In May 2016 the Special Minister of State asked Infrastructure Victoria to provide advice on the future capacity of Victoria’s commercial ports. Specifically, the Minister has asked for advice on when the need for a second container port is likely to arise and which variables may alter this timeline. The Minister has also asked for advice on where a second container port would ideally be located and under what conditions, including the suitability of, and barriers to investing in, sites at the Port of Hastings and the Bay West location.

In undertaking this task, Infrastructure Victoria reviewed work that was completed as part of the Port of Hastings development project before it was cancelled in 2014. This document forms part of the initial work undertaken for the proposed port development at Hastings. Infrastructure Victoria considers that much of the previous Hastings work, although preliminary in nature, is relevant and suitable for informing a strategic assessment. Therefore, Infrastructure Victoria has made the reports previously commissioned for the development project part of the evidence base on which Infrastructure Victoria will use in providing the Minister with advice.

The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this document are based on conditions encountered and information reviewed at the date of preparation of the document and for the purposes of the Port of Hastings Development Project.

Infrastructure Victoria and its consultants have used the information contained in these reports as an input but have not wholly relied on all the information presented in these reports.
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Executive Summary

The primary objective in this preliminary desktop review is to identify relevant legislative and policy frameworks for historical heritage and current statutory heritage controls within the study area. The review also seeks to identify potential heritage issues for the project arising from these legislative and policy frameworks and heritage listings.

There are currently relatively few heritage places within or in close proximity to the study area that are subject to statutory heritage controls. The study area does not include any historical sites listed on the National Heritage List (NHL) or the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999. The implications under the Heritage Act 1995 are also limited, with a single Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) place located just outside the study area. While there are no listed archaeological sites on the Victorian Heritage Inventory (HI) in the study area, the Heritage Act affords blanket protection to archaeological sites and relics over 50 years in age and so the issue of historical archaeology is one that will require further consideration.

The majority of places with statutory heritage controls within the study area are locally listed Heritage Overlay (HO) places in the Mornington Peninsula and Casey planning schemes under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (P&E Act). These HO places are generally located within townships within the study area but also include a series of dispersed farming and orcharding properties outside the towns. For these listed places, planning permits are required for subdivision and all external works (including demolition, part demolition, additions and new development). For some places, where identified in the HO schedule, permits are also required for external painting and the removal of trees.

The HO places are listed in Table 1 and Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>HO places within the port landside development area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mornington Planning Scheme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO268</td>
<td>Brunning’s Farm House and Trees (Chinese fan palm, Norfolk Island pine, palms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO269</td>
<td>Thomas Brunning’s Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO311</td>
<td>John Brunning &amp; Sons Complex, Trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>HO places within the transport infrastructure development area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mornington Planning Scheme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO60</td>
<td>Tyabb Soldiers Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO142</td>
<td>Former Vicarage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO283</td>
<td>Tyabb Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO284</td>
<td>George G &amp; Sarah Cole House &amp; Trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The retention and conservation of these HO places is supported by the relevant provisions of the local planning schemes including the HO provisions and local planning policies for heritage. The heritage values of these places are documented in local heritage studies which are typically reference documents in the planning schemes.

In addition to identifying statutory heritage controls, a range of studies and other sources relevant to the study area have also been reviewed. This work has identified numbers of other sites which are not subject to heritage controls but which may have the potential to have heritage value. These include sites which have been identified in local heritage studies but which have not been assessed in detail nor proposed for a planning scheme amendment. The nature and level of significance of these is unknown at this time and it is not possible to comment on any implications these may have for the project. Further investigation could be undertaken where sites are likely to be affected.

Based on the limited investigation to date, the issue of landscape within the study area is also considered to be a potential heritage issue, particularly in the southern half of the study area (port landside development area and the southern parts of the transport infrastructure development area) and it is recommended that this be further considered.
## Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>Australian Heritage Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heritage List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTPLI</td>
<td>Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPBC Act</td>
<td>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Council</td>
<td>Heritage Council of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Victorian Heritage Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPPF</td>
<td>Local Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine development area</td>
<td>Marine components of the project including shipping channels, swing basins, anchorage and aids for navigation connecting the port to Bass Strait as well as dredging and dredge material management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>Municipal Strategic Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>National Heritage List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;E Act</td>
<td>Planning and Environment Act 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port landside development area</td>
<td>Port precinct and port environs within the area zoned as Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) for port related activities, and the container terminal at Long Island Point which extends into the intertidal area of Western Port. Also includes the SUZ1 area at Crib Point and the Stony Point jetty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project area</td>
<td>Area where the project is located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPF</td>
<td>State Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>Area considered by this assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZ1</td>
<td>Special Use Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFU</td>
<td>Twenty Foot Equivalents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Authority</td>
<td>The Port of Hastings Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Project</td>
<td>The Port of Hastings Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure development area</td>
<td>Road and provision for rail corridors and associated rail marshalling staging areas to connect the port with the state and national transport networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHR</td>
<td>Victorian Heritage Register</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Victorian Government has identified the Port of Hastings as the preferred site for the state’s next major container port. This port is essential for the long-term economic growth of Victoria as container trades are increasing and the Port of Melbourne is expected to reach capacity.

The Port of Hastings Development Authority (the Authority) is progressing staged planning of the Port of Hastings Development Project (the Project) from 2014 to 2018, culminating in the development of a rigorous business case and a full environmental and social impact assessment.

The Authority has selected a team of specialists to undertake detailed environmental, social and economic studies that will form part of a strict approval process. Specialists will also plan the conceptual design of new port infrastructure including wharf facilities and a logistics precinct, with road and rail access to the Port. Involvement of community and industry will be a critical part of the success.

By the mid-2020s it is envisaged that a world-class sustainable container port facility will begin operations at Hastings, handling up to 3 million twenty foot equivalent units (TEUs) each year, increasing to around 9 million TEU by 2060.

The Project would include the following components:

- Port landside development area - includes the port precinct and port environs within the area zoned as Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) for port related activities, and the container terminal at Long Island Point which extends into the intertidal area of Western Port. The development area also includes the SUZ1 area at Crib Point and the Stony Point jetty.
- Transport infrastructure development area - road and provision for rail corridors and associated rail marshalling staging areas to connect the port with the state and national transport networks.
- Marine development area - marine components of the project would include shipping channels, swing basins, anchorage and aids for navigation connecting the port to Bass Strait as well as dredging and dredge material management.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

The Authority requires desktop assessments to be undertaken for the part of the port landside development area comprising the SUZ1 at Hastings and the transport infrastructure development area to the south of Ballarto Road.

