



Heritage Council Registrations and Reviews Committee

Grant House (H2392)

14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris, City of Bayside

Hearing – 3 June 2019

Members – Ms Leigh Mackay OAM (Chair), Dr Christine Phillips, Mr Jeffrey Robinson

DETERMINATION OF THE HERITAGE COUNCIL

Inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Register – After considering the Executive Director's recommendation, all submissions received, and conducting a hearing into the matter, the Heritage Council has determined, pursuant to section 49(1)(a) of the *Heritage Act 2017*, that the Grant House located at 14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris is of State-level cultural heritage significance and is to be included in the Victorian Heritage Register.

Leigh Mackay (Chair)
Christine Phillips
Jeffrey Robinson

Decision Date – 23 August 2019

DECISION SUMMARY

The Heritage Council provides a decision summary if a Registrations and Reviews Committee is of the view that there are points of interest in the decision which should be identified. This summary does not form part of the decision or reasons for decision.

The Committee determined that the Grant House is of cultural heritage significance to the State of Victoria and is to be included in the Victorian Heritage Register, because of the significant innovation and flexibility of the design of the Place, being a representative example of small-scale Modernist residential architecture, and because of its notable use of simple and readily available materials. The modest scale of the house is significant, as postwar houses needed to be both affordable and functional and the engineering and architectural solutions to these challenges are clearly visible in the design and form of the Place.

The Place also retains the principal characteristics of the class of postwar domestic architecture and is a fine, representative example of the class of place. This allows the class of place to be easily understood and appreciated in the Place.

The Grant House will now be included on the Victorian Heritage register and protected under provisions outlined in the *Heritage Act 2017*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As a peak Heritage body, the Heritage Council is proud to acknowledge Traditional Owners, the Kulin Nation, as the original custodians of the land and waters on which we meet, and to acknowledge the importance and significance of Aboriginal cultural heritage in Victoria. We honour Elders past and present whose knowledge and wisdom has ensured the continuation of culture and traditional practices.

HEARING PARTICIPANTS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HERITAGE VICTORIA ('THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR')

Submissions were received from the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria ('the Executive Director').

MR PETER GRANT ('THE OWNER')

Submissions were received from Rigby Cooke Lawyers on behalf of Mr Peter Grant, one of three joint proprietors of the Grant House located at 14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris ('the Place').

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

JOINT PROPRIETORS OF THE PLACE

Mrs Susan Coffey and Mr John Grant were notified of the matter as joint proprietors of the Place. No submissions were received from Mrs Coffey or Mr J. Grant and they did not participate in the hearing.

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

THE PLACE

01. On 10 January 2019, the Executive Director made a recommendation ('the Recommendation') to the Heritage Council pursuant to section 37(1)(a) of the *Heritage Act 2017* ('the Act') that the Grant House, located at 14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris ('the Place') should be included in the Victorian Heritage Register ('the Register').

02. The Place is described on page 6 of the Recommendation as follows:

The Grant House is centrally located on a suburban block in Beaumaris. It comprises two offset modules with concrete slab floors and curved roofs connected by a central section containing the kitchen, bathroom and laundry. A sunroom is located between the two modules of the eastern side. Light framed timber pergolas are located over the courtyard on the western side and at the front of the house. The modules are made of Stramit Board panels between timber posts at 27 foot (8.3 metres) centres. Each post sits on a metal bracket set into a concrete slab and supports a curved bowstring truss which in turn supports the ceiling/roof. Each module has four timber bowstring trusses. The front module comprises an open plan living and dining area dominated by a black metal chimney flue. The rear module contains four bedrooms off a central hallway. The trusses in this module are visible but intersected by dividing walls.

03. The following historical summary is taken from page 6 of the Recommendation:

*In 1956, Alan and Barbara Grant commissioned architect Peter McIntyre to design a two bedroom home for them on a block of land in the newly formed suburb of Beaumaris. They lived in it their entire lives and it is now owned by their three children. The Grant House is one of eight similar 'bowstring truss'¹ houses designed by McIntyre and constructed in Victoria between 1954 and 1956. The bowstring trusses were designed by McIntyre with engineering by Bill Irwin. The design concept centred around the need for a cost-effective housing solution and resulted in a flexible modular system. The trusses allowed for open internal spaces without central supports which could be configured in any arrangement with the use of non-load-bearing walls. McIntyre supplied designs for individual clients and a version of the design (T40) was published in *The Age* on 28 March 1955 as part of the Small Homes Service of the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects (RVIA).*

04. The above description and history summary have been taken from the Recommendation and are provided for information purposes only.

