

WHITEHORSE PLANNING SCHEME

PLANNING PANEL HEARING: AMENDMENT C172 (PART 2)

STATEMENT OF EXPERT EVIDENCE

Prepared for
Whitehorse City Council

8 March 2016



HERITAGE PTY
LTD
604124-000-110

architectural historians
heritage consultants

TWENTIETH CENTURY SPECIALISTS

PO Box 222 Emerald 3782
phone 9018 9311

www.builtheritage.com.au

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background & Brief

This Expert Witness Statement has been prepared for the Whitehorse City Council by Simon Reeves, director and principal of Built Heritage Pty Ltd, for the Independent Panel appointed to consider submissions received in response to Whitehorse Planning Scheme Amendment C172 (Part 2). This amendment proposes to apply individual heritage overlays to places that were recommended for such protection in the *City of Whitehorse Post-1945 Heritage Study* (hereafter referred to as “the Study”), which was undertaken by Built Heritage Pty Ltd between October 2013 and July 2015.

Following public exhibition in the second half of 2015, and a review of the public submissions received during that period, the proposed amendment (Amendment C172) was split into two parts. The properties that had not elicited any objecting submissions were consolidated as Amendment C172 (Part 1), while those that had were consolidated as Amendment C172 (Part 2). This statement of expert evidence has been prepared to address only the latter properties.

It is noted that, at various points during and after the course of the study, several individual places and precincts that were identified therein were removed from further consideration.

- The former E G Greenway factory at 127 Whitehorse Road, Blackburn, and the so-called *Blue Flame Project* display housing precinct in Vermont South, were both removed from the study following the planning panel hearing that was held in November 2014 to consider their introduction into the planning scheme as Amendment C164. The independent panel had recommended that the Blackburn factory be removed from the study, but the housing precinct remain included. Both, however, were subsequently removed from the study by council.
- In May 2015, the telecommunications tower in Canterbury Road, Surrey Hills, was removed from the study by council due to the large volume of public objection to its inclusion.
- In December 2015, I was advised that seven more individual places and one precinct had been removed after the exhibition of Amendment C172. These comprised the Housing Commission of Victoria precinct in Cadorna Street, Box Hill South, the Mount Scopus Memorial College at 245 Burwood Highway in Burwood, the former MMBW eastern regional office in Lucknow Street, Mitcham, and five private dwellings at 17 Grange Street, Mont Albert, 17 Sheehans Road, Blackburn, 111 Main Street, Blackburn, 31 Fowler Street, Box Hill South and 18 Gilmour Street, Burwood East. Of these, my preliminary responses to submissions received had recommended only that the MMBW office and the two houses at 17 Sheehans Road and 17 Grange Road be removed from further consideration.
- In December 2015, I was also advised that two places for which no objecting submissions had been received had been referred to the independent panel. These were the former Bill Green House at 40 Somers Street, Burwood East, and the Contemporary Homes project house at 4 Ian Grove, Burwood East. A late submission was received for the latter property.

As a result of these revisions, the following twelve individual places remain and form Amendment C172 (Part 2), to be addressed in this statement of evidence:

- House, 24 Arnott Street, Mont Albert North
- Dental clinic (former display house), 150 Canterbury Road, Blackburn South
- House, 1 Gracefield Drive, Box Hill North
- House, 4 Ian Grove, Burwood
- House, 7 Norris Court, Blackburn
- House, 1163 Riversdale Road, Box Hill South
- House, 40 Somers Street, Burwood
- House, 12 Sunhill Avenue, Burwood
- House, 1 Verona Avenue, Vermont South
- House (*Wildwood*), 3 Villa Mews, Vermont
- House, 359 Whitehorse Road, Nunawading
- Former ES&A Bank, 153-155 Springvale Road, Nunawading

1.2 Statement of Qualifications and Experience

My name is Simon Reeves and I am the Director and Principal of Built Heritage Pty Ltd, a firm of architectural historians and heritage consultants based in Emerald, Victoria. I am an architecture graduate, holding the degrees of *Bachelor of Planning & Design* and *Bachelor of Architecture (Hons)* from the University of Melbourne, conferred respectively in 1994 and 1998. These qualifications satisfy the industry requirements for me to practice as a heritage consultant.

Since 1998 I have worked full-time as an architectural historian and heritage consultant, initially with Allom Lovell & Associates (1998-2002) and then with Heritage Alliance (2002-2009). In January 2009, I established my own practice, Built Heritage Pty Ltd, to specialise in twentieth century heritage and, particularly, the heritage of the post-Second World War era.

Since forming my own practice in 2009, I have been commissioned to undertake several large-scale heritage projects for municipal councils, notably the *Shire of Bass Coast Heritage Study (Stage 2): Post-Panel Implementation* (2009), the *City of Boroondara Thematic Environmental History* (2011), the *Balwyn & Balwyn North Heritage Study* (2012-13), the *City of Whitehorse Post-1945 Heritage Study* (2013-14) and Stage Two of the *Frankston City Post-War Heritage Study* (2014-15).

I have completed individual heritage assessments (or other smaller-scale heritage projects) for the City of Maribyrnong, City of Brimbank, City of Boroondara, City of Greater Dandenong, Mornington Peninsula Shire Council and the City of Ballarat. My experience in dealing with heritage issues in local government also encapsulates stints as regular heritage advisor to the Rural City of Swan Hill (2002-2009), the Shire of Gannawarra (2002-2009), the City of Brimbank (2003-2004) and the Shire of Bass Coast (2002-2012). I have also provided locum heritage advice to several other metropolitan municipalities, such as the Cities of Maribyrnong and Moreland.

I have appeared as an expert witness in heritage matters on many occasions, including at VCAT hearings, registration hearings held by the Heritage Council, and independent panel hearings for planning scheme amendments for the Cities of Bayside, Boroondara, Melbourne, Port Phillip, Whitehorse, Wyndham and the Shire of Mornington Peninsula.

I am currently a member of ICOMOS International, and have, at various other times, been a member of DoCoMoMo Australia, the National Trust of Australia (Victoria), the Society of Architectural Historians of Australia & New Zealand (SAHANZ), the Art Deco & Modernism Society of Victoria, the Walter Burley Griffin Society, the Australian Garden History Society and the Robin Boyd Foundation.

A full *Curriculum Vitae* is included as Appendix A of this statement.

1.3 Statement of Expertise

1.3.1 The Heritage of the Post-Second World War Era

Over the past six years, my firm's involvement in the neglected field of post-Second World War heritage has included the completion of two municipal heritage studies specifically focused on post-war buildings (for the City of Whitehorse and City of Frankston), two smaller-scaled area studies looking at post-war buildings in the suburbs of Balwyn and Balwyn North (for the City of Boroondara) and on the Ranelagh Estate at Mount Eliza (for the Shire of Mornington Peninsula).

Built Heritage Pty Ltd has been engaged by municipal councils to prepare one-off heritage assessments for post-war buildings that include the former St Joseph's Convent in Werribee (City of Wyndham), the former MMBW Western Regional Depot in Sunshine (City of Brimbank), the former Edment's jewellery store in Footscray (City of Maribyrnong) and the Robin Boyd-designed Selkirk House at Ballarat (City of Ballarat). Submissions prepared for the nomination of post-war places to the *Victorian Heritage Register* have included the Robert Cochrane Free Kindergarten in Hawthorn (1950), the Snelleman House in Ivanhoe East (1953), the Ballarat Civic Hall (1956), the Oakleigh Motel at Oakleigh (1956), the Southern Right Motel in Warrnambool (1959), the former MTC Theatre in Russell Street (1968) and the House-on-a-Pole on the Great Ocean Road at Fairhaven (1970-78).