The desktop assessments are required to identify issues and constraints affecting the potential Project area and assist VicRoads and the Authority in meeting obligations required under applicable acts. These assessments will also inform the strategic assessment for the transport infrastructure development area that is currently being undertaken to determine the preferred transport corridor. The desktop assessments include a review and incorporate the previous desktop studies completed on the Western Port Highway.

The specific purpose of the Historic Heritage Desktop Investigation is to identify known and potential historical heritage places and values within the study area and to identify likely issues and constraints arising.
1.3 Scope

The scope of this report includes:

- a review of applicable legislation, policies and guidelines as relevant to a consideration of historical heritage issues within the study area
- a review of relevant statutory controls to identify heritage places and values and applicable approvals
- a review of publicly available lists, registers, reports and other heritage assessments to identify any additional heritage places/values or potential heritage places/values within the study area
- a preliminary review of other sources including published histories, historical maps and plans and selected historical aerial photographs to identify potential heritage places and issues

The study area for this assessment is shown in Figure 1 and includes the Hastings SUZ1 component of the port landside development area and the transport infrastructure development area to the south of Ballarto Road. The Crib Point SUZ1, Stony Point jetty and transport infrastructure development area to the north of Ballarto Road are outside the scope of this assessment.

The contents of this document reflect Lovell Chen’s current position on the subject matter of the document. It is provided for discussion or information purposes and is intended to be a guide only. The contents of this document should not be relied upon as representing Lovell Chen’s final position on the subject matter, except where stated otherwise. Any views expressed by Lovell Chen in this document may change as a consequence of Lovell Chen finalising formal technical studies or specifications, or legislative, or procedure and regulatory developments. Any figures provided are indicative only, are subject to change and are dependent upon a number of factors.

1.4 Limitations

No fieldwork has been undertaken as part of this study.

No consultation was undertaken as part of the study.

The study does not consider maritime heritage issues.

Only publicly accessible information sources were reviewed.
Figure 1 Study Area
2.0 Legislation, Policy and Guidelines

This section provides an overview of the legislation and policy frameworks relevant to historical heritage in Victoria, with specific reference where relevant to the study area.

2.1 Commonwealth

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999 and the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000 establish two registers for places of cultural heritage significance and set management requirements that apply to places on these registers.

The two registers are the National Heritage List (NHL) for places of outstanding cultural heritage significance to Australia and the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) for significant heritage places owned or controlled by Australian Government agencies. The NHL includes places that have outstanding value to the nation whereas the CHL can contain heritage items that have state, territory or local heritage significance.

The EPBC Act Regulations define a suite of Commonwealth Heritage Values and Commonwealth Heritage Management Principles and National Heritage Values and National Heritage Management Principles. These are required to be referenced in the management of listed places. The Heritage Values describe aesthetic, historic, scientific or social or other special value for future generations as well as for the present community. The Heritage Management Principles are broad principles which provide a guiding framework for excellence in managing heritage places, and address aspects of the management of heritage properties including objectives, standards, processes and practices.

The Australian Heritage Council (AHC) was established under the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003, and replaced the former Australian Heritage Commission. The AHC is the principal adviser to the Australian Government on heritage matters.

Its main roles are

- to assess places nominated for the NHL and CHL
- to nominate places for inclusion in the NHL or CHL
- to promote the identification, assessment, conservation and monitoring of heritage
- to advise the Minister for the Environment on various heritage matters including the preparation and amendment of heritage strategies and management plans for Australian Government areas and agencies.

The Australian Department of the Environment provides administrative support to the AHC, and works with the AHC in the area of nominations and additions to the NHL and CHL. It develops and implements national policy, programs and legislation to protect and conserve Australia’s natural environment and cultural heritage. More specifically, the heritage division oversees the statutory processes and procedures of the EPBC Act as they apply to places of historical cultural heritage.

2.1.1 Commonwealth Heritage List

To be considered for inclusion in the CHL, a place must be owned or leased by the Australian Government. Places that are included in the CHL are subject to management and approvals requirements detailed in the EPBC Act and its regulations.

2.1.2 National Heritage List

The NHL is a list of places of outstanding heritage significance to Australia, and comprises natural, historic and indigenous places. Unlike the CHL places, there is no requirement that
NHL places be Commonwealth owned. Places that are included in the NHL are subject to management and approvals requirements detailed in the EPBC Act and its regulations.

2.1.3 Implications of the EPBC Act

There are no historical heritage places within the study area that are included in either the NHL or the CHL.

2.2 State

There are two pieces of legislation which relate to heritage in Victoria: the Heritage Act 1995 and the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (P&E Act).

2.2.1 Heritage Act

The Heritage Act enables the identification and protection of heritage places and objects that are of significance to Victoria and establishes the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR), the Victorian Heritage Inventory (HI) and the Heritage Council of Victoria (Heritage Council), the expert statutory body for determining matters relating to historic cultural heritage. The Heritage Act is administered by Heritage Victoria within the Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure (DTPLI).

Places and objects of recognised state heritage significance are included in the VHR, and are legally protected under the provisions of the Heritage Act. All shipwrecks and shipwreck relics that have been situated in Victorian waters for at least 75 years are automatically considered to be historic for the purposes of the Heritage Act and are also included in the VHR, whether or not their existence/location is known.

All known places and objects in Victoria that possess archaeological value or archaeological potential (these need not be of state significance) are included in the HI, and are also protected under the Heritage Act.

The Heritage Council and the Victorian government agency Heritage Victoria are responsible for maintaining the VHR and issuing heritage permits and other approvals for the development of heritage places of state significance under the Heritage Act. Heritage Victoria also provides administrative and technical support to the Heritage Council.

The Heritage Council decides which places and objects should be added to the VHR after careful consideration of the heritage values. The Heritage Council also hears appeals made on issued heritage permits, or refusals, for registered places.

The HI is also administered by Heritage Victoria. Any activities that will result in the excavation or disturbance to a site or its objects that is included in the HI must have first obtained the consent of Heritage Victoria.

Places of local significance are listed for protection in local planning schemes, under the provisions of the P&E Act. These places are also generally identified and recommended to local councils through municipal heritage studies. Places are added to planning schemes through amendments to individual planning schemes, and are mapped and scheduled as HO places.

In addition to their administration of heritage controls through the HO provisions of their own planning schemes, local councils may also be involved in commenting on applications made for permits under the Heritage Act (for places included in the VHR).