NOMINATION

05. On 26 October 2018, the Executive Director accepted a nomination to include the Place in the Register.

¹ A bowstring truss is a structural truss consisting of a curved top chord meeting a straight bottom chord at each end.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

- 06.** On 10 January 2019, the Executive Director recommended that the Place be included in the Register under section 37(1)(a) of the Act.

PROCESS FOLLOWING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

- 07.** After the Recommendation, notice was published on 18 January 2019 in accordance with section 41 of the Act for a period of 60 days.
- 08.** One (1) submission was received pursuant to section 44 of the Act, from the Owner of the Place. The submission objected to the Recommendation and requested a hearing into the matter.
- 09.** In accordance with section 46(2)(a) of the Act, a hearing was required to be held.
- 010.** The Heritage Council Registrations and Reviews Committee ('the Committee') was constituted to consider the Recommendation and submissions received in response to it, and to make a determination. The Committee invited further written submissions and a hearing was scheduled for 3 June 2019 ('the hearing').

PRELIMINARY, PROCEDURAL AND OTHER MATTERS

HEARING 'ON THE PAPERS'

- 011.** On 27 May 2019, having only received a request to make verbal submissions at the hearing from the Executive Director, the Committee, in consultation with all hearing participants, decided to determine the matter 'on the papers', relying on written submissions received. Subsequently, the public hearing previously scheduled for 3 June 2019 was cancelled.
- 012.** On 3 June 2019, the Committee met to determine the matter.

SITE INSPECTION

- 013.** On 3 June 2019, the Committee undertook a site inspection of the Place accompanied by the Heritage Council Project Officer. Access to the site was arranged through the Owner's representative, however one of the joint proprietors of the Place, Mrs Susan Coffey, was unexpectedly on site at the time of the inspection and conducted the Committee through the Place. No submissions were sought, made or received at the time of the site inspection.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

- 014.** The Chair invited Committee members to make declarations, written or otherwise, in relation to any matters that may potentially give rise to an actual or apprehended conflict of interest. The Committee members were satisfied that there were no relevant conflicts of interests and made no such declarations.

FUTURE USE, MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLACE

- 015.** It is not the role of the Committee to consider future proposals or to pre-empt any decisions regarding future permits under the Act. Pursuant to section 49(1) of the Act, the role of the Committee is to determine whether or not the Place, or part of it, is of State-level cultural heritage significance and is, or is not, to be included in the Register.

ISSUES

- 016.** The following section is not intended to be a complete record of submissions that were made to the Committee. It is a summary of what the Committee considers to be the key issues, followed by an explanation of the position that the Committee takes on each key issue.
- 017.** Any reference to Criteria refers to the Heritage Council Criteria for Assessment of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance (as adopted by the Heritage Council on 7 August 2008) (see **Attachment 1**).
- 018.** The Committee has referred to the assessment framework in The Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines (updated 6 December 2018) ('the Guidelines') in considering the issues before it.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- 019.** The Executive Director recommended that the Place be included in the Register for architectural and historical significance to the State of Victoria. The assessment found that the Place satisfies two Criteria for inclusion in the Register:
- **Criterion A** – Importance to the course, or pattern, of Victoria's cultural history; and
 - **Criterion D** – Importance in demonstrating the principle characteristics of a class of cultural places and objects.
- 020.** The Owner submitted that the Place is of low historical importance, potentially being one of 5,000 dwellings constructed for the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects ('RVIA') Small Homes Services. The Owner further submitted that the replacement of the original roof fabric and extensive internal renovation works undertaken in 1982 have resulted in significant changes at the Place, to the extent that it does not demonstrate a high level of intactness to warrant inclusion in the Register.

HIGH NUMBER OF EXTANT MODERNIST PLACES

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 021.** In assessing the cultural heritage significance of the Place, the Executive Director noted, on page 4 of the Recommendation, that the sheer number of extant Modernist postwar places in Victoria means that the threshold tests for State-level cultural heritage significance need to be carefully applied for inclusion in the Register.
- 022.** The Owner submitted that, being one of 5,000 dwellings constructed at this time, the Place does not represent an intact example of dwellings constructed as part of the Small Homes Service of the RVIA.
- 023.** In response to the submission of the Owner pursuant to section 44 of the Act, the Executive Director argued that while the Grant House was constructed in the 1950s, it was not constructed under the RVIA Small Homes Service, and its significance should be assessed as an innovative solution to cost effective housing during the post-war period.

