

Meeting with Council re Jubilee Park Development, 6th April 2016

1. About us

- members of Ringwood & District Historical Society & Jubilee Park Residents Heritage Group (JPRHG)
- JPRHG mission:
 - o Advocates for a greater balance between development and protection of both neighbourhood character and heritage

Key Issues

- JP borders the activity centre, so the development impact of Eastland and the growth zone spills over into our residential area
- JP residents would like greater consultation re issues impacting development in our area (for both heritage and nonheritage)

2. Concerns about Inadequate Protective controls for Ringwood's heritage in context of intensifying development

- Due to its location, Jubilee Park's neighbourhood character and heritage value is under particular threat from growing development
- The south-side of the train station, particularly those streets in close proximity to Federation Estate, hold a high proportion of homes with heritage value (relative to other areas of Ringwood).
- Unlike neighbouring suburbs along the train line, Ringwood does not have any formal protective controls on the streets in which early settlement of the township occurred. This has already led to loss of important heritage.
- While existing zoning may have been sufficient and appropriate for this area in times gone by, the current pressures of development from Eastland and designation as a Metropolitan Activity Centre (MAC), call for the need for certain areas bordering the MAC to be protected

Suburb	NRZ Protective Controls around train station	Street-wide Heritage Precincts	Neighbourhood Character Overlays
Boxhill (MAC)	✓	✓	✓
Ringwood (MAC)	✗	✗	✗
Footscray (MAC)	✓	✓	✓
Croydon	✓	✗	✓
Mitcham	✓	✓	✗
Blackburn	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Forms of Protective Controls Applied in close proximity to train stations, including neighbouring suburbs of Ringwood and comparable Metropolitan Activity Centres

Jubilee Park Residents' Heritage Group

Street	Characteristics	Potential Planning Controls
Ellison St (H098)	Arguably the most intact heritage street in Ringwood, representing early residential establishment of the town. Largely Californian Bungalows & weatherboard interwar homes. 4 homes are listed in the HO but there is no street-wide precinct or recognition of "Contributory" buildings	Heritage Precinct Neighbourhood Character Overlay NRZ rezoning
Kendall St	A street that is of high historical significance with regard to it being a representation of the transition of Ringwood from a rural township to becoming a residential township post-electrification of the railway line. Due to lack of protective controls, the condition of some houses is compromised but the streetscape is largely intact and has good consistency with regard to architectural rhythm.	Heritage Precinct Neighbourhood Character Overlay NRZ rezoning
James St	Very similar characteristics to Kendall St (see above), however, lack of planning controls have meant that the heritage value has begun to be compromised with new developments disrupting the intactness of the streetscape. Implementing controls would prevent further destruction to this historically significant street.	Heritage Precinct Neighbourhood Character Overlay NRZ rezoning
Haig St	A highly intact and consistent streetscape of special neighbourhood character and heritage. Characterised by a collection of 1920s weatherboards and interwar homes. Very good condition. Also a very good representation of early residential Ringwood in 1920s.	Heritage Precinct Neighbourhood Character Overlay NRZ rezoning
Wantirna Road Heritage Precinct (H067, H068)	Currently, the HO schedule includes 7 homes within this heritage pocket on Wantirna Rd. They are all on the west side of Wantirna Rd and face other buildings that are now architecturally 'rare' for Ringwood. Consider inclusion of these east-side buildings of Wantirna Rd heritage pocket as either 'contributory' or for inclusion in the schedule themselves.	Heritage Precinct Neighbourhood Character Overlay
Henry St	Characterised by similar style and set-back weatherboard 1950s homes and some rare art-deco and clincker brick homes. An existing covenant prevents more than single-dwelling, so this is not a	Neighbourhood Character Overlay Individual Heritage Assessment for art-deco

	medium-density street. However, its current consistency of character is at risk and an overlay would ensure the achievement of the JP Neighbourhood Character	home and clicker, which are under-represented in HO schedule (7 Henry St)
Caroline St (up until Thomas Street)	Features several homes with high heritage value – brick Californian Bungalow circa 1923 (#5), intact art-deco 'Calisbrook' home (#20), rare, intact Norwegian design timber home (#25-27), intact brick interwar home (#12), type under-represented in schedule However, its current consistency of character is at risk and an overlay would ensure the achievement of the JP Neighbourhood Character	Individual Heritage Assessment for several homes (#5, 12, 20, 25). Art-deco home under-represented in schedule. Neighbourhood Character Overlay

Table 2: Precinct Streets, Characteristics of Streets and Possible Planning Controls for Assessment

3. Concerns about Council's Under-Prioritising of Heritage responsibilities in recent years

- "Heritage" is not included in the current Council Plan.
- no heritage policy in Clause 22 of the Maroondah planning scheme. It was recommended to council by C42 Panel Report in 2010 to develop a policy at Clause 22 but this has not been followed through on.
- no Heritage Advisory Committee
- lack of active promotion of heritage in municipality via website, resident education or advertisement of Heritage Advisory Service
- Heritage Advisory Service functioning differently to the guidelines established by Heritage Victoria
- no Heritage Restoration Fund

