



Heritage Advisory Committee

Minutes

16 May 2018

Committee Terms of Reference

The Heritage Advisory Committee is to provide heritage advice on:

- City-owned heritage assets*
- strategic and statutory planning instruments*
- promotion and education of heritage*
- enhancement of economic development and tourism opportunities*
- matters raised by the general community*

City of Bunbury
4 Stephen Street
Bunbury WA 6230
Western Australia

Correspondence to:
Post Office Box 21
Bunbury WA 6231

Heritage Advisory Committee

Minutes

16 May 2018

Members of the public to note that recommendations made by this committee are not final and will be subject to adoption (or otherwise) at a future meeting of the Bunbury City Council.

Committee Members:

Member Name	Representing
Cr Brendan Kelly	City of Bunbury
Cr Tresslyn Smith	City of Bunbury
Mrs Del Ambrosius	Community
Mr Bernhard Bischoff	Community
Mr Morris Johnston	Community
Mr Kent Lyon	Community
Mr Raymond Parks	Community
Mr Peter Suckling	Community

Support Staff:

Name	Title
Ms Lacey Brown	Strategic Planning Officer (Heritage)
Mr Matthew Young	Team Leader Development Assessment and Compliance
Mr Anthony Pick	Senior Planning Officer
Ms Felicity Anderson	Acting Director Planning and Development Services
Ms Cassandra Uren (Minutes)	Executive Assistant to Director Planning and Development Services

Table of Contents

Item No	Subject	Page No
1.	Declaration of Opening	3
2.	Disclaimer	3
3.	Announcements from the Presiding Member	3
4.	Attendances	3
4.1	Apologies.....	3
4.2	Approved Leave of Absence.....	3
5.	Declaration of Interest	3
6.	Public Question Time	3
7.	Confirmation of Minutes	4
8.	Petitions, Presentations and Deputations	4
8.1	Petitions	4
8.2	Presentations	4
8.3	Deputations.....	4
9.	Method of Dealing with Agenda Business	4
10.	Reports	5
10.1	Alterations and Additions to Single House at Lot 6 (#41) King Road, East Bunbury.....	5
10.2	Demolition of Single House at Lot 48 (#5) Charles Street, Bunbury	11
10.3	Bunbury History Research.....	16
11.	Applications for Leave of Absence	18
12.	Questions from Members	18
12.1	Response to Previous Questions from Members taken on Notice.....	18
12.2	Questions from Members	18
13.	Urgent Business	18
14.	Date of Next Meeting	18
15.	Close of Meeting	18

1. Declaration of Opening

The presiding member declared the meeting open at 4.03pm.

2. Disclaimer

Not applicable to this committee.

3. Announcements from the Presiding Member

Summary of Council Decision (144/18) on Proposed Carport at Lot 17#49 Moore Street, Bunbury (DA.2017.281.1) which was for approval (Four votes “for”, five votes “against”). Executive and HAC recommendation was for refusal. Councillors Kelly, Smith, McCleary and Brown wished to have their names recorded as voting for the executive recommendation.

“The reason for passing a motion that was contrary to the recommendation provided by the Executive was that Council considered the relatively low individual heritage value of the existing building and merit of the application and concluded that the streetscape impact of the proposed carport was acceptable and within the bounds of its discretion to approve the proposed development, in accordance with Local Planning Scheme No. 8.”

4. Attendances

4.1 Apologies

- Mr Kent Lyon
- Mr Peter Suckling
- Ms Felicity Anderson
- Ms Cassandra Uren

4.2 Approved Leave of Absence

5. Declaration of Interest

IMPORTANT: Committee members to complete a “Disclosure of Interest” form for each item on the agenda in which they wish to disclose a financial/proximity/impartiality interest. They should give the form to the Presiding Member <u>before</u> the meeting commences. After the meeting, the form is to be forwarded to the Administration Services Section for inclusion in the Corporate Financial Disclosures Register.
--

- Mr Morris Johnson declared a financial interest in item 10.1.
- Cr Kelly declared an impartiality interest in item 10.1 and would not be voting.
- Cr Smith declared an impartiality interest in item 10.1 and would not be voting.