I maintain an extensive professional library of published primary and secondary sources relating to modern architecture in Australia and overseas (including contemporary monographs, magazines and ephemera), as well as unpublished research files on individual architects and building types. For more than a decade, I have compiled a computer database that indexes published sources on Australian post-war architecture (including contemporary books and magazines such as *Australian Home Beautiful*), which now has almost 40,000 entries.

I have published articles on numerous aspects of the post-war built environment, including the architectural styles, building types and individual architects and other design professionals. I contributed over a dozen entries to the *Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*, including those on motels, airports, recreational buildings and post-war architects W E Gower, Anthony Hayden, Donald Ward, Sydney Baggs and Smith & Tracey. I have recently published my first book, a full-length biography of Russian-born and German-trained émigré architect Anatol Kagan (1913-2009), entitled *Gentle Modernist: The Nine Lives of Anatol Kagan*.

A select bibliography of published work is included in Appendix A.

1.4 Statement of Authorship

This expert witness statement, and the component tasks of historical research, fieldwork and analysis that underpins it, represents the work of Simon Reeves. There have been no other significant contributors to this statement. With the exception of those whose work or opinion has been quoted and referenced in the text to support my own viewpoint, no other persons have carried out any tests, experiments or investigations upon which I have relied.

1.5 Declaration

I have made all the inquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and no matters of significance which I regard as relevant have to my knowledge been withheld from the Panel.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Simon Reeves". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

8 March 2016

2.0 METHODOLOGY

Note: The study methodology is outlined in the preamble to the study itself (pp 11-15) and will only be briefly summarized here.

2.1 Stage One

2.1.1 Thematic Environmental History

The first task was the preparation of a Thematic Environmental History (TEH) covering the physical development of the City of Whitehorse in the post-Second World War period. This was intended to be supplementary to the existing thematic history that had been prepared as part of the original *City of Whitehorse Heritage Review*, undertaken by Allom Lovell & Associates in 1999.

The supplementary TEH was prepared in accordance with *Victoria's Framework of Historic Themes*, which has been adopted by Heritage Victoria as the industry standard. This framework is divided into a number of broad themes and more specific-subthemes. In preparing the supplementary TEH, a number of even more specific sub-headings were introduced to allow more detailed coverage of particular aspects of post-war development.

The supplementary TEH drew from various readily-available sources including not only the 1999 thematic history but also subsequent heritage studies and typological studies, published secondary sources (eg local history books) and various online resources including digitized newspapers, maps, subdivision plans and historic images. The consultant's own in-house database of post-war Australian architecture, which has more than 40,000 entries, was also a key reference source. Due to limitations of time and budget, unpublished sources, such as manuscripts, were not consulted.

A draft of the supplementary TEH was provided to Council on 24 December 2014, and an updated version, with minor revisions and typographical corrections, issued on 15 January 2014.

2.2 Stage Two

2.2.1 Identification of places and areas

Places and areas of potential heritage significance were mostly identified by the following means:

- *Previous heritage studies.* These included studies/reviews done in 1999, 2001 and 2012.
- *Desktop research.* This included the aforementioned sources consulted for the TEH.
- *Stakeholder consultation.* Representatives of local history societies and other interest groups (the National Trust, the Art Deco & Modernism Society and the Robin Boyd Foundation) were contacted via email, so that they might suggest places or areas for inclusion.
- *Focused fieldwork.* This comprised limited investigation of selected areas deemed to be of potential significance during desktop research. The brief did not allow for a comprehensive windscreen survey of the entire study area.

All places and areas thus identified were added to a tabulated master list. To provide a complete picture, the list also included post-1945 places that were already on the HO schedule, and those that had been recommended for inclusion following the 2012 heritage review.

2.2.2 Prioritising places and areas

Once compiled, the master list of places of potential heritage significance was annotated in order to assist in prioritizing which places represented the highest priority for further assessment. It was noted, for example, if a place had already been demolished, could not be located or was not visible from the street or other public vantage point. Buildings known or suspected to date from earlier than 1945 were eliminated from further consideration, and those dating from after 1990 were flagged as lower priorities to perhaps be considered as part of a future review.

The master list, by now including over 400 individual places, was filtered by adopting a nominal scoring system. Each place was given a score out of ten, with a certain number of points being allotted according to its rarity, potential significance (at least at face value), vulnerability, and level of existing documentation. In this way, those places deemed to be the highest priority for further reassessment could be readily identified. This filtering process identified four places that scored the maximum ten out of ten, 24 places that scored nine out of ten, and 25 places that scored eight out of ten.

In the case of potential heritage precincts, of which twelve had been identified during the research phase, a similar grading system was not deemed appropriate. Instead, these precincts were prioritised based on a *prima facie* case for heritage significance at the local level. Selection was also informed by the knowledge that certain precincts already had some support for their inclusion from local residents and/or interest groups.

2.3 Stage Three

2.3.1 Outline citations

The budget allowed for the preparation of 40 'outline citations' that would provide a preliminary assessment of selected places and areas. Drawing from the filtered master-list of places and areas, it was resolved to prepare outline citations for 32 individual places and eight precincts. Each outline citation would be two pages in length and provide a current photograph, basic descriptive and historical notes, and a brief comment as to its likely significance.

The completed outline citations were presented to Council at a meeting in March 2014.

2.3.2 Full citations

Following presentation of the outline citations, discussion was held regarding which places and areas were considered to be the best candidates for more thorough assessments in the form of full-length citations. The project budget allowed for the preparation of 25 full-length citations for individual places, and five full-length citations for precincts. Once these places and areas had been selected, the existing two-page outline citations were expanded to create more detailed and rigorous citations, each four or five pages in length.

Full-length citations were completed in the standard form, providing location maps, current (and sometimes historic) images, detailed history, description and comparative analysis, and a Statement of Significance in Heritage Victoria's standard tripartite format. Research was informed by aforementioned secondary sources, supplemented by primary sources (including original architectural drawings) and oral history (eg contact with original owners or architects). Citations for precincts included maps that clearly delineated the proposed boundaries and also identified elements of primary, contributory or no significance.

A draft of the heritage study, with the completed full-length citations for places and precincts, was issued to Council on 2 May 2014. This was followed, on 20 May, by an expanded version that included introduction, methodology, appendices and an updated TEH.

2.3.3 Peer Review

On 16 June 2014, the consultant attended a peer review session at Heritage Victoria that was facilitated by Geoff Austin, Heritage Victoria's Manager of Heritage Planning. Mr Austin provided general feedback and identified a number of minor revisions. A hard copy of the draft study, bearing Mr Austin's annotations, can be tabled at the hearing if required.

2.4 Aftermath

2.4.1 Subsequent revisions

The draft heritage study was revised in December 2014 to correct a few (mostly typographical) errors identified by Councillors, and to make changes suggested at the peer review. This included the insertion of HERCON criteria, which had been inadvertently omitted in the initial draft.