Victorian Heritage Register

The VHR includes heritage places and heritage objects, as well as shipwrecks. Heritage places can include buildings, trees, parks and gardens, streetscapes, archaeological sites, and shipwrecks. Heritage objects are generally moveable and could include furniture, signs,
shipwreck relics, archaeological artefacts, equipment, vehicles and many other features. The VHR includes a legal extent of registration for any registered place or object and a statement of cultural heritage significance which typically explains what is significant about a heritage place or object, why it is significant and how it is significant. Nominations to the VHR can be made by any person at any time.

Any changes to registered places, objects, shipwrecks, shipwreck relics and associated protected zones require permit approval by the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria. Permits are required for subdivision and any physical works, unless specifically determined to be exempt from the requirement for a permit. Use of a heritage place is not controlled under the Heritage Act. Section 73 of the Heritage Act sets down the matters to be considered in determining permit applications. Although there are a number of matters listed, a key consideration is the extent to which a permit application, if approved, would affect the cultural heritage significance of the registered place or object. Additionally, in the case of a ‘public authority’ the Executive Director must consider ‘the extent to which the application, if refused, would unreasonably detrimentally affect the ability of the public authority to carry out a statutory duty specified in the application’ [s. 73(1)(b)].

The Heritage Council, on the recommendation of the Executive Director, may determine particular classes of works or activities which may be undertaken for any registered place or object or class of places or registered objects without a permit. In the main, these determinations are made in the case of works which are assessed as minor and/or are not considered likely to have an adverse impact on the cultural heritage significance of the place or object. For some places, permit exemptions are provided for and a permit policy identified for that place.

**Victorian Heritage Inventory**

The HI is a register of known historical (non-Aboriginal) archaeological sites in Victoria. The HI enables Heritage Victoria to record and monitor archaeological sites that are not considered to be of state significance or where the significance is unknown. Places that are assessed as of archaeological significance at a state level are included in the VHR.

The two levels of protection (the VHR and the HI) are reflected in two different principles in terms of approvals. The guiding principle for places in the VHR is to protect and conserve as much of the fabric of the place and the relics/artefacts as is possible. However, for places listed in the HI, recording, excavating and monitoring are the usual methods of assessing and managing the heritage values of a site.

Any activities that would result in the excavation or disturbance to an archaeological site or its objects included on the HI must have first obtained the consent of Heritage Victoria. Section 129 of the Heritage Act sets down the process for issuing of consents.

Heritage Victoria has introduced a ‘D classification’ for some places that are not considered to demonstrate archaeological values and are ‘delisted’ on the basis that they do not meet the threshold for inclusion in the HI. The site cards for these sites are retained by Heritage Victoria as an archive for reference and comparison, but are not afforded any statutory protection under the Heritage Act.

Note that all archaeological sites more than 50 years in age in Victoria are protected by the Heritage Act, regardless of whether they are included in the HI. As for the VHR, there are enforcement provisions for unlawful activities in relation to archaeological relics and places.
Implications of the Heritage Act

The implications of the Heritage Act are principally in the area of historical archaeology, given the protection afforded all archaeological sites and relics over 50 years in age, whether known or not.

While not an issue that requires any particular action, there is the possibility that a place or places within the study area could be the subject of a nomination to the VHR under the Heritage Act.

2.2.2 Planning and Environment Act

For all municipalities in Victoria, the requirements for land use, development and protection are covered by land use planning controls prepared and administered by state and local government authorities through planning schemes. The legislation governing these controls is the P&E Act. Planning schemes contain standard Heritage Overlay (HO) provisions (found at Cl. 43.01 of planning schemes) that are directed at conserving and enhancing places of natural and cultural heritage significance, including historical heritage places.

The planning schemes relevant to the study area are those for Mornington Peninsula, Casey and Frankston.

Heritage Overlay

Places of recognised local significance are listed for protection in local planning schemes by HOs.

HOs also include places included in the VHR under the Heritage Act, though in the case of these registered places these places are subject to the requirements of the Heritage Act, and not the HO provisions of the relevant planning scheme. Effectively, Heritage Victoria is the responsible authority for these places, though applications are referred to local Councils.

The HO provisions are set out at Cl 43.01 of all Victorian planning schemes, and a Schedule to the HO lists the properties affected by the HO in that particular planning scheme. HOs are mapped to show the location and extent of heritage controls over a particular heritage place. There are two types of HO control. Some are site-specific relating to individually significant heritage places and others are precinct-based HOs which can extend over larger areas and include multiple individual properties.

The HO triggers a permit requirement for a range of works and actions, including subdivision, demolition, external alterations and additions, and any other works and new development. In some instances, additional external paint controls, internal alteration controls and control over trees may also apply. As applicable, these controls are identified in the Schedule to the HO.

Decision guidelines are set out at Cl. 43.01-4 of all Victorian planning schemes. Broadly, the focus of these is on whether there would be any adverse impact on the significance of the heritage place and whether the proposed development or new building is in keeping with the heritage significance, character and appearance of adjacent buildings and the heritage place.

Local Planning Policy Framework

The majority of planning schemes include reference to historical heritage both in the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS), at Cl. 21 of each scheme, and in other local planning policies, at Cl. 22 of each scheme. These local planning policies for historical heritage are generally considered when determining a planning application under the HO and are known as the Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF). Within the LPPF, specific policies can address issues of full or partial demolition of heritage buildings and places, alterations and additions.
to heritage buildings and places, and provide guidance on the preferred outcomes in terms of new development.

It is on occasion the case that local planning policies can draw in heritage issues to a consideration of sites adjacent or in proximity to HO places. This is the case for the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme, which includes a cultural heritage policy at Clause 22.04 which applies both the HO sites and to sites adjacent to them.

In many cases, planning schemes also identify Reference Documents and, in some cases, Incorporated Documents that are also considered when determining a planning application under the HO. Examples include local municipal heritage studies and place-specific citations for HO places within a particular municipality.

All three planning schemes within the study area (Frankston, Casey and Mornington Shire) reference the issue of cultural heritage in their MSS and each also includes detailed local policies relating to heritage.

**State Planning Policy Framework**

The State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) forms part of all Victorian planning schemes and seeks to inform planning and responsible authorities of State planning policy.

Cl. 10.02 notes that one of the stated objectives of planning in Victoria is:

(d) to conserve and enhance those buildings, areas or other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value.