6. Public Question Time

Not applicable

7. Confirmation of Minutes

Committee Decision: **Moved: Mr Bischoff Seconded: Mrs Ambrosius**

The minutes of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting held on 11 April 2018, are confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Petitions, Presentations and Deputations

8.1 Petitions

Nil

8.2 Presentations

Nil

8.3 Deputations

Nil

9. Method of Dealing with Agenda Business

Items were discussed and voted on in the order they appeared on the agenda.

10. Reports

10.1 Alterations and Additions to Single House at Lot 6 (#41) King Road, East Bunbury

File Ref:	5/2017/154/2
Applicant/Proponent:	Morris Johnston
Responsible Officer:	Matthew Young, Team Leader Development Assessment & Compliance
Responsible Manager:	Thor Farnworth, Manager Sustainability, Planning and Development
Executive:	Felicity Anderson, A/Director Planning and Development Services
Authority/Discretion	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy <input type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Executive/Strategic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative <input type="checkbox"/> Information Purposes
Attachments:	DPDS1 – Decision Notice and Development Plans DPDS2 – Proposed Development Plans and Supporting Information DPDS3 – Site Photographs

Summary

Development approval was granted on 18 December 2017 for the partial infill of the front verandah, at either end, to create two small rooms (storage and a sewing room) under the existing roof of the dwelling. The property is known as ‘Ellen’s Cottage’ and is located at Lot 6 (#41) King Road, East Bunbury. The dwelling is included on the City of Bunbury Heritage List.

The applicant has now lodged an amended development application requesting to delete condition No. 4 of the development approval which states:

- Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised plans which show the proposed extension being timber framed and clad in timber weatherboard with details to be submitted to and approved by the City of Bunbury. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*

The applicant proposes to complete the verandah infill / extension in heritage red brick to match the original fabric of the dwelling.

The application has been referred to the Regional Heritage Advisor who has reaffirmed previous advice that the extension to the front of the building would only be acceptable if it was constructed of lightweight materials i.e. timber framed/and clad with weatherboard. The reason is that the extension is more easily reversible at a later date and the different material allows for the alteration to the dwelling to be readily identifiable from the original and early building.

The Council’s policy however is worded such that it gives preference to the use of similar materials, consistent with that proposed. The recommendation is therefore to approve the amended development application.

Executive Recommendation

That Council, pursuant to Clause 77 (4) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* approves the amended development application to delete condition

no. 4 of development approval DA/2017/154/1 for alterations and additions at Lot 6 (#41) King Road, East Bunbury.

Strategic Relevance

Theme 1:	Our community and culture
Objective 1.4	Arts, culture, heritage and events that enrich our understanding and enjoyment of life, celebrate our identity and bring the community together
Theme 3:	Our places and spaces
Objective 3.3	High-quality urban designs, well-planned neighbourhoods with housing choice, and appropriate provision for diverse land uses to meet the community's needs

Background

A summary table of details relating to the subject site is as follows:

Property Address:	Lot 6 (#41) King Road (Ellen's Cottage)
LPS8 Zoning:	Residential (R20/R30)
Lot Area:	1324.72m ²
Heritage Status:	City of Bunbury Heritage List Classified by the National Trust
Heritage Area	No

Ellen's Cottage is a single storey, brick and iron house with a symmetrical facade designed as an example of the Victorian Colonial style of architecture. The dwelling makes a positive contribution to the streetscape, although it is not located within a Heritage Area.

The dwelling is included on the City of Bunbury Heritage List due to its considerable level of contribution to Bunbury's cultural heritage. The Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) contains the following statement of significance for the place:

'The Slab Hut, a single storey, brick and iron house, has cultural heritage significance because it is one of the few remaining slab huts in Western Australia in continuing use; the place was built by one of the first convicts to be transported to Western Australia, Henry Trott, who went on to become a prominent Bunbury citizen; the restoration of the place in 1996 for commercial use is a demonstration of the potential of such buildings; the place has landmark qualities and contributes significantly to the streetscape and the community's sense of place.'

