

ADDRESS	SUBMISSION
67 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 – Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>We, the owners of 67 Kenny St in Town of Bassendean wish to remove our property from the proposed Municipal Heritage Inventory. We believe our home does not reflect a "Significant Property" which is the designated description of such properties in the council’s proposal documents.</p> <p>Our opinion is based on the many and varied changes that my property has undergone over the years to both the internal and external structure of my home as well as its streetscape. These include facades, roof design and layout as well as windows and doors. The lack of any original form of these render our homes heritage value null.</p> <p>Modifications include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Removal of original timber windows on entire building replaced with aluminium sash windows,2) Removal of front door and replacement with more modern door and features3) Addition of modern security door4) Extension to front and sides of property, both obvious and visible from the street including modern Windows and timber screening5) Removal of traditional roof tiles and brick chimney and replaced with corrugated zincalume, new zincalume gutters and down pipes6) Introduction of new modern colourbond fences around entire property7) Introduction of new front gates visible from street,8) Replacement of original front fence with a rendered brick wall some time post 1980's9) Replacement of entirety of original exterior timber cladding boards with modern compressed cement sheeting.10) The introduction of a modern concrete driveway11) The replacement of original timber window in front facade, replaced with timber French doors.12) Removal of original rotted turned timber posts on the verandah to more modern square posts13) Addition of modern balustrade and gate around entire front verandah,14) Solar panels (visible from street) <p>Please note that in addition to the personal removal of our property in the current MHI, we wish to have our property and the entire precinct listing of Place no. 105 Kenny Street precinct removed also. On consultation with our neighbours and members of the MHIRC and council, we believe the following points are relevant and justify our removal:</p> <p>- Kenny Street Precinct has been singled out for heritage protection yet we have no more and in some cases even less examples of heritage listed homes in similar streets around us.</p> <p>- Of the 46 residences that are proposed in the precinct, only 11 (or 24%) are desired to be a category 3 level listing individually. Along with a consistent splattering of 50s - 90s style homes and many modern renovated homes that lack authenticity like our own, most if not all homes proposed as heritage have very little if any original detail.</p> <p>- Lot 105 Precinct also contains 1 x vacant lot and some less then desirable homes that will ultimately need to be removed in full.</p> <p>- Similar if not more "significant" streets to our own have not been designated this management category. Our precinct contains no Category 2 or Category 1 listed buildings and the streetscape has changed more than other similar streets.</p> <p>- As previously stated our street contains just 24% category 3 homes. In comparison, we quote the following: Wilson street contains a 32% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes</p> <p>Precincts in James Street contains 32% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes Whitfield Street contains 45% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes Briggs Street contains 30% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes</p> <p>Based on the above, we request that the Lot 105 Kenny Street Precinct be rejected for recommendation as a category 2 heritage listing immediately.</p> <p>Furthermore we wish state that we, along with many of the residents that attended our own convened concerned residents meeting on Wednesday 15th of March, would be interested in ongoing consultation about how a more workable and fair proposal that genuinely protects the heritage of the area could be created and delivered in the future if council is interested in pursuing.</p>
64 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>We refer to your letters dated 13th February 2017, concerning the Town of Bassendean Municipal Inventory Review and the identification of our house, 64 Kenny Street, as a proposed management category of 3, and Nos. 38-85 Kenny Street being given a Heritage Precinct management category of 2.</p> <p>We wish to make submissions about both of these proposals, but - in particular - the proposal to list this part of Kenny Street as a Heritage Precinct.</p> <p>It is important to state that we bought houses in Kenny Street because we love old, character houses and the fact that there are many similar houses in Bassendean. Prior to purchasing No 64, we lived in No 66 Kenny Street, which was already renovated when we purchased it. We bought No 64 in 2013 when the old lady who owned it moved into a nursing home.</p> <p>We bought it because we didn’t want someone to demolish her old, but asbestos-riddled and dilapidated house and put up a two-storey, Tuscan (or similar) style house that would, in our view, be totally out-of-keeping with our lovely, little house a No 66. We then undertook extensive renovations and extensions to No 64 –all the while trying to preserve the original character of the house with its pressed tin ceilings, etc., and we subsequently moved into it .</p> <p>Both of your letters refer to the objectives of the State Planning Policies being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To conserve places and areas of historic or heritage significance.• To ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places and areas.• To ensure that heritage significance at both the State and local levels is given due weight in planning-decision making.• To provide improved certainty to landowners and the community about the planning processes for heritage identification, conservation and protection. <p>In this part of Kenny Street, a significant number of heritage homes have already been lost and been replaced by a couple of brick boxes, a two-storey ‘Federation’-style house, and an assortment of other houses of various architectural styles which do not appear to have any historic or heritage significance.</p> <p>Nonetheless, as stated previously, we are strongly in favour of preserving those houses of heritage significance that are left in Kenny Street and other parts of Bassendean, but certain things need to happen before declaring any areas as Heritage Precincts.</p>