The policy for Built Environment and Heritage is at Cl. 15:

Planning should ensure all new land use and development appropriately responds to its landscape, valued built form and cultural context, and protect places and sites with significant heritage, architectural, aesthetic, scientific and cultural value.

More detailed policy found at 15.03 identifies objectives and strategies for meeting the policy at Cl. 15.

Under Cl. 10.4, Integrated decision-making, state policy also recognises that on occasions there would be a need to balance conflicting planning objectives 'in favour of net community benefit and sustainable development for the benefit of present and future generations'. This could be a factor of relevance in considering heritage impacts or losses in the context of a project of this nature.

**Implications of the Planning and Environment Act**

There are numerous HO sites within the study area and these will need to be considered both in terms of heritage impacts and applicable approvals.

**2.2.3 Major Transport Project Facilitation Act**

The purpose of the Major Transport Project Facilitation Act 2009 is to facilitate the development of major transport projects. This Act establishes alternative processes through which approvals for heritage under the P&E Act and the Heritage Act can be sought from the Victorian Planning Minister.
3.0 Methodology

3.1 Statutory controls

In the first instance a review of existing statutory heritage controls applicable within and near the project boundary was undertaken. Statutory heritage controls applicable under the EPBC Act, the Heritage Act and the P&E Act were all reviewed. Documentation for places affected by the Heritage Act on the Victorian Heritage Register and the Heritage Inventory was accessed via Heritage Victoria’s Hermes database. Where available, supporting documentation (heritage study citations) for places subject to local statutory controls was also reviewed.

3.2 Review of relevant heritage studies and reports

In addition, a review of other relevant and publicly available heritage documentation for the study area was undertaken to identify existing and potential heritage places and values within and in close proximity to the study area. Sources consulted included local heritage studies and other heritage databases and reports, as well as archaeological investigations. These are listed at the end of this report (refer section 7.0 References).

3.3 Historical research and analysis

Limited historical research and analysis was undertaken to inform an appreciation of the potential heritage issues in the study area. This work involved a review of local histories and historical maps and plans, as well as a series of 1940s aerials. The issue of mature landscapes was a focus of this work and an analysis of historical aerials against current aerials was undertaken with a view to identifying mature landscape elements of some scale and age.

Refer to section 7.0 References for further detail.

4.0 Results

There are currently relatively few heritage places within or in close proximity to the study area that are subject to statutory heritage controls and the distribution of these places across the study area as a whole is mapped at Figure 2.

In addition, this desktop review has identified a series of sites which may have the potential to have heritage value or interest but which have yet to be assessed. These are mapped at Figure 3.

Further information and more detailed mapping is provided on the port landside development area Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) in section 4.1 and the transport infrastructure development area in section 4.2.
Figure 2   Overview of statutory heritage places
Figure 3  Overview of potential heritage values
4.1 Port landside development area (SUZ1)

While the port landside development area Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) does not contain any listed places under the EPBC Act or the Heritage Act, it does include a number of places that are subject to HO controls under the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme.

There are also a series of places within the area which have been identified as of potential heritage significance based on a review of local heritage studies and other sources of information.

4.1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

There are no historical heritage places included in the NHL or CHL within the port landside development area.

4.1.2 Heritage Act

Victorian Heritage Register

There are no VHR places located within the port landside development area.

Victorian Heritage Inventory

There are no HI places located within the port landside development area.

Historical archaeology

Notwithstanding there are no HI sites within the area, as noted, all archaeological sites more than 50 years in age in Victoria are protected by the Heritage Act, regardless of whether they are included in the HI, and there are enforcement provisions for unlawful activities in relation to archaeological relics and places.

A review has been undertaken of the archaeological investigations and reports within the broader study area (encompassing both the port landside development area and the transport infrastructure development area) and held by Heritage Victoria. Most archaeological investigations have been undertaken associated with residential development and road projects and the majority have been undertaken in rural locations, with relatively few in the townships. Very little archaeological evidence of significance has been uncovered in the course of these investigations. Given the history of the area and excluding maritime sites, the majority of archaeological sites would be likely to relate to early settlement and farming activities.

4.1.3 Planning and Environment Act

Heritage Overlay

Land within the port landside development area is affected by the provisions of the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme. There are three sites within the area that are subject to the HO provisions in the planning scheme. These are listed in Table 3 and mapped at Figure 4.

All three of these HO places occupy substantial sites in the north-east of the port landside development area and all are places associated historically with the Brunning family, who were prominent orchardists and nurserymen in the area from the nineteenth century. Two (HO268 and HO269) are located on the south side of Bungower Road and comprise farmhouses or the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with associated gardens including mature trees of significance. In both cases the HO control relates to both the buildings and associated landscaping, and external paint and tree controls are triggered in the schedule to the HO. The third HO (HO311) is an orcharding complex (comprising houses, coolstore and packing shed) also associated with the Brunning family; this complex also
includes mature trees of significance and external paint and tree controls are triggered. For all three HO places the schedule to the HO provides some guidance as to the extent of mature trees to be controlled and further information on significance is also available in citations prepared as part of the Hastings District Heritage Study 2001.

In the case of these places, any subdivision, demolition or other external works including painting, tree removal and all new development would require a permit under the HO provisions of the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme.

Table 3   HO places within the port landside development area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HO number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HO268</td>
<td>Brunning’s Farm House and Trees (Chinese fan palm, Norfolk Island pine, palms)</td>
<td>75 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO269</td>
<td>Thomas Brunning’s Farm</td>
<td>83 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO311</td>
<td>John Brunning &amp; Sons Complex, Trees</td>
<td>48 O’Neills Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tyabb Public Cemetery

There is a further local HO place, the Tyabb Public Cemetery (HO270) which is technically outside the port landside development area but is effectively contained within it. Refer to Figure 4. HO270 covers the full extent of the cemetery reserve. Works within the port landside development area directly abutting the cemetery would not trigger a permit requirement under the planning scheme, however depending on the nature of works and their proximity to the cemetery it is noted that there could be the potential for such works to have an adverse impact on the heritage values of the place.

4.1.4  Non-statutory listings

There are a number of places within the port landside development area that are not subject to statutory heritage controls but which have been identified as of heritage value or as having potential heritage value.

Local heritage studies

There are two places which were assessed in detail in the Hastings District Heritage Study and recommended for HO controls subject to the preparation of an incorporated plan. The sites are the Orchard Landscape Precinct and Lysaght Australia steel works; listed in Table 4 and mapped at Figure 5.