The following documents are provided for the Committee's information and to inform assessment of the application:

1. Decision notice and development plans **attached** at Appendix DPDS1
2. Proposed development plans and supporting information **attached** at Appendix DPDS2
3. Site photographs **attached** at Appendix DPDS3

Legislative and Council Policy Compliance

The following statutory planning instruments of the state planning framework and local planning framework are applicable to the assessment of this application:

- *Planning and Development Act 2005 (as amended);*
- *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015;*
- City of Bunbury Local Planning Scheme No. 8 (LPS8);
- City of Bunbury Heritage List;
- State Planning Policy 3.5: Historic Heritage Conservation;
- Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development Policy for Heritage Places; and
- Draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development

Officer Comments

Development approval for the extension was granted on 18 December 2017, consistent the recommendation of the Heritage Advisory Committee which included the requirement for the extension to be timber framed and clad in weatherboard. The use of appropriate and sympathetic materials is particularly important in this case, where the proposal constitutes a fundamental change to the primary elevation, which was characterised by a wide open front verandah, of the heritage building.

In terms of justifying the request to delete condition No. 4, and to build the extension using heritage red brick to match the existing, the applicant refers to the draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development. In particular, section 5.2 Alterations and Additions to Existing Buildings is referred to.

- (a) *It is recognised that heritage buildings often require adaption to facilitate new uses and meet modern standards. Adaption, however, should be carried out with the least amount of change to the significant fabric of the building as possible and should not detract from the heritage significance of the building.*

In respect of interpretation of this clause, officers submit that the intent of the clause is for adaptations of buildings to conserve the original fabric of the building e.g. minimising the number of new openings or internal changes to the absolute minimum. It does not dealing with alterations/extensions.

However, the following clauses of the draft local planning policy are relevant:

- (h) *Alterations / additions to a heritage building may be in the same general style as the existing building or provide a visual contrast. Where a major alteration or addition is in the same style as the existing building, it should be distinguishable at its intersection from the original fabric at close inspection (e.g. extension of main rooms in a similar material as that used in the original masonry walls, with minor side and rear additions in weatherboard. Whereas major alterations and additions that contrast with the existing building should always respect the heritage place in terms of scale, massing, form, setback, external materials, colours and detailing (i.e. including design aspects such as the proportions of doors and windows, width of eaves over-hangs, roofline and form, etc.).*

Section 5.3 Building Materials and Colours provides guidance on the use of appropriate materials for alterations and additions. In particular, subclause (d) states:

- (d) *Alterations or additions to an existing dwelling should use materials that match the original or that are compatible with its significance. Sometimes different materials can be used to distinguish the new from old.*

The applicant advises that the original verandah walls were constructed with rendered brick with supporting end buttresses. The verandah enclosure will be constructed with cut bricks, cream coloured mortar and brick laying sequence that will be clearly identifiable from the original.

The policy requirement refers to matching materials or the use of different materials to distinguish the new from the old. The preferred heritage outcome depends on the type of extension and the particulars of the heritage building.

In consideration of the original approved verandah development application it was acknowledged that whilst there is a general presumption against infilling of the front verandah, the HAC and Council recommended approval subject to the use of timber frame construction/weatherboard cladding. This was approved on the basis that, in the absence of feasible alternative locations which would have less impact on the heritage building, the infill of the verandah with light-weight materials was considered to be acceptable

In respect to this reconsideration request the Regional Heritage Advisor reaffirms that:

'If the extensions to the front of the building are to go ahead they should be constructed of lightweight materials i.e. timber framed, that are able to be removed at a later date. The different material also allows the changes to be readily identifiable from the original and early building. This advice is consistent with best practice and the Burra Charter principles.'

The advice of the Regional Heritage Advisor also reflects guidance contained in policy measure 6.6 of State Planning Policy 3.5: Historic Heritage Conservation which states:

- *Development should conserve and protect the cultural significance of a heritage place based on respect for the existing building or structure, and should involve the least possible change to the significant fabric.*
- *Alterations and additions to a heritage place should not detract from its significance and should be compatible with the siting, scale, architectural form, materials and external finishes of the place. **Compatibility requires additions or alterations to sit well with the original fabric rather than simply copying or mimicking it.***

In summary, the existing condition was imposed on heritage grounds so that the new development can clearly be distinguished from the older parts of the building and is also more easily reversible.