	<p>Your management category of 2 for the Kenny Street Precinct states that the ‘Desired Outcome’ is ‘Conservation of the place is highly desirable. Any alterations or extensions should reinforce the significance of the place.’ The necessary statutory protections governing the style of houses to be built within a Heritage Precinct; extensions/alterations to existing houses; and ensuring that building materials sympathetic to the heritage nature of the area are used, need to be put in place before listing any property on the Municipal Heritage Inventory and certainly before listing them within the Town’s Heritage List under Local Planning Scheme No 10 to protect owners of heritage listed houses and owners of houses in a Heritage Precinct. (Please refer to the Officer’s Response on p 78 of the Ordinary Council Agenda for the meeting Of 28/03/17, which appears to us to be the wrong way round). For us as owners of houses in a Heritage Precinct to be subject to all sorts of restrictions whilst owners of unlisted houses aren’t, does not appear to be fair. People would be unlikely to buy a house in this part of Kenny Street with a Heritage Precinct listing when they can buy a similar house in Kathleen, Parker, Wilson (or many other streets) that doesn’t have any such restrictions.</p> <p>On this point, it seems to have been an arbitrary decision to select this part of Kenny Street as a Heritage Precinct while other comparable neighbourhoods were not similarly designated for heritage classification. Of the 46 houses in our section of Kenny Street, only 11 have been assigned a proposed management category of 3. (34 Houses have apparently no heritage value at all.) Nearby Wilson Street (which has not been given Heritage Precinct status) has 13 Category 3 properties, and the story is the same in Kathleen and Parker Streets and others. This leads us to question your statement in your February letters that the MHI ‘identifies heritage assets in a systematic fashion’. In the agenda for the Council Meeting of 28/03/17, p 78, the responding Officer states ‘It is important to note that Wilson, Parker and Kathleen Streets were also earmarked for identification as a precinct under the next MHI Review. These were identified too late in the process of the current review and have therefore not been included’. This whole process has been rushed and poorly thought through. There is no mention of when the next MHI Review is to be held. Either defer listing Kenny Street as a Heritage Precinct until the next MHI Review, or include the other streets identified as precincts in this Review.</p> <p>In the Ordinary Council Agenda of 28/03/17, p76, the Officer’s comment states that ‘the MHI was last updated in 2006 where owners were given the option to opt in/opt out from inclusion within the MHI’. We would point out that many of the current owners of listed houses in Kenny Street were not here at that time and weren’t told of the existence of the 2006 MHI either at the time of purchasing our houses ,or when submitting renovation plans to Council. On the same page of the Agenda, the Officer also states ‘Inclusion/exclusion within a MHI should be based solely on the significance to the Bassendean community and not strong opposition to any listings’. We are part of the Bassendean community and that statement that our opposition to any listing is not going to make a difference is very concerning and makes a mockery of the whole process of inviting submissions.</p> <p>Eleven owners of residential properties in Kenny Street between Palmerston Street to Shackleton/Bridson Streets, received correspondence outlining that their properties had “been assigned a proposed management category of 3...” in the Town of Bassendean Municipal Heritage Inventory (or alternatively: Town of Bassendean Municipal Inventory Review... as both descriptions are used interchangeably, and incorrectly, in the correspondence).</p> <p>These eleven, along with all other property owners in Kenny Street from numbers 38 to 85, also received another piece of correspondence, which stated that “your property falls within a heritage precinct.”</p> <p>Both items of correspondence were dated 13th February 2017.</p> <p>Recipients of these letters attended a meeting on 15 March 2017 which was chaired by Councillor Bridges. This meeting was not called by any council staff or elected members: it was organised by concerned residents</p> <p>Meeting summary</p> <p>Attendees at the meeting held 15 March 2017 at Bassendean Council Offices, unanimously criticised the Bassendean Municipal Heritage Inventory process for its total lack of consultation with Kenny Street stakeholders and its failure to provide clear criteria for the selection and classification of “places”.</p> <p>Residents are concerned that the effect of Kenny Street being classified as a “Category 2” precinct will be that any dwelling in the precinct may also be classified as a Category 2 heritage place. There are concerns that such a classification could result in a significant loss of property values, increased levels of development restrictions and a diminished opportunity to realise the full development potential of property.</p> <p>Meeting participants also expressed concern at the apparent arbitrary nature of selecting Kenny Street as a heritage precinct, while other comparable neighbourhoods were not similarly designated for heritage classification. An example of the lack of consistency in the assignment of the Category levels is highlighted for us, the residents of Kenny Street (#38 to #85) who have been told that their “property falls within a heritage precinct”. Of the 46 houses in this section, only 11 have “been assigned a proposed management category of 3...” (one other house in the group was ‘assigned’ as a Category 4), while the adjacent Wilson Street which has NOT been assigned ‘precinct’ designation, has 13 Category 3 properties. It was unclear to the meeting participants how the consultants advising on the proposed Kenny Street precinct arrived at their recommended precinct classification: 34 houses in this proposed ‘precinct’ (which contains a total of 46) are not considered to have any Heritage value at all...and that only 11 are assigned a Category 3... that there are no Category 2 or Category 1 properties... and the highest Category is defined as having only “some” heritage significance.</p> <p>While the meeting participants all expressed a strong interest in the protection of the assets of our town, none were convinced that the classification of Kenny Street as an isolated Category 2 heritage precinct would achieve the objectives of conserving cultural values and local amenity in the Town of Bassendean. I do not believe that a single ribbon “precinct” which allows up to, and including, R60 for properties backing onto the houses in Kenny Street, will provide the desired protection. There already appears to be no protection of the ‘street scape’, as one house has recently been demolished in an apparent anticipation of the precinct decision.</p> <p>Meeting outcomes / action items:</p> <p>The meeting participants do not accept that there is a sound basis for classifying the section of Kenny Street (between Palmerton and Shackleton/Bridson Streets) as a Category 2 heritage precinct. The meeting participants call on Council to withdraw its proposal to assign the classification of “heritage precinct” to this part of Kenny Street.</p>