Discussion and conclusion

- 024.** The Committee agrees with the Executive Director that where a high number of extant examples of a class remain in Victoria, the thresholding tests for State-level cultural heritage significance should be applied with rigor.
- 025.** The Committee further agrees that the Place was privately commissioned by Alan and Barbara Grant in 1956 and its cultural heritage significance has not and should not be assessed in association with the RVIA Small Homes Service.

CRITERION A – IMPORTANCE TO THE COURSE, OR PATTERN OF VICTORIA'S CULTURAL HISTORY

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 026.** In assessing the Place under Criterion A, the Executive Director found that the Place is a fine, representative example of small-scale Modernist domestic architecture in Victoria, evidenced through its modest but inventive design, and the use of simple, readily available and cost-effective materials.
- 027.** The Executive Director acknowledged that while the Place is modest in scale, it was nonetheless finely designed, and is notable for its design and construction during a period of innovative, unconventional and experimental domestic architecture that responded to the growing need for housing, and the scarcity of building materials in the postwar period.
- 028.** In assessing the Place under step 2 of Criterion A, the Executive Director stated that it is the most intact surviving example of only eight similar bowstring truss houses constructed in Victoria at this time. The Executive Director assessed the Place as having a clear association with postwar residential development in Victoria that is understood better than most other places with the same association.
- 029.** The Executive Director recommended that Criterion A is likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 030.** The Owner objected to the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under Criterion A and submitted that the Place retains low or questionable historical importance. They argued that more iconic examples of the work of Peter McIntyre are already included in the Register and as such the Place does not warrant inclusion under Criterion A.
- 031.** The Owner further submitted that the historical importance of the Place cannot be better understood than most places with the same association, arguing that like all other McIntyre houses, the Place has been significantly altered.
- 032.** In response to the submissions of the Owner, the Executive Director submitted that the Place is significant as a notable example of an innovative solution to cost-effective housing, not as an example of McIntyre's iconic and well-known projects.

Discussion and conclusion

- 033.** The Committee considers that the innovation and flexibility of the design of the Place are significant and agrees with the Executive Director's assessment of the Place as a representative example of small-scale Modernist residential architecture, notable for its use of simple, readily available materials.

- 034.** The Committee also considers the modest scale of the Place to be important, with the need for postwar houses to be both affordable and functional and considers the engineering and architectural solutions to these challenges to be clearly visible in the design and form of the Place.
- 035.** Having regard to the comparative examples provided by the Executive Director in the Recommendation, the Committee is of the view that of the examples provided, the Place is most comparable to the Rice House (listed in the Register as place H0123), being innovative and modest Modernist domestic architecture. The Committee agrees with the statement of the Executive Director on page 25 of the Recommendation that most other Modernist comparisons currently in the Register have a higher profile than the Place, being ‘one-off’ designs of a more substantial scale and budget.
- 036.** The Committee also considers the Place to be comparable, in terms of Criterion A, to other types of modest domestic architecture, including prefabricated iron houses built during the gold rush in response to a shortage of houses, building materials and labor. In particular, the iron houses located on Brunswick Road, Brunswick (individually listed in the Register as places H1151, H1152, H1153 and H0665) and Bellhouse Iron House, South Melbourne (H1888). These places similarly registered for historical significance.
- 037.** The Committee notes that no evidence was provided in support of comparisons drawn by hearing participants between the Place and other bowstring truss houses constructed in Victoria at this time. The Committee also notes that the Nomination Document accepted by the Executive Director for the Place indicates that these other examples may have been either demolished or substantially altered.
- 038.** The Committee therefore agrees that the Place has a clear association with postwar residential development in Victoria, that is understood better than most other places with the same association and accepts the position of the Executive Director that the Place is the most intact surviving example of bowstring truss houses constructed in Victoria at this time.
- 039.** The Committee finds that Criterion A is satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION B – POSSESSION OF UNCOMMON, RARE OR ENDANGERED ASPECTS OF VICTORIA’S CULTURAL HISTORY

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 040.** In assessing the Place under Criterion B, the Executive Director found that it is not rare, uncommon, or in a class that is endangered. The Executive Director recommended that Criterion B is not likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 041.** The Owner agreed with the assessment of the Executive Director, further submitting that the Place could be one of 5,000 places built under the RVIA Small Homes Service (see paragraph 025 above).