The Council's policy however specifically requires that "*additions to an existing dwelling should use materials that match the original or that are compatible with its significance*". The recommendation is therefore to approve the request to delete condition No. 4.

Options

In accordance with clause 77 of the deemed provisions under the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the local government may determine an application for amending development approval by:

- (a) approving the application without conditions; or
- (b) approving the application with conditions; or
- (c) refusing the approval.

The Heritage Advisory Committee may therefore resolve to refuse the applicant's request to delete condition No. 4, on the basis that the use of brick is not acceptable and adversely affects the significance of the heritage place.

That Council, pursuant to Clause 77 (4) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* refuses the amended development application to delete condition no. 4 of development approval DA/2017/154/1 for alterations and additions at Lot 6 (#41) King Road, East Bunbury for the following reason:

1. The use of heritage red brick as a material for infilling the front verandah on the primary elevation does not provide for the development to be readily identifiable from the original fabric of the heritage building, and early building, and is not considered to be easily reversible at a later date.

The proposal would therefore adversely affect the significance of the heritage place contrary to State Planning Policy 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation and the City of Bunbury's adopted and draft local planning policies on heritage.

Analysis of Financial and Budget Implications

This application for development approval relates to private property, and therefore, the effect of the recommendation has no direct budgetary or financial implications for the City of Bunbury.

If the applicant is aggrieved by Council's decision the applicant may apply for a review of the decision through the State Administrative Tribunal. If the decision is forwarded to the Tribunal for appeal, the City of Bunbury may incur legal costs.

Community Consultation

The application is referred to the Heritage Advisory Committee for its recommendation in order to inform Council's assessment and determination.

Councillor/Officer Consultation

The proposal has been referred to the City of Bunbury's Development Coordination Unit (DCU) for professional advice and technical assessment prior to the finalisation of this report.

Applicant Consultation

Officers have met with the applicant during the assessment of the original application, including a site meeting with the Regional Heritage Advisor and also separately with the Heritage Advisory Committee.

The applicant has been advised of the process for requesting the City of Bunbury to reconsider the requirements of condition No.4. The applicant has also been advised that the application would be referred to the Heritage Advisory Committee, prior to being presented to Council for determination.

Outcome of Meeting

There was no quorum for the item, hence no Heritage Advisory Committee recommendation will be provided to the Council for consideration.

10.2 Demolition of Single House at Lot 48 (#5) Charles Street, Bunbury

File Ref:	2018/72/1
Applicant/Proponent:	Stan Clifton, Clifton Realty
Responsible Officer:	Anthony Pick, Senior Planning Officer
Manager:	Thor Farnworth, Manager Sustainability, Planning and Development
Executive:	Felicity Anderson, Acting Director Planning and Development Services
Attachments:	DPDS1 – Site Plan and Photographs DPDS2 – Heritage Impact Statement, including Structural Engineer’s Report DPDS3 – Public Submission

Summary

The City of Bunbury has received an application for the demolition of a single dwelling at Lot 48 (#5) Charles Street, East Bunbury. The house is located within the Stirling Street Heritage Area and the draft East Bunbury Heritage Area. The building is identified as making a “moderate contribution” to the cultural heritage significance and character of the heritage area.

State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation (SPP3.5) and the City of Bunbury Local Planning Policy on heritage provide a general presumption in favour of retaining buildings that make a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage area, unless the applicant provides clear justification. In this case, it is considered there is no overriding justification presented to justify demolition. SPP3.5 provides clear guidance that demolition should not be expected because redevelopment is a more attractive proposition or because a building has been neglected, which in this case there is evidence that lack of security has led to vandalism (e.g. broken windows, missing doors, holes in lathe and plaster walls).