52 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>This letter contains the views of the residents of 52 Kenny Street, Bassendean in relation to the plan inclusion of our property on the Heritage Listing and the assignment of Category 2 level of significance in the said property. First of all, I would like you to know that we bought this house in Kenny Street because we loved it and if we ever win Lotto, we will still build exactly the same house on that block.</p> <p>Why did an individual or a small group of people picked Nos. 38-85Kenny Street for their heritage listing when almost every street in Bassendean have much older houses? Why only a fraction of Kenny was chosen instead of the whole street from Guildford Road? What's the point of conserving only a part of Kenny Street when in future, the rest of Kenny Street will be full of apartment buildings due to density purposes for suburbs closest to the CBD.</p> <p>Number 38 is not heritage looking to us. Because the Heritage Listing won't include the start of Kenny Street from Guildford Road where the real actions in the community happens such as the Old Perth Road business centre, the train, the RSL Club, it doesn't make sense to impose the Heritage classification to a few houses. I'll be happy for the assignment of a Category 3 or 4 which won't be as restrictive and will give owners room to move with their decisions. It's not that somebody famous lived in that specific part of Kenny Street like Rolf Harris. I cannot find any logic on this decision.</p> <p>I can understand the Heritage Listing in Guildford as there's a lot of historic houses there like previous homes of WW1 soldiers and nurses, the Rose & Crown of 1841, Padbury of 1869, churches, etc. However, our home is circa 1954 and nowhere as significant as those in Guildford.</p> <p>Incentives: The incentives mentioned are: Heritage Award program; Waiving of application fee; Variation to scheme and R-code provisions; Density bonuses; Heritage assistance fund. As far as we're concern, these are nice-sounding incentives which won't have any financial impact on owners. Heritage award program - wow, out of thousands of properties, you'll be lucky to get a piece of paper to show you've won. Heritage assistance fund - you have to apply for it in competition with other heritage listed properties who are also in need of funds. There is nothing concrete written about heritage assistance in terms of monetary support or benefits.</p> <p>I would like to see a more simplified and detailed description on the MHI draft about: (a) installation of solar panels on roofs; (b) installation of gates; (c) building of granny flat in the backyard; (d) construction of a second level/storey; (e) building of blocks of units/apartments in the block. You have to seriously consider the opinions/suggestions of owners. The owners must be consulted at every step or level of discussions.</p>

	<p>Our first submission/letter addressed to Timothy Roberts was handed to Councillor Paul Bridges to be given to Mr Roberts during our meeting on 15 March 2017. After our meeting with Councillor P Bridges, we have a new assessment and decision about the Heritage plan of the Council.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Bridges has given us a little bit more explanation and information about the Council’s plan. Therefore, this, our second email reflects the views we formed after that meeting. This is our <u>final submission</u> regarding the Heritage Listing plan for our property at 52 Kenny and for assigning Precinct 2 to our street.</p> <p>We, at 52 Kenny Street, Bassendean, <u>have rejected</u> the Council’s plan to assign our property, together with properties in #38 - #85 Kenny Street, under Precinct 2 and under Management category Level 2 in the Heritage Listing. We do not want our property at #52 Kenny Street, Bassendean to be included in any heritage listing or planning in Bassendean. We wish to remove our property at 52 Kenny Street, Bassendean from the proposed Municipal Heritage Inventory.</p> <p>Our reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) we believe that it will affect severely the future value of the property; (b) we cannot rely on Council to protect our rights as owners of 52 Kenny Street; (c) we feel that the Council does not have a clear and detailed plan on how to proceed with heritage issue and Kenny Street is made as a “guinea pig” on their study; (d) uncertainties - that the plans of Council won’t be derailed by lack of funds; (e) unfairness – the cultural heritage significance (i.e. aesthetic, historic, scientific or social) is lost or defeated if a vacant block next to a heritage listed house, is able to build without any restriction; (f) red tape - asking permission on every repair or addition to the property will be very stressful and limiting; (g) funds – direct our rate money in creating legislations that will limit heights of buildings in residential streets. This action will result in the preservation of the heritage atmosphere in the suburb. (h) we agree to all the reasons given by other members under their own submissions, and we agree to the Section 26- Notice of Motion for Consideration submitted by Councillor Paul Bridges. <p><u>Recommendation:</u> To preserve the atmosphere of the town of Bassendean, we would like to see Council concentrate actively on producing a legislation about the heights of buildings in residential streets. Stop paying expensive consultants for a project that will not be completed. If Council runs out of funds for this plan/project, then, you will just leave many ratepayers/ property owners angry for messing up their lives and causing so much stress that will affect their health.</p>
82 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	We, have decided to opt out of the Council’s plan to assign our property under category 3 in the Heritage Listing. We do not want our property at #82 Kenny Street, Bassendean to be included in any heritage listing or planning in Bassendean.
