B.Ch., University of Dublin and Licentiate in Midwifery, Rotunda Hospital, Dublin. Born Dublin 1853; died Gisborne 1933. Married Laura May (nee Lord) 1886, son Ulick Lord Daly born 1891, daughter Ismy Laura Therese born 1894.

Ulick Lord Daly was awarded an MBE for services to local government in 1968. In 1976 he negotiated with the then Gisborne Shire Council to — upon his death — gift a major part of his property “to the people of Gisborne for passive recreation.”

Council considered that the additional information added value and included most of it in a revised HO281 Heritage Citation.

(iii) Discussion

The Panel supports Council’s post-exhibition changes to the Heritage Citation. The Panel considers that the carport is sufficiently separated from the dwelling and not visible from the dwelling’s frontage. The carport guideline, while not mandatory, is not needed to manage the heritage place and should be deleted.

(iv) Conclusions

The Panel concludes that the HO281 Heritage Citation should be revised to more accurately capture the place.

5.2.4 Recommendations

The Panel recommends:

2. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:

HO281 (59 Howey Street, Gisborne) to correct a reference, add history information provided by Ms Perkin, revise a source comment, replace discussion about the Weeping Chinese Cypress and delete the carport guideline.
5.3 64 Aitken Street, Gisborne (HO282)

(i) The Place

Statement of significance

What is significant?
St Brigid’s Church is significant to the extent of the existing building envelope, materials and architectural details, as well as the interior the building. It does not include fencing, outbuildings or landscaping.

How is it significant?
St Brigid’s Church is significant aesthetically, architecturally, historically and socially.

Why is it significant?
St Brigid’s Church is significant aesthetically for its visual dominance which helps create and support the traditional character and scale of Gisborne.

St Brigid’s Church is significant architecturally for its intact Gothic Revival style, the Victorian style of choice for church buildings in the 19th century. This significance is enhanced by the siting of this church, and others in visually important locations which contribute to the traditional character of the Shire’s townships. The breadth of architectural details, external and assumingly internal, contribute to its stylistic representation.

St Brigid’s Church is significant historically and socially to the shire as a substantive demonstration of the Christian nature of the settlers, the Catholic religion, the desire and commitment to worship and meet in the context of their church, and the sense of community which the building reflects. Like most churches, St Brigid’s is also historically significant for the long line of priests which served the community and families who made financial and physical contributions to the building.

(ii) The issue

The issue is whether the Heritage Overlay Schedule should be changed to apply the internal alteration and tree controls for HO282.
(iii) Evidence and submissions

MRRA submitted that the internal alteration and trees controls should be applied for this place through the Heritage Overlay Schedule. It explained that applying the internal alteration control corresponds with the significance identified for the site’s interior in the 2017 Heritage Study. MRRA added that the trees controls should include the large trees along the Fisher Street frontage and the immediate environs of the building for their contribution to street vegetation generally in Gisborne and their association with the Church site. It submitted that these trees were identified in the HO282 Heritage Citation which states in the guidelines “it is encouraged that the large trees in the immediate environs of the building be retained”.

At its 25 July 2018 meeting, Council resolved to apply the internal alteration control but did not agree to apply the tree controls. It considered the internal alterations control to be appropriate and noted that the Heritage Overlay does not require a planning permit for internal alterations to a church for liturgical purposes if the responsible authority is satisfied that the alterations are required for liturgical purposes.

Council submitted that the tree controls were not justified because the vegetation is not a planned landscape complementing the church or part of any memorial planting.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel considers that the internal alteration control should only be applied if Council considers the Church’s interior to be special and of high significance. In line with advice in Planning Practice Note 1, the HO282 Citation should be changed so that the statement of significance explains what is significant about the interior and why it is important. The Panel does not object to the internal alteration control progressing subject to the property owner being notified and provided with an opportunity to respond.

Regarding the trees, there is a distinct difference between what is significant and the recommended guidelines. Recommending that the trees be retained does not mean that they are significant enough to warrant additional heritage controls. The Panel agrees with Council on this matter.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The Heritage Overlay Schedule internal alteration control for HO282 should only progress if:
  - the HO282 Heritage Citation is changed to explain what is significant about the interior and why it is important
  - the property owner has been notified of the change.
- Heritage Overlay Schedule tree controls are not justified for HO282.
5.4 42 Fisher Street, Gisborne (HO284)

(i) The Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Residence is significant to the extent of the main house and the interiors which still demonstrate notable features. It does not include the rear skillion addition, timber fences or outbuildings or landscaping generally. It does include the stone wall on the street frontages and the larger mature trees in the environs of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is it significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Residence is significant historically, representatively, aesthetically and technically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why is it significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Residence is significant historically for its reflection of the growth and importance of the Presbyterian Church in Gisborne and the optimism of the Federation era.  
The Residence is significant representatively and aesthetically as a notable example of the Federation Queen Anne style in a visually dominant location and siting.  
The Residence is significant technically for its early use of concrete block construction. |

(ii) The issues

The issues are:
- whether the 284 Heritage Citation should be changed to reflect the relevant Heritage Overlay Schedule tree control
- whether the Heritage Overlay should be extended to apply to the neighbouring property.
(iii) Submissions

The 42 Fisher Street property owners supported the Heritage Overlay being applied. MRRA requested that the 284 Heritage Citation be changed to acknowledge that restrictions apply. It submitted that the Heritage Overlay Schedule applies the tree control for the heritage place whereas the Citation’s guidelines states “The retention of large trees in strongly encouraged.”

At its 25 July 2018 meeting, Council resolved to change the HO284 Heritage Citation to:

- There are no restrictions on the general landscaping or specific trees on the property. However, the large mature trees on the property do not contribute to the character of the property as well as its environs in Gisborne and must be retained. The retention of large trees is strongly encouraged.

Council also resolved to change the Heritage Overlay Schedule to specify that the tree controls apply to the large mature trees.

At the Hearing, the property owner requested that the Heritage Overlay be extended to include the stone fence on the neighbouring property. She highlighted that the neighbouring property also had a fruit tree and large cypress trees that may be considered for inclusion.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel considers that Council is best placed to consider whether the neighbouring property should be further investigated to determine whether it has sufficient local heritage significance. Pending the outcome, Council could then prepare a heritage citation and notify the affected property. This process should be conducted through a separate process.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The 284 Heritage Citation should be changed to reflect the relevant Heritage Overlay Schedule tree control.
- Council is best placed to consider whether the Heritage Overlay should be considered for the property neighbouring 42 Fisher Street through a separate process.

(vi) Recommendations

The Panel recommends:

3. Amend the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:
   a) specify ‘mature trees’ in the HO284 tree controls

4. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:
   a) HO284 (42 Fisher Street, Gisborne) to revise tree and landscape guidelines.
5.5 46 Howey Street, Gisborne (HO286)

(i) The Place

Statement of significance

What is significant?
The Residence is significant to the extent of the weatherboard house. It does not include the garage, the garden, the extension on the north nor the interior of the building.

How is it significant?
The Residence is significant aesthetically, architecturally and historically to the Shire.

Why is it significant?
The Residence is significant aesthetically for its visual contribution to Gisborne, being on a corner site with a large garden. It makes a more generic contribution to Gisborne as one of the few traditional residences remaining.

The Residence is significant architecturally, for its expression of small residence of the Federation Queen Anne style, constructed over a period and demonstrating elements of the style and the previous Victorian era as well.

The Residence is significant historically as a modest expression of the post-1890s depression and the optimism of Federation and nationhood, which the Queen Anne style exemplified.

(ii) The issue

The issue is whether the HO286 Heritage Citation accurately reflects the heritage place at 46 Howey Street, Gisborne.
(iii) Evidence and submissions

The 46 Howey Street property owners, who appeared as a party of the Hearing, supported the Heritage Overlay being applied to their property and requested changes to the HO286 Heritage Citation. Specifically, they requested that:

- History: state that the property was named ‘Annadale’ in the 1970s by the owners at that time
- Discussion:
  - state that the owners no longer seek to prepare a master plan because it is complex and costly
  - state that the previous owners (c1975 to 1993) informed that the second storey addition was constructed in the 1970s
  - revise “extensive front yard” to “extensive garden/private open space” to reflect its actual usage
  - delete “It is unfortunate that a better compromise could not have been achieved. It is only a fence though and it may be possible to achieve that compromise in the future”.
- Statement of Cultural Value:
  - revise “being on a corner site with a large garden to the front” to “being on a corner site with a large garden” to reflect that the building faces Princes Street although the property has a Howey Street address
- Guidelines:
  - delete “but it may be possible to visually treat it with less emphasis – one colour with no accents” because the residence should remain consistent with other residences in the area
  - delete the guideline encouraging the treated pine paling fence to be removed because the fence maintains their privacy
  - delete the guideline seeking some form of entry from the west or southwest corner to be maintained because there is no evidence that there was ever access from the southwest corner
  - delete “No new buildings, or subdivisions must be allowed to the west of the residence, which is its street address” because the building faces Princes Street and the address is Howey Street
  - delete the master plan guideline because they do not intend to prepare one.

They said that they met with Mr Nelsen to discuss their concerns in mid-2017 and he agreed with some of them.

The property owners submitted that if they were required to apply for a permit to select paint colours, they should not be required to pay planning fees.

In response, Council agreed to:

- reference the name ‘Annadale’ – it acknowledged that the name has not been confirmed historically
- reference the second storey addition
- revise the front yard reference
- delete discussion regarding the fence design
• delete the guideline for an entry from the west or southwest corner but retain the fence design guideline
• delete the colour scheme guideline to enable more flexibility
• revise the buildings/subdivision guideline to “Any new building or development must not obscure the visual appreciation of the house from the west (Prince Street) side, as this is the primary orientation of the residence”

Council submitted that it did not support changing other guidelines because they were matters for owners to consider were not obligatory or mandatory. It added that waiving planning permit fees is not relevant to the Amendment and note that such requests can be considered through another process.

(iv) Discussion
The Panel agrees with changes which were supported by Council. Referencing the name and second storey addition will provide some insight into the place’s transition. Deleting other references would address the building’s unusual orientation toward a street other than its address and address the issue of insufficient evidence that there was an entry at the southwest corner.

A heritage citation should provide objective information and guidance should avoid emotive comments. The Panel therefore supports the comment “It is unfortunate that a better compromise could not have been achieved” being deleted. Council should review all other heritage citations with a view to removing any similar statements.

The Panel agrees with Council that waiving planning permit fees are not relevant to the Amendment.

(v) Conclusions
The Panel concludes that amending the HO286 Heritage Citation to add history information about the property name, delete guidelines about the entry, new buildings and subdivision, and to add a new built form guideline regarding new built form would better inform any future permit application.

(vi) Recommendations
The Panel recommends:

5. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:
   a) HO286 (46 Howey Street, Gisborne) to add history information about the property name, delete unneeded discussion about the fence, delete guidelines about the entry, new buildings and subdivision, and to add a new built form guideline.
5.6 60 Prince Street, Gisborne (HO298)

(i) The Place

Statement of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Residence is significant to the extent of the weatherboard Victorian building and its presentation to the public realm. It does not include the skillion additions at the rear, vegetation of fences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How is it significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Residence is significant aesthetically and architecturally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why is it significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Residence is significant aesthetically as a highly visible traditional feature in Gisborne, reinforcing the townships early character and development.  
The Residence is significant architecturally as an intact example of a Late Victorian style residence, which is surprisingly intact and well maintained. It demonstrates all of the classical features of the style as manifested in rural areas. |

(ii) The issues

The issues are:

- whether the Heritage Overlay is justified for 60 Prince Street, Gisborne
- whether the HO298 Heritage Citation accurately reflects the place.
(iii) Evidence and submissions

The 60 Princes Street property owner opposed the Heritage Overlay being applied. She explained that she has maintained the property for 45 years without directives from anyone. The owner considered that the Heritage Overlay may increase insurance costs, reduce property value and invade their lives.

Council responded that these matters are irrelevant to whether the place has sufficient significance to justify the Heritage Overlay.

The owner also had issues with the HO298 Heritage Citation. She objected to the comment that their house is “Surprisingly intact and well maintained”. They added:

The comment “Landscaping or development should not introduce upon the visual appreciation of the building from the public realm” irks me somewhat when I see what was permitted to happen at “Eblana”. I always admired the beautiful old property, but it is now destroyed by houses being jammed into what was once the garden.

Council responded that comments in the Heritage Citation were not intended to be interpreted as judgement and proposed to replace ‘surprisingly’ with ‘remarkably’. It added that a previous outcome at another place is not a relevant when assessing whether the merit Heritage Overlay is justified.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel has already determined that property value and insurance premiums are not relevant to the Amendment. The Statement of significance should refer to the building being intact and well maintained without any emotive language such as ‘surprisingly’ or ‘remarkably’.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The Heritage Overlay is justified for 60 Prince Street, Gisborne
- The HO298 Heritage Citation should be modified to remove any comment that can be interpreted as judgement.

(vi) Recommendations

The Panel recommends:

6. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:
   a) HO298 (60 Princes Street, Gisborne) to delete the word ‘surprisingly’ in the Statement of significance.
5.7 New Gisborne Avenue of Honour (HO304)

(i) The Place

Statement of significance

What is significant?

The New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is significant to the extent of the Oak and Elm trees between within the road reserve of Station Road between Early Street and Saunders Road.

There are approximately 70 mature trees still existing from the Avenue. The extent does not include the kerbs or gutters in the environs of the trees.

How is it significant?

The New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is of significance aesthetically, culturally, historically and socially to the Community of New Gisborne and Macedon Ranges Shire.

Why is it significant?

The New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is significant aesthetically for the visual pleasure it creates along Station Road and the way it unifies the variety of buildings along that same road.

The New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is significant culturally and historically for its very localised commemoration of the contribution of the men of New Gisborne to the ‘War to end all wars’. While its origin was in a Gisborne Avenue of Honour, the small community desired to create its own, separate celebration.

The New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is significant socially for the spirit it created within its local community and the resulting working bees, donations and endeavours to display their pride.

(ii) The issue

The issue is whether the Heritage Overlay is justified for trees in Station Street, which the 2017 Heritage Study considers to be the New Gisborne Avenue of Honour.
(iii)  Evidence and submissions

Ms Kalajdzic submitted that the Heritage Overlay should not be applied to the New Gisborne Avenue of Honour because there are other avenues of trees worthier of recognition. She referred to considerable history attached to the other avenues.

In the report for its 25 July 2018 meeting, Council stated that the New Gisborne Avenue of Honour is of local heritage value, worthy of the Heritage Overlay and:

> The other avenues in the Gisborne environs have been degraded over the years and do not reflect the continuity of trees, parallel planting creating the avenue and visual impact. Their partial existence as fragments does not merit heritage recognition.

Council added that there are landscape and vegetation overlays in the Planning Scheme which could protect the landscapes in those fragmented avenues.

Council subsequently engaged GJM Heritage to peer review the HO304 Heritage Citation, conduct historical research, and to advise whether the avenue is an Avenue of Honour. GJM Heritage prepared a memorandum on 29 August 2018 which concluded that there was insufficient evidence to support the Station Road trees between the railway line and Saunders Road, New Gisborne to be included in the Heritage Overlay as an Avenue of Honour. Specifically, it stated:

> Local newspapers reported that an Avenue of Honour was planted in New Gisborne (and Gisborne) in 1918, however, the exact location of this Avenue and the tree species planted cannot been confirmed from the records available. Contemporary newspaper accounts discussing honour avenues in Gisborne Shire are often not clear to distinguish between Gisborne and New Gisborne.

At the Hearing, Mr Nelsen gave evidence that he accepted the peer review findings and concluded that it is no longer appropriate to apply the Heritage Overlay to the Station Road trees. He added:

> Due to their importance as a significant landscape element in New Gisborne, an alternative means of ensuring their conservation may be considered.

Council accepted the GJM Heritage findings and Mr Nelsen’s evidence to no longer apply the Heritage Overlay. It reiterated that there are landscape and vegetation overlays in the Planning Scheme which could protect the landscapes in those fragmented avenues.

(iv)  Discussion

There was considerable discussion and information at the Hearing regarding the proposed Heritage Overlay to the Station Street trees. It confirmed that there is insufficient evidence to confirm that the Station Street trees were planted as an Avenue of Honour. The Panel therefore accepts the GJM Heritage findings and Mr Nelson’s recommendation to no longer apply the Heritage Overlay to these trees.
(v) **Conclusions**

The Panel concludes that there is insignificant evidence to justify the Heritage Overlay for the Station Street trees.

(vi) **Recommendation**

The Panel recommends:

7. **Amend the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:**
   a) delete HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour)

8. **Amend the Heritage Overlay mapping to delete HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour).**

9. **Delete the following Heritage Citation:**
   a) HO304 (New Gisborne Avenue of Honour).
5.8 5 Bowen Street, Kyneton (HO305)

(i) The Place

Statement of significance

What is significant?

The Salvation Army Barracks is significant to the extent of its early brick and timber structure, including the roof, decoration and north timber wall. The significance does not include the modern additions to the west or associated developments not the interior of the building.

How is it significant?

The Salvation Army Barracks is significant architecturally, historically and socially.

Why is it significant?

The Salvation Army Barracks is significant architecturally as a classical expression of the Army's aesthetic approach to its buildings. The buildings were meant to be imposing to provide the salvation movement with a credible presence. Its use of red brick, rendered details and castellation’s, a strong sense of symmetry to the façade, is contrasted with the relative simplicity and austerity of the rest of the building – and clearly expressed in this building.

The Salvation Army Barracks is historically significant for its associations with Salvation Army itself, and its pioneering non-conformist approach to religion and welfare, as well as with Edward Saunders, their sole architect responsible for Army buildings throughout Australia and New Zealand and in particular his development of the pseudo-military architectural expression of those buildings.

