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1. **Reason for Addendum**

1. On 30 July 2018, I received advice from Melbourne City Council as follows:

2. In the course of reviewing the evidence of another witness, a Council officer became aware of a discrepancy in relation to the property at 91 Barnett Street, Kensington. As a consequence of that discrepancy, the Council Officer investigated the grading of the property in:
   - The Kensington Heritage Review 2013;
   - The Heritage Inventory used in the grading’s conversion process under Amendment C258 (June 2016, as gazetted);
   - Attachment 5 to Agenda Item 6.1 of FMC 5-Jul-16;
   - The original exhibited Heritage Inventory under C258 (as originally exhibited);
   - The corrected exhibited Heritage Inventory under C258 (FMC 21-Nov-17);
   - The corrected excerpt of the Heritage Inventory under C258 (FMC 20-Feb-18).

3. As a result of this investigation, the Council officer determined that the following properties graded ‘Contributory’ in the Kensington Heritage Review 2013 had been incorrectly graded ‘Significant’ in the exhibited and corrected Heritage Inventories under C258:
   - 71 Barnett Street;
   - 73 Barnett Street;
   - 75 Barnett Street;
   - 77 Barnett Street;
   - 79 Barnett Street;
   - 81 Barnett Street;
   - 83 Barnett Street;
   - 85 Barnett Street;
   - 87 Barnett Street;
   - 89 Barnett Street;
   - 91 Barnett Street;
   - 93 Barnett Street;
   - 95 Barnett Street.

4. Upon checking the information which had been provided to me for the purpose of my review, the officer determined that I had been provided with the incorrect document for the proposed gradings for properties in Kensington, namely the Incorporated ‘Statements of Significance’ for Kensington under Amendment C215, which did not provide individual building gradings for heritage places canvassed by the review.

5. The correct document ‘Kensington Heritage Review 2013’, which includes a spreadsheet (p.13 to 36 of the report), has now been provided to me sets out the individual building gradings for heritage places canvassed by the Review.

6. The officer confirmed that all other documentation provided to me was correct.
2. Additional Work Performed

7. The following additional work was performed based on the additional information provided:

8. All properties within a Kensington precinct (58 in total) included in the sample of 369 properties initially reviewed were re-examined.

9. The correct grading for the property was confirmed (where applicable) by reference to the additional information contained in the spreadsheet on p.13 to 36 of the ‘Kensington Heritage Review 2013’.

10. The correct grading was cross checked with the grading recorded in Amendment C258: Heritage Places Inventory 2017 Corrected for re-exhibition November 2017.

3. Impact on Findings

11. The additional work identified the following errors in the “Corrected C258 Inventory”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Streetscape</th>
<th>Correctly recorded in Amendment C258</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>615562</td>
<td>87 Barnett Street</td>
<td>Kensington Heritage</td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recorded as significant in C258 but not individually significant in heritage review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENSINGTON VIC 3031</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615552</td>
<td>75 Barnett Street</td>
<td>Kensington Heritage</td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENSINGTON VIC 3031</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615559</td>
<td>83 Barnett Street</td>
<td>Kensington Heritage</td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENSINGTON VIC 3031</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The errors identified resulted in the properties being incorrectly graded ‘Significant’ in the exhibited and corrected Heritage Inventories under C258 rather than ‘Contributory’ as detailed in the Kensington Heritage Review 2013.

13. These errors were consistent with those identified by the Council Officer as outlined in paragraph 3 above and re-testing confirmed they were isolated to the properties listed in paragraph 3.
14. With the exception of the anomalies identified in paragraph 3 above, the “Corrected C258 Inventory” is an accurate and complete record of properties reclassified as Significant, Contributory or Non-Contributory within a “Significant” Streetscape (represented by “-“).

4. Declaration

I have made all 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.

Signed:  
Dated: 31st July 2018