66 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>The purpose of this letter is to advise the Town of Bassendean that as owners of 66 Kenny Street, we wish to have our property and the entire precinct listing of Place no. 105 Kenny Street precinct removed from the draft Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) listing for the Town of Bassendean. On consultation with our neighbours and members of the MHIRC and Council, our decision to object to the proposed inclusion of the Kenny Street Precinct in the draft MHI is based on the following relevant points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It appears that the criteria for determining and designating a heritage precinct has not been applied consistently to the whole of Bassendean. The Kenny Street Precinct has been singled out for heritage protection yet we have no more and, in some cases, fewer examples of heritage listed homes compared to those streets around us which also contain ‘heritage’ homes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Of the 46 individual residences that are proposed in the Kenny Street Precinct, only 11 residences (24%) are proposed as a Category 3 level individual listing. There is also a consistent splattering of 50s - 90s style homes and most if not all homes listed as heritage have very little, if any, original detail remaining. No homes are proposed as Category 2 or Category 1 listed ‘place’. b. The following streets have not been proposed as a precinct, even though their proportion of category three homes is higher than Kenny Street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Wilson Street contains a 32% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes o James Street contains 32% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes o Whitfield Street contains 45% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes o Briggs Street contains 30% mix of heritage vs. non heritage homes c. Councillors and members of the MHIRC have also verbally expressed their surprise at the size of the Kenny Street Precinct. This implies that the criteria has not been appropriately applied. 2. We strongly believe that the designation of Kenny Street as the only residential Category 2 Heritage Precinct within the immediate surrounding area will have the impact of decreasing our property value. Being part of a Category 2 Heritage Precinct means that there will be restrictions placed on our property, which will be unappealing to future potential buyers. These buyers could easily look for a similar home in the surrounding streets, which are not subject to the same conditions. Alternatively, it is likely that they would request a discount to the true market value in order to take on the burden of these conditions. 3. Our 'Precinct' contains 1 x vacant lot and some double blocks which owners could subdivide in future .Although the area would be deemed a precinct, without strict design guidelines for new homes the owners of these vacant and double blocks could build properties that are not consistent with the overall streetscape. As such, owners of existing homes that fall under the precinct would be further disadvantaged. 4. Incentives offered are not meaningful nor are they sufficient to offset the burden of being designated as a Category 2 Heritage Precinct. For example, waiving of application fees is not a true incentive as these applications fees currently do not apply. <p>In summary, we believe that the proposal to include the Kenny Street Precinct on the MHI will not achieve the objectives of conserving cultural values and local amenity in the Town of Bassendean. Instead, it places unnecessary burden and disadvantage on the existing homeowners. As such, we strongly request that our property and the entire precinct listing of Place no. 105 Kenny Street precinct be removed from the draft Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) listing for the Town of Bassendean.</p>
59 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>We wish for the property we own at 59 Kenny Street Bassendean, not to be included on the proposed Municipal Heritage Inventory.</p> <p>We believe that our property has no significant historical value. Relating to the streetscape, this house appears in no way the same, as it would have been when originally built. We have tried to keep a look, which we believe is in the heritage style but this does not represent how the property may have looked when originally built. This property would have been extremely basic, it would not have had fencing, a veranda, a deck and the cladding would have been different also. So its appearance today would not in any way match that of its original construction. We also do not believe our property matches the points in the statement of significance in the draft MHI; we do not see any evidence to back this up.</p> <p>STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The streetscape has aesthetic value for the remaining intact examples of an early 20th century streetscape. • The precinct has historic value for its association with the development of Bassendean from the 1890s. • This precinct has social value as the house demonstrates the form and scale of housing for families of a range of incomes and types of occupations. <p>We completed an extension to our property and kept the front façade of the property as is, as this was important to us to retain the cottage look of our individual house, but the whole internal and rear of house was completely demolished and has been modernised. The internal walls & ceilings of pressed tin & jarrah floors were removed and replaced with plasterboard walls & blackbutt flooring. This was due to the very bad state that the original materials were in and previous owners had not maintained the materials in an appropriate manner to keep them in good condition. Relating to the streetscape, we have a limestone wall on the front of our property, which has no heritage value (installed by previous owners). The original double hung wooden windows have been replaced with aluminium framed double hung windows. We have had the power put underground so no cabling over the front of the property. We have two alfresco blind screens installed on our veranda to stop the harsh afternoon sun hitting our front of house, which has no insulation behind the weatherboard. The front timber weatherboard was installed by previous owners and the house was previously enclosed with a “sleepout veranda”, similar to 61 Kenny Street. Rear and sides of building we have installed Scyon cladding boards for its distinctive features and charm of weatherboard to keep with the style of the current weatherboard of the front facade without the maintenance needed for traditional timber.