The Salvation Army Barracks is socially significant for its association with the Army’s alternative, and innovative approach to religion, its celebration, and its focus on the welfare of others. The Barracks reflects the development of a social conscience in the wake of the Industrial Revolution – a conscience which saw the importation into Australia of other welfare and self-education movements (friendly societies, mechanics institutes, Freemasons, etc).
(ii) The issues

The issues are:

- whether the internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule should apply, and if so, what should be included
- whether the Heritage Overlay should apply to the adjoining property
- whether prohibited land uses should be enabled through the Heritage Overlay Schedule.

(iii) Evidence and submissions

Mr Nelsen gave evidence that he had inspected the interior of 5 Bowen Street and considered that the internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay should not apply. He explained that the HO305 Heritage Citation (Statement of cultural value – What is significant?) should be changed to replace ‘not with ‘nor’:

*The significance does not include the modern additions to the west or associated developments nor the interior of the building.*

Macedon Ranges Residents’ Association Inc (MRRA) submitted that it supported the Heritage Overlay being proposed to 5 Bowen Street, Kyneton. However, it requested that the internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule include timber ceilings, wall panelling and joinery. Council accepted Mr Nelsen’s evidence and did not support the request.

MRRA asked Council to consider whether the Heritage Overlay should also apply to the adjoining associated commercial premises. Council did not make this change.

For consistency, MRRA requested that:

- prohibited land uses be enabled through the Heritage Overlay Schedule, or
- the HO305 Heritage Citation be changed to delete guidelines regarding prohibited commercial use of the building.

Council responded that the subject land is in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone which prohibits the existing commercial land use. It explained that the business operates under existing use rights. Council considered it appropriate to allow other future commercial uses if they minimised amenity impacts on neighbouring residential uses. Council subsequently changed the Heritage Overlay Schedule to enable prohibited uses.

(iv) Discussion

Like Council, the Panel accepts Mr Nelsen’s updated evidence regarding the internal alteration control. Accordingly, the Panel is unable to support the control being extended to other elements.

A heritage place needs to be robustly investigated before being considered for the Heritage Overlay. For fairness, the affected property owner should be notified and provided with an opportunity to respond to such a proposal. As neither of these have occurred, the Panel does not support extending the Heritage Overlay to apply to the adjoining commercial building.
The Panel supports Council’s proposal to permit prohibited land uses through the Heritage Overlay Schedule for reasons provided in its submission. It is noted that permitting such uses would generate income that would help maintain the building’s heritage fabric.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The internal alteration control in the Heritage Overlay Schedule should not apply.
- The Heritage Overlay (HO305) should not apply beyond 5 Bowen Street, Kyneton.
- Prohibited land uses should be enabled through the Heritage Overlay Schedule.

(vi) Recommendation

The Panel recommends:

10. Amend the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:
   a) remove the HO305 internal alteration control by changing ‘yes’ to ‘no’ and deleting ‘timber floor’
   b) enable prohibited uses for HO305 by changing ‘yes’ to ‘no’ in ‘Prohibited uses may be permitted?’.
5.9 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton (HO313)

(i) The Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm is significant to the extent of the brick dwelling and an area 20 metres in radius from the centre of the Residence and the east-west dry stone wall. It does not include other outbuildings, the interior of the dwelling, fencing, or miscellaneous structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is it significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm is significant historically and aesthetically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why is it significant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm is significant historically as a demonstration of the settlement pattern and landscape features around the fringes of Kyneton. The Farm is significant aesthetically as features in the landscape. The east-west dry stone wall in particular is acknowledged as one of the longest in the Shire and provides a subtle, but tangible, link to the settlement of Kyneton. The dwelling is likewise a tangible feature to complement the wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) The issues

The issues are:
- whether the Heritage Overlay is justified for 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton
- whether the HO313 Heritage Citation accurately reflects the place.
(iii) Evidence and submissions

Ms Tomkinson represented the 101 Pleasant Hill Road property owners at the Hearing. Ms Tomkinson submitted that the Heritage Overlay is not appropriate for the property and referred to a heritage assessment prepared for the property by a heritage consultant, Ray Tonkin, in 2014. His advice concluded:

Throughout Victoria there are hundreds of similar complexes, dating from a period when closer settlement and new intensive forms of agriculture (such as dairying) was growing. Given this there is no basis for pursuing any future heritage control and the current status should stand. The sections of drystone wall on the western side of the drive are in better condition than the ruinous sections on the eastern side of the drive. When considering a permit the Shire will have regard to the relationship of these walls to others in the Shire.

Ms Tomkinson explained that, since Amendment VC148 was introduced, dry stone walls are managed by other planning provisions, notably Clause 52.33 (Post boxes and dry stone walls). She requested that the guideline in the HO313 Heritage Citation “The Dwelling must be retained and adapted as a residence” be deleted because of its prescriptive nature.

At the Hearing, Mr Nelsen gave evidence that he had reviewed 101 Pleasant Hill Road against Mr Tonkin’s advice. Mr Nelsen said that Mr Tonkin identified that he had minimal information to draw his conclusion. Mr Nelsen continued to support the Heritage Overlay and noted that the 2017 Heritage Study included new information since Mr Tonkin’s work four years ago.

Mr Nelsen recommended that the relevant guideline be changed to refer to the dwelling being retained, without any reference to it being adapted as a residence.

At the Hearing, Council submitted that, from the officer’s perspective, it accepted Mr Nelsen’s advice and considered Mr Tonkin’s advice not be useful to considering whether the Heritage Overlay should be applied. Council said that it would not change its recommendation to apply the Heritage Overlay and agreed with Mr Nelsen to delete the guideline for the dwelling to be “adopted as a residence”.

Tonkin study not useful for HO and does not say what elements worthy of protection. From officer perspective, no need to change recommendation. Agree with Nelsen change wording to remove residence preserve but can be adapted for reuse.

Regarding Clause 52.33 referred to by Ms Tomkinson, Council noted that the clause requires a responsible authority to consider, among other matters, any applicable heritage study statement of significance and conservation policy.

(iv) Discussion

The Panel was not presented with any information to persuade it to not apply the Heritage Overlay to 101 Pleasant Hill Road. It accepts that the heritage place has sufficient local heritage significance to justify the Heritage Overlay for reasons specified in the HO313 Heritage Citation. The Citation should be changed to delete any reference to how the building should be used. There are successful examples of heritage buildings that have been readapted into different uses without adversely impacting on the heritage fabric. Guidance on how to use the building should be deleted because the Planning Scheme more suitably
specifies what land uses are permitted or prohibited and it overreaches advice needed for heritage purposes.

The Panel agrees with Council’s submission regarding the dry-stone wall control and Clause 52.33. The dry-stone wall achieves sufficient local heritage significance to warrant the Heritage Overlay Schedule control. Clause 52.33 anticipates the existence of a relevant heritage study and can operate harmoniously with the Heritage Overlay Schedule control.

(v) Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- The Heritage Overlay and associated fence control for the dry-stone wall are justified for 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton.
- The HO313 Heritage Citation should be revised to remove any reference to how the building should be used.

(vi) Recommendation

The Panel recommends:

11. Amend the following Heritage Citation:

a) HO313 (101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton) to replace “The Dwelling must be retained and adapted as a residence” in the guidelines with “The Dwelling should be retained”.
6 Drafting matters

6.1 The issue

The issue is whether the Heritage Citations and planning provisions should be changed to improve their operation.

6.2 Submissions

Council submitted that the Amendment proposes to change the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:

- make drafting related changes to heritage places not subject to the 2017 Heritage Study
- change its formatting consistent with advice in Planning Practice Note 1.

It added that the Amendment was not required to change the Heritage Overlay Schedule and Clause 72.04 to align with the arrangements introduced through Amendment VC148 because it was subject to the three-month transitional arrangement. However, Council considered that the Planning Scheme would be more current if documents were amended to align.

In response to a query from Council about changes associated with Amendment VC148, the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) advised:

- it would be feasible to incorporate the 2017 Heritage Study into the Planning Scheme through Clause 72.04
- the Heritage Overlay Schedule should be amended to reference the 2017 Heritage Study for each entry to show where the relevant statement of significance can be found
- the guidelines in each heritage citation should be changed so that it is expressed as discretionary (not mandatory) to avoid any potential interpretation issues once they are incorporated into the Planning Scheme.

Council said that the revised Planning Practice Note 1 (August 2018) subsequently superseded DELWP’s advice. The Practice Note advises that the design guidelines for each heritage place should be in a separate incorporated document. Council said that if it sought to align the Amendment with Amendment VC148, it would now have to produce:

- a separate statement of significance for each heritage place and include in ‘Why is it significant?’ the relevant criterion specified in brackets at the end of each paragraph
- a separate heritage guidelines document for each heritage place with discretionary language.

At the Hearing, Council explained that it was not possible to prepare redrafted documents for the Panel to consider. However, Council said that it could revise the documents before making a final decision on the Amendment, should the Panel recommend changes to align documents with Amendment C148 changes.

MRRA submitted that grouping the Heritage Overlay Schedule places by locality and street makes the Heritage Overlay numbers non-sequential. It explained that this format creates
difficulties because some localities and street names are not shown on the Heritage Overlay mapping in the Planning Scheme.

MRRA submitted that the reference document, Macedon Ranges Pre-contact Pilot Study Victoria, Hilary, in Clause 21.08 should acknowledge ‘Hilary du Cros’ as the author. At its 25 July 2018 meeting, Council resolved to delete the author’s name from the reference document.

MRRA submitted that there are redundant references, such as:
- ‘Dumbarton’ which burnt down years ago and subsequently had the Heritage Overlay removed
- Gisborne Cemetery which has an existing Heritage Overlay (HO01) but is recommended for a future assessment.

Council agreed that these were errors and resolved to delete obsolete references to Dumbarton and Gisborne Cemetery.

MRRA submitted that spelling and typographical errors, at time, makes it difficult to understand and the Guidelines need to remove confusion, contradictions and inconsistencies.

MRRA identified that the Heritage Overlay Schedule for HO285 (29 Melbourne Road, Gisborne) specified in the ‘Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt’ control specified ‘No (Underground well)’ and requested that this be changed to ‘Yes’. Council submitted that the underground well was specifically referenced so that it would not be exempt from the control. It agreed to MRRA’s change because this would correct an error in the Schedule.

6.3 Discussion

(i) Clause 21.08

The post-exhibition change to Clause 21.08 addresses the issue related to the author’s name while making it consistent with other document references in that clause.

(ii) Heritage Overlay Schedule

The Panel is satisfied that the Heritage Overlay Schedule (HO285) ‘Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt’ ‘No’ control is a clerical error which should be corrected to reflect the intended provision.

The proposed Heritage Overlay Schedule adopts the same format as the existing Schedule in the Planning Scheme. While listing the heritage places and precincts in numeric order has some advantages, the Schedule’s grouping by town then by street is a recognised format in Planning Practice Note 1.

(iii) Heritage citations

Statement of Significance

The Panel notes that the Statement of Significance format shown in Planning Practice Note 1 broadly reflects the format applied in many heritage studies. Now that they are required to be incorporated as part of the Planning Scheme, it is important that they are presented clearly and consistently. Although there is a three-month transition period, Council and
permit applicants would benefit from applying this format at this stage. Changes should include:

- adding the relevant criterion in brackets after each relevant statement in ‘What is significant?’
- changing the title ‘Statement of Cultural Value’ to ‘Statement of Significance’.

Guidelines

Guidelines are advisory, therefore applying language such as “must” may create the impression that they are mandatory and must be applied. The Panel supports Council’s proposal to change the guidelines language, so it is expressed as discretionary advice. This will avoid any misinterpretation issues when the guidelines document is incorporated into the Planning Scheme.

Commentary

As discussed in earlier chapters, emotive comments were found in heritage citations, predominantly in the guidelines section. Examples of emotive language include ‘surprisingly’, ‘anxious’ and ‘unfortunate’. Council should review the citations and either translate them into objective language or delete them entirely.

Sawdust Kiln (AK1)

The Sawdust Kiln at 39 Lauriston Reservoir Road, Kyneton was recommended by the heritage consultant during Part One of the 2017 Heritage Study. Council submitted that the was demolished before the Amendment process commenced and was not included in the Amendment. Mr Nelsen acknowledged this in his expert witness statement. The Panel agrees that the AK1 Heritage Citation should be deleted because it refers to heritage fabric which no longer exists.

Homestead/Hay Hill (G25)

As outlined in in the submissions section of this chapter, MRRA submitted that the G25 Heritage Citation had obsolete references. The Panel supports Council’s proposal to correct these errors.

6.4 Conclusions

The Panel concludes:

- Deleting the author from the Macedon Ranges Pre-contact Pilot Study in Clause 21.08 would make it consistent with other document references in that clause.
- The Heritage Overlay Schedule (HO285) should be corrected to reflect the intention to not exempt the underground well.
- The Amendment does not propose to change how the Heritage Overlay Schedule presents listings therefore the Panel does not make a recommendation on this matter.
- Council’s drafting post-exhibition changes to existing property listings in the Heritage Overlay Schedule should be applied because they will improve its clarity and operation.
- Each heritage citation should be reformatted to align with Planning Practice Note 1 and changes introduced through Amendment VC148.
• The AK1 Heritage Citation should be deleted because it refers to heritage fabric which no longer exists.
• The G25 Heritage Citation (otherwise known as HO295 426 Hamilton Road, New Gisborne) should be changed to delete obsolete references to Dumbarton and the Gisborne Cemetery.

6.5 Recommendations

The Panel recommends:

12. Amend Clause 21.08 to change the relevant document reference to ‘Macedon Ranges Pre-contact Pilot Study Victoria, 1996’.

13. Amend the Heritage Overlay Schedule to:
   a) change the HO285 ‘Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt’ control from ‘No’ to ‘Yes’
   b) make drafting changes which improve its clarity and operation.

14. Amend Clause 72.04 to incorporate 37 statements of significance and 37 heritage design guideline documents.

15. Amend each heritage citation to:
   a) reformat each statement of significance consistent with the example appended to Planning Practice Note 1
   b) ensure that it includes information and guidance without emotive comments
   c) change the guidelines language, so it is expressed as discretionary advice
   d) transfer the guidelines into a separate document.

16. Amend the following Heritage Citation, as shown in Appendix B:
   a) HO295 (426 Hamilton Road, New Gisborne) to delete obsolete references to Dumbarton and the Gisborne Cemetery.

17. Delete the following Heritage Citation:
   a) AK1 (Sawdust Kiln, 39 Lauriston Reservoir Road, Kyneton).
# Appendix A  Document list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presented by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1a Part A Submission</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b Expert witness statement – Ivar Nelson</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 Part B Submission</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Submission – Jane Sharwood and David Hosking</td>
<td>Ms Sharwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Submission – Friends of Daly Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Ms Gauci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Submission – Friends of Daly Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Mr Phair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Submission – 59 Howey Street, Gisborne</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Submission – 101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton</td>
<td>Ms Tomkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Submission – 46 Howey Street, Gisborne</td>
<td>Property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Submission – Macedon Ranges Residents’ Association Inc</td>
<td>Ms Pruneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Folder – various documents</td>
<td>Ms Gauci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11 Submission – 59 Howey Street, Gisborne</td>
<td>Ms Kalajdzic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Submission – New Gisborne Avenue of Honour</td>
<td>Ms Kalajdzic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Submission</td>
<td>Ms Perkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Submission – 2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne</td>
<td>Mr Banon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Planning Scheme maps – selected Heritage Overlay polygons</td>
<td>Mr Banon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTE: Content is not shown where no changes are proposed.
Macedon Ranges Shire Gisborne/Kyneton Heritage Study

27 November 2017

Homestead/Gisborne Park (G1)
2 Cabbage Tree Lane, Gisborne

Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes associated with this property are 4.3 Grazing and Raising Livestock, 4.4 Farming and 6.7 Making Homes for Victorians.
- The 1995 Heritage Study presents a compelling case of the property’s heritage values, complemented by the photographic documentation provided by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon Districts Historical Society.
- The heritage values are associated with not just the main house but the bluestone outbuildings as well. The main house and coach house are the two dominant buildings, but there are two skillion sheds behind the main house as well. There are a number of more contemporary timber buildings which do not contribute to the early history of the property. A portion of the coach house has been fitted out as a shearing shed, but there is no remaining shearing shed of the scale of the one photographed above. It is proposed to identify only a portion of the property, focusing around the built-up area, as having heritage values.
- The main house is a classic Australian homestead of the Italianate style. Its date is given in the 1995 Heritage Study as ‘about 1860’, which would give it more importance as an early example of that style. It displays the archetypal formal symmetry accented by two bay windows/roofs with the verandah stepping out to accommodate them. The cast iron columns and lace work are highlights against the dark bluestone construction. The bluestone and the slate roof indicate a high-status and high-quality building.
- The interior contains many fine features, not the least of which are varnished cedar joinery. While changes are evident, the main rooms are worthy of conservation.
- The ‘coach house’ a very sophisticated farm building, again indicating a property of quality and status, complementing the main house. It is in need of stabilisation and the stonework is deteriorating.
- At the rear of the main house are several bluestone skillion service buildings associated with the farming activities of the property. They indicate changes but in form, materials and extent complement the other buildings on site.
- The heritage value of the vegetation or landscape to the property is difficult. The gardens are contemporary although there are several mature introduced trees throughout. They do not demonstrate a ‘designed’ pattern. The present gardens however complement the house. Experience indicates this is unlikely.
- The larger landscape is generically complementary in providing a setting for the built-up area. What appears to be an ‘avenue’ of trees at the entry drive is an irregular plantation of pines, not a strict ‘avenue’. The alignment and age of the pines varies considerably, minimising their contribution.
- The Gisborne district, and Gisborne itself, is a venue for the development of homesteads and residences for wealthy families. Its proximity to Melbourne and the availability of the railway were undoubtedly part of that attraction. Few unfortunately have retained their outbuildings, and fewer demonstrate the quality of Gisborne Park.
- It may also be possible to develop a brief, mutually agreed, management document (and included in the Planning Scheme as an ‘incorporated document’) to identify activities and buildings/features exempt from the requirements of the Heritage Overlay.