Table 4   Port landside development area: places assessed in the Hastings District Heritage Study but with no statutory controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchard landscape precinct</td>
<td>Graydens Road, Hastings (various properties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lysaght Australia Western Port Bay steel works (now Bluescope Steel)</td>
<td>Off Bayview Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4  Statutory heritage controls – port landside development area
Unlike the other places documented and assessed in detail in the Hastings District Heritage Study, these two sites are not currently subject to HO controls in the Mornington Planning Scheme. A future planning scheme amendment would be required to introduce the recommended controls.

Detailed information and assessment of significance for the proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct and Lysaght Australia steel works is provided in citations contained in the Hastings District Heritage Study. Refer to Volume 1, Appendix 1, Orchard Landscape Precinct citation, pp. 228-232, place identifier 660 and Lysaght Australia Western Port Bay steel works, pp. 52-56, place identifier 281.

The proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct (c.1910s-1920s) is a large non-contiguous precinct focussed on Graydens Road. It encompasses a series of privately-owned properties including packing sheds, houses, and mature trees including windrow plantings. It also extends into the transport infrastructure development area to the east.

Located at the southern end of the port landside development area, the Lysaght Australia steelworks (Bluescope, c. 1972) also occupies a large area on Bayview Road. The citation for the steelworks refers to a large number of process buildings, structures and plant as well as the administration offices. Windrow plantings predating the development of the steel works are also referenced.

No mapping is provided for either site in the citations. Approximate mapping has been undertaken based on the descriptions contained in the heritage study citations (refer Figure 5) and based on that, it is clear that both sites occupy large areas of land within the port landside development area. Please note in particular that the area covered by citation for the Lysaght Australia steelworks is unclear.

It is important to note that in both cases the Hastings District Heritage Study recommended significant further investigation, assessment and documentation, prior to the introduction of a control in the planning scheme.

The study recommended as follows in relation to the proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct:

No planning controls should be considered before the completion of an incorporated plan based on a conservation management plan and owner consultation.

In the case of the steel works, the study recommendation was as follows:

To encourage the preparation of a comprehensive conservation management plan for the precinct followed by the creation of an incorporated plan prior to the inclusion in the planning scheme.

It has not been confirmed that the Orchard Landscape Precinct and the steel works were excluded from the amendment which gave effect to the recommendations of the 2006 study, however this appears likely, and could be related to the recommendation in the study for incorporated plans to be prepared for both precincts prior to a planning scheme amendment.

The recommendation for an incorporated plan reflects the scale and complexity of the sites; such a plan would provide an opportunity to moderate the HO permit triggers by clarifying the intention of the HO and specifying works that might be exempt from the requirement for a permit.

There are also an additional 12 places within the port landside development area that were identified in the Hastings District Heritage Study as of potential significance subject to further assessment. The places are listed at Table 5 and are also mapped at Figure 5. These 12 places comprise a mix of buildings and trees, including some major landscape features (see,
for example the windrow plantings on McKirdys Road, Tyabb, no. 15) and individual tree specimens. Note that the mapping has been prepared based on limited information available and is approximate only. These places are not included in the schedule to the HO. They differ from the places listed in Table 4 in that they have been identified as of potential significance but are yet to undergo any detailed assessment and this would be required prior to proceeding with a future planning scheme amendment to introduce the HO control.

Table 5 Port landside development area: places identified for further assessment in the Hastings District Heritage Study (Appendix A10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geodesic Domed House</td>
<td>54 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>63 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outbuildings, Farm</td>
<td>68 Dandenong-Hastings Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tea Tree and Gums</td>
<td>(east of) 54 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>67 Dandenong-Hastings Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oaks</td>
<td>27 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Trees/Monterey Cypress</td>
<td>Mckirdys Road, Tyabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>Thornells Road, Tyabb (unclear location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>46 Tyabb-Tooradin Road, Tyabb (unclear location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conifer Row</td>
<td>(near) 13 Dandenong-Hastings Road, Tyabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Western Port Hotel</td>
<td>16 High Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BHP Steel Wharves</td>
<td>Off Long Island Drive, Hastings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.5 Landscape elements of potential interest

Given the history of land use within the area as a whole but particularly the southern part (predominantly orcharding and associated nurseries), and the identification of significant landscape elements in the Hastings District Heritage Study, it was considered that the issue warranted some investigation. Accordingly, a preliminary review of historic maps and aerial photographs has been undertaken to further consider the issue of landscape. A desktop review comparing 1940s and current aerial photography has been undertaken with the objective of identifying major landscape elements within the port landside development area which appear to be consistent and which based on maturity could have the potential to be of heritage value. This work has been undertaken as a preliminary predictive exercise and no assessment has been undertaken nor are there any conclusions drawn in relation to significance. Many of the features identified appear as windrow plantings and this is a major characteristic of the area.

The results of this preliminary analysis are shown at Figure 6. It is noted that a number of landscape elements identified through this desktop review work have also been identified as of potential significance in the Hastings District Heritage Study and also appear on the map at Figure 5, including as part of the proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct.
Figure 5  Potential heritage places – port landside development area
Figure 6  Landscape elements and areas of potential interest – port landside development area
4.2 Transport infrastructure development area

While the transport infrastructure development area does not contain any listed places under the EPBC Act or the Heritage Act, it does include a number of places that are subject to HO controls under the Mornington Peninsula and Casey planning schemes.

There are also a series of places within the area which have been identified as being of potential heritage significance based on a review of local heritage studies and other sources of information.

4.2.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

There are no historical heritage places included in the NHL or the CHL within the transport infrastructure development area.

4.2.2 Heritage Act

Victorian Heritage Register

There are no VHR places located within the transport infrastructure development area.

There is one VHR-listed place outside the boundaries of the study area but in close proximity (refer Table 6 and Figure 1).

Table 6 Transport infrastructure development area: VHR sites outside the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0094</td>
<td>Former Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation Hangar</td>
<td>110 Stuart Road, Tyabb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victorian Heritage Inventory

There are no HI places located within the transport infrastructure development area. Two HI sites are located outside the boundaries of the study area but in close proximity (refer Table 7), however assuming no subsurface disturbance would occur to these sites there would be no implications in terms of heritage issues or approvals.