</p> <p>The cottage house appealed to us at the time of purchase & we have no intent of changing the front façade, apart from installing a new carport in the future when funds permit. We don’t wish for any restrictions in place (both heritage & very limited approval) when we submit future plans for approval to council (but any design will be as per planning approval and will coincide with front façade of our house). As you can see above, we have invested a lot of money into this property as we like the area of Bassendean, and we feel it is a good place to bring up our two young children, but we do have concerns on how our house was selected alongside the other houses that have been picked for this review. When looking at the photos submitted of our neighbouring houses, there is no consistency in the appearance of the houses. Looking at other suburbs who have heritage value, Mt Lawley, Inglewood etc. these houses are all in the same format, and all predominantly built around the same time, of the same material, and all look very similar. Looking at the houses from 38 – 85 Kenny Street, and it states on the physical description that they display similar designs & detailing but we disagree to this statement. In this list of houses as well, one has since been demolished. If council are invested in the heritage appeal of this area, there is a lot of development of new modern multi-storey apartments, original housing being demolished and blocks subdivided and all modern houses being built on them. None of the recent new developments hold any heritage features that are being stated in the proposed MHI. We have also visited the council office to obtain more information, as we would really like to be able to know the exact impacts both in restrictions & financial that this proposed MHI would have on our house, and haven’t been able to get clear answers. Due to the unknown and no clear definition of impacts to our property, plus that we believe our house does not hold any heritage significance due to works that has been carried out on it, we are requesting for it to please be reviewed and our house to withdrawn from the proposed MHI.</p>
41 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>The correspondence asking for response of 13th February, 2017, is a cause of confusion and concern. The confusion is due to the limited and subjective nature of the information supplied, making it far from evident what the legal result of agreement was, concerning due to the very limited time given to respond to something of any legal significance, let alone a decision affecting a significant part of my financial future.</p> <p>By supplying the letter to people whose opinions I respect I found I wasn’t alone in confusion or feeling a need for further information, and following contact and consultation with the community affected, that it was not just myself that was concerned by potential legal implications that could result from an un- or misinformed agreement, or it’s summary application if no response was made in the limited time.</p> <p>Further investigation revealed the extremely limited scale of the area considered in the proposal. I have not worked out mathematically what proportion area of Bassendean as a whole the precinct represents, or percentage of population, but looking at the town map it appears not to be an area of any statistical significance in any parameter considered for creating the guidelines of a legally binding community initiative.</p> <p>At an informal meeting of community representation and some council members (15/03/2017) it became apparent that an agreement for further detailed accurate information, then further time following provision of information to make considered, informed decision, was not going to be possible within a time frame that fell within the response due date, following which Council appeared to be able to arbitrarily apply the precinct designation and powers suggested by your correspondence. The Precinct premise is a good idea coming from reasonable thinking, however this initiative appears to have been rushed into existence, and the time and scale are inadequate for it to be critically considered. I am also concerned that any decision made at this time may be used as a legal precedent to be applied to the suburb as a whole later. If it had been 75% of the whole suburb considered and asked for input it would have had that much more relevance. Lastly, if no response was received by the due date that it be considered as opting out, not mandatory acquiescence, with no evident recourse for decision change beyond the due date.</p> <p>My response to your correspondence dated 13/02/2017 is to wholly opt out of the initiative as it exists at present, due to lack of information, time, and the physically and statistically small area being considered. I would like my property to remain as it is, with the same freedoms and rights that apply to the whole of Bassendean and its larger community.</p>
68 Kenny Street 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>Just wishing to express my desire not to have 68 Kenny Street included as part of the heritage precinct initiative. My belief is that my home holds no Heritage value..</p>
76 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>We refer to your letter dated 13 February 2017, concerning the listing of our property at 76 Kenny Street, Bassendean "within a heritage precinct" in the Town of Bassendean Municipal Heritage Inventory. The third paragraph the letter invites owners of places listed within the draft Municipal Heritage Inventory to comment on the property listing.</p> <p>At the Ordinary Council meeting of 23 May 2017, a Notice of Motion (Agenda item No. 11.8) titled "Bassendean Municipal Heritage Inventory" was tabled.</p> <p>The Officers Comment appearing in the Agenda in relation to the motion states: "The consultants assessed the nomination [Kenny Street Precinct 2] and assigned the precinct a management category of three. When the draft version was presented to the MHI Review Committee for comment and recommendation, it was considered that all precincts should be assigned a management category of two. It was on this basis that the draft version was modified prior to public advertising of the document. Upon receipt of submissions from property owners in line with the consultant's original recommended management category for the precinct, it will be the officer's recommendation that the Kenny Street precinct be changed from a Category two to a Category three." [emphasis added]</p> <p>The reason for this email is to take up the Town's invitation and to state categorically that we do not wish to have the Place No.105: Kenny Street Precinct - 2, listed in any way in any of the prescribed lists mentioned in your correspondence: "Town of Bassendean Municipal Inventory Review"; the "Municipal Heritage Inventory" or the "Heritage List under Local Planning Scheme No.10". Your letter says that Place No.105: Kenny Street Precinct 2 has been placed on a draft Municipal Heritage Inventory. We wish to state plainly that we do not support the proposed listing. However, given this matter has an impact on all of the property owners in Kenny Street between Palmerston Street and Shackleton/Bridson Streets, should the overwhelming position be in favour of the allocation of some form of Municipal Heritage Inventory Category, we would support the Consultant's original recommendation and the Officer's recommendation as outlined in the General Meeting Agenda of the Ordinary Council Meeting 23 May 2017: that of a Category three management category.</p>