Comparative Comment

The present Heritage Overlay includes homesteads of a similar nature, although generally Gisborne Park would appear to have a higher quality and greater extent. Dumbarton (HO258) in Gisborne, Brennanah (HO208) in Kyneton, Bolobek (HO249) in Macedon and Duneira (HO265) are amongst these.

These homesteads are indicative of the early (non-urban) development of the Shire and, despite inclusion on the existing Heritage Overlay) continue to be viable and contribute to the Shire’s heritage.

It would be consistent and appropriate to include Gisborne Park on the Heritage Overlay.
Statement of Cultural Value

- **What is significant?**
  
  Gisborne Park is significant to the extent of ‘built-up’ portion of the property, including that is the main house (with interiors), the ‘coach house’ and bluestone skillion buildings. It does not include any post-WWI buildings or developments.

- **How is it significant?**

  Gisborne Park is significant historically, representatively, aesthetically and technically.

- **Why is it significant?**

  - Gisborne Park is significant historically and representatively for its association with the early agricultural and residential development of the Gisborne district, and in particular the establishment of large quality properties for wealthy families.
  
  - Gisborne Park is significant aesthetically and technically for the classic Italianate style main house and complementary outbuildings. The bluestone buildings illustrate a homestead complex of considerable merit.

Level of Significance – Local

![Nominal area of listing](image)

Nominal area of listing -100 metres radius from the centre of the courtyard.

Guidelines

- Gisborne Park must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.

- There are no restrictions on existing post-WWI buildings or structures. (Post-WWI is a nominal figure but the historical information does not appear to indicate any significant development after that period.)

- There are no internal restrictions on buildings except upon the main rooms of the main house. It is encouraged that any traditional interiors or features however should they exist are retained and expressed. The varnished cedar joinery must not be painted.

- Within the area of listing, new development must not intrude upon the appreciation of the traditional qualities of the pre-WWI buildings. It must seek to be visually recessive in its design and placement. Major new development should be outside the area of listing.

- **Subdivision may be possible for the overall property but the pre-WWI buildings must be protected and provided with a significant area within which to be appreciated. The minimal area is indicated by the 100 metre boundary.** New built development must not intrude upon the pre-WWI buildings in their siting, designs or fencing.

- **It may be possible to subdivide the outlying areas of the overall property without compromising the heritage values. A substantial area around the bluestone buildings must be retained as a buffer, not just the 100 metre radius and any development areas around them must maximise the presence and dominance of the traditional buildings in their siting, size and visual impact.**

- Within the area of listing, it is encouraged that existing vegetation be retained where it complements the traditional character of the pre-WWI buildings. It is encouraged that new vegetation also complement the traditional character of the place. Vegetation outside the area of listing is encouraged to continue the existing landscape character.

- There are no landscape or tree restrictions. It is encouraged however that the existing landscape and variety of vegetation be maintained and developed as required to establish a continuity.

- There are no fence restrictions.
Residence/Eblana (G2)

59 Howey Street, Gisborne (previously 82 Aitken Street, Gisborne)
Including part of UL Daly Reserve, 63 Howey Street, Gisborne

History

The following is an extract from the 1994 Heritage Study.

“History: Eblana was built in 1896 (by Cherry?) for Dr Ulick Daly, a Gisborne doctor who Irish with an American wife. The house stood on an eleven acre site and replaced a cottage once owned by the grantee, James Cavanagh, who sold the site to Daly the previous year. Cavanagh was later know in Gisborne as the one who drive the lorry carting Cherry’s churns to the railway station.

The ownership passed to his wife, Laura May in the 193Os and later an Ulick Lord Daly (a son?). His son Jack Daly, is thought to have lived there also over a long period being a good friend of Alistair Clark. Daly grew some plants for sale. It is currently owned by Neil Robertson’s mother.

Description: Eblana is a large timber Federation Bungalow style villa which has been designed for the two major frontages on which it stands. A broad expanse of gable –form roofing provides the backdrop for several projecting half timbered gable room bays at the extremities of the elevation. These room projections differ in width promoting visual diversity. They also provide the ends to a north facing timber framed verandah and one abuts the arch entry porch on the east side. It is possible that verandah has been placed with a new sun consciousness reflecting emerging modernist principles.

The half timbering to the gables is set on the diagonal on most elevations while some form deep overhangs, either side of a projecting window bay. Some windows are grouped casements, others are single double hung.

Ornament is confined to timber slatting and simple fretted brackets. Red brick chimneys with belted tops are also numerous and seemingly randomly placed adding to the picturesque qualities of the roofline.

Context: The house relates to other contemporary examples nearby (i.e 46 Howey Street) while playing a landmark role because of the spacious ground, size and corner siting. It is typically sized and prominent for a doctor’s house and surgery and hence expresses his role and status in the town.

Landscape: The house is set well back from Aitken Street, at the Howey Street corner, with an extensive woodland garden area which merges with the street frontage. Bulbs, pin-oaks and almond trees comprise the major character of the garden while there are also signs of large trees having been recently removed on the north side. The exotic and native vegetation on the adjoining Daly Reserve was reputedly donated to the Gisborne Shire by the Daly estate as a nature reserve.

Significance: Eblana is significant as a well preserved and large 19th century house, which is among a relatively small group of similar houses in the Gisborne Township, today and presents an architectural stylism, which is distinct within the town and region among contemporary houses. The house by its size and grounds also reflects its use by a key figure in town, Dr Daly, and Eblana, by its integrity and age, has relative antiquity within the context of most other houses in town.

Eblana’s architectural character and landscape setting relate to those of other adjacent houses and civic buildings nearby. The house adjoins a nature reserve which commemorates its owner, Daly’s name and perpetuates some (still visible) essence of the garden.

Eblana is significant as a landmark building and because of the degree to which the original fabric of the building has survived. It is associated with a key figure in Gisborne’s history.”

The following information has been prepared by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon Districts Historical Society from their files.
Extracted from Rate Books

- "11 Acres and Cottage, Bounded by Aitken, Howey and Prince Streets
- 1871 – 1878 - J. Lane (James & Thomas Kavanagh – Tenants) and at times the Crown (Owners)
- 1879 – 1894 - J. Lane (Sometimes Owner) (Tenants – James Kavanagh)
- 1895 – Transferred to Dr. Ulick Arthur Daly
- 1896 – Net Annual Value was £12-0-0
- 1897 - Net Annual Value increased to £60-0-0. Described as Villa – Eblana was built by Cherry & Son. Details Re: Cherry
- 1933 – Transferred to Laura May Daly.
- 1936 – Lord Ulick Lord Daly retired (Owner). Died 1976.”

Extracted from Property File. Source: Telegraph – Jan ‘08, Feb ‘08 and Sept ’09.

- "Presumably most of the larger trees were planted about the same time as Eblana was built.
- The Doctor’s son Ulick and his wife were knowledgeable and enthusiastic gardeners who during their lives embellished and added to the garden.
- Ulick Daly died in the early 70’s. The house was sold and the garden fell into decay.
- The house was purchased by the Shire of Gisborne in 1978 and was later purchased by Laurie & Frazer Caddy who have been coaxing the surrounds back to order.
- The cottage garden built in the orchard is a new addition.
- Eblana was auctioned in March 2008 (Sold). Many of the features have been retained including timber panelled walls, high ceilings, numerous open fireplaces and detailed mantle-pieces.
- Dr. Daly’s original servant bell and room register still remain.
- The dining room is a special place with timber clad walls, built-in shelving, fireplace and a coffered ceiling.
- Subdivided in 2009.
- Dr. Ulick A. Daly – Born Dublin 1853. Arrived 1888.
- Eblana was built as a private residence and as a surgery.”

The following information was provided by local resident, Irene Perkin:

Doctor Ulick Arthur William Daly, M.B., B.Ch., University of Dublin and Licentiate in Midwifery, Rotunda Hospital, Dublin. Born Dublin 1853, died Gisborne 1933. Married Laura May (nee Lord) 1886, son Ulick Lord Daly born 1891, daughter Ismy Laura Therese born 1894.

Ulick Lord Daly was awarded an MBE for services to local government in 1968. In 1976 he negotiated with the then Gisborne Shire Council to – upon his death – gift a major part of his property “to the people of Gisborne for passive recreation.”

The following is an extract from the VCAT Report dated July 2009 prepared for the owners by heritage consultant Mandy Jean.

“DESCRIPTION OF THE RESIDENCE AND GARDEN

6. The residence at 82 Aitken Street is set in a large garden of 6,022square metres, which roughly forms a rectangle, with a 95.58metre north boundary facing Howey Street, and 100.58m south boundary facing U.L. Daly Reserve and 60 metres west boundary and 55metres east boundary, fronting onto Aitken Street.

7. The residence is a large single storey building designed in the Federation Queen Anne/ Bungalow architectural style. The ten room building accommodated the professional medical rooms of the owner, Dr. Daly, as well as providing elegant and spacious rooms for his family home. From historic photographs it appears that the rear rooms were built shortly after the house was first constructed in 1896. The rear addition includes a cedar lined vaulted ceiling to the dining room and large rear living room which has a square bay window looking out onto distant views of Mount Macedon. The rear addition created a house with two front facades, the public entrance and medical rooms overlooking Aitken Street and a private entrance facing onto Howey Street.

8. The timber frame house is well built and exhibits exemplary timber construction, joinery and decorative detailing. References provided in the Heritage Study citation sheet suggest that the house may have been built and designed by a local timber merchant and builder, Cherry & Son, who is also known to have made fine cabinets and furniture. The timber weatherboard board home has extensive cedar lined paneling internally, superb tongue and groove flooring, timber joinery, wide central corridor and large fireplaces and elaborate surrounds in every room.

9. The simple layout of the house belies the complex roof form with its steep angled gable ends, decorated with half-timber bargeboards and bracketed projecting gables, while the tall elegant brick strapped chimneys dominate the
roofscape. Fine external timber detailing includes the turned verandah posts, decorative timber brackets and valence, timber double hung sash windows and timber panelled doors and angled timber projecting bay windows. Quality original architectural detailing is found internally although several rooms have been re-lined due to poor conditions found previously. The residence is a good representative example of a provincial variation of the Federation Queen Anne style found in rural towns in Victoria. The general architectural style became the most dominant domestic style in Australia from 1890 to 1900. The Heritage Study citation sheet suggests the style of the subject building is more Federation Bungalow than Federation Queen Anne. The former architectural style represents a transitional period between Queen Anne and Inter War Californian Bungalow styles, where the picturesque complexities of the Queen Anne style were progressively reduced in favour of a more grounded simple style.”

Illustrations

Source: GMMDHS Photo D6753 59A5, location of the artefact unknown

Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes associated with the Residence are 6.5 Living in Country Towns and 8.3 Providing Health and Welfare Services.
- Access to the interior of the Residence has not been permitted by the current owners.
- Eblana was recommended in the 1995 Heritage Study for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay. There is no documentation as to why it wasn’t included at that time.
- In 1978 the majority of the land associated with Eblana was gifted to the Shire and is now managed by the Shire as U.L. Daly Reserve – at the rear of the Residence. The gifting left only a small amount of land associated with the Residence and its frontage to Howey Street.
- In 2009 the entry and front garden associated with Eblana fronting Howey Street was subdivided, leaving the Residence with only a small amount of land and a narrow access to the Residence. The original entry was from the corner of Aitken and Howey Streets with a curving driveway towards the Residence. The present narrow driveway to the Residence off Howey Street is not original. (It should be noted the Shire objected to this subdivision and the issue went to VCAT who found in favour of the applicant.) As a result, the original garden facing Howey Street has been lost to development. No further comment will be made on the subdivision.
- The land still directly associated with Eblana, on the same title, is subsequently only token in both size and originality. Heritage consultants Context P/L in a report on the landscape of Eblana have noted that plants near the house on the remaining land associated with Eblana were recent (within 20 years) and while sympathetic, had no heritage significance. One tree to the west of the Residence, a Weeping Chinese Cypress, was note by Context P/L as having individual value as a specimen. This tree however is known to be aggressive in its root system and has been planted within 10 meters of the house. By its regrowth pattern, it would have been a hedge. Its current size is beyond return to this state. The veracity of this species identification, however, has been questioned. Its regrowth pattern indicates that it would have been a hedge but its current size makes a return to that state impossible, so it is not recommended for protection.
- Within the UL Daly Reserve, there is a series of remnant plantings from associations with the Residence which Context P/L have noted as having value as’ remnants’. These are a series of fruit trees and a row of Italian Cypresses. No other landscape elements or plants at the rear of the present Residence were identified as having heritage values. Context P/L has recommended however that the fruit trees and Italian Cypresses should be included within the boundary of any Eblana Heritage Overlay for their historical associations with Eblana. As the remaining landscape and gardens associated with Eblana have been lost to development, this is a worthy recommendation. An agreement to this end has been reached with the owners.
The design of the Residence Eblana is a masterful demonstration of the Federation Queen Anne style, popular at the time. It is a flamboyant style expressing the confidence of Australia coming out of the 1890s depression and optimism as the country approached Federation. Eblana’s steep projecting gables, variety of roof shapes, tall brick chimneys with decorated corbelled tops, decorated gables and timber verandah details are all features associated with the style and expressed at Eblana.

It is obvious from the old photos that an addition/alteration has been made to the west end, but it has been undertaken to maintain a continuity with the original style.

The interior was not accessible. However, it is noted that the description of the Residence in the 2009 VCAT Report makes direct reference to potentially significant internal features which include Cedar vaulted ceilings, exemplary timber joinery and decorative detailing, Cedar panelling, and elaborate fireplace surrounds in every room. This extent of internal detailing leads the author to assume (without access) that the interior is also worthy of conservation and inclusion on the Heritage Overlay.

As a doctor in a large country town, UL Daly would have been one of the pillars of the community. His name appears frequently in newspaper reports about community activities and as chairman of this committee or that. The house is a demonstration of his wealth and position in the district.

A large carport has been constructed within the land still associated with the Residence. With the tall fencing around the property now, its presence is minimised. It should not be used as a precedent for similar additional structures.

An inspection could further clarify how much of the interior is worthy of conservation, and this could be documented into a mutually agreed document to become an ‘Incorporated Document’ within the Heritage Overlay/Planning Scheme.

**Guidelines**

- The Residence must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.
- There are no restrictions on the vegetation, fencing or outbuildings, beyond the fruit trees and Italian Cypresses in the Reserve.
- An inspection of the interior may be able to reduce the extent of internal heritage significance and identify opportunities for change.
- The return of an appropriate colour scheme similar to that shown in the early photographs is encouraged. The brick chimneys must not be painted.
- There are no constraints to the gardens on the title land with the Residence. A garden which reflects the era of the Residence is encouraged. Any garden must retain views of the Residence from Howey Street.
- The fruit trees and Italian Cypresses within the UL Daly Reserve must be retained and maintained. Their visual association with the Residence should not be restricted. The reconstruction of an original orchard (to accompany the fruit trees) would be entirely hypothetical and unnecessary. Interpretative signage explaining the association of the fruit trees to the Residence is encouraged. The area of the UL Daly Reserve to be part of the Heritage Overlay should be the minimal area necessary to include the two features. The portion of the reserve included in the listing may stay under separate management, but cooperation in encouraged in this.
- The remaining land associated with the Residence, after the 2009 subdivision, is limited. Any new built development must be critically considered, sited and designed so as not to intrude upon the appreciation of the Residence from Howey Street.
- The removal of the carport is encouraged should the opportunity present itself. Any new fencing must maximise the visual access to the residence. Any new structures/buildings must be avoided given the small amount of land associated with the residence. If necessary, they should not disrupt views of the residence from the public realm and be minimal in size and concept.
- Likewise, opportunities for expansion of the Residence itself are limited. They too must be critically considered so as to minimise physical and visual intrusion.
St Brigid’s Catholic Church (G3)
64 Aitken Street, Gisborne

History

The following is an extract from the 1994 Study

“The site faces Gisborne’s principal thoroughfare, Aitken Street, at its intersection with Fisher Street, the location of the Presbyterian and National School Reserves.

A priest renowned for his church building, the Rev TJ O’Callaghan was the first Catholic priest to reside at Gisborne in 1871 (or 1868?), the previous clergy having resided at Bacchus Marsh (Fr O’Connell, Rev Madden, Rev Shinnick). He replaced the timber St Brigid’s Mission Church (used as a school) at Gisborne with the present brick one for a cost of £3000. The presbytery was erected in the same construction period for £1065, reputedly after construction of a clergyman’s residence in 1868. The church was dedicated in 1875.

Reputedly services were held in the Gisborne Catholic School (Denominational School 288) from its creation in 1860. The school closed in 1870.

Other buildings created within the Mission during the latter half of the 19th century include St Mary’s at Sunbury, St Ambrose at Riddell’s Creek and St Patricks at Macedon.

The foundation Stone reads, “St Brigid’s Church, Gisborne, Foundation Stone was laid by the Very Reverend Dr John Fitzpatrick, VEG, on the 30th November 1873. The church was blessed and opened by the Right Reverend Dr James Halipias Goold, D.D.O.S.A. Archbishop of Melbourne, on 5th February, 1875. Parrish Priest was the Reverend Father Timothy, J O’Callaghan: Parish Chairman; Mr Michael Brady; Parish Secretary, Mr Patrick Barry; Architect, Mr Daniel J Buckley (Gisborne); and the builder, Mr Richard Grant.”

Other sources credit the contract to Robert Bodkin of Riddell and Grant was given the plumbing to carry out. Michael Waugh of Collingwood was the plasterer.

An early photograph of the church and presbytery shows the face brick walls of both and an arrow head timber picket fence around the frontages. An angle rail fence was erected inside this fence line.

There is a gallery across the rear, with a number of leadlight windows dedicated to persons such as Mr & Mrs John Flannagan, the Power family, the Wilson’s, and the Slattery’s, amongst others. The organ loft (minus organ) was donated by the parents of Annie Burns.”