Table 7 Transport infrastructure development area: HI sites outside the boundaries of the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7921-0043</td>
<td>Maintop Farm</td>
<td>95-97 Settlers Run, Botanic Ridge 1-5 Greenwood Court, Botanic Ridge 33-45 Waterhouse Way, Botanic Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7921-0064</td>
<td>Warringine House Site and Orchard</td>
<td>273 High Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also two D-listed HI sites in the northern section of the transport development area (note there are no statutory consequences as a result).

Notwithstanding, as noted, all archaeological sites more than 50 years in age in Victoria are protected by the Heritage Act, regardless of whether they are included in the HI, and there are enforcement provisions for unlawful activities in relation to archaeological relics and places.
Historical archaeology

Notwithstanding there are no HI sites within the area, as noted, all archaeological sites more than 50 years in age in Victoria are protected by the Heritage Act, regardless of whether they are included in the HI, and there are enforcement provisions for unlawful activities in relation to archaeological relics and places.

A review has been undertaken of the archaeological investigations and reports within the broader study area (encompassing both the port landside development area and the transport infrastructure development area) and held by Heritage Victoria. Most archaeological investigations have been undertaken associated with residential development and road projects and the majority have been undertaken in rural locations, with relatively few in the townships. Very little archaeological evidence of significance has been uncovered in the course of these investigations. Given the history of the area and excluding maritime sites, the majority of archaeological sites would be likely to relate to early settlement and farming activities.

4.2.3 Planning and Environment Act

Heritage Overlay

Table 8 lists places included in the schedules to the HO in the Mornington and Casey planning schemes that are located within the transport infrastructure development area. Note that while the transport infrastructure development area extends into land controlled under the Frankston Planning Scheme, there are no HO sites within this part of the municipality.

As the map at Figure 7 indicates, the majority of HO places in the southern section of the transport infrastructure development area are associated with the townships of Tyabb and Hastings.

In the case of Tyabb, a precinct-based HO, the Tyabb Residential, Commercial and Civic Precinct (HO289) falls within the study area, as do a number of individual HOs, including houses, churches, a school, war memorial and a vicarage. There are also two HOs in Tyabb that fall outside the study area boundaries (generally to the north-east) but are in close proximity. These are the Government Cool Store (HO313) and the Former Tyabb All Saints Church of England and Hall (HO309). These are included in the list at Table 9 and appear on the map at Figure 8.

In Hastings there are three HO places that fall within the boundaries of the transport infrastructure development area; these are the former Vicarage (HO142), the Hastings State School 1098, Memorial Gateway and Trees (HO293) and the Holy Trinity Anglican Church Complex (HO299).

Further HOs associated with the township of Hastings are located further south outside the study area boundaries. These are shown on the map at Figure 7 and in the list at Table 9.

In the northern section of the transport infrastructure development area there are five HO sites listed in the Casey Planning Scheme, refer to Table 8 and the map at Figure 8. Four of these are associated with the township of Pearcedale. They include two churches, a hall and a residence. The fifth property is a residence located at 15 East Road, some distance to the south-east of the township (HO160).
Table 8  
HO places within the transport infrastructure development area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mornington Planning Scheme</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO060</td>
<td>Tyabb Soldiers Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO142</td>
<td>Former Vicarage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO283</td>
<td>Tyabb Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO284</td>
<td>George G &amp; Sarah Cole House &amp; Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO289</td>
<td>Tyabb Residential, Commercial and Civic Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO293</td>
<td>Hastings State School 1098, Memorial Gateway, Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO299</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Anglican Church Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO308</td>
<td>Former David Grant House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO320</td>
<td>Former Tyabb Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO321</td>
<td>Hybrid Oak and Tyabb Railway Station School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Casey Planning Scheme</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO149</td>
<td>Perry (Male) Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO150</td>
<td>St Peter’s Church of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO160</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO177</td>
<td>Pearcedale Public Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO180</td>
<td>Former Pearcedale Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7   Statutory heritage controls – transport infrastructure development area: southern section
Figure 8  Statutory heritage controls – transport infrastructure development area: northern section
There are a number of places within the transport infrastructure development area that are not subject to statutory heritage controls but which have been identified as of heritage value or as having potential heritage value.

Local heritage studies

There are 13 places within the transport infrastructure development area that were identified in the Hastings District Heritage Study as of potential significance (subject to further assessment). These places are not currently subject to the HO control in the Mornington Planning Scheme. The places are mapped at Figure 9 and Figure 10 (the mapping is approximate and based on available information) and are listed in Table 10.

The majority of these places are yet to undergo any detailed assessment and this would be required prior to proceeding with a future planning scheme amendment to introduce the HO control.

The exception to this is the Orchard Landscape Precinct (c.1910s-1920s) which was assessed in detail in the Hastings District Heritage Study and recommended for HO controls subject to the preparation of an incorporated plan. This is a large non-contiguous precinct focussed on Graydens Road. It encompasses a series of privately-owned properties including packing sheds, houses, and mature trees including windrow plantings. It also extends into the port landside development area to the west. Refer to the Hastings District Heritage Study, Volume 1, Appendix 1, Orchard Landscape Precinct citation, pp. 228-232, place identifier 660.

The study recommended as follows in relation to the proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct:

No planning controls should be considered before the completion of an incorporated plan based on a conservation management plan and owner consultation.

As noted earlier it has not been confirmed that the Orchard Landscape Precinct was excluded from the amendment which gave effect to the recommendations of the 2006 study, however...
this appears likely, based on this recommendation. The recommendation for an incorporated plan reflects the scale and complexity of the precinct; such a plan would provide an opportunity to moderate the HO permit triggers by clarifying the intention of the HO and specifying works that might be exempt from the requirement for a permit. As for the other sites in Table 10, a future planning scheme amendment would be required to introduce the recommended controls.

Table 10  Transport infrastructure development area: places identified for further assessment in the Hastings District Heritage Study (Appendix A10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>House, Trees</td>
<td>157 Eramosa Road East, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monkey cypress</td>
<td>170 Eramosa Road East, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oaks</td>
<td>27 Bungower Road, Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchard landscape precinct</td>
<td>Graydens Road, Hastings (various properties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>1950 Frankston-Flinders Road, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Monterey Pine Row</td>
<td>88 Hodgins Road, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hastings Railway Station</td>
<td>Church Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>68 Church Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Catholic Church Site</td>
<td>Cool Stores Road, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>8 Cool Stores Road, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>51 Marine Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>J A Babington Park, Marine Parade, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>164 Pearcedale Road, Pearcedale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also a number of places just outside the study boundaries that are not subject to statutory heritage controls but were identified in the Hastings District Heritage Study as of potential significance (subject to further assessment). These places are not currently subject to the HO controls in the Mornington Planning Scheme. The places are listed in Table 11 and are also mapped at Figure 9.