A second round of revision, picking up further typographical errors, took place in February 2015. The so-called 'final draft' was issued in July 2015, to form the basis for public consultation.

2.4.2 Response to public submissions

In November 2015, the consultant was provided with copies of the written submissions that had been made in response to the public exhibition of Whitehorse Amendment C172. This amendment sought to introduce a Heritage Overlay to 27 heritage places identified in the study. The amendment was later split by Council, and several properties removed.

A six-page document was then prepared, providing my preliminary responses to the issues raised in each of these submissions. The document briefly tabulated the issue, my response, and a recommendation as to whether the contested property should still remain in the heritage study and, if so, whether the citation needed to be revised in any way.

Two late submissions were also made, which were brought to my attention in late January 2016 and have been considered as part of this statement.

3.0 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

3.1 Preamble

Here, formal responses will be made to the submissions pertaining to the twelve individual places listed on page four of this evidence. Submissions are arranged in order of the numerical sequence that was allotted to them by Council. For each of them the pertinent issues have been extracted and discussed separately under sub-headings, with the submitter's (verbatim) text in italics and my own response following.

3.2 House, 12 Sunhill Ave, Burwood [Submission 5]

3.2.1 House is not in good condition

- a) *Regarding to the report which provided by Built Heritage Pty Ltd mentioned the property is in GOOD condition, we cannot agree with this.*

From the photo with cracks in the gutter and timber frame, peeling off concretes, rusty roof, we don't think it states the GOOD condition as the report. Actually, when he bought it, it was one of the worst houses on the street which has not been maintained at all by the previous owner.

Given the somewhat experimental nature of this house as a progenitor to the emerging post-modernist style, it is hardly surprising that some of its fabric may not have aged as well as more conventional construction.

The heritage assessment undertaken by the consultant took the condition of the house into account. While many of the houses included in the heritage study were categorised as 'excellent condition', this example was admittedly in a less pristine state. This was clearly acknowledged by designating it as being in 'good' rather than 'excellent' condition. It is not considered that the current condition of the house is such that it should be further downgraded to 'poor condition', which is reserved for rather more neglected buildings.

Ultimately, the current condition of the house is not considered to have diminished the significance that has been ascribed to the place.

3.2.2 House is not a good example of Peter Corrigan's work

- a) *Peter Corrigan designed 12 Sunhill Avenue, Burwood, as his first job when he was twenty four years old and still hasn't finished his university.*

The fact that Corrigan designed this house before he completed his university studies, or even before he became registered as an architect in Victoria, is not a valid reason for a heritage overlay not to be applied. A designer can be capable of creating a significant work irrespective of his level of qualifications or experience. There are numerous buildings on local HO schedules, and even on the *Victorian Heritage Register*, that were designed by people who were not formally qualified as architects.

- b) *It's hard to say and believe Peter has actually formed his style from his first design at that early stage. We didn't pick up the similar character from 12 Sunhill Avenue, Burwood, with any other classic Peter Corrigan projects.*

In Conrad Hamann's definitive monograph, *Cities of Hope: Australian Architecture & Design by Edmund & Corrigan* (1993), an entire chapter is devoted to Corrigan's early solo work between 1965 and 1967. The discussion leaves no doubt that these early projects, of which some remained unbuilt, represented a significant departure from prevailing architecture tastes in Melbourne at the time, and demonstrably anticipated Corrigan's ground-breaking work in the 1970s. Of the Mercovich House in particular, Hamann writes:

This house followed the Melbourne Regional tendency: its yard areas were secluded behind a high brick fence, the driveway was like a channel in between high brick walls, and its roof was arranged into a group of shed forms and skillions. Beyond that, though, the design was strongly individual, mixing forms from the new suburbs with other imagery. The conspicuous use of brick piers in the entry walls was an inner-suburban, inner-city detail. The new sense of weight and awkward faceting distinguished the walls from those with flat surfaces that marked most contemporary Melbourne work, thereby focusing attention on both the plane and material. Similarly, the massing veered away from the spread and horizontality of most contemporary Australian Regionalism. The massing and surface texture almost turned the house into a series of episodes and fragments.¹

Hamann goes on to draw parallels between Corrigan's architectural approach, as evidenced through this particular house, and the work of American architects Charles Moore and Robert Venturi, who are considered to be amongst the key figures in the development of the post-modernist movement in architecture.

Even if one sets aside the complex theoretical underpinning and simply considers the subject house at face value, it is difficult to argue why Corrigan's use of jagged angles, quirky massing and the bold contrast of seemingly unlikely surface treatments (in this case, brick and shingles) cannot be seen to anticipate the recurrence of these same techniques in this later work of the 1970s, including the Church of the Resurrection at Keysborough that was illustrated in the objecting submission.

3.2.3 House was not erected in accordance with axonometric drawing

- a) *The builder, who is Don Moore, didn't quite follow Peter's plan. Not only is the garage not in the position, but the back of the house was completely changed. The garage was straight facing the road and the main area was changed to flat roof.*

The axonometric drawing, which is clearly a presentation drawing rather than part of the final contract documentation, depicts a preliminary scheme. It is not unusual for revisions to be made during design development.

- b) *From our opinion, would be the builder or the owner changed Peter's plan to either suit owner's needs or reduce the building costs.*

No documentary or other evidence has been submitted to confirm that revisions to the design of this house were made without the architect's consent.

In any case, design revisions, irrespective of whether they were done to reduce costs or to satisfy the client's needs, will not necessarily diminish the significance of a place.

1 Conrad Hamann, *Cities of Hope: Australian Architecture & Design by Edmund & Corrigan*, pp 19-20.

One might cite the example of the Pearce House in Moore Road, Vermont South, designed by Grounds, Romberg & Boyd in 1959. This building is currently included on the City of Whitehorse's heritage overlay schedule, even though it was not built entirely in accordance with the original plans, with a double carport being located where a large master bedroom was intended to be placed.

3.3 House, 1 Verona Street, Vermont South [Submission 27]

3.3.1 Inadequate basis for inclusion

- a) *There is no proper justification within the study as to why this property has been chosen.*

The heritage study did, in fact, identify why this particular property was included. At the end of each citation, the original source was noted under the sub-heading "Identified by". In various instances, this source may have been an earlier heritage study, a stakeholder group or local interest group, or, in cases where a place had not been previously identified by anyone else, the firm of Built Heritage Pty Ltd.

In the case of 1 Verona Street, Vermont South, the citation noted that the property was originally identified by Andrew Ward, author of the 2001 heritage review. It was also noted that, while Ward had flagged the building as being of potential significance, he did not know who the architect was. The attribution to Chancellor & Patrick was confirmed by Built Heritage Pty Ltd, by reference to our in-house database of post-war architecture.

- b) *It appears that the house has been selected due to who designed the dwelling rather than any specific elements that are of heritage significance.*

As noted above, the house was first flagged by Andrew Ward as a potential heritage place before the architects' identify was known. As such, it cannot be said that the attribution was the governing factor in including the property in the Study. Confirmation that it was designed by a well-known firm, whose work is well represented in local heritage overlay schedules, served only to strengthen the case for an individual heritage overlay.