The following additional history is from the St Brigid’s, Gisborne Parish website (www.st-brigidis-gisborne-parish.org.au/history). The website credits Nori Gardner for the text.

“HISTORY OF THE PARISH

We have no record of the early days of the Gisborne Parish until about 1855 when Father Madden was appointed parish priest of the Blackwood Parish. This consisted of Gisborne, Bacchus Marsh and Ballan. To visit his parishioners he had to travel on horseback or in a horse-drawn jinker or buggy. There were very few people living in this area and he could only say Mass at irregular times.

As time passes, and more people took up residence in these parts, the parishes were made smaller and Gisborne and Bacchus Marsh were controlled by the one priest who lived in Bacchus Marsh. He travelled to Gisborne to say Mass here, still by horseback, sometimes staying at Bullengaroo overnight and coming on to Gisborne.

A very fine Catholic man, Michael Brady, who lived just next to the present Mitre 10 shop in Gisborne, was anxious to help the priest. Brady’s house was built a distance back from the front fence, so he decided to build a place consisting of
two rooms for the use of the priest on his visits to Gisborne. One room was to be used for saying Mass and the other as a bedroom, so that the priest could stay overnight and meet his parishioners.

As the population in the area increased fairly rapidly the room became too small to hold the congregation. There was already a small wooden school in Gisborne and it was here Mass was held. The building was just inside the school ground, near Fisher Street and as time went on it was enlarged and Mass was said there for many years. The land was given by the Government.

As time passed and more and more people settled in the area, the need for a proper church became most important and in 1875 the Church, which is in Gisborne today, was built and when completed was blessed and opened on February 2nd, 1875 by Archbishop Gould. The church cost £3125, very different from the cost of building a church today. A plaque on the outside wall of the church facing Fisher Street gives all the details of the blessing. Since the parish was formed there have been 22 different priests in the parish, staying for different lengths of time. The longest, Father Patrick Gibbons, stayed for thirty years.

In 1888 the teacher at the school was Mary Slattery who filled this position when she completed her teacher training and taught for 57 years. She was a very good teacher, at times had up to 50 children in the one big room where Mass had been said. She taught classes 1 - 8 with very good results and managed to give every child a fine education, as well as an excellent grounding in religion. On her retirement in 1945 Father Nolan who was our parish priest at the time found it impossible to obtain nuns to take over the school, so St. Brigid’s had to be closed and all children from there had to attend the Gisborne Primary School. This lasted till 1950 when Father Nolan was successful in persuading nuns from W.A. belonging to the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition to come over to Gisborne. Next problem was where they would live. Father Nolan then decided to give up his presbytery (built several years before the church was built) for a Convent for the nuns. This is the building next to the school and used as St. Brigid’s office. Father then boarded with Mrs. Murray, whose home was on the spot where the present school now stands. The nuns taught in the old wooden building until about 1953, when because of the increase of enrolments and overcrowding, a new school had to be built.

Father Nolan then set about building a new presbytery, which was completed in 1951, between the Convent and the church. The nuns remained in Gisborne for 15 years when they were recalled to W.A. and again the Catholic school was closed for two years, 1966 and 1967.

After the death of Father Elliot who replaced Fr Nolan in 1955, Father Griffin came to Gisborne. He was eventually able to bring the nuns of the order of St Joseph, founded by Mother Mary McKillop, to teach in Gisborne, and they remained here from 1968 till 1990. Sister Barbara was here for 12 years and Sister Maureen for 10 years. Replacing them were another Sister Maureen and Sister Patricia. Sister Maureen taught at the school but Sr Patricia worked with the lay people in the Parish. At the end of 1990 the nuns were recalled and the school was left in the hands of lay teachers.

In 1977 because of the worsening condition of the convent, built nearly 100 years before, Fr Griffin purchased a house in Brantome Street for a new Convent which remained as such till the end of 1990 when the nuns left the district. Fr Griffin was followed by Fr Loughlin, then Fr Tobin who was parish priest for 13 1/2 years. During his time in Gisborne many major changes have taken place. In his early years here, the church was carpeted, adding much comfort to parishioners in winter, as did the padding of the kneelers. Later the church was painted.

With the increased number of enrolments, 2 new rooms had to be added to the building in 1986 and in 1989 two portable rooms were placed in the school grounds. In 1979 the hall was built and is used for school purposes, as well as being hired out for entertainment. In 1983 when the Ash Wednesday fire devastated so much of our district our Catholic church at Macedon was completely destroyed. Some years later a modern Catholic church was built to cater for the needs of the Macedon people.

Father Tobin’s last work was the addition of two new rooms to be added to the small presbytery enabling him to have accommodation for visiting priests who, from time to time, came up at weekends to help with Mass in the country areas of Riddell and Macedon. Weekend Masses were 7.30pm Saturday in Gisborne, also 8am and 10.30 am Sunday, 9.15 am at Macedon and 10.30 at Riddell. We are very thankful to the priests. Father King, (Jesuit) came up every weekend from W.A. belonging to the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition to come over to Gisborne. Next problem was where they would live. Father Nolan then decided to give up his presbytery (built several years before the church was built) for a Convent for the nuns. This is the building next to the school and used as St. Brigid’s office. Father then boarded with Mrs. Murray, whose home was on the spot where the present school now stands. The nuns taught in the old wooden building until about 1953, when because of the increase of enrolments and overcrowding, a new school had to be built.

Father Nolan then set about building a new presbytery, which was completed in 1951, between the Convent and the church. The nuns remained in Gisborne for 15 years when they were recalled to W.A. and again the Catholic school was closed for two years, 1966 and 1967.

After the death of Father Elliot who replaced Fr Nolan in 1955, Father Griffin came to Gisborne. He was eventually able to bring the nuns of the order of St Joseph, founded by Mother Mary McKillop, to teach in Gisborne, and they remained here from 1968 till 1990. Sister Barbara was here for 12 years and Sister Maureen for 10 years. Replacing them were another Sister Maureen and Sister Patricia. Sister Maureen taught at the school but Sr Patricia worked with the lay people in the Parish. At the end of 1990 the nuns were recalled and the school was left in the hands of lay teachers.

In 1977 because of the worsening condition of the convent, built nearly 100 years before, Fr Griffin purchased a house in Brantome Street for a new Convent which remained as such till the end of 1990 when the nuns left the district. Fr Griffin was followed by Fr Loughlin, then Fr Tobin who was parish priest for 13 1/2 years. During his time in Gisborne many major changes have taken place. In his early years here, the church was carpeted, adding much comfort to parishioners in winter, as did the padding of the kneelers. Later the church was painted.

With the increased number of enrolments, 2 new rooms had to be added to the building in 1986 and in 1989 two portable rooms were placed in the school grounds. In 1979 the hall was built and is used for school purposes, as well as being hired out for entertainment. In 1983 when the Ash Wednesday fire devastated so much of our district our Catholic church at Macedon was completely destroyed. Some years later a modern Catholic church was built to cater for the needs of the Macedon people.

Father Tobin’s last work was the addition of two new rooms to be added to the small presbytery enabling him to have accommodation for visiting priests who, from time to time, came up at weekends to help with Mass in the country areas of Riddell and Macedon. Weekend Masses were 7.30pm Saturday in Gisborne, also 8am and 10.30 am Sunday, 9.15 am at Macedon and 10.30 at Riddell. We are very thankful to the priests. Father King, (Jesuit) came up every weekend from the Jesuit College in Parkville, required to be driven up and back to Melbourne, hence the roster for drivers. Also Father Coolie, Father Jongerbloed and the late Father Curley assisted in this way. During his time near the last couple of years of his stay in Gisborne, Fr Tobin celebrated his silver Jubilee as a priest, with a celebrated mass in the church and an evening in the hall.

Not too many people know that 100 years ago we had a church built in Bullengarook at the further end of the ‘Rook’ road out towards Bacchus Marsh. It was called Saint Kolumbkil. The population decreased, young people leaving the district and there were fewer Masses said out there till finally only once in five weeks. The final one was said by Father James Carroll who was the first priest ordained from our parish. Later people attended Mass in Gisborne where Father Griffin was Parish Priest. The church fell into disrepair, seats were given to St Patrick’s Macedon.
In those days Gisborne had a Younger Set, boys and girls who had left school. They brought all the timber from the church into Gisborne, intending to put it to good use, but nothing eventuated from this plan.

Over the years we see that Mary Slattery's religious education has resulted in some vocations in the parish. A boy living in Bullengarook became the first one in this area to enter the priesthood. This was Father James Carroll who joined the Salesian Fathers. Salesians are stationed in many places throughout Australia. They are at the College in Sunbury where many boys from this area had been educated. Nowadays they later confined enrolments only to Sunbury students, Gisborne boys then began to attend Sacred Heart.

A few miles from Gisborne out towards Melton was a small place called Couangalt, later becoming Gisborne South. A Catholic family there, Mrs Dunne, had the mail run bringing the mail to be posted in Gisborne and collecting and distributing the mail for Couangalt. Two of Mrs. Dunne's daughters joined the Order of the Sisters of Charity.

In 1942, a Gisborne painter, Frank W. Clareborough's daughter Alice (now Sr. Teresa), who is today living in retirement, entered the Order of the Sister of Mercy. Frank had painted the Sanctuary a beautiful shade of blue, dotted here and there with small gold crosses. In recent years, Stephen De Lai became a Brother in the Salesian Order and is now teaching in Tasmania.

In 1992 Greg Bennett who lived at Bullengarook, educated in Gisborne, spent a few years working in the Commercial Bank in Gisborne. He then studied for the priesthood and was ordained in 1992 for the Melbourne diocese.

The following are selected extracts from 'Parish, Priests and Pioneers' by Leo Duggan for GMMDS in 2001.

- "12-July 1852 – The Vicar General of the diocese applied for a grant of two acres on the corner of Aitken and Fisher Streets to be reserved for the erection of a school, church and dwelling. His application was approved.
- 20-September-1873 – Tenders called for the erection of a brick church at Gisborne. The architect is Mr. T.A. Kelly of Elizabeth Street.
- 30-November-1873 – Foundation Stone of St. Brigid’s Gisborne (later changed to St. Brigid’s) laid by the Very Reverend Dr. Fitzpatrick.
- The initial contract was let to Mr. Richard Grant of Kyneton for the construction of a church. It was to consist of a nave – 62 ft. by 28 ft., a sacristy – 18 ft. by 12 ft., and two porches each 7 ft. 6 in. by 6 ft. A tower was to be later erected at the north-east angle of the building. The church was to be built in a Gothic style of brick on bluestone foundations. The mullions, traceries of windows etc., were to be made of pressed cement according to plans prepared by Mr D. I. Buckley. Mr Buckley was a draftsman and head-teacher of the Catholic school. Mr Kelly, the architect, seems to have had no further input into the project.
- March 1874 – The walls of the church were close to completion. Additional funds were required to construct the roof. A Bruce’s Auction raised 530 pounds. Less than a year later the church was completed.
- 30-January 1875 – The church was blessed and dedicated to St. Brigid’s by Archbishop Gould, the Very Rev. Dr. Fitzpatrick and Fr. Kelly. The cost of the church was 2150 pounds in total and a further 200 pounds was collected at mass that day.
- The church was ‘lighted by four two-light windows’ on each side of the nave and ‘by an elegant rose window on the eastern end’. The nave and chancel were ‘separated by a light polished cedar rail with cusped spandrels, etc. ‘The window over the altar has three lights’.
- The seats – with their Gothic Tre-foiled heads – have been replaced by much plainer ones, although with padded kneelers they are more comfortable.
- The side altars, stained glass windows and choir loft were not part of the original construction.
- The first major renovation was carried out in 1893 while Fr. Gallivan was parish priest. Architects Kempson, Connolly and Oldham drew up the plans for a complete renovation internally and externally which were so extensive the church was closed for some time. The contractor was Mr. E. A. Morris of Prahran. Major structural work was done on the roof and its supporting timbers. Tie rods were inserted to strengthen the roof and the timbers were bolted more tightly to close gaping joints that had appeared. The brickwork was tuck-pointed and the windows and surrounding cement were painted soft green. The interior walls were repainted, the lower section a very dull red and then varnished. Separating this from the soft green upper wall was a two inch line of dull red. The area around the windows was finished in light blue. The woodwork in the roof, confessional, altar rail, seats, and exterior doors was stained and varnished. A different colour scheme was used for the sanctuary and the main altar and tabernacle were finished in rich blue and vermillion with ornate giltiging.
- Another renovation was undertaken soon after the appointment of Fr. Fallon as parish priest in 1911. The walls were painted light blue and chocolate, and the seats matched the chocolate wall. A new choir loft with Gothic arches and the new confessional with patent doors, surmounted by a Celtic cross, were erected. It is not clear when the stained glass window was installed above the altar, but it is known that the other windows were installed in 1925. Each was donated by a family within the parish in memory of deceased relatives.
The beautiful large window in the eastern wall was financed by a bequest of 50 pounds from Mrs Ada Dwyer. At the same time, Michael Haire donated a new pulpit, in memory of his parents John and Bridget, which is still in use. By the 1930’s the church was structurally much the same as it is today.”

The following are selected extracts from the GMMDHS General Topics File
- “Church built in Macedon brick with cement dressing and slate roof.
- Plans by W. J. Buckley of Gisborne.
- Builder was Robert Bodkin of Riddell’s Creek.
- Completed September 1874.
- Plumbing by R. Grant of Kyneton for 755 pounds.
- Plastering by Michael Waugh of Smith’s Street Collingwood.
- Church cost 3175 pounds.
- Painted by Harris of Woodend.”

The following extract is from the Kyneton Guardian newspaper 17-Jan-1903
“Mr James Nicholls of Macedon made the bricks that were used in the construction of St. Brigid’s Church.”

The following are selected extracts from the Gothic Revival Style in the ‘Pennsylvania Architectural Field Guide 2015’.
“The Gothic Revival style is part of the mid-19th Century picturesque and romantic movement in architecture, reflecting the public’s taste for buildings inspired by medieval design. This was a real departure from the previously popular styles that drew inspiration from the classical forms of ancient Greece and Rome. While distinctly different, both the Gothic Revival style and the Greek Revival style looked to the past, and both remained popular throughout the mid 19th century. ...This style was promoted as an appropriate design for rural settings, with its complex and irregular shapes and forms fitting well into the natural landscape.
The Gothic Revival style was also popular for churches, where high style elements such as towers, parapets, and tracery windows were common, as well as the pointed arched windows and entries.”

Identifiable Features
1. Pointed arches as decorative element and as window shape
2. Front facing gables with decorative incised trim (verge boards or bargeboards)
3. Porches
4. Steeply pitched roof
5. Gables often topped with finials or cross bracing
6. Decorative crowns (gable or drip mould) over windows and doors
7. Castle-like towers with parapets on some high style buildings”

Discussion
- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes, associated with this building are 2.6 Maintaining distinctive cultures, 6.5 Living in Country Towns and 8.1 Maintaining spiritual life.
- The traditional residence seen in the postcard above has been demolished at an unknown date, possibly around 1977.
- The picket fence seen in the postcard above has been removed at an unknown date.
- The undated postcard is interesting in that it seems to show the building in a ‘red’ colour. There are several references to the building being red brick with no reference to it being originally rendered. The rendering of the brickwork is not documented, although it would not be inconsistent with churches generally. Render could have been used to conceal poor brickwork or cracking, or simply to enhance its appearance by implying stonework.
- The building’s design is consistent with small churches of the Victorian era. The Gothic Revival style became the standard for church architecture in the nineteenth century. The simple rectangular plan, steep pitched roofs, parapet end walls, pointed openings, large end window and evenly spaces buttresses are the definition of church architecture at that time worldwide. The side entry is a somewhat unusual but not rare feature.
- Those traditional features are complemented then with the slate roof, rendered walls/details, timber boarded doors, leadlight windows and bluestone footings. The reference to the windows surrounds being pressed concrete is unusual, these would usually have been stone. The building is in exceptional condition – an indication of its appreciation by the church community.
- Four architects are mentioned in association with the building – Patrick Barry Architect, T A Kelly Architect, Daniel Buckley Architect and Kempson, Connolly and Oldham Architects. The latter are directly related to the 1893 major renovation, but the role of the first three is somewhat confused. T A Kelly is described elsewhere as a ‘noted church architect’ and a Google search identifies several Catholic churches, convents and school attributed to him. Patrick is
elsewhere described as a ‘draftsman’ and Daniel Buckley is only noted on the more recent bronze plaque attached to the church building. The confused authorship of the building does not detract from the final product.

- The existing landscape around the church is not part of a previous formal garden or landscape setting. There appears to have been more vegetation around the church on the early photographs. The two or three large trees along the Fisher Street frontage support the abundance of street vegetation generally in Gisborne. The major contribution of landscaping to the importance of the church is that its minimal qualities allow significant views of the building and establish it as a visual feature in Gisborne.
- The general location of the church south of the business area of Gisborne is shared by the Church of England and the Presbyterian churches. They however are placed far enough apart to give each its own presence and do not create a religious precinct.
- Access to the interior was not available. However, from the historical references and the one internal photo, it is obvious that the interior was consistent with the Gothic Revival approach and that there are numerous elements (furniture/plaques, etc) which have been donated or sponsored by the congregation and individual church members. The building in this regard was not just a place of worship but a place of commemoration too.
- Along with the Church of England and several protestant churches, the Catholic Church was one of dominant religions in Victoria and Australia. Many of the names associated with this Catholic Church were important and influential men and families in the community and the State.
- The Catholic religion has always been a dominant element in Australian society since the foundation of Australia at Port Jackson. The co-existence of the various Christian religions in a tolerant manner is one of the crucial building blocks of Australian society. The existence of these country Gothic Revival buildings across the country, state and individual towns, demonstrates the importance of religion and worship to communities and early Victorian settlement.

**Comparative Threshold Comment**

Churches are widely recognised as heritage places because of their generic associations with settlement, Christian worship, the effort made in their design, and their usual places as features in townships.