Discussion and conclusion

- 042.** The Committee agrees with the assessment of the Executive Director that the Place is not rare, uncommon or in a class that is endangered.
- 043.** The Committee finds that Criterion B is not satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION C – POTENTIAL TO YIELD INFORMATION THAT WILL CONTRIBUTE TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF VICTORIA’S CULTURAL HISTORY

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 044.** The Executive Director’s assessment of the Place under Criterion C found that it is unlikely that the Place contains physical evidence or historical information that is not currently visible or understood, with the form, function and historical interest of the Place being well documented. The Executive Director recommended that Criterion C is not likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 045.** The Owner agreed with the assessment of the Executive Director in relation to Criterion C and did not make further detailed submissions.

Discussion and conclusion

- 046.** The Committee agrees with the assessment of the Executive Director that the Place is unlikely to contain physical evidence of historical interest that is not currently visible or understood.
- 047.** The Committee finds that Criterion C is not satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION D – IMPORTANCE IN DEMONSTRATING THE PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS OF A CLASS OF CULTURAL PLACES AND OBJECTS

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 048.** The Executive Director, in assessing the Place under step 1 of Criterion D, found that the Place is of the class of postwar domestic architecture, having associations with the development of unconventional and experimental architecture which emerged at this time. The Executive Director found that the principle characteristics of postwar domestic architecture are evident in the physical fabric of the Place, including the;
- considered, cost-effective design;
 - non-traditional floor plan;
 - incorporation of outdoor living space into the design;
 - uncommon curved roof form;
 - modest scale of the building;
 - design and engineering of the bowstring trusses;
 - use of new materials such as Stramit Board; and
 - use of a concrete slab.
- 049.** In assessing the Place under step 2 of Criterion D, the Executive Director also found that the Place is a notable example of its class, being both fine and highly intact.
- 050.** In terms of the Place being a fine example of its class, the Executive Director found that the characteristics of the class displayed at the Place are of higher quality than typical of places in the class. The Executive Director found that the principle characteristics of the class were displayed at the Place in a way that allows the class to be easily understood, and for the Place to be appreciated as a small-scale Modernist home.

- 051.** The Executive Director also assessed that the key characteristics of the class of place remain mostly intact and unchanged from the time of the construction of the Place in 1956.
- 052.** The Executive Director therefore recommended that Criterion D is likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 053.** In objecting to the Recommendation, the Owner submitted that the Place does not exhibit a high level of intactness and the Executive Director, in assessing the Place under Criterion D, did not review all evidence available in relation to the intactness of the Place.
- 054.** In support of their submission that the Place retains a low level of intactness and does not warrant inclusion in the Register, the Owner submitted that the replacement of the material of the curved roof in the 1980s undermined the cultural heritage significance of the Place. The submission noted a Building Defects Report dated 13 March 2019, which states that the current roof has issues:
- The overall condition of the roof coverings is poor. The fiberglass over melthoid roof covering is delaminating and needs to be replaced.*
- 055.** The Owner also expressed the view that residences built of inexpensive materials, such as the Grant House, were designed to last approximately 25 years and the Place, having stood for 60 years, is now well passed its expiry date.
- 056.** The Owner further submitted that extensive renovation works undertaken in 1982 significantly altered the original design, form and plan of the Place, particularly the roof and layout of the bedrooms. The Owner submitted that the Place has been altered to the extent that it demonstrates few characteristics of McIntyre houses and as such, does not meet the threshold for inclusion in the Register under Criterion D.
- 057.** In response to the submissions of the Owner, the Executive Director acknowledged that it is evident that changes have been made at the Place, however submitted that such changes are not unusual in heritage places and do not affect the cultural heritage significance of the Place.
- 058.** The Executive Director further submitted that most of the material lodged by the Owner as evidence of the lack of intactness of the Place, in fact refers to condition of the Place, not its intactness. The Executive Director expressed the view that despite the condition of the Place, it remains substantially intact, with the design, plan and characteristics of the class of place still evident at the Place.