3.3.2 Extent of alteration

- a) *The fact that there have been substantial alterations that have been made to the dwelling since it was constructed, as acknowledged in the heritage study, yet Council considers these alterations in keeping with the dwelling. We disagree with the council assessment and the fact is these alterations are substantial.*

The submitter has not specified whether these 'substantial alterations' relate to the interior or exterior, or both. The extent of external alteration was noted in the citation.

Alterations made to the interior of a heritage place, no matter how substantial, are not generally considered to have a negative impact on the cultural significance of that place unless, for example, they are evident from the exterior. As such, internal alterations cannot be given as a compelling reason for a proposed heritage overlay not to be applied.

Similarly, alterations to the exterior of a heritage place do not necessarily have a negative impact on cultural significance. The impact of any external alteration depends entirely on the degree to which original fabric has been altered, removed or lost, as well as the position, scale, form and finishes of any new fabric that has been introduced.

In this case, external alterations to the house are not deemed to have had a negative impact on the ascribed significance of the place. As acknowledged in the citation, the double garage to the west of the original house is sympathetic in its form, scale, materials and finishes, and cannot be considered as an element that has somehow overwhelmed, defaced, detracted from or otherwise impacted negatively upon the original dwelling.

3.3.3 Context

- a) *The dwelling is not part of a group of dwelling that are all intact like you would expect to see with a row of terrace houses for example*

The subject building is being recommended for inclusion on the heritage overlay schedule as an individual heritage place, not as part of a larger group or precinct of buildings. As such, it is necessarily being considered in isolation, as an individual specimen in its own right, irrespective of its streetscape context or the style or age of adjacent properties.

3.4 House, 7 Norris Court, Blackburn [Submission 28]

3.4.1 Unknown/inexperienced architect

- a) *If you google Miss Francis Seidel, not one article comes up about her. It would be very different if the architect was of the caliber for Robin Boyd, Harry Seidler Peter Muller or Peter McIntyre, whose work in the 50s and 60s was well known and recognised.*

A Google™ search on Frances Seidel in fact elicits several hits, including two separate articles from 1962 (one in the *Age* newspaper and the other from student broadsheet *Cross Section*) concerning her university scholarship, as well as a vintage photograph held by the National Archives, showing a young Miss Seidel at university, posing alongside a model of a strikingly modernist building.

Ultimately, cultural significance is not something inherent only in the works of architects who are well known or well-documented, such as Robin Boyd, Peter McIntyre and so on. There are countless examples of heritage-listed buildings designed by lesser-known architects who are not household names, and whose lives or careers are not (or at least not yet) adequately documented. The recent *City of Frankston Post-War Heritage Study* (2014) secured individual heritage overlays for modernist houses designed by such lesser-known but demonstrably talented individuals as Ian Banner, John Rouse, David Dalrymple and E W Hillman. Even the *Victorian Heritage Register* includes some post-war buildings by architects who are not household names, such as Theodore Berman and J W Rivett.

- b) *This was also the second house that Miss Seidel designed, so a very inexperienced and unknown architect.*

An architect's level of experience is not necessarily an accurate reflection of his or her skills. Robin Boyd would have similarly been a 'very inexperienced and unknown architect' when, as a teenager in the late 1930s, he designed a backyard studio at Murrumbeena (long since demolished) for his artist cousin, Arthur Boyd. Nevertheless, it was an eye-catching and boldly conceived building. In many respects, an architect's early work can actually be deemed particularly important, for the way in which it may foreshadow their mature work later in life (as has been discussed in relation to the early example of Peter Corrigan's work at 12 Sunhill Avenue).

3.4.2 House is not unique

- a) *The Statement of Significance states that it is an “unusual example of residential architecture”, then goes onto say there are other similar houses in the City of Whitehorse, which then doesn’t make it unique.*

The citation did not suggest that the house was “unique”, only that it was “unusual” in a local context. The word “unique” was only used in the citation was when quoting from the author of a contemporary newspaper article who mentioned the “unique architectural space” within.

Comparative analysis, identifying other buildings in the study area that are comparable in some respect, is a standard component of any heritage citation. Even when a place is demonstrably rare and unusual, with few or even no truly pertinent comparators, it is still necessary to provide some comparative analysis to underpin this.

- b) *I understand that one of these similar properties, 238 Canterbury Road, Forest Hill, is not heritage listed. How do you decide which house get listed and which doesn’t?*

It is correct that the house at 238 Canterbury Road, Forest Hill, which has some qualities in common with the subject house, is not yet heritage listed. However, the current study did recommended that a heritage overlay be applied to it, as part of the proposed *Concept Constructions Display Homes* precinct, at 234-238 Canterbury Road. It is worth noting that this proposed precinct, included in Amendment C172 (Part 1), did not engender any objecting submissions. In fact, one of the residents made a submission in support of it.

3.4.3 House is less than 50 years old

- a) *... an unconscionable restriction can be forced upon us at the whim of the council, based on a perceived historical significance on a less than 50 year old house....*

The fact that the house is less than fifty years old is not a valid reason for the proposed heritage overlay to be abandoned. It is a recurring misconception that a building must reach a certain minimum age before it can be considered “old enough” for heritage listing. This, however, is not the case. In current Victorian heritage practice, there is no minimum age that a building must reach before statutory heritage protection can be considered, either at the local or state level. There are currently at least a dozen places on the *Victorian Heritage Register* created after 1970, with the “newest” dating from as recently as 1984.

The heritage overlay schedule to the Whitehorse Planning Scheme already includes a several places dating from the mid-1960s or later, including the Wattle Park Uniting Church in Box Hill South (1964), the former ARRB offices in Vermont South (1970), the Vermont Park housing estate in Vermont (1976 onwards), the former Chapel of St Joseph in Box Hill North (1976-78) and the Box Hill Community Arts Centre in Box Hill (1990).

It should be noted that the brief for the Study did not impose any requirement or restriction that places had to be at least fifty years old to be considered for inclusion. Rather, the very intention of the project itself was to identify heritage places of more recent origin. Dating from 1967, the house at 7 Norris Court was by no means the most recent place identified in the Study. Our original master-list of places of potential significance even included some that dated from the as recently as the 1980s, which had been flagged in Andrew Ward’s 2001 heritage review.

3.5 House, 3 Villa Mews, Vermont [Submission 47]

3.5.1 Impact of residential subdivision and redevelopment

- a) *The land on which the proposed heritage building stands has already been extensively subdivided and developed and as a result the original integrity, cohesiveness and aesthetic value of the building has not been conserved and enhanced.*

The citation already acknowledges that the house formerly occupied a substantial bush block that was subdivided in the 2000s so that the property is now accessed from the rear rather than from Ferrara Road. Notwithstanding this change in setting, the house itself remains substantially intact and is still deemed to be worthy of an individual heritage overlay, irrespective of its new setting.

- b) *Development on sites adjacent to the building has not been sympathetic in terms of its bulk, setbacks, materials, colour schemes and forms. Neighboring houses on all sides are of two storeys, have been built to within one or two metres of our boundary and directly overlook our property.*

The citation in the heritage study recommended that the heritage overlay only extend to the current boundaries of the property known as 3 Villa Mews. It was not proposed that the overlay should extend across what was formerly the entire extent of the original property prior to subdivision, and thus incorporate the new houses that have been built thereon. As such, the scale, bulk, setbacks and form of these houses do not need to be taken into consideration in evaluating the individual significance of the subject property.