- Currently in the Heritage Overlay, there are 9 individually listed churches of the same scale and design as well as approximately 6 others included within heritage precincts. Only one of these (HO251) is included on the Victorian Heritage Register.
- The threshold between State and local significance is not clear or consistent. To a degree it is based upon the size of the building. In relative terms, St Brigid’s is a modest church, in scale and design. Its historical and civic associations are local. While T A Kelly architect is associated with this building, there is no indication that his stature is such that his buildings are automatically of State significance.

Within Gisborne, both St Andrew’s and St Brigid’s are of a similar scale and design – reflecting the well-used Gothic Revival style of church architecture. St Andrew’s has a slightly more sophisticated attention to detail, but only in relative terms.

It would be consistent and appropriate to include St Brigid’s Catholic Church in Gisborne on the Heritage Overlay.

**Statement of Cultural Value**

- **What is significant?**
  - St Brigid’s Church is significant to the extent of the existing building envelope, materials and architectural details, as well as the interior the building. It does not include fencing, outbuildings or landscaping.

- **How is it significant?**
  - St Brigid’s Church is significant aesthetically, architecturally, historically and socially.

- **Why is it significant?**
  - St Brigid’s Church is significant aesthetically for its visual dominance which helps create and support the traditional character and scale of Gisborne.
  - St Brigid’s Church is significant architecturally for its intact Gothic Revival style, the Victorian style of choice for church buildings in the 19th century. This significance is enhanced by the siting of this church, and others in visually important locations which contribute to the traditional character of the Shire’s townships. The breadth of architectural details, external and assumingly internal, contribute to its stylistic representation.
  - St Brigid’s Church is significant historically and socially to the shire as a substantive demonstration of the Christian nature of the settlers, the Catholic religion, the desire and commitment to worship and meet in the context of their church, and the sense of community which the building reflects. Like most churches, St Brigid’s is also historically significant for the long line of priests which served the community and families who made financial and physical contributions to the building.
Guidelines

- St Brigid’s Church must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable use wherever possible.
- The buildings external envelope, decorative features, roof, windows and associated internal elements, must be retained.
- Alterations for liturgical purposes are not restricted. However, it is encouraged that liaison is undertaken regarding liturgical changes to ensure minimal impact upon the architectural and historical values of the building from such changes.
- The existing metal fence around the church is not original and need not be retained. Its removal however is not required. A new fence is not required but any alternatives must be as low and transparent as possible. Signage must be freestanding.
- Any new landscaping must be minimal and maximise views of the church building from the public realm. No new buildings must be constructed between the building and Aitken and Fisher Streets.
- It is encouraged that the large trees in the immediate environs of the building be retained. Replacement trees should be considered in light of the above statement and the pattern of trees in Gisborne generally.
- The concrete paving around the perimeter of the church must be reduced in extent at the earliest convenience to remove it where it directly abuts the church building. There should be 600mm wide gravel buffer between the paving and the building to inhibit rising damp in the walls.
- Additions or alterations to the building must be restricted to the rear, away from the public realm. Minor alterations should be undertaken in a manner sensitive to the existing building. Larger alterations may be undertaken in a more contemporary manner or to match the existing building.
- While internal access was not available, the one existing internal photo and the historical references, indicate that the interior is worthy of conservation as well. Sensitivity towards the original design is required of changes. This does not imply a literal ‘restoration’ of the interior.
- Should the building ever lose its liturgical function, care should be taken regarding the future of features donated or sponsored by families. While their retention within the church is preferred, if this would ‘threaten’ them, alternative relocation may be appropriate.
- Sensitivity and creativity are two qualities which must be employed in considering any changes to the building.
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Residence/St Andrew’s Presbyterian Manse (G6)
42 Fisher Street, Gisborne

History
The following information has been provided by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon Districts Historical Society.

Extract from Newspaper Files
- “The house was built in 1906 to serve as a home, a meeting place, and a doctor’s surgery.
- Situated on a corner amongst the various churches, it stands solid and majestic on a large block of land, with two further blocks make up the front garden that contains a circular driveway.
- The building remained unaltered till sold to its present owners in 1974.
- Many alterations have been made, but the character and beauty of the place remain unchanged.
- On opening the stained-glass front door and entering the large entrance hall one has mixed feelings of warmth and beauty.
- All the moulded woodwork shines in antique white, accentuated by flock wallpaper and new carpets throughout.
- The original embossed zinc ceilings remain.
- All bedrooms, the living room, and the full-size billiard room have large carved fireplaces.
- In addition, the house has been fully air-conditioned, which the owners state was not an easy task through the 18 inch thick bluestone foundations.
- The master bedroom has been altered slightly to include a ceramic tiled ensuite unit, with an arched, glass panelled doorway.
- The kitchen has a double oven set in an arched wall of local handmade bricks.
- Fine wall panelling is from the original dwelling in New Gisborne, and is over 100 years old.
- Bench tops are made of two inch thick timber into which has been set a Corning ware cooking top.
- It also has a large exposed disposal unit. The kitchen has been similarly treated with floor and wall tiles, and contains a third toilet.
- There is a dining room study or sewing room.
- The utility room has a cellar under it.
- The backyard has been cut into the hill and contains a heated in ground swimming pool. “

Extract from General Topics File
- Sold in 1970’s.
- Allotments 1.3.4.5 of section XV11 as a site for a church, school and minister’s dwelling (2 acres).
- In May 1859 allotments no’s 26, 27 & 28 township of Gisborne were bought by Mr. Robertson in name of The Trustees of the Presbyterian Church.
- 22nd June 1863 stated land was purchased by Mr. Robertson at public auction.
- Manse build 1908 for £887.0.0 pounds. Bluestone on concrete block foundation.
- Stone fence built 1938. Was built for Rev. Baillie and his wife, Mrs Baillie was able to carry on her medical practice using a couple of rooms as a surgery.
- It was again auctioned in 1973. ¾ acre under three titles.
- Again, for sale in 1975”
- Manse was auctioned in 1980 and passed in reserve price was $110,000.”

The following is an extract from 1995 Heritage Study.
“History:
This former Presbyterian manse and stable (demolished) was built in 1908 for a contract price of £887. Originally conceived as a timber building, the substitution of the new wall material, concrete blockwork, was considered at the time of construction to be a great reduction in maintenance costs and insurance, over a timber equivalent, while keeping
the building cooler during the summer months. Basalt footings were also to be used. This was decided at a congregational meeting held 22 September 1907 and after plans and estimates had been prepared. The old timber manse and the lot it stood on were to be sold.

‘Once more only the best was good enough for the Presbyterians in Gisborne...The manse is an ornament of the township and a comfort to our minister, and will for many years to come be an object of justifiable pride to us as Presbyterians. With four fine church buildings, a good Sabbath School and a handsome manse, the charge is now fully equipped, and if we only rally around the kirk, as in the old days, we will soon be free of debt once more, and ready for new spheres of usefulness.’ Only 134 pounds had been donated at that time towards the debt.

Early ministers to reside at the manse included the Revs. Baillie and Vickerman. The first minister’s car was purchased by the management committee in 1926 for the Rev. Vickerman, costing 200 pounds.

The former Cherry & Sons churn manufacturing company partner (and nationally renowned butter-fly collector), George Lyell, constructed the rubble stone fence around both the manse and the church in 1938 and 1940. In 1974 the manse was sold.

Description:
This is an Edwardian hipped and gabled roofed house, composed as a picturesque composition of roofs, room bays and roof dormers, with tapered stuccoed chimneys and oculus windows. The walls are of concrete blocks (since Painted) set on quarry faced basalt footings. Typical for the Federation Bungalow style used, the main roof is in a hipped form with half-timbered gables used on projecting room bays and at the verandah corner. Verandah posts are typically of turned profile and the ornament is restricted to fretted brackets. Segmented arched and arched label mould are used over openings in formed cement, some windows being grouped casements and other set as double hung sashes in wall openings.

The angled room bays are reflected internally to provide unusual room shapes while much of the notable coloured glass used and the polished timber fireplace joinery are still present.

The manse (and the church) is surrounded by as distinctive rubble stone fence on the two main frontages, the fence stretching to the west and demarcating the orignal house yare, prior to subdivision.

Significance:
The former Presbyterian manse is a fine and near intact example of a medium sized villa designed after the Federation Bungalow style. It also represents an early use of concrete blockwork which is made more significant because of its adoption by a traditionally conservative body such as a church management committee. Its prominent siting adjacent to the church and the rubble stone fencing shared by both buildings reinforce the visual and historic bond between the two and allow the manse to express its former ecclesiastical function within this locally important Gisborne township civic precinct.

As the residence of Presbyterian clergy until the 1970s the house is identical in many people’s minds with the function of the church and the high standing it held in the Gisborne community, particularly when this house was built.”

Discussion
- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes which are associated with this property are 6.5 Living in Country Towns, 6.7 Making Homes for Victorians and 8.1 Maintaining Spiritual Life.
- The owners have meet with the author and subsequently an inspection of the property has been undertaken. The owners are very proud of their building and are anxious to see it included on the Heritage Overlay.
- While the Residence is associated functionally with the Presbyterian Church across Fisher Street, there is no architectural continuity between the two buildings, except the later stone walls surrounding the two buildings.
- The Residence is generously situated on the block allowing views of the building from the public realm and complementing it sophisticated design. Its siting back from the street frontages is a statement in itself regarding the status of the house, its occupants and the church in Gisborne. The fact that the minister’s wife practiced as a doctor from the same building enhances its status and quality of design.
- The style of the building is Federation Queen Anne, a popular style for buildings of this age in Gisborne (Dixon’s Office, Eblana, etc). The Residence demonstrates most of the classic features of the style – asymmetry, corner projection, bay windows, dominant roof, tall chimneys with terra cotta pots, dormer, half-timbered projecting gables, timber verandah detailing, etc. The interesting feature particular to this building is the use of concrete blocks for the walls, rather than the more typical brick or even timber. These were rendered originally. At the time, prior to WW1, the use of concrete in residential building was just developing. This would indeed have been an early example.
- The interior is largely intact, although relatively minor changes are evident, and service areas have been upgraded.
- The Federation Queen Anne style was an illustration of the optimism of the country at the time of Federation and coming out of the 1890 Depression. It is still decorative like later Victorian buildings, but is a distinct and deliberate variation to celebrate the times.
- The original timber fence, with corner entry, has been replaced in 1938 with a stone fence, identical to the one around the adjacent, and associated, Presbyterian Church. This provides the continuity between the two functionally associated buildings which their architecture does not.
- The grounds are extensively landscaped, although the early photos of the building do not indicate the existing gardens. The present landscaping is complementary to the building and its presentation, but cannot be verified as original, except generically. There are several large Oak and Cypress trees which complement the house and the presence of large trees generally in Gisborne.
- At the rear of the Residence, there is a large contemporary garage/shed and a small skillion addition to the main house. Neither of these reflect the composition or design of the main house and are latter additions, making no contribution to the significance of the property.
- The 1995 Heritage Study makes several references to the interior of the building being intact and having some value, although goes on to describe an obviously new kitchen as well.

Comparative Threshold Comment

As noted, the Federation Queen Anne style is demonstrated elsewhere in Gisborne with this period obviously reflecting the growth of the township. It is a style for homes of substance and importance. The other notable examples of the style in Gisborne (Eblana, Wyabun Park, Dixon’s Office) are all timber construction however. All of these are proposed for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay in this Survey.

Similar buildings in the Shire have already been placed on the Heritage Overlay either individually or as part of a precinct – Residence in Woodend (HO104) and Residence in Kyneton (HO212).

It would be appropriate and consistent to include the Residence at 42 Fisher Street, Gisborne on the Heritage Overlay.

Statement of Cultural Value

- What is significant?
  - The Residence is significant to the extent of the main house and the interiors which still demonstrate notable features. It does not include the rear skillion addition, timber fences or outbuildings or landscaping generally. It does include the stone wall on the street frontages and the larger mature trees in the environs of the property.
- How is it significant?
  - The Residence is significant historically, representatively, aesthetically and technically.
- Why is it significant?
  - The Residence is significant historically for its reflection of the growth and importance of the Presbyterian Church in Gisborne and the optimism of the Federation era.
  - The Residence is significant representatively and aesthetically as a notable example of the Federation Queen Anne style in a visually dominant location and siting.
  - The Residence is significant technically for its early use of concrete block construction.

Level of Significance – Local

Guidelines

- The Residence must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.
- There are no restrictions on the timber fences or outbuildings on the property.
- The stone fence along the street frontages must be retained as a visual link with the nearby Presbyterian Church and as a familiar feature generally within Gisborne. New openings and minor modifications should be possible in a sympathetic manner.
- There are no restrictions on the general landscaping or specific trees on the property. However, the large mature trees on the property do contribute to the character of the property as well as its environs in Gisborne and must be retained. The retention of large trees is strongly encouraged. Landscaping which is complementary to the presentation of the
Residence is encouraged and is the retention of a turning circle in front of the Residence. Landscaping should not obscure or inhibit visual access to the Residence from the public realm.

- Visual access to the Residence from the public realm must be maintained and buildings must not be constructed between the Residence and the adjacent streets.
- Further built development must be focused to the rear (west) of the Residence. Any new buildings or structures must be single storey, simple in design, avoid monolithic forms, dark generally in colours and seek not to disrupt from the appreciation of the Residence. They need not be replicas of traditional buildings.
- The external form and expression of materials and forms must be retained. Alterations at the rear may be considered so long as they don’t visually overwhelm the Residence.
- A sensitive colour scheme, reflecting the early photographs, is encouraged.
- Internally, the main rooms are of interest and the major joinery features and fireplaces must be retained. Further upgradings and modifications may be permitted if they are restricted to the service area or are minor in extent. Generally, significant features such as original joinery, fireplaces, ceiling and panelling should be retained and expressed. Improvements or changes may be permitted if subtle in their implementation.
- It may be possible to prepare a mutually agreed conservation document to clarify further constraints and opportunities and include it in the Heritage Overlay as an ‘Incorporated Document. Such as document can provide owners with greater certainty about the property in the future.
The following is an extract from the 1995 Heritage Study.

“HISTORY:

John C. Thomson owned this site from the Grant in 1864 when he acquired 12 acres of government land (former crown land commissioner’s residence) from a subdivision of the former police paddock. It was sited at a bend in the Macedon River and was reached by a metalled road. Early plans show the residence as L-shaped and set in a quadrangle with buildings on the north and east sides, all at the south end of Thomson’s block (initially lot 1A) with a garden plot at the north end.

The balance of the police paddock to the east held a grave (1pt 3) in 1856 while on the west, were the goal and police officers’ barracks which remained a reserve. Attached to the paddock on the south was ‘Gordon’s Wheat Paddock’.

Dr. Andrew Plummer purchased the balance of the police paddock which included some seven lots of 30 odd acres each. Early rate books show Dr. Plummer as occupying the total acreage of over 200 acres from the early 1870’s having lived on 28 acres in the locality prior to that.

The rated improvements on the land vary from ‘land, house and garden’ (or orchard) near Gisborne in 1873-4 to “homestead” 1875-6 all with land varying from 206 to 290 acres. The valuation rose in 1875-6 (25% increase) but declined steadily thereafter until another surge in 1890-1 (25% increase) with no further indication of construction in the assumed period of the existing house. It was listed as Wyabun Park from the early 1890’s and the land stayed at around 204-6 acres from the mid-1880s.

The architect, E. Wilson Dobbs accepted a tender for the erection of wooden residence at Wyabun Park, for Dr. A. Plummer, at Gisborne Vic in 1894. Dobbs was known to be practising mainly in Melbourne during the period 1891-4. Dobbs also worked in the office of Charles D’Ebro when he designed the heraldry on the notable Adelaide Steamship Co. Building, Collins Street. This coincided with the marriage of Dr. Plummer to Levena Dixon (daughter of Henry and Sarah) in 1894.

This confirms the general belief that the main house was built for Dr. Plummer in the 1890’s while the stone house is thought to have been used by a police commissioner (crown lands commissioner in 1865) for a residence. Reputedly troops were housed in temporary barracks set up where the current woolshed stands, in route to quell the Eureka uprising in the 1850’s. The Heard family have owned the property for a long period this century.

Description

This is a farm complex set in a mature grove of trees. The house is verandahed, with a typically Edwardian slatted frieze and balustrade, but is set on an unusual multi-bayed plan. The house is weatherboard with a corrugated iron roof, and red brick (painted) ribbed chimneys.

Interiors have diagonal board lining (Kauri?) and the angled window bays are generously sized, some windows having diamond-pane upper sashes. The house is early stylistically if the 1890s date is correct.

At a distance to the house is an old rubble stone (basalt) former house with shingled hip roof, now reclad and internally altered. This is thought to have been used as a Crown land commissioner’s residence, located on the then Gisborne police paddock, and that troops camped here en-route to quell the Eureka uprising in 1854. One small and low window openings survives with worn hand-made bricks trimming the opening.

Nearby is a cast-iron hand pump (Middeconn brand, patent 1843, made by W&B Douglas) attached to an underground tank.

Landscape
The trees include large elms, two large bunya bunyas Araucaria bidwillii (one notable), agaves, two large Monterey cypress, oaks, evergreen oak (Quercus ilex), two olives in the house yard, cedars and mature hawthorn and box hedging. The drive traverses a grassed oval in the seep of the house. The land size is now 94 acres. The tree grouping is individually notable.

Significance

Wyabun is significant as an example of an early phase in the settlement of the area and for links with land office and its key role in transforming the character of the study area. The 1894 house is an unusual and early design of its type and is near intact inside and out. Both the houses on the site have associations with Dr Plummer who is known throughout the three shires.

The valley setting of the complex is picturesque as are the numerous mature and notable trees which surround the house.”

The following information was prepared by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon District Historical Society from their files.

Extract from Property File

- “In 1911 Campbell Scott was owner of Wyabun Park – sold 1912 to J.N. Heard.
- Map 1851 showing Wyabun Park & 200 acres.
- Stone house & office of first police magistrate Mr. J.C. Thomson also many outbuildings also made of stone.
- After staging camp disbanded the property passed to Dr. Andrew Plummer who built present home for his son in 1891.
- The original shingle roof on the kitchen can still be seen underneath the iron roof.”