The proposed demolition of the dwelling, which forms part of the rare ‘saw tooth’ setback pattern, would have a negative impact on the cultural heritage significance of Charles Street and the heritage area. The accompanying heritage impact statement has been assessed and it is considered there is no overriding justification to warrant the demolition of the building.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Executive Recommendation

That the Heritage Advisory Committee:

1. In accordance with the *Planning and Development Act 2005 (as amended)*, the Heritage Advisory Committee resolves to recommend refusal, for the following reasons:
 - 1.1 In accordance with State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation and the City of Bunbury Local Planning Policies on heritage, there is a general presumption in favour of retaining original buildings that make a positive contribution to the significance of the Heritage Area.
 - 1.2 The existing dwelling contributes to the significance of the heritage area and forms part of the rare saw tooth setback pattern.

- 1.3 The building has been neglected and neglect is not a reason to justify demolition.
2. Formally advise the applicant that the City of Bunbury is willing to consider any feasible option for retention and restoration of the dwelling, with additions to the rear of the existing building which are compatible with the fabric and significance of the original building, in accordance with draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development.

Strategic Relevance

- Theme 1: Our community and culture
Goal: A safe, healthy and cohesive community, with a rich cultural life, and supportive social environment.
Objective 1.4 Arts, culture, heritage and events that enrich our understanding and enjoyment of life, celebrate our identity and bring the community together
- Theme 3: Our places and spaces
Goal: A natural and built environment that reflects Bunbury's core values.
Objective 3.3 High-quality urban designs, well-planned neighbourhoods with housing choice, and appropriate provision for diverse land uses to meet the community's needs

Background

A summary table of details relating to the subject site is as follows:

Property Address:	Lot 48 (#5) Charles Street, Bunbury
Zoning:	Residential R15/40
Existing Land Use:	Single Dwelling
Lot Area:	749.44
Heritage:	Located within the Stirling Street Heritage Area

The subject site is not included on the City of Bunbury Municipal Inventory as an individual place; however, it is included within the Stirling Street Heritage Area and draft East Bunbury Heritage Area. The heritage area has been on the assessment program for consideration as a State Registered Place since 2003. The MHI contains a statement of significance for the area as:

“Precinct which contains areas of high cultural significance illustrating the evolution of settlement with the period 1875 to 1925 particularly well represented. The precinct contains areas of aesthetic characteristics highly valued by the community; cultural landscapes and notable streetscapes, all ensconced in a collection of harmoniously related buildings. Illustrations of several major historic themes of human settlement are evident. The precinct is also important for a range of social, cultural, education and spiritual associations.”

5 Charles Street is an early 20th century timber framed single storey workers cottage and the building is identified as making a “moderate contribution” to the cultural heritage significance and character of the Heritage Area.

The site plan and officer photographs are **attached** at Appendix DPDS1 and the heritage impact statement is **attached** at DPDS2.

Legislative Compliance

The following statutory planning instruments of the State and local planning framework are applicable to the assessment of this application for development approval:

- *Planning and Development Act 2005 (as amended)*;
- *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
- City of Bunbury Local Planning Scheme No. 8 (the Scheme);
- City of Bunbury Heritage List;
- State Planning Policy 3.5: Historic Heritage Conservation;
- Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development Policy for Heritage Places; and
- Draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development

Officer Comments

State Planning Policy 3.5 and the City's Local Planning Policy on heritage provide a general presumption in favour of retaining buildings that make a positive contribution to the significance of the area. Where demolition is proposed there needs to be a clear justification.

The site is identified as making a "moderate contribution" to the cultural heritage significance and character of the Heritage Area. The building, originally a workers cottage, is part of the rare saw tooth building setback pattern, which is characteristic of the built form in this locality. The building makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and the essential form, scale and appearance are retained.

The policy position is clear that demolition approval should not be expected simply because redevelopment is a more attractive economic proposition, or because a building has been neglected. It is considered that the proposal represents a clear case of 'demolition by neglect'. This is evidenced by the lack of measures undertaken to appropriately secure the building and the resulting vandalism that has occurred. The City is in the process of writing to the landowner requiring immediate action to remedy this to avoid any further vandalism.