- c) *The setting of the proposed heritage building has not been conserved with gardens and driveways completely redesigned and developed.*

The citation did not suggest that any of the original landscaping or driveway arrangement remained, nor ascribe any significance to their presumed or actual survival. The fact that these elements may have been altered or removed is not deemed to have diminished the significance ascribed to the house. The gardens of most post-war architect-designed houses would have been altered, re-configured and/or re-planted since the house was completed, but this would seldom (if indeed ever) be considered to have a negative impact on the significance of the house itself.

- d) *Original views of the proposed heritage building have not been preserved and thus the building does not contribute to the streetscape.*

Although it is desirable for heritage places to retain at least some of their original views, it is not always possible. For example, there are many large Victorian mansions in suburban Melbourne (including such iconic examples as *Como House*, *Ripponlea* and *Labassa*) that no longer retain their original presentation due to residential subdivision that took place in the inter-war and post-war eras. However, it could not be argued that such a change in setting has necessarily voided the cultural significance vested in the mansions themselves.

Ultimately, a building that is deemed to be of cultural significance will retain that significance irrespective of whether it can be appreciated from the street or other public vantage point. There are many heritage-listed buildings that are set back and cannot be seen from the street, or are otherwise concealed from public view by fences, walls or dense foliage. This, however, does not mean that they cannot be considered significant.

3.6 House, 1 Gracefield Drive, Box Hill North [Submission 56]

Note: This submission was twofold, comprising the submitter's own single-page submission, accompanied by a six-page report by a professional heritage consultant. As similar issues were raised in both documents, responses will be provided collectively to minimise repetition.

3.6.1 Incorrect architectural attribution of 2 Gracefield Drive

- a) *My husband did not design or have anything to do with the property a 2 Gracefield Drive, Box Hill North. It was designed by an architect in the same era under review.*

The architectural attribution of the house at 2 Gracefield Drive was sourced from Heritage Alliance's *Survey of Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria* (2008), which stated that Weight designed all **three** houses at Nos 1, 2 and 3 Gracefield Drive, Box Hill North.² This data is footnoted to Samantha Westbrooke, then heritage advisor to the City of Whitehorse. At the time, Miss Westbrooke had been involved in assessing the significance of these houses due to a demolition application for the one at No 3 (which was subsequently demolished). While the submitter has stated that No 2 was designed by "an architect in the same era under review", she has chosen not to reveal that architect's identity to the consultants.

As it is desirable for a heritage citation to be as accurate as practicable, references to 2 Gracefield Drive in the current heritage study should be revised accordingly. However, it is not considered that a revised attribution diminishes the cultural significance ascribed to No 1. In fact, the knowledge that Weight had nothing to do with No 2 would only serve to bolster the significance of the house at No 1, which, following the aforementioned demolition of its twin at No 3 (not disputed to be Weight's work), is now the sole survivor.

3.6.2 Extent of alterations/extension

- a) *My home had an extension added to the front of the house in the early 1960s through necessity, as the original design resulted in water entering internally into the front living room, because of poor design my husband always stated.*

Issues with water penetration are not necessarily evidence of intrinsically "poor design". In the broader history of modern architecture, such problems are more frequently seen as the outcome of experimental construction methods, or new and hitherto untested materials. The flat roofs that Walter Burley Griffin pioneered in Australia in the 1920s were notorious for leaks, yet this is no basis to dismiss them as "poor design". In 1951, when Robin Boyd designed a house at Brighton for the Bergin family that had perhaps the first flat roof seen in Melbourne since the war, water penetration remained a perennial problem. This, however, does not detract from a building's significance, and can, in some cases, even contribute to it (eg the technological significance demonstrated by a new material).

- b) *The early 1960s addition at the front has changed the house from its pure mid-1950s presentation to a blended 1950s/60s presentation. The porch is indicative of early 1960s trends including classicising (eg podium, columns and organisation of elements) and references to Japanese architecture (exaggerated projecting beams). The addition of the porch has the effect of rendering it less box-like and changing the house's relationship with its landscape, causing it to appear as if raised on a podium rather than it being placed box-like on the site, as was originally the case.*

² Heritage Alliance, *Survey of Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria: Stage One* (2008), p 139.

It is not considered that the changes made to the building in the early 1960s have somehow diminished the cultural significance ascribed to the place. By contrast, the fact that these changes were made by the same architect, and in such a sensitive manner (not surprisingly, as it was his own residence), actually add an extra layer of architectural interest to the place. The same can be said of the suggestion that the alterations demonstrate changing tastes in contemporary architecture, such as the emerging influence of Japanese architecture. This enhances, rather than detracts from, the overall significance of the place.

- c) *Whilst the 1960 addition cannot be said to be unsympathetic, it has nonetheless decidedly altered the original expression of the house to the front and thus it can be argued that the addition of the porch is more than a 'minimal alteration, as state in the Statement of Significance.*

Here, the owner's own heritage expert concedes that the changes made in the early 1960s are not considered unsympathetic. As such, it is unclear why these changes should be cited as evidence that the house has been somehow defaced or disfigured to the extent that it an individual heritage overlay is no longer appropriate.

3.6.3 House not suitable for current standard of living

- a) *My home is a modest dwelling inside and does not meet modern day living requirements of the era we now live in.*

Heritage protection should not only be afforded to residences that are conducive to present-day living standards. If it were, there would be no protection for grand Victorian mansions (which are now seldom economically viable as single private dwellings), modest worker's cottages (which are perceived as small and badly-planned), and most architect-designed modernist houses of the 1950s (which often have notoriously small kitchens and bathrooms). In fact, such a restriction would eliminate from consideration most houses erected before circa 1970, when larger living areas, dedicated family/rumpus rooms, integrated kitchens and bedrooms with *en suite* bathrooms, became the norm.

Ultimately, any heritage-listed house, whether it dates from the 1850s, the 1880s, the 1920s or the 1950s, has the capacity to be updated, refurbished, renovated and enlarged to accommodate present-day standards of living. The subject property is no exception. As the current proposal does not include any recommendation for internal controls, the interior of the house can be altered or updated as the current owner, or any future owner, sees fit. There would also be scope for enlargement (eg, discreet rear additions), provided that the cultural significance ascribed to the place is not compromised.

3.6.4 Only a representative example of its type

- a) *Rather than being a "notable" example, we would argue that it is a "representative example" of the type of modernist expression being employed by progressive architects of the time.*

The house could well be deemed only a representative example when considered on a broader scale, held up alongside comparators across the entire Melbourne metropolitan area. However, this study is only concerned with establishing a case for local significance, rather than regional or state significance. At this more limited municipality-wide level, the house is most certainly "notable" rather than merely "representative".

3.6.5 House is no longer part of a group

- a) *Originally, Nos 1 and 3 were designed as a pair of almost identical houses on larger shared block of land. However, the later subdivision of the land and the recent demolition of No 3 has altered the original broader setting of the house.*

In an earlier heritage study, it was stated that Nos 1, 2 and 3 Gracefield Drive were of “especial interest” on the basis that they formed a group of similar minimalist dwellings designed by Charles Weight. This is no longer the case, as it has since been found that Charles Weight was not responsible for No 2, and furthermore the house at No 3 has been demolished.