Extract from The Age January 4th, 1992.

- “Timber, 10 rooms, land 38.1 hectares plus 5.1 hectares with permit for subdivision.
- For auction again in 1996 – 37.3 hectares.”

The following is an extract from the Australian Dictionary of Biography Vol. 5 1974

“Andrew Plummer (1812-1901) medical practitioner and agriculturist, was born on 25 November 1812 at Dalkeith, Midlothian, Scotland, son of William Plummer, butcher, and his wife Sarah, née King. Educated for the medical profession at University of Edinburgh (L.R.C.S., 1832; M.D. 1834) he practised in Edinburgh and probably London before he arrived in Victoria on 31 May 1853. In July, he settled at Sandridge and at once got into an extensive and lucrative practice. He also entered into public affairs and was elected chairman of the relief committee formed after the Sandridge fire in 1854; he was elected to the Melbourne City Council, and in 1862-64 served as mayor of Sandridge after it separated from the City of Melbourne. From 1854 Plummer held such appointments as magistrate, deputy registrar of births and deaths, officer for celebrating marriages, electoral returning officer, public vaccinator and medical officer in charge of various prison and reformatory hulks and training ships in Hobson’s Bay. He also joined the naval brigade of the Victorian Volunteer Force.

In December 1857 Plummer began to buy land at Gisborne and by 1880 owned 1089 acres (441 ha) on the edge of the township. At Wyabun Park in the 1870’s he bred long wool sheep, particularly Lincolns, which he exhibited with success at local shows, but in the early 1880s disposed of his stud and concentrated on mixed farming. He was a member of the West Bourke and Kyneton Agricultural Societies, and the Gisborne Roads Board. In 1871 he was elected to the inaugural Council of the National Agricultural Society, and later became a trustee and was president in 1882 and 1884-90.

Plummer’s involvement with the National Agricultural Society in the 1880s, and his support for J.L. Dow led to further offices. In 1883-89 he was chairman of the Council of Agricultural Education, the Board of Agriculture and the board of inquiry on tuberculosis in cattle. He was a member of the royal commission on vegetable products and of five other commissions appointed to organize Victoria’s representation at various international exhibitions.

With a friendly disposition and later a large white beard, Plummer was very popular. His energy and organizing ability enabled him to take part in public affairs as well as maintaining a large medical practice (M.D. Melb. Ad eund. 1867) Wyabun Park, one of the fancy farms of the colony, was run by an overseer according to detailed written plans by Plummer. In Edinburgh, he had married Mary Nairne Ker, they had a daughter and two sons, James Ker Beck who became mayor of Port Melbourne in 1885 and 1889, and William Andrew. When he migrated to Victoria Plummer left his wife and daughter behind. On 3 October 1871 at St. James’s pro-Cathedral he married Mary Jacques who came from Newton Barry, County Wexford. He died at his elder son’s home in Port Melbourne on 22 July 1901 and was buried in the Anglican section of the Melbourne general cemetery.”

Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes associate with this property are 6.5 Living in Country Towns, 6.7 Making Homes for Victorians, and 8.3 Providing Health and Welfare Services.
- In built terms, there are several structures on the site. There is one large corrugated iron shed on the north edge of the built-up area, a smaller hip roofed building called a ‘Feed Shed’ on the east side of the built-up area, a large shingle
roofed building called the ‘Block House’ downhill from the residence, and there is the residence itself. There are also several minor sheds and structures around the periphery of the built-up area. In terms of the remains demonstrating a working farm or homestead, this is limited. The built remains are miscellaneous places and the overall integrity is low.

- The large corrugated iron shed is modern in construction and not relevant to this assessment.

- While the ‘Feed Shed’ has a hip roof of traditional proportions, its structure is contemporary. It is clad in corrugated iron and some vertical boarding. The spacing of the roof battens suggests the roof was always corrugated iron. It has no floor. It is a vernacular, utilitarian, building of undeterminable age.

- The “Block House” has a partially exposed timber shingle roof, which would date it to an early era in the development of the site, probably for the era of the Land Commissioner. Two of the four walls are masonry rendered on both sides but the other two are profiled asbestos cladding. The windows and doors are modern. A concrete floor has been poured internally and part of the exterior. The roof is a hip roof of traditional proportions and as said a shingle roof is now exposed. There are no internal partitions. This structure is the remains of a traditional building, probably from the era of the Land Commissioner. There is no indication of where the term ‘Block House’ comes from.

- Of the minor structures, most are obviously contemporary by their materials or design – except for a two hole ‘dunny’ which may be an early remnant.

- There is also an underground well with a beehive top to the east of the residence. It appears as though it is an early brick lined well.

- While the early plans and descriptions associated with the Land Commissioners present indicate more buildings than exist today. The ‘Block House’ and the ‘Feed Shed’ are possibly early. It was known the earlier Land Commissioner’s house was demolished, its location, and the location of other earlier building, was not evident. Evidence may remain under the grass. From the timber shingle roof of the ‘Block House’ it is most probably early, although its integrity has dramatically suffered beyond restoration.

- The residence is an unfortunate case. It has been allowed to deteriorate to a near critical degree. The photos of 1991 indicate is was in good condition then. This document is to assess its significance not its condition or retrievability. That is an issue for its management.

- Like Eblana, this is the residence of a doctor – Dr Plummer - and its design is a symbol of his status in the community. We know Dr Plummer commissioned Architect E, Wilson Dobbs to design it and the result is certainly not the average country residence. The ‘style’ of the residence would best be referred to as Federation Queen Anne with its attention to overhanging gables, decorated chimneys, timber gable screens and articulated plan. It is a single storey weatherboard residence with numerous projections and bay windows, all most surrounded by a verandah. There is one obvious addition on the north side and a portion of the verandah has been enclosed. Otherwise, the exterior appears intact – if in a poor condition. A notable feature at the front of the house are the highlight windows over the verandah but under the main roof. This was a normally commercial trick to allow light into shops with a verandah and the author has never seen it on a residential building. These would most certainly have been the major rooms. Access to the interior was not possible but it is anticipated that some rooms will be of merit to match the exterior.

- The verandah is wide with similar timber handrails and timber valance between posts. These details are a common element which provides a degree of continuity to the verandah as it winds around the building. Where there are stairs from the verandah, curved timber boards accent these positions. The verandah has numerous gable accents which, with the handrail and valances, provide a decorative feel to the ubiquitous country verandah.

- The tall red brick chimneys stand well above the roof level and are decorated with corbelled tops and vertical projections. These have unfortunately been painted at some stage.

- While the overall impression of the residence is complicated and busy, this is a factor in its presentation – to create visually more than actually exists. If floor plan is relatively small for a doctor’s country house but its visual impression is memorable.

- The landscape in the environs of the built-up area is quite mixed lot and lacking any obvious cohesion. There are several large Bunya pines (Araularia bidwillii) which are notable from a distance for their canopies and up close for their long branches. Several large Monterey cypress are also evident in the built-up area but they are reaching their maturity and have no apparent plan. Like the residence, the garden has not been maintained. While 1995 Heritage Study suggests the plantings as a group are notable, the author’s assessment is otherwise. Because of their distinct canopy profile, and their position adjacent the entry to the home paddock entry, the Bunya pines make a notable contribution.

- The property and the buildings of Wyabun Park are set well away from Gisborne and any other dwellings. Its visual isolation would have enhanced its presence and importance as the home of Dr Plummer. The vegetation around the built-up area would have accentuated its presence, in the otherwise open paddocks.

- At some stage, the owner and/or occupant has erected ‘interpretative’ signs highlighting buildings, features and walks. There was obviously an interest in the heritage of the site.

- Of the Land Commissioner’s occupancy, there is no clear evidence of remains, except for possibly the ‘Block House’ and the ‘Feed Shed’, but even these are not authenticated.

- The story about troops spending the night at this location on their way to Ballarat to suppress the Eureka Rebellion has not authentication. It would seem unlikely that in the haste to get troops to Ballarat, they would have first headed north to Gisborne and then west to Ballarat.
• Dr Plummer was an important citizen of Gisborne and made numerous contributions here, in Melbourne and in Victoria. His association with the present residence is critical to its significance.

Comparative Threshold Comment

While the Residence is quite unusual and atypical, it is consistent with several Federation Queen Anne residences in the Shire which are either recommended for, or already included on the Heritage Overlay. Eblana and Dixon’s Office in Gisborne demonstrate versions of this style and are recommended in this study for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay.

It would be consistent and appropriate to include Wyabun Park in Gisborne on the Heritage Overlay.

Statement of Cultural Value

What is significant?

Wyabun Park is significant to the extent of the Residence, the underground well, two Bunya Pines and an appropriate setting of 50 metres radius from the well. The ‘Block House’ and ‘Feed Shed’ are included only in order to facilitate their recording. It does not include the minor sheds and structures or vegetation generally.

How is it significant?

Wyabun Park is significant historically, representatively, aesthetically and technically and associatively.

Why is it significant?

• Wyabun Park is historically significant as the site of the Land Commissioner’s residence and associate buildings and features (Police Paddock). While physical remains of these are limited and much altered, their location here was notable.
• Wyabun Park is representatively significant demonstrating a high quality, architect designed, Residence for a local identity and prominent citizen. This demonstration of importance and social standing was a feature of the era and demonstrated elsewhere in the Shire.
• Wyabun Park is significant aesthetically and technically for the atypical design of the Residence and in particular its irregular plan, encompassing verandah and unusual highlight windows over the verandah to principle rooms. While its ‘style’ can easily be associated with the features of the Federation Queen Anne era, its manifestation is quite unlike anything else in the Gisborne environs.
• Wyabun Park is significant associatively with the early development of Gisborne and the establishment of a government presence. The Residence is significant for its association with Dr Plummer and his wide-ranging community endeavours and role as a local doctor. The design of the Residence is a demonstration of that significance.

Level of Significance – Local

Extent of listing – 50 metres radius from the well
Guidelines

- Wyabun Park must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.
- Subdivision of the property may be considered, if it leaves the residence with a significant physical context within which to appreciate it and its origins and facilitates the viable occupation of the residence.
- Any subdivision or development of the site must include an investigation to locate and record the possible remains of the early Land Commissioners buildings.
- The ‘Block House’ and the ‘Feed Shed’ and two-hole outhouse must be recorded with a plan drawing and photographs and these recordings held with the Gisborne and Mount Macedon Historical Society. Their retention is encouraged. Their removal may be considered only after the recording and it is demonstrated that they could not be incorporated a viable management option.
- The underground well must be retained and remain on the allotment associated with the Residence.
- Two Bunya Pines must be retained and remain on the allotment associated with the Residence.
- There are no restrictions otherwise on the garden/landscape, with the exception of the Bunya Pines. The retention of other mature trees in the environs of the Residence is encouraged, as is the planting of further ‘introduced’ trees in that same area.
- The Residence must be restored/conserved to provide it with a viable future.
- The extension to the north need not be retained and likewise the enclosure of the verandah on the south-west corner.
- The paint should be removed from the chimneys with a non aggressive method like Dupont ‘Peel-Away’.
- Significant rooms internally must be identified and care should be taken to reinstate their fabric. The alteration/upgrade of other rooms may be possible so long as there is not external impact.
- Extensions may be considered, but their position and design must be carefully considered to minimise their visual impact.
- Sub-floor ventilation is critical and must be re-established, and increased, wherever possible.
- Vegetation directly against the building must be removed and avoided in any new gardening.
- The reinstatement of a traditional colour scheme is encouraged to complement the design of the building.
- Any development must retain the house as the primary built feature. This may involve subdivision. New buildings/structures must be physically removed from the residence in order to avoid competing with it for visual dominance and providing it with an appropriate context. New buildings/structures should be minimal in size and design for the same reason. Their forms should avoid monolithic forms and be articulated in colours, building envelopes and materials. Significant vegetation should be focused around the environs of residence to reflect the density of the existing vegetation.
Gisborne

22 November 2017

Residence/Annandale (G8)

46 Howey Street, Gisborne

History

The following is an extract from the 1995 Heritage Study.

“Creation Date:

1905, 1914

History:

This house was built in two stages (1905 and 1914) for (and by) Harry Brandum, as Gisborne carpenter, with later occupiers including Jack Peavey, a Gisborne Shire President for 1912 and another Shire President (1928, 1940), seed and nurseryman, James Railton.

Brandum has owned the vacant lot since c1902 which was close to Haidee Brandum’s property in Brantome Street. The Griggs family ran a nursery at Howey Street more recently. Railton & Co (established I 1866) were described as seed merchants and nurserymen, early this century, being importers of American and European seeds and with premises in Swanston Street, Melbourne. The brothers, Thomas and James Railton were the principals. Railton is known for his tree planting along the Calder Highway.

Significance:

Annandale has been extended in a way which although related to the original house, obscure the original expression of its distinguished owner-occupiers. Nevertheless, the original parts of the house are complete and with the garden and fence, with its holly hedge, provide links with a noted seedsman and local identity, Railton, while the house contributes to an urban context which includes the contemporary Eblana to the east and the Gisborne ecclesiastical precinct to the north.”

The following information has been prepared by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon District Historical Society from their files.

The following are extracts from the Society’s Property Files.

▪ “Harry Brandum, Carpenter, lived in the house situated on the corner of Gisborne State School grounds.
▪ Harry Brandum built the house known as ‘ANNADALE’ on the corner of Prince and Howey Streets, circa 1910, for his son Stanley Brandum.
▪ Peavey, Railton, Quinne, Grigg and L. Terry were later owners.
▪ Refer scan of ‘Floor Plan’ of Annandale residence.”

The following is an extract from a Real Estate Brochure in Property Files.

▪ “5 Bedroom Federation Style Residence of approx. 26 squares.
▪ Beautiful mature English garden featuring Pin Oaks, Maples, Ashes, Poplars and Rhododendrons
▪ Ideal location adjacent to Council Parkland, close to schools & churches and only 2 blocks from town centre.
▪ Accommodation includes entrance hall, huge north facing sitting room, dining room, 5 bedrooms, study, kitchen, fully renovated bathroom and laundry.
▪ Other features include garage, storage shed and large flat lawn area (former tennis court).”

Previous owners (circa 1975-1993) had been informed the property was named ‘Annandale’ in the 1970s by the then owners. This has not been confirmed.
Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes are: 6.5 Living in Country Towns and 6.7 Making Homes for Victorians.
- The owners took the opportunity to meet with the author. Their main concern was the additional cost of applying for Planning Permits as a result of the Heritage Overlay. It was discussed that it may be possible to apply for several projects at once as part of a ‘master plan’ and then undertake the works over the following 2 years. They also requested the reconsideration of the value of the trees at the front of the property.
- On close inspection, the garage on the east side of the Residence are not contemporary with the house and do not contribute to its heritage values. While its materials and colours are similar to the Residence, its roof pitch and details are inconsistent with the Residence.
- The carport is obviously modern.
- Likewise, the alterations on the north side have been undertaken recently by the present owners in the recent past. While the expression of the additions from the front is sensitive, the second storey extension, as seen from the rear, is somewhat unfortunate in its an odd form.
- The whole of the upstairs portion of the Residence, is part of the recent work and does not contribute to heritage values of the Residence.
- The skillion portion of the Residence to the east is most likely original to the house, enclosing service areas. It would have been located to the rear of the house, but due to its corner location it is more visible than usual. It has several identifiable alterations. Its contribution to the whole is limited.
- The interior of the ground floor portion has been upgraded sensitively but is not intact to its original period. There are individual elements such as some boarded walls, pressed metal ceilings and joinery, but they do not create an intact interior of note.
- The Residence is an unpretentious expression of the Federation Queen Anne style of architecture - a style well represented in the Shire. It is obviously an expression of optimism and success as Australia came out of the 1890s depression and was embarking upon nationhood.
- The Residence exhibits the classic features of the Federation Queen Anne style such as tall chimneys with terra-cotta pots and polychrome brick details, projecting gables, projecting window sets under the gables, as well as projecting and bracketed timber awnings over windows. While the level of decoration or exemplar features is not to the same extent as other Queen Anne buildings within the Shire, eg Eblana in Gisborne and Ailsa Craig in Kyneton, the Residence at 46 Howey Street is a solid example and contributes to the evolution of traditional buildings over a period of time. Heritage is not about just the best, or the most ornate, or the largest of one thing. The timber scallops on the projecting gables are interesting details. These had been avoided in most Queen Anne buildings which favoured plane projecting gables. However their inclusion here may be an expression of the cross-over from Victorian to Queen Anne.
- The fact that the original owner was also the carpenter who built it, reflects on the quality of the building. The fact that it was built in two stages (1905 and 1914) may explain why its stylistic expression is not more embellished – the style had evolved over that time. As with the scalloped gables, builders of the period did not necessarily think in the same purist manner that architectural historians do today.
- This Residence contributes positively to Gisborne’s traditional character. Its corner location and extensive front yard garden/private open space enhances that expression and contribution. The modern changes, have had minimal impact.
- The present treated pine fence on the street frontages is obviously modern. While it provides the owners with privacy, it also unfortunately obscures the house from the public realm. Traditionally houses of style were a statement of achievement by their owners and meant to be seen. It is unfortunate that a better compromise could not have been achieved. It is only a fence though and it may be possible to achieve that compromise in the future. The ‘picket’ fence and gate along south side of the Residence is more appropriate.
- The garden around the building was most likely a statement as well – given one owner’s involvement in the landscape industry. However, there is little evidence of a ‘planned’ original garden remaining. There are several large mature trees which may be associated with Railton’s occupancy but there is no evidence of this.

Comparative Threshold Comment

Similar weatherboard Queen Anne style building are already included on the Heritage Overlay in Woodend, Kyneton and Lancefield, most as part of heritage precincts.