61 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>This letter is provided in response to an initial consultation letter dated 13 February 2017 arising out of the Town of Bassendean (TOB) Municipal Inventory Review (MIR) which seeks to identify and propose properties or places for inclusion in the Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI).</p> <p>I require that my property at 61 Kenny Street, Bassendean be excluded from the proposed MHI. The MHI Report 2016 does not individually identify my property in Section 5 Summary Tables, however individual feedback on this property is provided as it is visually identified in Place Number 105 for Kenny Street Precinct 2.</p> <p>My assessment of 61 Kenny Street, Bassendean using the MIR criteria is as follows:</p>

	<p>Aesthetic</p> <p>The property does not exhibit any aesthetic characteristics that are of significance for cultural heritage or value.</p> <p>The property has undergone significant and extensive renovation over a number of decades, that has affected the external and internal structure of the house, the overall appearance of the house (façade and roof design), and the relationship of house to the street (i.e. streetscape).</p> <p>None of the materials on the part of the house which the TOB would look to preserve (i.e. streetscape) are original.</p> <p>The lack of any remaining original form means this house has no cultural heritage significance or value.</p> <p>Historic</p> <p>The property does not have any significant relevance to the story of the local region’s (i.e. TOB) history or development.</p> <p>The property does not have any relevant significance to the story of Western Australia’s history and development.</p> <p>Furthermore, both the consultation documentation and MHI fail to identify the property’s significance to the local region.</p> <p>Research</p> <p>Both the consultation documentation and the MHI Report 2016 fail to identify any relevant significance that contributes to an understanding of the natural or cultural history of the local region.</p> <p>The property does not demonstrate any worthwhile degree of technical innovation or achievement.</p> <p>Social</p> <p>Both the consultation documentation and the MHI Report 2016 fail to identify any relevant significance through association with a community or cultural group in the local region for social, cultural, educational or spiritual reasons.</p> <p>Rarity</p> <p>The property does not demonstrate rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of the cultural heritage of the local region.</p> <p>Representativeness</p> <p>The consultation documentation and the MHI Report 2016 both fail to demonstrate any significance relevant to the characteristics of a class of cultural places or environments in the local region.</p> <p>In fact, no reasonable assessment could draw the conclusion that this property is representative of anything the consultation documentation and the MHI Report 2016 may be seeking to identify.</p> <p>Condition Poor</p> <p>Integrity Medium</p> <p>Authenticity Low</p> <p>Further to my requirement that my property be excluded from the MHI, I strongly suggest that Place Number 105 for Kenny Street Precinct 2 (38 to 85 Kenny Street, Bassendean) be removed from the MHI.</p> <p>The community consultation documents identify Kenny Street Precinct 2 as being of cultural heritage significance based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aesthetic value: for the remaining intact examples of early 20th century streetscape;• Historic value: based on the Precinct’s association with the development of Bassendean from the 1890s; and• Social value: as the houses demonstrate the form and scale of housing for families of a range of incomes and types of occupations. <p>I believe that Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not reflect a ‘considerable significance (2)’ level of significance classification as proposed within the community consultation documents.</p> <p>My assessment of Kenny Street Precinct 2 using the MIR criteria is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aesthetic value: for the remaining intact examples of early 20th century streetscape;• Historic value: based on the Precinct’s association with the development of Bassendean from the 1890s; and• Social value: as the houses demonstrate the form and scale of housing for families of a range of incomes and types of occupations. <p>I believe that Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not reflect a ‘considerable significance (2)’ level of significance classification as proposed within the community consultation documents.</p> <p>My assessment of Kenny Street Precinct 2 using the MIR criteria is as follows:</p> <p>Aesthetic</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not exhibit particular aesthetic characteristics that are of significance for cultural heritage or value.</p> <p>The Precinct is not a unique example of quaint and adorable looking houses from the early 20th century.</p> <p>There are numerous other houses in surrounding streets that also look quaint and adorable, for example Whitfield, Wilson and James Streets to name just three.</p> <p>Houses within the Precinct have undergone significant and extensive renovation over a number of decades.</p> <p>Most houses have been modified substantially and significantly from their original form.</p> <p>There are no houses that have been authentically restored, and their value in terms of cultural heritage significance is therefore highly questionable.</p> <p>Historic</p> <p>There are a number of other streets with ‘quaint and adorable’ examples of housing established early in TOB’s history.</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not have any unique relevant significance to the story of the local region’s (i.e. TOB) history or development</p>
--	--

