

Edithvale & Bonbeach Level Crossing Removal Project

Statement of heritage evidence for
Inquiry and Advisory Committee

Prepared by
Ms Katherine White

Instructed by
Clayton Utz

May 2018

Prepared by

Prepared for

1.0 Introduction

My firm, Lovell Chen, prepared the technical report titled *Historic Heritage Impact Assessment Level Crossing Removal Programme: Edithvale & Bonbeach Level Crossing Removal Projects* (Technical Report) which is included as Technical Report N to the Environment Effects Statement (EES) for the Edithvale and Bonbeach Level Crossing Removal Projects (the Project).

I was the principal author of the Technical Report. Other significant contributors to the Technical Report and their expertise is set out as follows:

Mr Peter Lovell, Director and Founding Principal

Mr Lovell's role in the preparation of the Technical Report was in a review capacity.

His expertise is as follows:

Peter brought expertise to the Project in relation to the analysis and assessment of development impacts in a heritage context. This expertise is primarily derived from his experience over 38 years in researching and assessing heritage places for the application of heritage controls at both a local and state level, in the formulation and review of guidelines for the implementation of such controls, in the application of heritage controls to projects undertaken by Lovell Chen and other architects and in the testing of those controls by way of Victorian Heritage Council and Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal review.

Ms Michelle Knehans, Associate

Ms Knehans' role in the preparation of the Technical Report was in an assistance capacity, including the collation of background information, historical research and drafting of descriptive material.

Her expertise is as follows:

Michelle also brought expertise to the Project in relation to the assessment of development impacts in a heritage context. This expertise is primarily derived from Michelle's background in archaeological research, and her contribution to projects which involve the provision of technical heritage advice for complex sites, adaptive reuse schemes and/or major public infrastructure.

I adopt the Technical Report, in combination with this document, as my written expert evidence for the purposes of the Edithvale and Bonbeach Level Crossing Removal Project Inquiry and Advisory Committee's review of the EES and draft planning scheme amendment.

2.0 Qualifications and experience

Appendix A contains a statement setting out my qualifications and experience, and the other matters required for inclusion in an expert's report, as set out by Planning Panels Victoria in their 'Guide to the Expert Evidence'.

A copy of my curriculum vitae is provided in Appendix B.

3.0 Further work since preparation of the Technical Report

Since the Technical Report was finalised, I have not undertaken any further work in relation to the matters addressed in the Technical Report relevant to the Project.

4.0 Written submissions

4.1 Submissions received

I have read the public submissions provided to me in relation to the EES and draft planning scheme amendment and have identified those that are relevant to the Technical report and my area of expertise (historic heritage). These include the following submissions:

- Submission 3
- Submission 79
- Submission 161
- Submission 170
- Submission 209

4.2 Summary of issues raised

The submissions have raised the following issues relevant to historic heritage:

- Installation of interpretation signage and walking trails along the railway line commencing at Mentone railway station and outlining the history of the Frankston railway line.
- A rail over road proposal ‘...doesn’t go with our heritage homes. It is so out of place’.
- The removal of the railway line will ‘...undermine Melbourne’s traditional beauty...’.
- The loss of the historic railway stations and mature trees along the Dandenong/Cranbourne line (Carnegie and Murrumbeena) was ‘hard to accept’.
- The design of the new stations should retain ‘...the look and feel of the stations on the Frankston line. We are losing our heritage every time we make change...’.

4.3 Response to issues raised

Set out below in Table 1 are my comments and response to the issues raised by the written submissions as relevant to historic heritage. There are no issues arising from the submissions which would require modification or amendment of the Technical Report.