It would be appropriate and consistent to include the Residence at 46 Howey Street on the Heritage Overlay.
Statement of Cultural Value

- **What is significant?**
  
The Residence is significant to the extent of the weatherboard house. It does not include the garage, the garden, the extension on the north nor the interior of the building.

- **How is it significant?**
  
The Residence is significant aesthetically, architecturally and historically to the Shire.

- **Why is it significant?**
  
  - The Residence is significant aesthetically for its visual contribution to Gisborne, being on a corner site with a large garden to the front. It makes a more generic contribution to Gisborne as one of the few traditional residences remaining.
  
  - The Residence is significant architecturally, for its expression of small residence of the Federation Queen Anne style, constructed over a period and demonstrating elements of the style and the previous Victorian era as well.
  
  - The Residence is significant historically as a modest expression of the post-1890s depression and the optimism of Federation and nationhood, which the Queen Anne style exemplified.

Level of Significance – Local

**Guidelines**

- The Residence must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.

- There are no restrictions on the fencing or outbuildings. The retention of the garage and carport to the east is not required. Any replacement however must be carefully considered so as to be understated and not to disrupt the appreciation of the double gables at that end of the house.

- The skillion at the east end of the Residence may be retained, altered or removed. If altered or removed however, it must be undertaken in an understated manner and not disrupt the appreciation of the double gables at that end of the house.

- The alterations/extension on the north side of the house have for the most part been undertaken with some sensitivity. The expression of the first floor eastern end is the only unfortunate aspect, but its removal is not required but it may be possible to visually treat it with less emphasis – one colour with no accents. Its further enlargement should be avoided in favour of ground level extensions.

- Further extensions in the future must be limited to the northern side of the house, possibly as a separate (or at least visually separate) building. Any such extension must be set back from the front of the existing house and designed not to mimic the existing building and minimise its visual presence.

- There are no restrictions on the interior of the building. However, the retention and expression of remnant traditional finishes and/or features (boarded walls, pressed metal finishes, joinery) is encouraged.

- The chimneys must be retained. The brickwork must not be painted.

- A traditional colour scheme for the existing building should be maintained.

- The existing treated pine paling fence should eventually be replaced with one more similar to the picket fence along the south side of the house. The removal of the existing fence is not mandatory but encouraged. Maintaining some form of entry from the west or southwest corner is encouraged as well.

- A traditional garden to the west and north of the Residence is encouraged to complement the house. This need not be a literal recreation of any previous garden, but should reflect positively on the Residence.

- There are a variety of several mature trees at the front of the Residence which may be from the occupancy of Railton, the seed merchant. It is encouraged (but not mandatory) that they be retained and incorporated into any new garden.

- No new buildings or subdivision must be allowed to the west of the residence, which is its street address. Any new building or development must not obscure the visual appreciation of the house from the west (Prince Street) side, as this is the primary orientation of the residence.

- It may be possible to develop a master plan for the future of the property and have this endorsed as an ‘incorporated’ document in the Planning Scheme. This would eliminate the need for multiple planning applications.
Homestead/Hay Hill (G25)
426 Hamilton Road, New Gisborne

History

The following is an extract from the 1995 Heritage Study.

“HISTORY

The grantee of Hay Hill was J. Dewar prior to circa 1860 (parish plan lot updated) and the name Janet Dewar is listed as the owner-occupier in the 1880s until the early 1890s when Kate Dewar took up the property for a brief period prior to its acquisition by the Campbell Brothers.

Throughout this period the property was always known as Hay Hill (house and land) in the Shire’s rate books. The graziers, Hugh & John Campbell had extensive holdings (2083 acres) around Riddell’s Creek, including the property Straw Hill (400 acres).

Reputedly, established as a model farm by the Dewar family, Hay Hill was owned over a long period by the Campbell family (still of Campbell Road) as the homestead of what was thought to be a 3000 acre property. A house was built on the property in circa 1853.

DESCRIPTION OF THE HOUSE

There are two hipped-roofed house on the property, one new and of a similar character to the other which is old. The old house has brick-nogged walls (rare), with quarry tiles to the verandah floor which is supported on rubble stone walls, and brick chimneys with dog-toothed cornice (one new at the north end). The verandah roof is concave, the verandah structure timber and the frieze a slotted one. Internally there are indications of Edwardian renovations.

Next to the north is a man’s room built in stone rubble, with a chimney at one end and a hipped roof and ledge and braced door. Adjacent are the weatherboarded (some new boards) groom’s quarters and a cart shed, the former having once been a kitchen with a large brick (rare English size) and stone fireplace and chimney. This has been relined in the Edwardian era and has an added rear skillion.

A rubble-stone (basalt and ironstone) structure built into the hillside was apparently part of a dairy (upper level gone) with stout stop-chamfered posts supporting the plat form above.

There is extensive drystone walling around the house, above the dairy and along the driveway approaching the house.

LANDSCAPE

Around the house are lavender and rosemary hedges which may be old. Other exotic planting includes Monterey cypress hedges (1940s) and young elms, some remnant impressive mature gums, also extensive Hawthorn hedging along the drive. Much of the planting around the house is more recent but sympathetic. Above the dairy, on top of the hill are two old ash specimens.”

The following is an extract from The Telegraph newspaper 24-October-1989

“Hay Hill was established in 1853 by John and Janet Dewar; they had come from Scotland with two children. They had seven more children, believed to be daughters. Hay Hill in those days was a mixed farm with orchards and an extensive vineyard which flourished until the outbreak of phylloxera at about the turn of the 20th century. Hay Hill’s cheese was highly regarded, and in 1860 won a gold watch which was first prize for the model farm of the Port Phillip District.

The Dewars lived at Hay Hill until about 1900, and are buried in the local cemetery at Gisborne.

Over the years, the farm was sub-divided, and by the 1980’s had been reduced to about 31 hectares. A decade earlier, the house had been given an exterior cladding of fibro-cement but was virtually derelict. The fibro-cement cladding was subsequently removed to reveal a house of hand-made bricks set into an Oregon frame, much in the Tudor style of architecture. In the late 1980s the house was thoroughly restored by the then owners, one of whom was an architect.
The house has three bedrooms, three reception rooms, bathroom, kitchen, laundry and a bluestone cellar under the dining-room. The bedrooms feature 19th century charm with high panelled timber ceilings.

The house is the main focus of the small “village” that forms the Hay Hill Estate which includes a bluestone cottage with open fireplace, a timber cottage, a carriage shed and the original bluestone wine cellars.

The property features old established trees – elms, golden poplars and yellow box. The paddocks still have the original bluestone walls.

The old stables have four berths for horses, and the original shingle roof is visible from the inside of the structure.

The property is located in Hamilton Road, east of Gisborne and about two kilometres from the New Gisborne railway station."

Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes which are associated with this property are 2.5 Migrating and Making a Home, 4.3 Grazing and Raising Livestock, 4.4 Farming and 6.7 Making Homes for Victorians.
- The owners have denied access to inspect the property. It is their opinion that they have appreciated and cared for the heritage values of the property now and do not want external interference in the future. They feel the property does not public exposure and therefore does not require listing on the Heritage Overlay. The owners were polite and respectful. The owners accepted the offer to meet with the author and Council planning staff (although the author was unable to attend). One of the owner’s, Fiona Hutton, reiterated their objection to the listing on the grounds of not wishing external interference with their management of the property.
- The 1995 Heritage Study presents a compelling case of the property’s heritage values, complemented by the photographic documentation provided by the Gisborne and Mount Macedon Districts Historical Society.
- It would appear that Hay Hill is a property with many elements and not just the residence, e.g. dairy, stables, wagon shed, etc which contribute to Hay Hill’s reputation as a ‘model farm’. It demonstrates the self-sufficient nature of early properties such as this before the full development of towns in the area.
- It would appear the construction and design of the buildings at Hay Hill demonstrates a variety of techniques and materials, enhancing further the understanding of the property.
- The main house appears to be two buildings, of traditional characters, joined at some time. The two buildings appear to be vernacular early Victorian residences with classic roof forms, chimneys, and verandahs. They represent a homestead house design less sophisticated than others such as Gisborne Park, but none the less classic in that building type.
- The floor plan available indicates the interior of the main house has been altered significantly. In this light, there are no restrictions upon the interiors of the buildings generally. It is encouraged that traditional interiors or features however should be retained and expressed.
- Several outbuildings are noted and probably of a similar vintage to the main residence. One appears to be bluestone in construction and traditional in character. Until they can be specifically exempted, they should be retained.
- Outbuildings from post-WW1 (this is a nominal date) are not included in the proposed listing.
- It is noted the landscaping, while visually notable and pleasant, maybe a relatively recent endeavour. It is also noted that the interiors of the buildings have received no direct reference to warranting merit. In this regards the Planning Practice Note 1 of Applying the Heritage Overlay states the identification of internal restrictions should be ‘applied sparingly’.
- Within the area of listing, new development must not intrude upon the appreciation of the traditional qualities of the pre-WW1 buildings. It must seek to be visually recessive in its design and placement. Major new development should be outside the area of listing.
- A detailed inspection of the property will enable a more accurate, and critical, assessment of individual elements. Some buildings and features may be more accurately identified as not significant. It may also be possible to develop a brief, mutually agreed, management document (and included in the Planning Scheme as an ‘incorporated document’) to identify activities and buildings/features exempt from the requirements of the Heritage Overlay.

Comparative Threshold Comment

The present Heritage Overlay includes homesteads of a similar nature. Dumbarton (HO258) in Gisborne, Brennanah (HO208) in Kyneton, Bolobek (HO249) in Macedon and Duneira (HO265) are amongst these.

These homesteads are indicative of the early (non-urban) development of the Shire and, despite inclusion on the existing Heritage Overlay) continue to be viable and contribute to the Shire’s heritage.

It would be consistent and appropriate to include Hay Hill on the Heritage Overlay.
Statement of Cultural Value

▪ **What is significant**

Hay Hill is significant to the extent of existing pre-WW1 buildings, and layout of those buildings, within a circle 75 metres in radius from the north edge of the first house.

▪ **How is it significant**

Hay Hill is significant historically, representatively, and aesthetically.

▪ **Why is it significant**

▪ Hay Hill is significant historically for its associations with the early settlement of the area and its close associations with the migrant Dewar family.
▪ Hay Hill is significant representatively in its demonstration of a complex of buildings for a self-sufficient farm. This includes not just residential buildings but working ones as well.
▪ Hay Hill is significant aesthetically in demonstrating a variety of residential and working buildings of a vernacular nature. While some residences on other properties are more flamboyant architecturally, the buildings at Hay Hill are simpler and more functional – a characteristic associated with the early development of the area.

Level of Significance – Local

Area of listing - 150 metres diameter centred on a point immediately north of the first dwelling

Guidelines

▪ Hay Hill must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.
▪ Access to the property was not permitted.
▪ With access to the property, it may be possible to expand these guidelines and clarify exemptions. These must be documented as a mutually agreed ‘Incorporated Document’ in the Planning Scheme to provide the owners/occupants with clarity and certainty for future management.
▪ There are no fence restrictions.
▪ There are no internal restrictions. It is encouraged however that where there are traditional features in both the residential and functional buildings, these be retained and expressed.
▪ There are no restrictions on existing post-WW1 buildings or structures. (Post-WW1 is a nominal figure but the historical information does not appear to indicate any significant development after that period.)
▪ New development must not intrude upon the appreciation of the traditional qualities of the pre-WW1 buildings. It must seek to be visually recessive in its design and placement.
▪ Subdivision may be possible for the overall property but the pre-WW1 buildings must be protected and provided with a significant area within which to be appreciated. The minimal area is indicated by the 150 metre boundary. New built development must not intrude upon the pre-WW1 buildings in their siting, designs or fencing.
• It is encouraged that existing vegetation be retained where it complements the traditional character of the pre-WW1 buildings. It is encouraged that new vegetation also complement the traditional character of the place. Vegetation outside the area of listing is encouraged to continue the existing landscape character.
Gisborne
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Residence (AG4)

60 Prince Street, Gisborne

History

Unfortunately very little is known historically about this specific building. Based upon its architectural expression, it is a late Victorian building, probably 1880s. This would have been a time of consolidation in Gisborne, moving beyond the heyday of gold and into its agricultural future to support the new populations in rural Victoria.

Comparative Threshold Comment

Within Gisborne, there are few comparable buildings. Two in New Gisborne and one in Gisborne are recommended for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay in the Study.

Within Kyneton there are numerous similar weatherboard residences already included on the Heritage Overlay as parts of precincts (HO119, HO138, HO211 and HO239.

It would be consistent and appropriate to include this Residence on the Heritage Overlay.

Statement of Cultural Value

▪ What is significant?
  The Residence is significant to the extent of the weatherboard Victorian building and its presentation to the public realm. It does not include the skillion additions at the rear, vegetation of fences.

▪ How is it significant?
  The Residence is significant aesthetically and architecturally.

▪ Why is it significant?
  The Residence is significant aesthetically as a highly visible traditional feature in Gisborne, reinforcing the townships early character and development.

  The Residence is significant architecturally as an intact example of a Late Victorian style residence, which is surprisingly intact and well maintained. It demonstrates all of the classical features of the style as manifested in rural areas.

Level of Significance – Local

Guidelines

▪ The Residence must be conserved, maintained and provided with a viable future wherever possible.
▪ The appreciation of the Residence from Prince and Howey Streets must not be interrupted by any development or landscaping.
▪ The chimneys must not be painted. An appropriate colour scheme for the original portion must be maintained.
▪ There are no restrictions on fencing or outbuildings.
- There are no restrictions on landscaping, although a sensitive landscape is encouraged at the front.
- Landscaping or development must not intrude upon the visual appreciation of the building from the public realm.
- Additions or alterations must be at the rear (west) of the building. Any changes must not overwhelm or disrupt the appreciation of the original portion of the building.
- There are no restrictions on the interior of the building. However, the retention of existing original elements and features is encouraged.
- Subdivision may be considered but only to the rear (west) of the property and only where subsequent built development does not outweigh the existing residence.
Kyneton
27 November 2017

Salvation Army Barracks/Citadel (K2)
5 Bowen Street, Kyneton

History

The following is an extract from www.salvationarmy.org.au/Who-We-Are/History and Heritage

Origins of the Salvation Army

'The Salvation Army's beginnings date back to July 2, 1865 when a Methodist minister commenced a work in East London that would encircle the world before the end of the 19th century. It began as the Christian Revival Society and soon after was called the East London Christian Mission. William Booth, the organisation's Founder, preached the Gospel to the poor and underprivileged. By 1867 it had developed into a ministry offering basic schooling, reading rooms, penny banks, soup kitchens, and relief aid to the destitute.

The organisation grew rapidly and became known simply as the Christian Mission, with William Booth as its General-Superintendent.

The Salvation Army is Born

In 1878 came another name change. William Booth was perusing a printer's proof which referred to the Christian Mission as a 'volunteer army'. Booth swept his pen through the word 'volunteer' and changed it to read Salvation Army. The name was adopted. Elijah Cadman, an enthusiastic believer, excitedly proclaimed in a meeting soon after, "God bless the Captains of The Salvation Army! I should like to wear a suit of clothes that would let everybody know I meant war to the teeth and salvation to the world". A simple form of uniform was gradually adopted by its members. This, in 1880, was developed into a regulated uniform system.

After responding to a call from America in early 1880, The Salvation Army next answered calls to commence operations in Australia. The Salvation Army has grown into a global evangelical movement with extensive social services. It now works in 106 countries and 160 languages, offering spiritual counsel, a sense of community and practical support to thousands of people, regardless of race, creed or conviction.

1880-1900: Gaining a Foothold in Australia

Several localities lay claim to having held the first Salvationist meetings in Australia. These pioneering meetings were conducted by various immigrants who had been converted by The Salvation Army back in Britain. It is Adelaide, however, that owns the right to claim the first official Salvation Army Corps in Australia.

In 1882, Major James Barker and his wife Alice were appointed by the General and sent from London to extend and establish The Salvation Army's work "in all the colonies of the Southern Seas". Intending to disembark at the Port of Adelaide, a wharf-strike forced the Barkers on to Williamstown, Victoria. Friends of The Salvation Army met them and took them into Melbourne, where the Barkers were so impressed by the potential of Victoria that they determined to begin work there.

Salvation Army Church Growth in Australia

In 1891, Booth-Tucker (the son-in-law of William Booth) wrote, "Perhaps no country has welcomed The Salvation Army with greater heartiness and offered for its operations a more congenial sphere, than has Australia."

However, this statement fails to present the whole picture, for whilst the social work of The Salvation Army gained popular support across the wide spectrum of society, including the other religious denominations and the Government, the evangelical mission of The Salvation Army often met with suspicion, derision and violence. Local councils passed by-laws forbidding Salvation Army street processions, and the Police were liable to arrest them.

Despite persecution and prosecution the number of Salvation Army Corps (churches), and in turn Salvationists, grew at an amazing rate. So much so, that by 1900, there were over 1300 Corps and Outposts across Australia and New Zealand. By the 1920s it was a very small town indeed that did not boast a Salvation Army Hall.
Much of the rapid growth of The Salvation Army in those early days may be attributed to its own formative stages being closely linked to the social needs of a developing nation.

The economic depressions of the 1890s and 1930s brought the role of the churches into sharp relief against the background of dire need. The Army, through its social work, acquired a reputation as being characteristic of “Christianity with its sleeves rolled up”. The Army, along with the other Christian churches, makes that commitment because of Christ’s example.”

The following are selected extracts from an article from 2015 in Fabrications (The Journal of Architectural Historians in Australia). It is entitled Building Salvation and written by Renee Muratore and Julie Willis.

“The early Salvation Army building in Australia were solely the result of Lt Col Edward Saunders. As well as being instrumental in founding the Army in Australia, Saunders was a trained stonemason and master builder. He became the Army’s in-house architect and head of its Property Department, overseeing the design and building of Army properties across Australia and New Zealand until his retirement in 1912. After Saunders’s retirement, the architectural direction of the Salvation Army became the responsibility of Col Percival Dale, under the supervision of the Property Secretary J. Horskins.”