The house at No 1 is recommended for heritage protection as an individual specimen of modernist residential architecture. If the identical house at No 3 was still standing at the time the Post-1945 heritage study was undertaken, it may well have recommended that the overlay extend across both properties. However regrettable, the loss of No 3 is not such that it has diminished the significance ascribed to No 1 as an object in its own right. This is particularly true given that No 1 has an extra layer of interest as the architect’s own home.

While it is correct that an earlier heritage study ascribed potential significance to the house as part of a group of three identical residences, it should be clarified that this earlier study was a broad-brush scoping exercise to identify places of potential significance. Based entirely on desktop research and covering the entire state, the survey was not intended to provide rigorous assessment of any individual examples. In undertaking the Study, I was certainly under no obligation to blithely adopt any recommendation made in this (or any other) earlier survey.

Ultimately, the present proposal is to apply an individual HO to the house at 1 Gracefield Drive, so it is not relevant to consider any earlier recommendation to consider the building as part of a potential heritage precinct that, in any case, is no longer a viable option.

3.6.6 Architect is not notable

- a) *It does appear that Weight has hitherto been recognised as an architect of note (for example neither he nor Hipwell, Weight and Mason is included in the Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture).*

The rationale for the inclusion of architects in the *Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture* is explained in the preface of that book.³ It was a complex collaborative task, involving input from an editorial advisory board of multi-disciplinary experts from around Australia. Limited by the physical restraint of producing a single volume, the challenge was to offer adequate coverage of well-known architects and commensurate coverage of lesser-known or hitherto unrecorded ones. The encyclopedia was not intended to be exhaustive, nor was it conceived as a canon. As such, little weight can be applied to the fact that any particular architect or firm was not included therein.

There is no doubt that the architectural output of Charles Weight, and the firm of Hipwell, Weight & Mason, was highly regarded in its time. The consultant’s in-house database of post-war Australian architecture contains no fewer than 17 entries on Hipwell, Weight & Mason (and its successor, Hipwell, Weight & Ross) as well as a further 18 entries on Charles Weight, 11 entries on John Hipwell and 25 entries on Albert Ross.

3 Philip Goad and Julie Willis (eds), *Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*, pp xix-xx.

These entries refer to articles in contemporary sources that include the weekly property columns of the *Herald* and *Age* newspapers, populist journals such as *Australian Home Beautiful* and *Australian House & Garden*, and professional journals such as *Architecture & Arts*. A house in Ivanhoe designed by Hipwell, Weight & Mason was also profiled in Neil Clerehan's 1961 book, *Best Australian Houses*.

- b) *It appears that Weight's work has only been documented by Built Heritage, both on the Built Heritage website ('Dictionary of Unsung Architects') and in the citation for the City of Whitehorse Post-1945 Heritage Study.*

The online 'Dictionary of Unsung Architects', maintained by Built Heritage Pty Ltd, was conceived to record the work of architects who are not well covered in other sources, such as the *Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*. In some cases, my dictionary has heralded a renewed interest in architects who have then been researched, documented and published more widely, including Anatol Kagan, Walter & Auty and O N Coulson (who was recently the subject of an article in the *RMIT Design Archives Journal*). Several other architects or firms, including Mordechai Benshemesh, Rae Featherstone, John Hipwell and Muir & Shepherd, now have entries on www.wikipedia.com that post-date their corresponding biographical entries on my website.

Ultimately, as has been explained in an earlier discussion on Miss Frances Seidel (see p 14), the extent to which an architect and his/her work has been researched, discussed, documented or published is not necessarily an accurate indicator of the significance of any individual example of his/her work.

3.6.7 An insufficient number of HERCON criteria have been referenced

- a) *It is unusual that only the aesthetic criterion is cited as the basis of the place's significance. Whilst it may only be necessary to satisfy one criterion to meet the threshold for inclusion in the heritage overlay, it is typical that satisfaction of two or more criteria is demonstrated. The lack of demonstration of other criteria results in a less rounded and architecture focused view of the place's significance.*

The brief for the Study did not stipulate (nor, to my knowledge, is there any such stipulation in the *Heritage Act*, the *Burra Charter* or Heritage Victoria's practice note, 'Applying the Heritage Overlay'), that two or more criteria must necessarily be satisfied in order establish a case for cultural significance at the local level.

Although it has been asserted that it is 'unusual' or 'not typical' for only one criteria to be referenced in a heritage citation, one would surely expect that, in a suburban heritage study specifically focused on the more recent heritage of the 1950s, '60s and '70s, that the emphasis would be on the criterion of architectural/aesthetic significance rather than those of historic, social or spiritual significance.

3.7 House, 24 Arnott Street, Mont Albert North [Submission 60]

3.7.1 Extent of external repainting

- a) *The front stand-alone wall has been repainted before by the previous owner prior to going for auction in March 2015. The timber beams in the front courtyard has also been repainted and had a colour change from a dark timber stain to a more darker grey tone colour.*

Repainting of previously painted external surfaces, which is entirely to be expected in any house of a certain age, is rarely (if ever) considered to be major alteration that has fundamentally or irreversibly compromised the appearance of the house. It is noted that, under the proposed heritage overlay, external paint controls were not recommended.

3.7.2 Extent of internal alterations

- a) *The kitchen has recently been updated in the last three years with new laminated floorings. The fireplace is also a recent addition. The raised hearth was added to comply with the safety requirements for the fireplace and is not part of the original house.*

All bedrooms have been updated with new robes and the new laminated floorboards run into all the bedrooms. The previous owner has also updated the bathroom and laundry with his own style and a vinyl floor has been put in for both of these areas..... all ceiling linings have been removed and all beams exposed. All electrical wiring and cords and exposed with unconventional lighting methods used throughout the house...

As with external repainting, the internal changes noted here are entirely typical of any house of a certain age (and particularly any upgrading of kitchen, bathroom or laundry areas). These changes to the interior are not evident from the exterior and therefore are not deemed to negatively impact the ascribed cultural significance of the place in any way.

It is noted that the proposal to apply an individual heritage overlay to the house did not include a recommendation for internal controls (a recommendation that, in any case, is seldom invoked in the case of single private dwellings).

3.7.3 Extent of external alterations

- a) *Alfresco area has been updated with new timber parts and old timber stairs have been replaced by previous owner. New roof covering has been put in place with Polycarbonate sheets.*

The outdoor deck area, only slightly visible from the side (Tyrrell Street) frontage of the house, is a discreet element that is not considered to be unsympathetic, intrusive or otherwise have a negative impact on the significance of the place. The fact that some of its components have been replaced or rebuilt is not a pertinent factor.

- b) *It is believed that the workshop/shed at the rear of the property was not part of the original house and was also a later addition.*

The citation acknowledged that the freestanding garage is not original, although it was noted that it is located where space for a garage was allowed on the original site plan. As with the rear deck, it is not considered to be intrusive or unsympathetic in its scale, form, materials or detailing. The Statement of Significance explicitly mentions that the garage is not considered to be significant. As such, it could be removed or replaced as necessary.

3.7.4 Structural problems

- a) *A major concern for the house are the location of big trees located at very close proximity to the existing house. The roots of these trees have started to uproot the ground and foundations of the footings and stumps adjacent to the roots of the trees.*

This is not a heritage issue *per se*. If the trees are causing structural issues, they should be removed.

