

HERITAGE LIST & LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 'HERITAGE LIST'

Schedule of Submissions Received

| Submission | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <i>Submitted on behalf of St Joachim's Parish Victoria Park (as Chair of Parish Council)</i> Do you support the draft Heritage List and draft Local Planning Policy 43 Heritage List? Yes</p> | Noted. |
| <p>2. 48A Teague Street <i>I'm in receipt of your correspondence dated March 24th 2022 indicating my residence is either Category 1 or 2 significance in the proposed draft Heritage list.</i> <i>I strongly object to my property being categorised without consultation. Limitations on the future of my property have already been adhered to previously after gaining approval to reconstruct the garage attached to the property being considered.</i> <i>The property in question belongs to me.</i> <i>I take the necessary steps to ensure the building and surrounds are kept in A class conditions.</i> <i>Accept this communication as a rejection of your proposal.</i></p> | <p>Consultation has taken place in accordance with the requirements of <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> as detailed in the report.</p> <p>Including a place on the heritage list gives the place recognition and protection under the local planning scheme. Including a place in the heritage list does not limit or restrict the ability of the Town to determine a development application in a particular way or prohibit building works or other development from occurring.</p> |
| <p>3. 13 Teague Street <i>I write to you as the Chairperson of the School of Philosophy Nominees Pty Ltd, the organisation that owns 13 Teague Street, Burswood on behalf of the School of Philosophy Inc.</i></p> | <p>The Town's appointed heritage consultant Stephen Carrick Architects have undertaken assessment of all properties including in both the Local Heritage Survey and subsequently as recommended for inclusion on the Heritage List as places of highest or most significant heritage significance. That statement of significance for Richmond House includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The place has aesthetic value as an example of a residence |

| Submission | Response |
|--|--|
| <p><i>The School of Philosophy has owned the property since 2004. It has used the building to run classes in Practical Philosophy, as per its planning approval.</i></p> <p><i>The Richmond Fellowship were the previous owners of the building. They purchased the property in 1978 thus occupied it for perhaps 26-27 years. It is acknowledged that they provided valuable support for those with mental health issues. Nowhere on the property is it identified as being the 'Richmond Fellowship Community House'. They did not maintain the property in good condition. Other potential buyers at the time were considering demolishing the property to construct developments similar to those that immediately surround it.</i></p> <p><i>The School of Philosophy opposes the property being listed as a Category 2 (Place of Considerable Significance) on the Heritage Register. Its former and current use seems inconsequential. There appears to be no valid rationale as to why it should be considered for the Heritage Register and be subject to the restrictions of such a listing.</i></p> | <p>built in the Federation Bungalow style of architecture; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The place has social value as serving as housing for vulnerable community citizens. |