Discussion and conclusion

- 059.** The Committee accepts the Executive Director's assessment that the Place retains principle characteristics of the class of postwar domestic architecture, evident in the physical fabric of the Place.
- 060.** The Committee also agrees with the Executive Director, that the Place is a fine, representative example of the class of place, allowing the class to be easily understood and appreciated.
- 061.** The Committee notes the definition of 'intactness' as set out in the Guidelines and disagrees with the submission of the Owner that the alterations and renovations undertaken at the Place have diminished the intactness and cultural

heritage significance of the Place to the extent that it does not warrant inclusion in the Register.

- 062.** The Committee is of the view that the changes made to the Place throughout its use as a family home do not hinder the original form and design of the Place. The Committee notes that the Place retains a high proportion of its significant fabric and that the alterations undertaken throughout have been sensitively and thoughtfully completed, in keeping with the original design and intent. The Committee also notes that the addition and removal of internal non-load bearing walls undertaken within the Place in fact highlight the ingenuity and success of the original design.
- 063.** Furthermore, the Committee considers that the innovative use of materials and space is still clearly evident at the Place. The Committee finds that the cultural heritage significance of the Place is directly linked to its adaptability and intended use as a family home, to the extent that the structure and form allows for a certain amount of flexibility in maintaining the fabric of the Place.
- 064.** The Committee also disagrees with the submission of the Owner that the Place, built of inexpensive materials, was not built to last longer than 25 years and should therefore not be included in the Register. The Committee considers that the current condition of a place should not preclude its inclusion in the Register, noting that the Committee's remit is to consider the cultural heritage significance of the Place, not its intended or predicted lifespan.
- 065.** The Committee finds that Criterion D is satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION E – IMPORTANCE IN EXHIBITING PARTICULAR AESTHETIC CHARACTERISTICS

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 066.** In assessing the Place under step 1 of Criterion E, the Executive Director found that the Place exhibits particular aesthetic characteristics in the form of the curved roofs of the two offset modules, and the internal exposed bowstring trusses.
- 067.** However, in assessing the Place under step 2 of Criterion E for State-level cultural heritage significance, the Executive Director found that while the aesthetic characteristics of the Place are appreciated by particular interest groups, there has been no critical recognition of the Place within relevant art, design, architectural or related discipline as an outstanding example within Victoria.
- 068.** The Executive Director recommended that Criterion E is not likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 069.** The Owner agreed with the assessment of the Executive Director and did not make further detailed submissions in relation to Criterion E.

Discussion and conclusion

- 070.** The Committee agrees with the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under step 1 of Criterion E, noting that the Place has particular aesthetic characteristics through the form of the curved roofs of the two offset modules and the exposed bowstring trusses.
- 071.** The Committee also agrees that there has been no critical recognition of the Place within relevant art, design, architectural or related discipline as an

outstanding example within Victoria, or wide public acknowledgement of exceptional merit in Victoria in any medium.

072. The Committee finds that Criterion E is not satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION F – IMPORTANCE IN DEMONSTRATING A HIGH DEGREE OF CREATIVE OR TECHNICAL ACHIEVEMENT AT A PARTICULAR PERIOD

Summary of submissions and evidence

073. The Executive Director, in assessing the Place under step 1 of Criterion F, found that the design and construction of the bowstring roof trusses demonstrate a creative and technical achievement for the time in which they were constructed, being designed to be constructed from readily available materials.

074. In assessing the Place under step 2 of Criterion F however, the Executive Director found that the nature of the design achievement of the bowstring roof trusses was not beyond the ordinary for the time in which they were constructed, with other architects producing equally innovative design solutions throughout the 1950s.

075. The Executive Director recommended that Criterion F is not likely to be satisfied at the State level.

076. The Owner submitted that they agreed with the Executive Director's assessment and did not make detailed submissions in relation to Criterion F.

Discussion and conclusion

077. The Committee agrees with the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under Criterion F, noting that while the use of the bowstring roof trusses demonstrates a creative achievement, the achievement has not gained critical acclaim, wide acknowledgement or recognition in publications or other media.

078. The Committee finds that Criterion F is not satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION G – STRONG OR SPECIAL ASSOCIATION WITH A PARTICULAR COMMUNITY OR CULTURAL GROUP FOR SOCIAL, CULTURAL OR SPIRITUAL REASONS. THIS INCLUDES THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A PLACE TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AS PART OF THEIR CONTINUING AND DEVELOPING CULTURAL TRADITIONS

Summary of submissions and evidence

079. The Executive Director found, in assessing the Place under Criterion G, that while the Place is acknowledged by groups with a shared interest in 1950s architecture, there is no direct association between any interest groups and the Place in particular.