- b) *There's limited subfloor access to the house and images show the stumps and floor joists towards the rear of the property. The stumps show a high level of 'wear and tear' and are due for a major re-stumping for the whole house.*

This is not a heritage issue *per se*. Re-stumping is something that will inevitably be required, sooner or later, for any timber-framed dwelling of a certain age

3.7.5 Issues with freestanding brick wall

- a) *The stand-alone façade wall has also gone through a minor facelift, with the wall recently bagged and painted over. The front pedestrian gate has also been replaced and updated to match the fence along Tyrrell Street.*

Stuart McIntosh's original architectural drawings, and an early (c.1958) photograph of the house, both confirm that the freestanding screen wall across the Arnott Street frontage is not part of the original fabric of the building. With the architect's widow confirming that it was not added during her family's period in residence, it can only be assumed that the wall was added by a subsequent owner.

As it does not represent part of the original fabric of the house, the screen wall is deemed to be an element of no heritage significance. Its current condition, and any changes that may have been made to it in recent times, are thus not pertinent to the case for cultural significance of the house itself.

- b) *The current owner feels unsafe and has voiced her concerns and wishes to remove the wall should it be granted for demolition*

As a non-original element that is not considered to be of any heritage significance, the screen wall could be removed at any time. In fact, this would actually be encouraged from a heritage viewpoint, as it would allow the original façade of house to become visible again from Arnott Street.

3.7.6 Significance of landscaped setting

- a) *It is also noted that the landscaping around the property does not demonstrate any significant contribution to the existing house.*

Although the history section of the citation did include some details of the original garden setting, it was not presumed that any of this planting still remained today. The Statement of Significance certainly does not ascribe any significance to the current landscaping.

3.7.7 House is not a significant example of post-modernism

- a) *The current features of the house doesn't relate to any significant post-modern architecture style that warrants a heritage overlay to be implemented.*

The citation did not assert that the building was an example of Post-Modernism. With its stark cubiform expression, plain wall surfaces, large areas of glazing and flat roof with broad overhang, the house demonstrably satisfies the criteria to be considered as a textbook example of Post-War International Modernism.⁴

4 R Apperley, R Irving & P Reynolds, *A Pictorial Guide to Identifying Australian Architecture*, pp 214-217.

3.8 Dental clinic, 150 Canterbury Rd, Blackburn South [Submission 63]

3.8.1 Flawed methodology

- a) *The proposed heritage overlay comprises mainly individual places rather than group listings or precincts. This is considered problematic in a way that the heritage significance of individual places is not as clearly identifiable and appears to be chosen more randomly rather than as part of a whole precinct or group of relevant buildings.*

As indicated in the preamble to this evidence (and, in greater detail, in the preamble to the Study itself), the Study was undertaken in accordance with standard industry methodologies. It is entirely in accordance with these methodologies for a heritage study to identify individual places as well as areas or precincts. The brief for the Study did not stipulate that only areas were to be identified. In over fifteen years' experience as a heritage consultant, every municipal heritage study with which I have been involved has identified a mixture of individual places and precincts, with the former always outnumbering the latter.

A review of the project methodology would also refute any suggestion that this particular building was 'chosen more randomly'. In fact, the property was identified through no fewer than three separate and unrelated avenues, as follows:

- Its inclusion in Heritage Alliance's *Survey of Post-war Built Heritage in Victoria* (2008)
- Several contemporary newspaper and journal references identified through our own in-house database of post-war Australian architecture
- Nomination by the Robin Boyd Foundation, which was contacted as part of the stakeholder consultation process. The foundation kindly provided us with a list of all known Boyd buildings located within what is now the City of Whitehorse. Later, the foundation supplied detailed documentation of this building, including vintage photographs, drawings, ephemera and excerpts from oral history interviews.

3.8.2 Change of use

- a) *The significance of the heritage place is said to emerge from the use of the subject site as a residential building. However the residential use has ceased long ago. The property has been used as a medical centre and continues in this use. The owner of the building also does not intend to use the property for residential purposes in the future, but seeks to expand the medical use.*

The citation did not actually ascribe cultural significance to this place on the basis of ongoing residential use but, rather, as a display unit for a prototype project housing unit. In this regard, its subsequent use, whether residential or not, is wholly irrelevant to the case for significance.

Changes in use do not constitute a valid reason for a heritage overlay not to be applied to any place. There are countless examples of culturally significant buildings, such as churches, masonic temples, schools, factories and retail buildings that are no longer used for the purpose for which they were designed or built, yet they have still been afforded statutory protection. The notion of finding and maintaining appropriate adaptive re-use is, in itself, a crucial aspect of modern heritage conservation practice.

3.8.3 Extent of alterations

- a) *The original floorplan and architectural features of the property have been altered in the past as part of works allowing the use of the subject site as a dental practice. These works are considered intrusive in a way that significantly alters the appearance of the heritage place.*

As has been discussed elsewhere in this evidence (see eg 3.7.2), any changes that have been made to the interior of the building are not deemed to have negatively impacted the cultural significance of the place. The proposal for an individual heritage overlay on this property did not include a recommendation for internal controls.

The citation acknowledged the external alterations, and specifically the partial infill of what was originally a semi-enclosed carport-like space to the left side of the street frontage. It is maintained that, while this infill is regrettable, it is readily reversible and is not deemed to unduly detract from the original building nor confuse interpretation of its original form.

While a number of more intact examples of the FLER project house are known to exist in Melbourne's eastern suburbs (including a virtually unaltered one that was recently discovered in Possum Lane, Heathmont), the one at 150 Canterbury Road still stands out as the original prototype and display unit, and the one with which Boyd himself would have been directly involved. As such, and despite the external alteration, the subject building accrues a layer of cultural significance that is absent from all subsequent copies.

3.9 House, 359 Whitehorse Road, Nunawading [Submission 73]

3.9.1 An insufficient number of HERCON criteria have been referenced

- a) *There are eight criteria used for the assessing the significance of a place or building... In the heritage citation completed by Built Heritage Pty Ltd, only 'architectural significance' (a sub-set of aesthetic significance) is referenced as the basis of the building's significance.*

This issue has evidently emerged following the submitter's preliminary discussions with RBA Architects, who raised this same issue (in very similar wording) in a report objecting to the proposed heritage overlay for the house at 1 Gracefield Drive, Box Hill North (see 3.6 of this evidence). A response has ready been provided under section 3.6.7.

3.9.2 House is concealed from public view

- a) *Views to the building from the public realm are largely restricted and this is compounded by the fact that the building was designed to back onto Whitehorse Road with the building frontage addressing the side boundary. This means that the building cannot be appreciated from the public realm.*

This issue has also been raised, and addressed, elsewhere in this evidence. As has been explained in the response to the objection regarding the house at 3 Villa Mews, Vermont (see section 3.5.1), the fact that a place cannot be readily appreciated from the public realm is not a valid justification for a heritage overlay not to be applied.

More specifically, the fact that the building was conceived with its principal facade to the rear, rather than the street, is a clear reflection of the developing modernist movement and departure from traditional notions of suburban residential architecture. Rather than a justification for a heritage overlay not to be applied, this is actually a key aspect of the cultural significance that has been ascribed to the place.