	<p>These other similar streets have not been designated the same level of significance classification for cultural heritage significance as the Kenny Street Precinct 2, which has been designated as of ‘considerable significance’ (2). I believe in the eyes of the ordinary person which you represent, your proposal, to use the popular vernacular, would fail the ‘Pub Test’.</p> <p>The Precinct does not have any unique relevant significance to the story of Western Australia’s history and development.</p> <p>The Precinct’s significance relative to any other place in the local region (for example, properties around Old Perth Road) is not obvious in the consultation documentation or MHI Report 2016.</p> <p>Research</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not have any unique relevant significance that contributes to an understanding of the natural or cultural history of the local region.</p> <p>Furthermore, the consultation documentation and the MHI Report 2016 both fail to demonstrate any significance.</p> <p>There is no proof that the properties in the Precinct demonstrate any degree of technical innovation or achievement.</p> <p>Social</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 does not have any relevant unique significance through association with a community or cultural group in the local region for social, cultural, educational or spiritual reasons.</p> <p>The form and scale of housing in the Precinct is not characteristic of a particular demographic, for example income category or type of occupation.</p> <p>There is limited evidence that the Kenny Street Precinct 2 is an authentic, historical example of the form and scale of housing for families of a range of incomes and types of occupations – or at least any more so than any other street in the local region.</p> <p>The basis for any significance assessed as part of the MHI has not been made transparent in the consultation documentation or the MHI Report 2016.</p> <p>Rarity</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 is not an example of rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of the cultural heritage of the local region.</p> <p>Refer also to aesthetic value, historic value and social value above.</p> <p>Representativeness</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 is not uniquely representative of the characteristics of a class of cultural place or environment in the local region.</p> <p>The basis for any significance assessed as part of the MHI has not been made transparent in the consultation documentation or the MHI Report 2016.</p> <p>The Kenny Street Precinct 2 is not uniquely representative of early 20th century streetscape, or of housing that is characteristic of a defined social demographic, for example income category or type of occupation.</p> <p>Refer also to aesthetic value, historic value and social value above.</p> <p>Condition Poor. The Kenny Street Precinct 2 is in poor condition in relation to the values that have been assessed as the priority – namely aesthetic, historic and social values.</p> <p>Integrity Medium. Many of the properties identified for inclusion in Kenny Street Precinct 2 are likely to have retained their original function, that being residential housing. A closer inspection of these properties is likely to find that the mid to longer term viability as housing is highly questionable</p> <p>Authenticity Low. Many of the properties identified for inclusion in Kenny Street Precinct 2 have not been preserved in their original form. These properties have been modified through renovation, not faithfully restored.</p> <p>There is a significant difference between ‘renovation’ and ‘restoration’ in relation to cultural heritage or value. Renovation may produce quaint and adorable looking houses, but these houses may bear no resemblance to a faithful restoration that is of cultural heritage or value. In the absence of any benchmark, it is impossible to assess any renovation as being a faithful restoration. It is critical for the MIR process, that any property proposed for inclusion in the MHI be compared with the benchmark for faithful restoration. Any property included in the MHI needs to have been faithfully restored to a specified benchmark.</p> <p>Establishing the Kenny Street Precinct 2 classifies my property as being of ‘considerable significance’ (2) for cultural heritage significance. This will mean that my previously termite infested, cladded asbestos dwelling with decromastic roof tiling needs to be preserved as if it were of cultural heritage significance.</p> <p>The impost of this requirement is beyond my means.</p> <p>The level of investment this property would require given a level 2 classification is not sustainable, nor cost-effective.</p> <p>Add to this the significant devaluing of my property due to no one else being interested in purchasing such a burden, and you should appreciate the concern of the majority of residents in Kenny Street Precinct 2 who do not have individual properties identified as being of cultural heritage significance.</p> <p>I have identified a few issues with the TOB’s process with regard to the MIR and MHI, and identify these here for further review by the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The assessment criteria used for determining the value for cultural heritage significance are vaguely defined and seem to have been subjectively applied, for example, in relation to aesthetic value, what aesthetic characteristics are valued and at what level are those characteristics considered significant;• I can find no evidence of incentives being available for properties listed within a precinct, however, the consultation documentation indicates otherwise. This raises the question of whether this information is a falsehood?; and• I have owned my property since 2003 and I do not recall any community consultation being undertaken by the TOB for the 2005 MHI. If consultation was undertaken in relation to my property, please provide all relevant material to me. <p>Expanding on the first dot point, a benchmark for what is considered to be of cultural heritage significance in the local region could be developed for individual property and for collective places. A benchmark would assist with providing definitional clarity and bring greater openness, transparency and fairness to the MIR process. Benchmarking could be used for each of the values used in assessing cultural heritage significance.</p> <p>During the TOB Council meeting of 28 March 2017, Councillor Bridges asked the question of one of the Kenny Street Precinct 2 residents, ‘If we made other similar streets precincts also, would you be happy for the Kenny Street Precinct 2 to be included in the MHI?’ I do not support the inclusion of the Kenny Street Precinct 2 in the MHI, based on the assessment of the cultural heritage value of the housing contained within the boundaries of the Precinct, irrespective of any other place or property that is proposed for inclusion in the MHI. This line of questioning highlights for me what appears to be the lack of a fair and considered process, which by consequence raises questions as to the impartiality, integrity and insight that underpins the TOB’s MIR.</p> <p>I welcome the opportunity to discuss the MIR further with the TOB, in whatever manner of forum you may propose</p>
72 Kenny St, Bassendean	I write in relation to submissions sought in relation to the above. I provide my following observations and comments. As a directly affected property owner I object to the blanket inclusion of a zone or area (precinct) for heritage listing.

