

HERITAGE, JOHN STREET, COTTESLOE

582. Mr McGOWAN to the Minister for Heritage:

I refer to heritage issues surrounding John Street in Cottesloe and ask -

- (a) why was it necessary to obtain an alternative recommendation in relation to the appeal concerning 66 John Street;
- (b) what process was undertaken by the person preparing the alternative recommendation;
- (c) were there any site inspections, of 66 John Street, conducted by the person preparing the alternative recommendation;
- (d) why was not Lloyd Graham's report accepted for 66 John Street;
- (e) does the minister confirm or deny statements made on the stateline report that when driving down John Street there are numerous ugly, houses to be seen;
- (f) does the minister believe that houses stand in isolation to their community;
- (g) is the minister prepared to recognise the importance of entire streetscapes in considering the heritage values of any individual properties within a street;
- (h) if the minister is prepared to recognise the value of streetscapes, why does this not appear to have been taken into consideration with respect to John Street;
- (i) is the minister prepared to immediately allocate the funds required to enable an urgent re-assessment of the John Street historical precinct; and
- (j) if not, why not?

Mr KIERATH replied:

This question concerns an appeal which was made to me as Minister for Planning.

- (a) The appellant had supplied an architect's opinion supporting the architectural character of the house and its relationship to other buildings in the street. The John Street Action Group had an architect submit a contrary view. The opinion of an experienced, respected and impartial architect was therefore obtained and because this was not the same as that of the town planner who had done the initial report, an alternative recommendation was provided which referred to the opinion of the impartial architect.
- (b) The initial report was received, the decision was made that expert architectural opinion on the proposed house and its relationship to the street was necessary because of the conflicting architectural opinions in the appeal documents and because the investigating town planner had identified the design of the house as the key issue. The impartial expert opinion was obtained, it was referred to in a report with an alternative recommendation and placed on the file with the initial report for the Minister's consideration.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) After considering all aspects of the matter, greater weight was given to the alternative recommendation.
- (e) The statement I made was:
"I drove down the street and the irony is that the Council has already agreed to a wide range of different styles. In fact there is one house approved in there that I think is downright ugly and I don't think it was something I would have ever approved".
- (f) No.
- (g) Yes.
- (h) The importance of streetscapes in considering the heritage value of individual houses is recognised but it is the local government and Heritage Council of Western Australia which should first identify the heritage value of places. It is not the role of the Minister for Planning to do this for a council. The Town of Cottesloe failed to select and include John Street or the house at No.66 in Schedule 1 of its Town Planning Scheme even though it was first recommended in 1995 that the council select and include in its Scheme streets and dwellings it wanted recognised.
- (i) No.
- (j) This is the function of the Town of Cottesloe and the Heritage Council of Western Australia.