3.9.3 House is not unique

- a) *It is our submission that the building demonstrates a representative example of this building type, not a notable example. This view is supported by the fact that during the late 1940s and early 1950s, architects throughout Melbourne began designing in the Modernist idiom and the butterfly roof form, elevated structure and elevations of this building as typical examples of this and not notably unique.*

Again, this argument is virtually identical to one put forward by RBA Architects in their report objecting to the proposed heritage overlay for 1 Gracefield Drive. As such, the same rebuttal is applicable (see section 3.6.2 of this evidence). Although this building may indeed be representative of prevailing modernist trends when considered on a regional context across the entire Melbourne metropolitan area, it is rarer in the more limited municipality-wide context. The purpose of the Study was to identify places within the City of Whitehorse that were deemed to be significant at the local level, and not (necessarily) at a broader regional or state level.

It should also be pointed out that the expression 'notably unique', quoted in the objector's submission, was not actually used anywhere in the text of the citation itself.

3.10 House, 1163 Riversdale Road, Box Hill South [Submission 74]

3.10.1 Objection to proposed heritage overlay

- a) *We do not wish to have a heritage overlay applied to our property.*

As this written submission has objected to the proposed heritage overlay without raising any specific issue (on heritage or other grounds), I am not able to provide a response.

3.11 Former ES&A Bank premises, 153-155 Springvale Road, Nunawading [Submission 75]

3.11.1 Building does not contribute to streetscape

- a) *Although the building is admittedly unusual in its presentation to the public realm, it provides little historic contribution to the aesthetics of the public realm. C172 intends to incorporate this building into a site specific heritage overlay while all adjoining buildings surrounding will be excluded from heritage overlays.*

The subject building was recommended for a heritage overlay because it was considered, in isolation, as a notable individual specimen of modern architecture, in its own right, and irrespective of its streetscape context. As such, it was not necessary to take into account the type, scale, style, form or era of any of the adjacent or nearby buildings. The bank is not being recommended as part of a heritage precinct, but as an individual heritage place.

3.12 House, 4 Ian Grove, Burwood [Submission 76]

Note: This late objection, a copy of which was provided to me on 27 January 2016, identified seven grounds for abandoning the proposed heritage overlay. All but one of these pertain to non-heritage issues such as health, safety and economics.

3.12.1 No heritage significance

a) *There is nothing significant and of heritage value to preserve 4 Ian Grove Burwood*

The basis for ascribing cultural significance to this property, including a comparative analysis of other local examples of this particular type of project house, has been clearly outlined in the citation.

3.13 House, 40 Somers Street, Burwood East [No Submission]

3.13.1 No submission received

The owners of this house did not submit a written objection, but the matter has been referred to panel by Councillors. As no rationale has been provided, I am unable to provide any response.

As stated for 3.12.1 above, the basis for ascribing cultural significance to this property has been clearly outlined in the citation.

APPENDIX A: CURRICULUM VITAE

Simon Reeves

Qualifications

- 1996-97 Bachelor of Architecture (Hons) (University of Melbourne)
- 1991-93 Bachelor of Planning & Design (University of Melbourne)

Full-time Professional Experience

- 2009- Director and principal, Built Heritage Pty Ltd
- 2002-2009 Architectural historian and heritage consultant, Heritage Alliance, Melbourne
- 1998-2002 Architectural historian, Allom Lovell & Associates, Melbourne

Other experience

- 2012-2014 Part time lecturer, *Architectural History & Theory 2: Australian Architecture*
School of Architecture & Design, RMIT University
- 2011 Tutor, *Architectural History & Theory 2: Australian Architecture*
School of Architecture & Design, RMIT University
- 2010 Tutor, *Modern Architecture: MoMo to PoMo*
Faculty of Architecture, University of Melbourne
- 2010 Guest editor, *Architect Victoria* (Journal of AIA Victorian Chapter)
Special issue on post-Second World War heritage places (Autumn 2010)
- 2000 Research assistant to Dr Philip Goad
Post-War Sydney Housing Project
Faculty of Architecture, University of Melbourne
- 1999 Archivist and curator of architectural drawings (Walter Burley Griffin Collection)
Newman College, University of Melbourne
- 1998 Architectural historian [Stephenson & Turner archive project]
State Library of Victoria
- 1998 Tutor, *History of Building Construction*
Faculty of Architecture, University of Melbourne
- 1995-1998 Assistant to the Building Project Co-ordinator
State Library of Victoria
- 1995 Teaching assistant to Jeffrey Turnbull
Faculty of Architecture, University of Melbourne
- 1994 Research assistant to Jeffrey Turnbull and Peter Navaretti
Walter Burley Griffin & Marion Mahony Griffin Catalogue Project
Faculty of Architecture, University of Melbourne

Past and Present Affiliations

Australia ICOMOS

DoCoMoMo Australia – also former Victorian Vice-Chair

National Trust of Australia (Victoria) – also former chair of Buildings Committee (2010-11)

Society of Architectural Historians of Australia & New Zealand (SAHANZ)

Art Deco & Modernism Society of Victoria

Water Burley Griffin Society

Garden History Society of Australia

Robin Boyd Foundation

Published works (selected)

Gentle Modernist: The Nine Lives of Anatol Kagan, Freemantle [WA]: Vivid Publishing, 2014.

“Gromboyd goes Hawaiian: Roy Grounds, Robin Boyd and the 'Exclusive Pacific Fellowship of Talent”, *Fabrications*, Vol 22, No 1 (2012).

“Googie goes Australian”, *Australian Modern*, Vol 1, No 1 (2012), pp 12-15.

“Commonwealth Bank Building, Bourke Street”, *Spirit of Progress*, Vol 12, No 4 (Spring 2011), pp 10-11.

“A Refreshing Classification”, *Victorian News: National Trust*, August 2011, p 5.

“Yule House”, *Spirit of Progress*, Vol 11, No 3 (Winter 2010), pp 27-29.

“Australia’s Early Motel Boom”, *Australian Motel Owners’ Journal*, Vol 11, No 1 (June 2010), pp 15ff.

“Remember those bowling nights?”, *Victorian News: National Trust*, May 2010, p 6.

“Tomorrow’s heritage... today!”, *Architect Victoria*, Autumn 2010, pp 1-3.

“W J Grassick: An Unqualified Success”, *Spirit of Progress*, Vol 10, No 3 (Winter 2009), pp 24-26.

“Pacific Modern: The Life and Work of Haydn Phillips”, in Miles Lewis (ed). *The Pacific Connection: Trade, Travel and Technology Transfer*. Proceedings of a seminar at University of Melbourne, 19-22 February 2009.

“The Walmsley House at Royal Park: La Trobe’s 'other' cottage”, *La Trobeana: Journal of the C J La Trobe Society Inc*. Vol 7, No 3 (November 2008), pp 12-19.

“Roy Prentice: Centenary Architect”, *Spirit of Progress*, Vol 7, No 3 (Winter 2006), pp 7-9.

“Heritage Overlooked”, *Architect Victoria*, Autumn 2005, pp 22-25.

“Millie Gibson blooms again”, *The La Trobe Journal*, No 65 (Autumn 2000), pp 4-16.

“Incineration and Incantation”, in Jeff Turnbull & Peter Navaretti (eds), *The Griffins in Australia and India: The Complete Works and Projects of Walter Burley Griffin and Marion Mahony Griffin*, Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 1998. pp 64-72.