Table 11  Transport infrastructure development area: places identified for further assessment in the Hastings District Heritage Study (Appendix A10) located outside but close to the study boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2 Herring Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Railway Station Residence</td>
<td>134 High Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Western Port Hotel</td>
<td>16 High Street, Hastings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, there are places within the transport infrastructure development area that were identified in the Casey Heritage Study as warranting further investigation and assessment. These places are not currently subject to the HO control in the Casey Planning Scheme detailed assessment would be required prior to proceeding with a future planning scheme amendment to introduce the HO control. They are mapped at Figure 9 and listed at Table 12.

Table 12  Transport infrastructure development area: places identified as of potential significance in the Casey Heritage Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>545 Tyabb-Tooradin Road, Pearcedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shannon Park</td>
<td>671 Baxter-Tooradin Road, Pearcedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pearcedale Primary School 1908 building</td>
<td>Baxter-Tooradin Road, Pearcedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Willows</td>
<td>South Boundary Road East, Pearcedale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the history of land use within the area as a whole but particularly the southern part (predominantly orcharding and associated nurseries), and the identification of significant landscape elements in the Hastings District Heritage Study, it was considered that the issue warranted some investigation. Accordingly, a preliminary review of historic maps and aerial photographs has been undertaken to further consider the issue of landscape.

A desktop review comparing 1940s and current aerial photography has been undertaken with the objective of identifying major landscape elements within the transport infrastructure development area which appear to be consistent and which based on maturity could have the potential to be of heritage interest. This work has been undertaken as a preliminary predictive exercise and no assessment has been undertaken, nor are there any conclusions drawn in relation to significance.

The results of this preliminary analysis are shown at Figure 11 and Figure 12. The majority of the features identified are located in the southern part of the transport infrastructure development area. Many appear on the aerials as windrow plantings and this is a major characteristic of the area. It is noted that a number of landscape elements identified through this desktop review work have also been identified as of potential significance in the Hastings District Heritage Study and also appear on the map at Figure 9, including as part of the proposed Orchard Landscape Precinct.
Figure 9  Potential heritage places – transport infrastructure development area: southern section
Figure 10  Potential heritage places – transport infrastructure development area: northern section
Figure 11  Landscape elements and areas of potential interest – transport infrastructure development area: southern section
Figure 12  Landscape elements and areas of potential interest – transport infrastructure development area: northern section
**Victorian War Inventory**

There are several sites listed on the Victorian War Inventory which are thought to be located within the transport infrastructure development area. The Victorian War Inventory is a database which contains information and images of sites relating to Victoria’s war history and was developed as a joint project between the Veteran’s Unit and Heritage Victoria.

While there are no statutory implications of inclusion in the database, there is the potential for these places to be assessed as of heritage significance.

Two of the sites in Table 13 (the Hastings Primary School Memorial Gates and the Tyabb Soldiers Memorial) are also subject to HO controls under the Mornington Planning Scheme.

The Hastings Drill Hall (‘The Parade, Hastings’), the Tyabb Military site and the Cranbourne Military Site were not located and it is unclear whether they would fall within the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings Drill Hall</td>
<td>The Parade, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings Primary School Memorial Gates</td>
<td>Hodgins Road, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyabb Military Site</td>
<td>Tyabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyabb Soldiers Memorial</td>
<td>Frankston-Flinders Road, Tyabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cranbourne Military Site</td>
<td>Casey City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.0 Preliminary Recommendations**

This preliminary desktop review has identified a number of heritage issues and potential heritage issues which should be considered in planning for the project.

There are currently relatively few heritage places within or in close proximity to the study area that are subject to statutory heritage controls. The study area does not include any historical sites listed on the NHL or the CHL under the EPBC Act. The implications under the Heritage Act are also limited. A single VHR-registered object is located just outside the study area. While there are also no HI sites within the study area, the issue of historical archaeology is one that will require further consideration given the Heritage Act affords blanket protection to archaeological sites and relics over 50 years in age.

The majority of places with statutory heritage controls within the study area are locally listed HO places in the Mornington Peninsula and Casey planning schemes. These are focused on townships within the study area but also include a series of dispersed farming and orcharding properties outside the towns. The strong preference from a heritage perspective would be to avoid any direct physical impact on these HO places as this would have the potential to diminish or remove heritage values. This is accepting that impacts would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis and there may be larger sites where there are areas which are of less sensitivity.

Consideration should also be given to the potential for any impacts to arise related to development in close proximity to HO places, on the basis that such development could have a visual impact on the setting or presentation of HO places and could also have an adverse
impact on their heritage values. This is also relevant in the case of the Tyabb Cemetery site, which abuts the port landside development area (SUZ1) on four sides but is excluded from it.

In addition to the listed HO places, there are numbers of additional sites which have been identified as of potential significance in local heritage studies but which have not been assessed in detail nor proposed for a planning scheme amendment. The nature and level of significance of these is unknown at this time and it is not possible to comment on any implications these may have for the project. Further investigation could be undertaken where sites are likely to be affected.

Based on the limited investigation to date, the issue of landscape within the study area is also considered to be a potential heritage issue, particularly in the southern half of the study area (port landside development area and the southern parts of the transport infrastructure development area) and it is recommended that this be further considered.

6.0 Conclusion

Based on this preliminary desktop review, the key constraints for historical heritage are those arising from the existing HO places within the study area and impacts on these places should be avoided if possible. While there are no listed HI sites, historical archaeology may also be an issue in this study area and will require further consideration.

Additionally there are numerous non-archaeological sites (buildings, precincts and landscape features) within the study area which may have the potential to be of heritage value, however these do not have statutory heritage controls and the majority have not been subject to a formal heritage assessment.
7.0 References

7.1 Databases and websites


Heritage Victoria’s mapping layer http://services.land.vic.gov.au/maps/hermes.jsp

NHL and CHL accessed via:
http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/heritage/heritage-places/national-heritage-list
http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/heritage/heritage-places/commonwealth-heritage-list


7.2 Heritage studies and technical reports


Andrew Long & Associates (Albrecht, Melinda), Western Port Highway (Ballarto Road to Hodgins Road): Cultural Heritage Desktop Assessment (Draft) for VicRoads, 4 October 2013

Andrew Long & Associates, Port of Hastings Stage One Investigations: Cultural Heritage Study, for AECOM, July 2009

Built Heritage, Survey of Post-war Built Heritage in Victoria: Stage Two, 2010


GHD and AECOM, Preliminary Review and Analysis of Recreation, Amenity and Heritage Issues, for the Port of Hastings Development Authority, November 2013


Graeme Butler & Associates, Hastings District Heritage Study, Volume 1, Heritage Place Reports, Project Methods, Recommendations and Volume 2, Environmental History, 2002

Graeme Butler et al, City of Casey Heritage Study, City of Casey, 1998

Heritage Alliance, Survey of Post-war Built Heritage in Victoria: Stage One, 2008

Melissa Albrecht, *Western Port Highway (Ballarto Road to Hodgkins Road), Cultural Heritage Desktop Assessment*, October 2013.