Table 1 Summary of issues raised in the submissions and a response in relation to historic heritage

Issue	Response
Installation of interpretation signage and walking trails along the railway line	<p>The Frankston railway line was established in the 1880s and electrified in the 1920s. The railway stations and associated infrastructure along the line date from various periods and demonstrate the evolution of the line through the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The Edithvale and Bonbeach railway stations which form part of the Project date from the late twentieth century, while the Chelsea railway station and signal box at the northern end of the Bonbeach project area dates from the early twentieth century. The Edithvale and Bonbeach railway station complexes, which are not subject to heritage controls, are to be removed and replaced as part of the Project, and the Chelsea railway station, which is included in the Heritage Overlay, will be retained and will not be altered.</p> <p>There will be no heritage impact associated with the Project and accordingly there is no need to provide heritage interpretation.</p>
A rail over road proposal ‘...doesn’t go with our heritage homes. It is so out of place’.	<p>The Project involves the lowering of the Frankston railway line into two separate trenches under Edithvale Road and Station Street/Bondi Road. An elevated rail bridge is not proposed as part of the Project.</p>

Issue	Response
<p>The removal of the railway line will ‘...undermine Melbourne’s traditional beauty...’.</p>	<p>The Frankston railway line will remain within the rail reserve in its existing alignment, however the level crossings will be removed by lowering the railway line into two separate trenches: one beneath Edithvale Road and one Station Street/Bondi Road.</p> <p>The Technical Report concludes that the trenches constructed as part of the Project would be unlikely to impact the significance of the heritage places included within the project area or those heritage places which immediately adjoin the project area (refer to Section 9.0 of the Technical Report). Further, the lowering of the railway line will not detract from the understanding of the broader alignment of the Frankston railway line as the tracks will remain within the rail reserve.</p>
<p>The loss of the historic railway stations and mature trees along the Dandenong/Cranbourne line (Carnegie and Murrumbeena) was ‘hard to accept’.</p>	<p>The Project involves the removal of Edithvale and Bonbeach railway stations. These station complexes date from the late twentieth century and are not included in the Victorian Heritage Register or the Heritage Overlay. There will be no heritage impact associated with the demolition of these station complexes (refer to Section 7.1.1.2 and Section 7.2.1.2 of the Technical Report)</p> <p>Chelsea railway station and signal box (within the Bonbeach project area) and the Chelsea clock tower (within the Edithvale project area), which are included in the Heritage Overlay, will be retained.</p>
<p>The design of the new stations should retain ‘...the look and feel of the stations on the Frankston line. We are losing our heritage every time we make change...’.</p>	<p>The Project involves the removal of Edithvale and Bonbeach railway stations and the construction of a new building and below grade station platforms within the rail trenches. The existing station complexes date from the late twentieth century and are not included in the Victorian Heritage Register or the Heritage Overlay. There will be no heritage impact associated with the demolition and replacement of these station complexes.</p> <p>With regard to the design of the new stations, the Technical Report concludes that the trenches and new buildings constructed as part of the Project would be unlikely to impact the significance of the heritage places included within the project area or those heritage places which immediately adjoin the project area (refer to Section 7.1.2.1 and Section 7.2.2.1 of the Technical report). Notwithstanding this conclusion, consideration of the heritage values of adjoining places and the broader context of the area is important, and accordingly the Technical Report includes two Environmental Performance Requirement (EPR) for the Project. EPR ID HH3 relates specifically to maintaining the heritage values of adjoining heritage places:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Avoid or minimise, to the extent practicable, adverse visual impacts on adjoining heritage places, and maintain landscape character and significant heritage precinct values (where relevant) by applying the Urban Design Framework and project specific Urban Design Guidelines during the design development process.</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>EPR ID UD1 considers the broader context of the place and relates the to the preparation of Urban Design Guidelines for the projects (noting that a draft of the Guidelines has been prepared for discussion purposes):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Design projects in accordance with the LXRA Urban Design Framework and project specific Urban Design Guidelines. The Urban Design Guidelines must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identity b) Connectivity and wayfinding c) urban integration d) resilience and sustainability e) amenity f) vibrancy g) safety h) accessibility <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Seek the advice of the LXRA Urban Design Advisory Panel (chaired by the Office of the Victorian Government Architect, and includes officers of Kinston City Council) during the preparation of detailed design to ensure an appropriate response to the LXRA Urban Design Framework.</p> <p>These EPRs will assist to mitigate adverse impacts on the significance of adjoining and nearby heritage places and will take into consideration the broader context of the area.</p>

4.4 Response regarding EPRs

Following the review of relevant submissions, I confirm that the recommended Environmental Performance Requirements (EPRs) with regard to historic heritage, and included in the Technical Report, remain an appropriate measure to manage and/or mitigate adverse impacts on historic heritage as associated with the Project (Table 2).