080. Although the submissions of the Owner referred to the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under Criterion G, it is noted that the excerpt provided is in fact taken directly from the Executive Director's assessment of Criterion H. The Owner did not make detailed submissions in relation to Criterion G.

Discussion and conclusion

- 081.** The Committee agrees with the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under Criterion G, in that the Place does not have a direct association with a particular community or cultural group.
- 082.** The Committee finds that Criterion G is not satisfied at the State level.

CRITERION H – SPECIAL ASSOCIATION WITH THE LIFE OR WORKS OF A PERSON, OR A GROUP OF PERSONS, OF IMPORTANCE IN VICTORIA'S HISTORY

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 083.** In assessing the Place under Criterion H, the Executive Director noted that the physical fabric of the Place demonstrates a direct association with the achievements of architect Peter McIntyre and engineer Bill Irwin.
- 084.** In assessing the Place under step 2 of Criterion H, the Executive Director however found that other places in Victoria co-designed by McIntyre and Irwin have gained greater iconic status than the Place, to the extent that the Place does not allow the clear association with McIntyre or Irwin to be readily appreciated better than most other places they designed in Victoria.
- 085.** The Executive Director Recommended that Criterion H is not likely to be satisfied at the State level.
- 086.** The Owner agreed with the Executive Director's assessment of the Place under Criterion H (incorrectly cited as Criterion G, see paragraph 080 above). The Owner further submitted that the Place does not provide a noteworthy understanding of the work of McIntyre and Irwin and as such, does not warrant inclusion in the Register or the iconic status of their other architectural designs.

Discussion and conclusion

- 087.** The Committee accepts that while the Place demonstrates a direct association with the achievements of McIntyre and Irwin, this association is not readily appreciated better than most other places they co-designed in Victoria.
- 088.** The Committee finds that Criterion H is not satisfied at the State level.

EXTENT OF REGISTRATION

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 089.** The Executive Director recommended that the extent of registration for the Place include the cadastral block of 14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris, being all of Lot 108 on Lodged Plan 30159. The Recommendation for the Place includes the residential building (exteriors and interiors), the western courtyard, and the pergolas to the front and west. The Executive Director also recommended that the registration include all fixtures and fittings attached to the building at the time of registration.
- 090.** In objecting to the inclusion of the Place in the Register, the Owner did not make submissions in relation to the recommended extent of registration.

Discussion and conclusion

- 091.** The Committee agrees with the extent of registration recommended by the Executive Director, encompassing all of Lot 108 on Lodged Plan 30159, and appends the registered extent of registration to this document as **Attachment 2**.

PERMIT EXEMPTIONS

Summary of submissions and evidence

- 092.** In recommending the Place for inclusion in the Register, pursuant to section 38 of the Act, the Executive Director recommended a number of categories of works or activities which may be carried out in relation to the Place without the need for a Permit ('permit exemptions').
- 093.** The permit exemptions recommended by the Executive Director included five 'general' exemptions, and specific exemptions for works to the interior and exterior of the residence, landscaping activities, and the demolition of buildings of no heritage significance, namely the garage and shed at the rear of the property.
- 094.** Although the Owner objected to the inclusion of the Place in the Register, in submissions to the Heritage Council, he noted the current, poor condition of the Place and argued that substantial rectification works are required which would be constrained by the conditions imposed on the Owner should the Place be included in the Register.
- 095.** In response to the submission of the Owner, the Executive Director submitted that an important factor of the cultural heritage significance of the Place is the flexibility and adaptability of the original design intent of the Place, meaning that any required repairs to and maintenance of the Place could easily be achieved through the permitting process pursuant to Part 5 of the Act.

Discussion and conclusion

- 096.** The Committee acknowledges the concerns of the Owner in relation to the condition and maintenance of the Place, and agrees with the Executive Director that the innovation of the original design and structure of the Place means that the Place is inherently flexible and adaptable, and its inclusion in the Register should not be seen to restrict ongoing maintenance or any rectification works required.
- 097.** The Committee agrees with the permit exemptions proposed by the Executive Director pursuant to section 38 of the Act, and notes that the proposed permit exemptions complement the cultural heritage significance of the form and structure of the Place, highlighting the original design intent of the innovative use of cost-effective, readily available materials.
- 098.** The Committee determines, pursuant to section 49(3) of the Act, to include the recommended categories of works or activities which may be carried out in relation to the Place for which a Permit under the Act is not required, as detailed in **Attachment 3**.