The Heritage Impact Statement is accompanied by two structural reports which provide a difference of opinion. The report produced by Engenuity Engineering states that:

'Given the age of the building it is considered that the structure is in a fair to reasonable condition and, in general, could be reutilised with some maintenance and repair works being undertaken'.

In contrast, the report of Graham Teede finds that the building is not viable to be retained in any form.

The Heritage Impact Statement summarises that neither report 'conclusively condemns the building structure or proves structural inadequacy with a need for further investigations left open ended'.

The structural reports and schedule of costing for renovation and new build have been considered by the Regional Heritage Advisor and a site visit undertaken. In response the advice is that the building is considered to be in reasonable structural condition and the adaptation and reuse of the existing building is feasible.

The Regional Heritage Advisor also makes the following comments:

1. *This proposal should be referred to the Heritage Advisory Committee*
2. *When considering this proposal consideration must be given to the precedence that it will set for the street. The adjoining houses are likely to be under a similar threat of demolition.*
3. *It should also be noted that a place that is included in a heritage area but is not listed on the Heritage List on an individual basis does not have a lesser level of heritage significance.*
4. *The overall advice from a heritage perspective must follow the City of Bunbury Policies. Therefore the proposal to demolish 5 Charles Street is not supported.*

In addition, the landowner's representative has been strongly encouraged at a site meeting to discuss alternative options with the landowner. This could include the retention and addition to the existing building which are compatible with the fabric and significance of the original building, in accordance with draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development.

Future proposal

The application provides some information (preliminary development plans) on a possible future proposal for the site. However, whilst not formally part of the development application the proposal is considered to mimic/copy the original building contrary to best practice and local planning policy.

For the reasons outlined in the report the recommendation is for refusal.

Analysis of Financial and Budget Implications

This application for development approval relates to private property, and therefore, the effect of the recommendation has no direct budgetary or financial implications for the City of Bunbury.

If the applicant is aggrieved by Council's decision they may apply for a review of the decision through SAT which may result in legal costs to the City of Bunbury.

Community Consultation

The application is also referred to the Heritage Advisory Committee as required by the LPP for proposed demolition of a heritage place. The application has been advertised between 24 April 2018 and 7 May 2018.

A copy of the public submission is attached at DPDS3 – Public submissions.

Councillor/Officer Consultation

The application for development approval has been referred to the City of Bunbury's Development Coordination Unit (DCU) for professional advice and technical assessment prior to the finalisation of this report.

Consultation with the applicant

The applicant was advised of the need to consult with the Heritage Advisory Committee and of the draft recommendation.

Delegation of Authority

This development application is referred to the Heritage Advisory Committee for a recommendation to assist with the decision making process as required by Local Planning Policy: Development Application Process for Heritage Places.

Outcome of Meeting

The recommendation was moved by Mr Bischoff and seconded by Mr Parks and was carried unanimously .

Committee Decision: **Moved: Mr Bischoff** **Seconded: Mr Parks**

That the Heritage Advisory Committee:

- 1. In accordance with the *Planning and Development Act 2005 (as amended)*, the Heritage Advisory Committee resolves to recommend refusal, for the following reasons:**
 - 1.1 In accordance with State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation and the City of Bunbury Local Planning Policies on heritage, there is a general presumption in favour of retaining original buildings that make a positive contribution to the significance of the Heritage Area.**
 - 1.2 The existing dwelling contributes to the significance of the heritage area and forms part of the rare saw tooth setback pattern.**
 - 1.3 The building has been neglected and neglect is not a reason to justify demolition.**
- 2. Formally advise the applicant that the City of Bunbury is willing to consider any feasible option for retention and restoration of the dwelling, with additions to the rear of the existing building which are compatible with the fabric and significance of the original building, in accordance with draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development.**

10.3 Bunbury History Research

File Ref:	A03335
Applicant/Proponent:	Bernhard Bischoff
Responsible Officer:	Lacey Brown, Strategic Planning Officer (Heritage)
Responsible Manager:	Thor Farnworth, Manager Planning and Development Services
Executive:	Felicity Anderson, Acting Director Planning and Development Services
Authority/Discretion	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy <input type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Executive/Strategic <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Purposes
Attachments:	Nil

Summary

The purpose of this report is to advise the Heritage Advisory Committee on the peer review of Mr Bischoff's recent research work on the history of Bunbury and the contribution of Governor Stirling.