Council	Heritage Places in HO Schedule	Cultural Heritage Policy	Active promotion of Heritage Advisor to residents	Heritage Advisory Committee	Council Plan explicitly includes heritage protection	Heritage Restoration Fund
Manningham	199	✓ (22.03)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maroondah	136	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Whitehorse (MAC)	241	✓ (22.01)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maribyrnong (MAC)	205	✓ (22.01)	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 3: Heritage promotion and local policy development across neighbouring councils and MACS

4. Concerns about transparency with which decisions were made pertaining to the current Heritage Schedule

- Maroondah Heritage Study Stage 2 identified 180 places of “local heritage significance” and the commissioned consultant recommended all of them to be listed in the Heritage Overlay. However, only a third of these places (61) were then listed by MCC, following several “meetings” with various stake-holders
- The C42 Panel report states that:

“180 places covered by the citations in the Stage 2 report (2 volumes) were all assessed as of at least local significance... and all were recommended for protection under the HO. However, there is no indication of what places or types places of potential heritage significance were assessed as not reaching the threshold for local significance or why they may have been excluded.”

Interestingly, in spite of the unclear reasons as to why so many places were excluded from the Heritage Overlay, the C42 Panel Report states that *“The majority of the places in the Stage 2 report were found to have historical significance and many were also identified as having either architectural or social significance (and sometimes both). A few had scientific / technical significance”*

- When queried further as to the processes followed that led to exclusion of the recommended places of significance, MCC provided the following response:

“Further discussions and some public consultation was held between the consultant, Council, the Croydon Historical Society and Ringwood Historical Society (formerly Ringwood Historical Research Group) (C42 Panel Report, 2010).

- Concerns about the impartiality and transparency of the decision-making process on which the current HO schedule is based.
- Moreover, this problem highlights the current issue facing Maroondah whereby several places originally identified and recommended for inclusion in the HO (but not listed) have now either been sold for lucrative prices for redevelopment or are under high threat (e.g., former Ringwood Methodist Church)

Recommendations

- Greater protective planning controls applied to the older, **'early establishment areas' of Ringwood as a township**, south of train station (e.g., **NCO, Heritage Precinct, NRZ rezoning**) surrounding Federation Estate
 - Assessment of these streets' heritage value should reflect current understandings of notions of 'Heritage' (e.g., condition of a place is not directly related to a place's significance, nor is heritage reserved exclusively for 'grand' places).
- Outside of the early settlement precinct, develop greater controls within **schedules to the General Residential Zone** for Jubilee Park as a whole with the aim of limiting detrimental effects of over-development of this area, much of which contains valued post-war homes (e.g., Ford St, Thomas St and surrounds are at risk of further loss to neighbourhood character due to inappropriate developments out of keeping with JP neighbourhood character)
- develop **guidelines for developers** for what constitutes "good urban design" in this 'at risk' area
- MCC should strive to **quickly list places** within the municipality that **have high heritage significance but that are not listed in the Schedule** and are at high risk of loss due to the pressures of development on bordering neighbourhoods of the activity centre such as Jubilee Park.
 - Work consultatively with Jubilee Park Residents Heritage Group to identify a list of places of heritage significance that warrant priority assessment
 - The former **Ringwood Methodist Church** (30 Station St, current Ringwood Uniting Church) is one such example. It was identified in the heritage study as having local significance and was recommended for listing, but council did not protect it in the schedule.
- The intensity of development in Ringwood as a metropolitan activity centre, behoves greater levels of protection of those 'at risk' heritage places not identified in the schedule. AS such, MCC should **make heritage a strategic priority** in the planning of the municipality. This will ensure a more attractive and vibrant city for many generations to come.
 - include heritage in the Council Plan
 - Develop a heritage policy at Clause 22 of the planning scheme in line with the C42 Panel Report Recommendation in 2010
 - Adopt a Heritage Advisory Committee
 - Utilise the Heritage Advisory Service in accordance with the Guidelines provided by Heritage Victoria. This will maximise the benefits to the municipality's attractiveness
 - Promote heritage values in the community (Clause 21.04) by promoting the Heritage Advisory Service on MCC website and developing factsheets for residents and owners of heritage properties
- **Undertake a current Heritage Study** of the whole municipality that gives special consideration to **under-represented periods** and **post-war heritage places**.
 - The study should **prioritise assessment of those places that were originally identified in the initial Heritage Study** (and recommended for listing in the Heritage Study two decades ago) but that did not go on to be included in the overlay by council.

- Given the breadth of such a task and the inherent subjectivity in the process of decision-making of what meets 'threshold' criteria, we recommend that commissioning a company that has access to a team of specialists rather than a solo practitioner.