There are no issues arising from the submissions which would require modification or amendment of the recommended EPRs in relation to historic heritage.

Table 2 Edithvale and Bonbeach Environmental Performance Requirements

EPR ID	Environmental Performance Requirement	Stage
HH1	<p>Unidentified historical archaeological sites Minimise impacts on any unidentified historical archaeological sites and values discovered during construction through the development and implementation of an archaeological discovery protocol. The management protocol would be consistent with the <i>Heritage Act 2017</i> and developed in consultation with Heritage Victoria, and include a procedure for ceasing work if remains are</p>	Construction

EPR ID	Environmental Performance Requirement	Stage
	discovered, notifying Heritage Victoria, obtaining consent and dealing with remains.	
HH2	Heritage overlay sites Avoid adverse impacts to the Chelsea Clock Tower and Chelsea Railway Station during construction through the implementation of no-go zones through the Construction Environmental Management Plan if required. Undertake a pre-condition survey in accordance with EPR reference GM1 .	Construction
HH3	Heritage values Avoid or minimise, to the extent practicable, adverse visual impacts on adjoining heritage places, and maintain landscape character and significant heritage precinct values (where relevant) by applying the Urban Design Framework and project specific Urban Design Guidelines during the design development process.	Design/Operational
UDI1	Urban Design Guidelines Design projects in accordance with the LXRA Urban Design Framework and project specific Urban Design Guidelines. The Urban Design Guidelines must consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) identity b) connectivity and wayfinding c) urban integration d) resilience and sustainability e) amenity f) vibrancy g) safety h) accessibility Seek the advice of the LXRA Urban Design Advisory Panel (chaired by the Office of the Victorian Government Architect, and includes officers of Kingston City Council) during the preparation of detailed design to ensure an appropriate response to the LXRA Urban Design Framework.	Operational

5.0 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 Inquiry and Advisory Committee.



Katherine White
Associate Principal – Heritage

22 May 2018

Appendix A Matters required by PPV 'Guide to the Expert Evidence'

As indicated in Planning Panels Victoria's 'Guide to the Expert Evidence', the following information is required to be included in the report of an expert:

(a) The name and address of the expert;

Ms Katherine Anna White
Associate Principal – Heritage

Lovell Chen
Level 5, 176 Wellington Parade
East Melbourne Victoria 3002

(b) The expert's qualifications and experience;

I hold a Bachelor of Social Science (Planning) (Honours) degree from RMIT University, and a Masters of Urban and Cultural Heritage from the University of Melbourne. I am a member of Australia ICOMOS and the Planning Institute Australia, and am a Certified Practicing Planner (CPP).

I have a multidisciplinary planning and heritage background and have worked in the heritage field for over 10 years. As Associate Principal - Heritage at Lovell Chen, I am responsible for the management and overseeing of heritage approvals, appeals, planning and Heritage Victoria permit applications. I have also been involved in the preparation of municipal heritage studies and Conservation Management Plans. My project experience includes the assessment of heritage impacts for numerous individual sites in Melbourne and further afield and the preparation of reviews and reports associated with development proposals.

In addition to my Lovell Chen experience, I have worked at the cities of Darebin (2002-3) and Boroondara (2009) in their Strategic Planning departments. At the latter Council, my role was focussed on heritage planning.

(c) a statement identifying the expert's area of expertise to make the report;

My expertise relates to heritage planning and the assessment of development impacts in a heritage context. This expertise is derived from over ten years' experience in the assessment of heritage impacts in relation to a wide range of projects, and involvement in planning and heritage permit applications and appeals.

(d) a statement identifying all other significant contributors to the report and where necessary outlining their expertise;

The preparation of this report was undertaken by Ms Katherine White.

Mr Peter Lovell and Ms Michelle Knehans were involved in the preparation of the Technical Report. Their role in the Project and expertise is outlined in Section 1.0 (Introduction) on page 1 of this report.