Executive Recommendation

That the Heritage Advisory Committee:

1. Note and congratulate Mr Bischoff on the peer review comments;
2. Refer to these comments at the Historians' Forum for deliberation when discussing the official settlement date of Bunbury.

Strategic Relevance

Theme 1: Our community and culture
Goal: A safe, healthy and cohesive community, with a rich cultural life, and supportive social environment.
Objective 1.4 Arts, culture, heritage and events that enrich our understanding and enjoyment of life, celebrate our identity and bring the community together.

Background

Mr Bischoff has provided some insightful research based on the original diary of the Survey Department in Perth that provides further information on Lt. Governor Stirling's expedition to Leschenault Peninsula and key milestones in Bunbury's history.

Officer Comments

Mr Bischoff's research work, "The beginning of Bunbury in 1830 - Stirling's failed settlement at Port Leschenault" as attachment DPDS5 to the HAC agenda of 14 December, 2017 was subject to peer review by Pamela Statham Drew. Pamela is a well known and respected historian in Perth who has written important publications especially about Governor Stirling.

Apart from a couple of technical suggestions she wrote:

Thank you for your most interesting paper....You have made a good case for the 1830 date. I would suggest you send it to the RWAHS for inclusion as a Research Note in "History West"....
(email dated 30 January, 2018) (RWAHS: Royal Western Australian Historical Society)

Mr Bishoff agreed to minor edit suggestions by Lenore Layman, editor of "History West", and to deposit the document on the RWAHS Library with a research note to alert members to the report should they be interested to read it in the Library.

No further comment has been received from members of RWAHS to date.

Analysis of Financial and Budget Implications

There are no financial or budget implications for the City of Bunbury.

Community Consultation

Community members are consulted through the Heritage Advisory Committee and key community stakeholders.

Councillor/Officer Consultation

Councillor members are consulted through the Heritage Advisory Committee.

Outcome of Meeting

Cr Smith commended Bernhard on his research, knowing how difficult research is with very limited official records.

Ray Parks will address Bernhard's research at the Historians' Forum.

The recommendation was moved by Cr Kelly and seconded by Cr Smith and was carried unanimously .

Committee Decision: **Moved: Cr Kelly** **Seconded: Cr Smith**

That the Heritage Advisory Committee:

- 1. Note and congratulate Mr Bischoff on the peer review comments;**
- 2. Refer to these comments at the Historians Forum for deliberation when discussing the official settlement date of Bunbury.**

11. Applications for Leave of Absence

Not applicable to this committee.

12. Questions from Members

12.1 Response to Previous Questions from Members taken on Notice

Nil

12.2 Questions from Members

Nil

13. Urgent Business

Nil

At 4.40pm Mr Parks moved and Mr Bischoff seconded to suspend standing orders pursuant to section 17 of the *City of Bunbury Standing Order Local Law 2012* to discuss further administrative changes to Draft Local Planning Policy: Heritage Conservation and Development that had been presented to the Heritage Advisory Committee for consideration at the 11 April 2018 meeting.

Committee Decision: Moved: Mr Parks Seconded: Mr Bischoff

That Standing Orders be suspended.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mrs Ambrosius moved and Cr Johnson seconded to resume standing orders.

Committee Decision: Moved: Mrs Ambrosius Seconded: Mr Johnson

That Standing Orders be resumed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. Date of Next Meeting

8 August 2018

The 13 June 2018 was the next scheduled date, but with the meeting held on 16 May 2018, it was recommended that the next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be held on 8 August, 2018.

Committee Decision: Moved Cr Kelly Seconded Cr Smith

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Close of Meeting

The Presiding Member closed the meeting at 5.00pm

Confirmed to be a true and correct record of proceedings of the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting held 16 May 2018.

Cr Brendan Kelly
PRESIDING MEMBER