105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>My concern is that, while some properties in the area may be of heritage interest, the listing of an entire precinct is disadvantageous to other property owners. The area includes properties altered and improved to a point of not having any cultural or heritage value any longer. The Town should take more active action and specify those properties to be included in an inventory rather than a blanket (lazy) approach. There is nothing to support a contention that the area has more aesthetic or historic value than most other areas of the old Town of Bassendean and as such should not be considered for a precinct listing.</p> <p>In 2005 the MHI wrote to landowners listing properties proposed for listing. My property was not one of those. Since then a number of proposed heritage properties so recommended have been demolished and replaced by modern properties. The history of the Town and its proposals and intentions in regards to heritage listing appears disjointed and irrational to this landowner observer.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence is that market value of properties with heritage listing is reduced. There is a counter argument that it enhances value because of heritage listing. While the latter may be correct for a truly historical property, such listing will reduce values on the average property that has little heritage value. This is because the market of buyers is smaller. Development opportunities are not as easily available and improvements would require approvals not required by unlisted properties, simply because the Town could not or would not take the extra step and truly identify properties worthy of heritage listing.</p> <p>The Town should take a more responsible approach to heritage and make detailed, individual recommendations for truly historical heritage reasons, not list precincts which is to the detriment of some property owners.</p>
65 Kenny St, Bassendean 105 Kenny Street Precinct 2	<p>I am writing with regards to the proposed heritage precinct, Place No:105 Kenny Street Precinct – 2.</p> <p>The draft Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) details a precinct that includes my property. As an owner occupier on Kenny St, and with family ties to the area dating back over 50 years, I support the preservation and celebration of heritage in the Bassendean area. I also hope that maintaining the character of Bassendean will ensure the location remains desirable for current and prospective residents.</p> <p>After careful consideration, including discussions with a representative from the Town of Bassendean Planning staff, staff from other local governments, and fellow ratepayers, I would like to voice some areas of concern and some areas of support for the current draft MHI. I have included some images at the end of this submission from the Kenny St precinct to illustrate my findings.</p> <p>When spending time in Kenny St, it is obvious the current streetscape contributes significantly to a spacious and comfortable residential character. This character is not strictly determined by heritage assets. The streetscape is dominated by elements derived from sustained and sensible development throughout the last century. These developments vary in style to include vital modern influences, as well as heritage and federation elements, across both building and nature strip development. This variety is a key element in forming the character of the area, and is testament to the current planning and development controls implemented by the Town of Bassendean. Please see the Attachment #1 for examples of modern developments that complement the Kenny St streetscape.</p> <p>Rather than defining a heritage precinct, the preservation of independently identified heritage assets would be more beneficial. This encourages ongoing development, upgrade, and improvement of non-heritage elements, while preserving key assets identified by the MHI. Given Kenny St’s character is derived from ongoing development, rather than any specific historic building, site or event, the proposed application of a Management Category 2 to most properties on Kenny St is inaccurate.</p> <p>The defining characteristics of category 2 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Considerable Significance.- Very important to the heritage of the locality.- High degree of integrity/authenticity. <p>Key elements listed in the Historical Notes and Statement of Significance included with the precinct details do not align with category 2 - “Considerable Significance”. Furthermore, Kenny St fails the description of “High degree of integrity/authenticity” due to the wide variety in style of building and nature strip development. The opportunity to preserve the aesthetic of the early 20th century streetscape has passed. Please see Attachment #2 for examples of streetscape that do not represent a high degree integrity/authenticity, and are of no significance to the heritage of the locality.</p> <p>More relevant descriptions can be found in the definitions of category 3 or 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Contributes to the heritage of the locality.- Has some altered or modified elements, not necessarily detracting from the overall significance of the item.- Little Significance or Historic site.- Contributes to the understanding of the history of the Town of Bassendean <p>The objectives and strategies of the Strategic Community Plan: 2013 – 2023 include the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Preserve our heritage for future generations by ensure heritage buildings will be preserved and showcased.- Maintain the rich culture of heritage of the community and support a sense of place and belonging with residents through protection and retention of the rich history...- Protect local history and heritage by supporting the protection and maintenance of buildings on the State Register of Heritage Places and key buildings on the Municipal Heritage Inventory... <p>The Kenny St precinct listed in the draft MHI does not effectively address these objectives and strategies. A more applicable approach focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The maintenance, protection, and promotion of individual properties and sites with established, recognised heritage significance.- Sourcing and preserving materials such as photos and news articles that show the area in its heritage state.- Encouraging community engagement with significant sites and materials depicting heritage buildings and sites.- Focus on development controls and incentives in areas with established heritage value such as Old Perth Rd, to ensure the centrepiece of Bassendean’s heritage culture and character is maintained.- Enhancement of development regulation and guidelines to ensure new developments maintain the character of the area.- Establish consistency in streetscapes through strategic development of nature strips and common spaces. <p>I strongly believe the true character of Bassendean is generated by the wonderful variety brought by decades of development across many eras. I agree that preserving the heritage elements of Bassendean’s’ character is vital, but it must be achieved through means that do not inhibit modern development.</p>