“Saunders’ buildings are notable for their castellated facades in an ‘awkward adaptation’ of the Tudor Revival style. ... Its, (the style), incorporation of small turrets and castellation leant it associations with castles, fortressed and barracks and was thus a suitable match for the overt militarism of the Salvation Army. The building were ‘strong points for the rallying of troops.... Saunders developed a consistent architectural language for the Salvation Army that reflected its military inspiration, but also one that was easily recognisable: the style and form he developed for the Army halls became synonymous with Salvationist architecture in Australia.”

“The Salvation Army Property Department and its architects produced a large number of buildings of remarkable consistency of its first four years in Australia. This consistency in language, evident across Australia, created a recognisable Salvation Army style and form. There is no evidence to suggest this was a leibyera strategy and nothing within the organisation indicat3d that it was a response of a specific ideal or on of sophisticated architectural intent. The distinctive tripartite division was not about branding or identification for the Salvation Army in Australia, but evolved mostly from their military ethos and practicality. The military form and processes in their day-to-day operation extended to the standardisation of their building designs, replicated across the continent, and reflected the frugal nature of the Salvation Army. Nevertheless, the uniformity of the building types acted as effective branding for the Salvation Army, as iconic as their distinctive uniforms. In the different areas of Australia, the Salvation Army building was thus immediately recognisable as a place of welfare and salvation.”

“The built legacy of the Salvation Army is important in understanding the development of religious architecture in Australia, particularly in comparison to other non-conformist Christian churches. The arm, through its Property Department, was unusual in the procurement of ecclesiastical building in Australia because of its internalised nature. The Salvation Army created, through Edward Saunders and then Percival Dale, a distinctive architectural form that both reflected current architectural trends but remained distinct from them, capable of incorporating local inflections without losing close associations with the Army type.”

The following is an extract from the Heritage New Zealand website (www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/7740) summarising Lt Col Edward Saunders’ contribution to the Salvation Army. The summary was presented in the context of The Salvation Army Barracks in Opotiki in New Zealand.

“The Salvation Army Barracks (Former) was designed by architect Major Edward Saunders of Melbourne. Major Saunders is credited with John Gore of pioneering the Salvation Army in Australia. Born in Stratfordshire in England he trained as a stone mason and worked in the building industry. He designed a number of buildings for the Salvation Army in Australia. Edward Saunders became an Officer in 1883 and the Salvation Army capitalized on his experience as a builder and sent him to Sydney to build a new Barracks for the increasing number of converts there. Other buildings being erected at that time were also supervised by him. He was appointed Property Secretary at territorial headquarters in Melbourne in 1889, a position that he retained until 1912, when as a Lieutenant-Colonel he retired from the Army.”

The following is an extract from the 1990 Heritage Study.

“The last Church to have been built in Kyneton, the Old Salvation Army Church contrasts with the buildings and siting of the other 19th century churches in the town, which are all bluestone, gothic in architectural style and set in large grounds away from the main commercial street, Mollison Street. The acquisition of the site is also very different, the other (Earlier) churches having received Government land grants, with the exception of the Congregationalists who insisted on buying the site of their Church, next to the others. In 1884 two Salvation Army Officers pegged out the site of the Drill
Hall in Market Street to try and obtain it under a Miner’s Right. This was quickly prevented by the Colonial Defence Department after local information was sent to the Minister. The design of the building by J. Flint itself is distinctive, as Salvation Army Churches at that time.”

“The old Salvation Army Barracks were built at the end of 1885, the foundation stones being laid on 3 September, while the building was opened on 25 November. The Army had attempted to obtain the Drill Hall site in Market Street during 1884 and opened a subscription list to build a Barracks on 11 October 1884. At the meeting held on 29 October to raise funds, a considerable sum was in hand. Mollison Street was the western edge of the original Kyneton Town Plan and the large 10 acre (4.047 hectares) lots on the east side were subdivided by private owners rather than the Crown as Mollison Street became increasingly the new main street of the town. Market Street at the back of High Street was the only street on the east side subdivided by the Crown.”

The following is the text from the Discover Historic Kyneton disk on the outside of the building.

“This stone was laid to the Glory of God buy Councillor J. Palmer, September 3rd 1886, Rev W. Booth General, Ballington Booth, Marshal, James Barker, Major, J. Flint Architect”

Discussion

- The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes associated with this building are 6.5 Living in Country Towns, 8.1 Maintaining Spiritual Life, 8.3 Providing Health and Welfare Services, and 8.4 Forming Community Organisations.
- The terminology associated with this building varies – Citadel, Barracks and even ‘church’. The Salvation Army however went to great lengths to avoid the term ‘church’ in keeping with their salvationist approach to worship and rejection of traditional church trappings and processes. The difference between a Citadel and a Barracks – in Army terminology was size, not function. Both a citadel and a barracks was a rallying point for the ‘troops’.
- The physical size of the building indicates a large presence on the part of the Salvation Army in Kyneton and the importance of Kyneton to the movement. The fact that the adjacent towns (Gisborne, Malmsbury, Woodend, Lancefield or Romsey) do not have any Army presence would strengthen the importance of the Barracks in Kyneton.
- The Kyneton Barracks is unique, but formulaic. It is a large hall with a decorative symmetrical front. That front is decorated using bands, piers, oculus windows, parapets, corner bastions and tripartite windows. This building’s most unique feature however is the pair of entrances either side of the façade, not centred which is the usual Army formula. It is still however strongly symmetrical. The level of decoration, and in fact its relative size, is a reflection of Kyneton’s own importance and the strength of the movement in Kyneton.
- The decoration appears to be intact under the paint. The rendered portions of the elevation would have been painted, but the majority of the building would have been exposed red brick.
- In its all white current colour scheme the building may not be immediately recognisable as a Salvation Army Barracks. However, behind the paint and current signage, lies a classic expression of the Salvation Army style of pseudo-military architecture, and on a scale rare in Kyneton.
- The interior of the building is still a large volume. The timber boarded ceiling and timber trusses are still intact and provide an almost church like feel to the building. Portions of the panelling on walls exist, although they are not intact throughout. The main portion of the walls are just painted brick. The paintworks is probably original to reflect light. A timber partition exists to the underside of the ceiling to divide the space into two unequal rooms.
- Likewise, the north wall of the building is timber clad with weatherboards on the outside and a sheet material (?) on the inside. This possibly indicates an opportunity for the Army to expand the building in the future.
- The development to the west side of building is unfortunate, but this area, may in the future, offers some opportunity for redevelopment to complement a more appropriate/alternative use of the building. Any new development should allow the original building to visually dominate and reinstate its earlier architectural composition/materials. New building forms should be simple and contemporary and not attempt to emulate or copy the original building. If
possible, they should be set back from the front and visually neutral in forms/colours. Signage should be subtle and respectful.

- The painting of the brickwork or the original building however is most unfortunate in appreciating the original building and should be reversed/mitigated at the earliest opportunity.

- The evolution and spread of the Salvation Army has been a worldwide movement and the building in Kyneton is a reflection of that in this region. The Army's alternative approach to the celebration of Christianity caught the mood of the time and has remained a force in the Kyneton community, Australia and the world. The movement’s focus on the welfare of others is recognised today beyond its own membership.

- The Salvation Army has set itself apart from mainstream religion in both practice and outward expression. Their use of uniforms, ranks, brass bands and even the architecture of its buildings are demonstration of quasi-military approach to salvation and uniformity.

### Comparative Threshold Statement

In terms of Salvation Army buildings, there are no others in the Shire. The size of this building indicates clearly that Kyneton was the centre for the Salvation Army for quite a large area.

Even within Kyneton itself, only the Mechanics Institute and the Town Hall are public meeting facilities of a comparable in size. The Mechanics Institute and Town Hall have a high degree of integrity internally and externally. Both of these have been added to the Heritage Overlay – HO254 and HO170 respectively.
Even compared to the churches in Kyneton, the Salvation Army Barracks is equal to the largest in size, the Catholic Church, which is include within the Kyneton Town Core Heritage Overlay – HO119.

It is recommended that within the Shire, the Salvation Army Barracks is comparable favourably with other similar buildings already included on the Heritage Overlay and worth of protection.

Statement of Cultural Value

▪ What is significant

The Salvation Army Barracks is significant to the extent of its early brick and timber structure, including the roof, decoration and north timber wall. The significance does not include the modern additions to the west or associated developments not the interior of the building.

▪ How is it significant

The Salvation Army Barracks is significant architecturally, historically and socially.

▪ Why is it significant

▪ The Salvation Army Barracks is significant architecturally as a classical expression of the Army’s aesthetic approach to its buildings. The buildings were meant to be imposing to provide the salvation movement with a credible presence. Its use of red brick, rendered details and castellation’s, a strong sense of symmetry to the façade, is contrasted with the relative simplicity and austerity of the rest of the building – and clearly expressed in this building.

▪ The Salvation Army Barracks is historically significant for its associations with Salvation Army itself, and its pioneering non-conformist approach to religion and welfare, as well as with Edward Saunders, their sole architect responsible for Army buildings throughout Australia and New Zealand and in particular his development of the pseudo-military architectural expression of those buildings.

▪ The Salvation Army Barracks is socially significant for its association with the Army’s alternative, and innovative approach to religion, its celebration, and its focus on the welfare of others. The Barracks reflects the development of a social conscience in the wake of the Industrial Revolution – a conscience which saw the importation into Australia of other welfare and self-education movements (friendly societies, mechanics institutes, Freemasons, etc).

Level of Significance – Local

Guidelines.

▪ The building must be conserved and maintained and wherever possible provided with a viable future.

▪ It is desirable, but not mandatory, to facilitate a more public function for the building. Commercial uses that are prohibited in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone may be considered if potentially adverse amenity impacts on the adjacent residential uses can be minimised. The viability of the original building may be enhanced by the sensitive use/redevelopment of the associated land to the west.

▪ It is encouraged to remove the paint from the original unpainted brickwork to re-establish the architectural composition. An alternative may be to use a dark red ‘brick’ paint over those brick surfaces. The paint removal must be non-aggressive – no sandblasting. A method such as DuPont ‘Peel-away’ is preferred.

▪ The reinstatement of an original colour scheme is recommended at the earliest opportunity.

▪ The three brick walls of the building must be retained along with the roof materials and form. The fourth, north wall should remain a ‘lightweight’ construction. There may be opportunity for new openings on the side and rear walls but the main elevation should remain unchanged. Preferably, the two front entrances should be activated.

▪ Existing signage should be re-considered with a preference for less dominant signage on the building front – focusing signage on the new buildings/development on the side. New signage must not dominate the building and must be sensitive to its architectural composition. Signage not located on the building is preferred.

▪ The timber floor internally must be maintained with subfloor ventilation to avoid moisture attacking the brick walls. Concrete floors must not be used.

▪ The literal ‘restoration’ of the interior back to a previous state or appearance is not required. The retention and expression of the timber ceiling is encouraged. The retention and expression of the internal timber panelling is encouraged, as is any remnant joinery.

▪ The introduction of a mezzanine internally may be considered if it is undertaken in a manner which still makes the large internal volume appreciable.
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Homestead/Jarrett’s Farm (AK3)
101 Pleasant Hill Road, Kyneton

Guidelines

- The Farm (Residence and wall) must be conserved and maintained and wherever possible provided with a viable future.
- The east-west stone wall must be retained and maintained as a landscape feature. It must be restored to create a stable and manageable feature. New openings in the wall may be considered but should be minimal in size and extent.
- The wall must be visually accessible to the public realm and preferably physically accessible as well. In the future design of the surrounding environs, the wall must be included within public open space.
- The Dwelling should be retained and adapted as a residence. Care should be taken with the brick portion of the dwelling retaining its form, verandah, openings onto the verandah and chimneys. The attached outbuilding and timber additions need not be retained. They may be replaced but this must be undertaken in an understated contemporary manner and allow the early brick portion to visually dominate.
- The dwelling must include as much land immediately around it as possible in order to highlight its presence. No new dwellings/development should come within 20 metres radius of the dwelling.
- While no specific trees are identified for retention, the area was once accentuated with large scale vegetation. The retention/reinstatement of significant trees in the environs must be included in any development. Garden features are not part of the listing of the dwelling. Any new garden may be contemporary but must demonstrate a scale and sensitivity to the scale of the dwelling.
- There are no restrictions on the interior of the dwelling. However, the retention and expression of remnant traditional features is encouraged.
- There are no restrictions on vegetation or landscaping. However, the retention of significant trees in the environs of the dwelling is encouraged, as is the introduction of substantial trees in the same environs.
- There are no restrictions on fences (other than the east-west dry stone wall) or outbuildings. However, the retention of other portions of dry stone walls on the property is encouraged.
- The retention of the dwelling and the stone wall need not be one physical identity. They may be conserved separately.
Discussion

▪ The themes from Victoria’s Framework of Historical Themes associated with this property are 4.3 Grazing and Raising Livestock, 4.4 Farming, and 6.8 Living on the Fringes.
▪ From the historical 1889 description of the Jarratt’s Farm, it is clear it is no longer intact. While some traditional fabric remains, it could no longer be considered as an example of a farming complex.
▪ A brick dwelling is evident, but it is far from ‘capacious’. It appears to be incorporate an earlier building at the rear and is modest in size and composition. Its style is somewhat eclectic, more Late-Victorian than Federation, with a minimum of any decoration. The front ‘windows’ extend to the verandah floor providing ideal ventilation is warmer weather. Its location on the top of a hill, overlooking Kyneton is a notable feature.
▪ There are other sheds, but their uses are not evident and most are obviously modern. A ‘stable’ building exists in part but it is uncertain whether this is the one described in the 1889 description. It is built of corrugated iron and retains some paving and joinery internally. It is not however, intact.
▪ The east-west dry stone wall is interesting in that it received mention and praise in the 1889 description. This wall still exists, essentially intact, although in need of some maintenance. It is an historical landscape feature of the previous farming endeavours in the environs of Kyneton. While there are other stone walls within the Shire, this is by far the longest.
▪ It would appear there was a ‘garden’ in the environs of the dwelling but this is only because of several remnant large introduced trees. The pattern or logic to the garden has been lost as a coherent form. The condition of the landscaping is poor.
▪ The Farm is within the proposed Kyneton South Investigation Area, an area of land being investigated for future residential growth. Amongst the objectives of this investigation is to ‘Protect environmental and rural landscape values of the Kyneton township...’ and ‘Protect the character of Kyneton...’. Dry stone walls in particular have been identified as important features of the area.
▪ The dwelling is intact and useable, if not outstanding in design terms. It could be added to and upgraded to complement the future residential development of the area. Likewise, the dry stone wall can complement open spaces and pedestrian circulation, with some minor alterations to provide access through the wall.
▪ The Farm lacks integrity as a whole. Its future ‘restoration’ of the property would require a great deal of conjecture and would render the exercise questionable. At the same time, and in the context of the mention of character and landscape values, there is a potential for the dwelling and the dry stone wall to make a meaningful contribution to the objectives of the Kyneton South Investigation Area, without list of the whole property. The author therefore is going to suggest the heritage value of the Farm is as a character demonstration rather than a more traditional restoration project.

Comparative Threshold Comment

Dry stone walls are a feature of the Shire, although overlooked generally as heritage places. Several are already included on the Heritage Overlay in Malmsbury (HO21 and HO150) as well as others as part of the Malmsbury Heritage Precinct (HO148).

Several similar residences on the fringes of Kyneton have already been included on the Heritage Overlay, including Brennanah (HO208), St Anne’s (HO28) and Barongaroon (HO122).

It would be appropriate and consistent to include the drystone walls and residence on the Heritage Overlay.

Statement of Cultural Value

▪ What is significant?

The Farm is significant to the extent of the brick dwelling and an area 20 metres in radius from the centre of the Residence and the east-west dry stone wall. It does not include other outbuildings, the interior of the dwelling, fencing, or miscellaneous structures.

▪ How is it significant?

The Farm is significant historically and aesthetically.

▪ Why is it significant?

The Farm is significant historically as a demonstration of the settlement pattern and landscape features around the fringes of Kyneton.
The Farm is significant aesthetically as features in the landscape. The east-west dry stone wall in particular is acknowledged as one of the longest in the Shire and provides a subtle, but tangible, link to the settlement of Kyneton. The dwelling is likewise a tangible feature to complement the wall.

Level of Significance - Local

Guidelines

- The Farm (Residence and wall) must be conserved and maintained and wherever possible provided with a viable future.
- The east-west stone wall must be retained and maintained as a landscape feature. It must be restored to create a stable and manageable feature. New openings in the wall may be considered but should be minimal in size and extent.
- The wall must be visually accessible to the public realm and preferably physically accessible as well. In the future design of the surrounding environs, the wall must be included within public open space.
- The dwelling must be retained and adapted as a residence. Care should be taken with the brick portion of the dwelling retaining its form, verandah, openings onto the verandah and chimneys. The attached outbuilding and timber additions need not be retained. They may be replaced but this must be undertaken in an understated contemporary manner and allow the early brick portion to visually dominate.
- The dwelling must include as much land immediately around it as possible in order to highlight its presence. No new dwellings/development should come within 20 metres radius of the dwelling.
- While no specific trees are identified for retention, the area was once accentuated with large scale vegetation. The retention/reinstatement of significant trees in the environs must be included in any development. Garden features are not part of the listing of the dwelling. Any new garden may be contemporary but must demonstrate a scale and sensitivity to the scale of the dwelling.
- There are no restrictions on the interior of the dwelling. However, the retention and expression of remnant traditional features is encouraged.
- There are no restrictions on vegetation or landscaping. However, the retention of significant trees in the environs of the dwelling is encouraged, as is the introduction of substantial trees in the same environs.
- There are no restrictions on fences (other than the east-west dry stone wall) or outbuildings. However, the retention of other portions of dry stone walls on the property is encouraged.
- The retention of the dwelling and the stone wall need not be one physical identity. They may be conserved separately.