CONCLUSION

- 099.** After considering the Executive Director's Recommendation, all submissions received, the site inspection and conducting a hearing into the matter, the Heritage Council has determined, pursuant to section 49(1)(a) of the *Heritage Act*

2017, that the Grant House located at 14 Pasadena Avenue, Beaumaris is of State-level cultural heritage significance and is to be included in the Victorian Heritage Register.

ATTACHMENT 1

HERITAGE COUNCIL CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF PLACES OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

CRITERION A	Importance to the course, or pattern, of Victoria's cultural history
CRITERION B	Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Victoria's cultural history.
CRITERION C	Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Victoria's cultural history.
CRITERION D	Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural places or environments.
CRITERION E	Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.
CRITERION F	Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.
CRITERION G	Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions.
CRITERION H	Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Victoria's history.

These were adopted by the Heritage Council at its meeting on 7 August 2008, and replace the previous criteria adopted by the Heritage Council on 6 March 1997.

ATTACHMENT 2

EXTENT OF REGISTRATION

All of the place shown hatched on Diagram 2392 encompassing all of Lot 108 on Lodged Plan 30159.



The extent of registration of the Grant House in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) affects the whole place shown on Diagram 2392 including the residential building (exteriors and interiors), the western courtyard and the pergolas to the front and west. The registration also includes all fixtures and fittings attached to the building at the time of registration.

ATTACHMENT 3

PERMIT EXEMPTIONS (PURSUANT TO SECTION 49(3) OF THE HERITAGE ACT 2017)

General Exemptions

General Condition 1

All exempted alterations are to be planned and carried out in a manner which prevents damage to the fabric of the registered place or object.

General Condition 2

Should it become apparent during further inspection or the carrying out of works that original or previously hidden or inaccessible details of the place or object are revealed which relate to the significance of the place or object, then the exemption covering such works shall cease and Heritage Victoria shall be notified as soon as possible.

General Condition 3

All works should ideally be informed by Conservation Management Plans prepared for the place. The Executive Director is not bound by any Conservation Management Plan, and permits still must be obtained for works suggested in any Conservation Management Plan.

General Condition 4

Nothing in this determination prevents the Heritage Council from amending or rescinding all or any of the permit exemptions.

General Condition 5

Nothing in this determination exempts owners or their agents from the responsibility to seek relevant planning or building permits from the relevant responsible authority, where applicable.

Specific Exemptions

Residence

General

- Repairs and maintenance which replace like with like and do not involve substantial alterations or modifications.
- Emergency building stabilisation (including propping) necessary to secure safety where a site feature has been irreparably damaged or destabilised and represents a safety risk.

Exteriors

- Removal of extraneous items such as air conditioners, pipe work, wiring, antennae and aerials.
- Painting of previously painted surfaces provided that preparation or painting does not remove all evidence of the original paint.

Interiors

- Painting of previously painted walls and ceilings provided that preparation or painting does not remove evidence of all original paint schemes (no stained timberwork is to be painted).
- Installation, removal or replacement of non-original floor coverings.

- Installation, removal or replacement of non-original curtains, blinds and other window furnishings.
- Installation, removal or replacement of devices for hanging artworks and the like.
- Maintenance, replacement or removal of plumbing and piping to the kitchen, bathroom and laundry provided that all new elements are fully concealed.
- Installation, removal or replacement of electrical wiring provided that all new wiring is fully concealed and any original light switches or power outlets are retained in-situ.

Landscape elements

All garden works including:

- The process of gardening, including mowing, disease and weed control, maintenance to care for existing plants and planting of new plants.
- Subsurface works involving the installation, removal or replacement of watering and drainage systems or services.
- Works associated with the management of possums and vermin.
- Removal or lopping of trees.
- Maintenance and repair of existing paving and other hard landscaping elements, like for like, provided works do not involve substantial alterations or modifications.
- Maintenance and repair of existing fences and gates.

Demolition

Demolition of buildings of no cultural heritage significance:

- Garage at rear of property.
- Shed at rear of property.