(e) all instructions that define the scope of the report (original and supplementary and whether in writing or oral);

In correspondence dated 27 April 2018, I was instructed by Clayton Utz to undertake the following tasks:

1. Review the previous report and the EES to the extent relevant to your area of expertise.
2. Review the public submissions referred to you to the extent relevant to your area of expertise.
3. Prepare an expert report that:
 - a. Responds to the public submissions relevant to your area of expertise;

- b. Addresses the previous report and identifies any changes required (if any) arising out of the issues raised in the public submissions; and
 - c. Addresses any other matter that you consider relevant to your area of expertise.
4. Prepare a short...PowerPoint presentation for presenting at the hearing.
5. Attend the hearing to give evidence in relation to your report.

(f) the identity of the person who carried out any tests or experiments upon which the expert relied in making this report and the qualifications of that person;

I was involved in undertaking visual site inspections, with Ms Knehans, of the identified heritage places referenced in the Technical Report.

No further tests or experiments were carried out in relation to historic heritage in the preparation of this report.

(g) a statement setting out the key assumptions made in preparing the report;

In preparing this report I have made the following assumptions:

- That all submissions relevant to historic heritage have been provided to me.
- That between the completion of the Technical Report (January 2018) and this report (May 2018), the City of Kingston has not prepared a heritage study or Planning Scheme Amendment which identifies additional heritage places within or immediately adjoining the project areas as defined in the Technical Report.

In preparing the Technical Report I made the following assumptions:

- That the site inspections undertaken to inform the Technical Report focussed on the HO sites or sites identified in the municipal heritage studies located within or immediately adjoining the project area, and did not include an inspection of the whole of the project areas.

(h) a statement setting out any questions falling outside the expert's expertise and also a statement indicating whether the report is incomplete or inaccurate in any respect.

To the extent of my knowledge, this report is complete and does not include inaccurate information.

Appendix B Curriculum Vitae for Ms Katherine White

KATHERINE WHITE

ASSOCIATE PRINCIPAL HERITAGE

B Soc Sci (Planning) (Hons) (RMIT) M Urban and Cultural Heritage (Melb) Affiliate RAI A CPP MPIA



Katherine White is an Associate Principal, working in heritage planning. She takes a co-ordinating role in our multi-disciplinary heritage team. Her work is focused on the assessment of heritage impacts, the preparation of planning and heritage permit applications and appeals, and the provision and delivery of expert evidence for panels and hearings. She joined Lovell Chen in 2004.

Katherine is a Certified Practising Planner, with a masters degree in urban and cultural heritage and a degree in town planning. She is thoroughly conversant in the state and national legislation that impacts on heritage and planning in Victoria and further afield, applying her practical understanding to heritage-related projects large and small.

EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE

Katherine's experience in the assessment of heritage impacts covers a wide range of project types and sectors, and includes individual sites, groups of sites and complex heritage places. She provides heritage planning advice to Lovell Chen's private clients, and to corporate organisations, government agencies and local government bodies. She also manages the preparation of reviews and reports associated with commercial and residential development proposals, and major public infrastructure projects.

A key aspect of Katherine's expertise is her knowledge of the various statutory planning frameworks that apply to projects with heritage elements, as well as applicable heritage and planning legislation — such as the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and the Heritage Act 1995 in the state of Victoria, and the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 at national level.

She also has experience in working with heritage and planning legislation in other states of Australia, including New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania.

PROJECTS

Katherine's recent projects include:

- City of Melbourne Heritage Review
- Perth GPO, Western Australia — tenancy guidelines
- Yarra Park, Melbourne (including Avenue of Legends) — heritage advice and permits
- Orica Deer Park — historical overview, interpretation plan, strategic advice, planning scheme amendment
- Melbourne GPO (former) — various projects
- Kinnears Rope Works — permit condition delivery, heritage advice
- Assessment of Heritage Precincts in Kew, Melbourne
- Ringwood Station upgrade, Melbourne — heritage advice
- Hobson's Bay post-WWII scoping study
- Australia Post heritage register review (nationwide)