### 7.3 Heritage Victoria Archaeology Reports collection

Reports collection as at December 2012, held by Lovell Chen. Report number shown in brackets.


**Alpha Archaeology**, *A Residential Subdivision at 22 Morrah Street, Hastings, Victoria: Cultural Heritage Report #3618, Draft Report, January 2010* (3618)

Andrea Murphy, *An Aboriginal and Historic Archaeological Site Survey of Land at Pearcedale*, December 1998 (0715)

Andrea Murphy, *An Aboriginal and Historic Archaeological site survey of ‘Kelbar’, North Road, Cranbourne South, Victoria*, November 1998 (0717)

Archaeology at Tardis, ‘Proposed Padua College, 1585 Frankston-Flinders Road’, correspondence with Heritage Victoria, 8 March 2012 (4076)

**Biosis Research**, *Historical Archaeological Testing at Hendersons Road House Site (H7921-0065), Hastings, Victoria*, December 2009 (4177)

**Biosis Research**, *Historical Archaeological Testing at Hendersons Road House Site (H7921-0065), Hastings, Victoria*, June 2010 (4178)

**Biosis Research**, *A cultural heritage survey of the Frankston-Flinders Road and Denham Road intersection, Tyabb, Victoria*, July 2002 (1524)

**Biosis Research**, *Desktop Archaeological Assessment of Pipeline between Cardinia Reservoir and Pearcedale, Victoria*, September 1999 (0849)


**Biosis Research**, *An archaeological survey of a property at Tyabb, Victoria, Railway Road, May 2003* (1812)

**Biosis Research**, *An archaeological monitoring program at Mt Erin Secondary College, Somerville, Victoria*, June 2006 (2803)

**Biosis Research**, *An archaeological survey of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Bungower Road and Westernport Highway, Somerville, Victoria*, March 2007 (3022)

**Biosis Research**, *An archaeological survey of Western Port Highway between Cranbourne-Frankston Road to North Road, Cranbourne South, Victoria*, July 2006 (2721)

**Jem Archaeology**, *Three Allotment Subdivision and Construction of Two Dwellings, 4-6 Terry Street, Pearcedale, Victoria: Historical Heritage Assessment*, December 2012 (4239)

**Matrix Archaeological Services**, *Cranbourne-Frankston Road & Westernport Highway, VIC: Cultural heritage survey*, March 2005 (2317)

**Tardis Enterprises**, *Cranbourne-Frankston Road, Langwarrin: Cultural Heritage Assessment*, July 2002 (1506)

Tardis Enterprises, *Cranbourne-Frankston Road, Cranbourne: Cultural Heritage Assessment*, May 2007 (3417)

Tardis Enterprises, *Cranbourne-Frankston Road, Langwarrin: Cultural Heritage Assessment*, July 2002 (1506)

Tardis Enterprises, *Cranbourne-Frankston Road, Cranbourne: Cultural Heritage Assessment*, May 2007 (3096)


### 7.4 Maps, plans and aerial photographs

Limited primary research was undertaken in the form of 1940s aerial photographs available at Land Victoria, historic maps and plans and limited 1970s aerial photography available digitally at the State Library of Victoria, and the Central Plan Office collection at the Land Victoria Landata page. The historic maps reviewed were:

- ‘Township of Hastings’, T125-5, undated, Central Plan Office, Landata
- ‘Parish of Langwarrin’, L16-4, undated, Central Plan Office, Landata
- ‘Parish of Sherwood’, S271-5, undated, Central Plan Office, Landata
- ‘Parish of Sherwood’, Sheet 2, S271, undated, Central Plan Office, Landata
- ‘Parish of Tyabb’, undated, Central Plan Office, Landata
- ‘Victoria, Hastings’, 1942, Australian Section Imperial General Staff, State Library of Victoria
Appendix A  Assignment Brief

Cultural Heritage Desktop

The investigation is to provide a desktop assessment of the historical heritage values of the corridor located east of the Western Port Highway, between Cranbourne-Frankston Road and Bungower Road (the site, as shown in Figure 1), with a view to making recommendations for potential historical heritage issues within the study area for the Land Transport Corridor.

Outcome

The investigation will inform the strategic assessment for the Land Transport Corridor that is currently being undertaken to determine the preferred transport corridor.

This investigation will assist VicRoads/PoHDA in meeting obligations for the management of historical archaeology in accordance with key legislation, most notably (but not limited to) the Heritage Act 1995 (Vic) and the Planning and Environment Act (1987) (Vic) as well as relevant State and Commonwealth legislation.

Please note that investigation of Aboriginal heritage is regarded as beyond the scope of this assignment.

In summary the specific outcome is to provide an understanding of the potential cultural heritage issues within the current study area for the Land Transport Corridor.

Approach:

This will be a desktop based assessment to inform the strategic transport corridor analysis being undertaken by VicRoads and PoHDA and will include the investigation of an area which curves and follows a north-south alignment parallel to and east of the existing Western Port Highway (refer Figure 1). The desktop investigation will also include a review and incorporate the previous historical heritage desktop study on the Western Port Highway.

Study area description

Refer to Figure 1 for a map of the study area.

The study area passes through special use areas, green wedge zones and large areas of parklands, bushland and farmland.

Summary of previous consultation

No previous consultation has been undertaken with any stakeholders on this study area.

Scope

Undertake a desktop assessment of the specified study area to identify historical heritage issues and constraints affecting the potential project area. The assessment is expected to involve minimal consultation with historical heritage stakeholders outside of researching existing registers and heritage report information.

Key scope areas are:

a) Review and summarise previous studies and incorporate into report;

b) Summarise the nature and significance of historical archaeological and clearly outline whether any sites are currently listed on the Victorian Heritage Register, Victorian Heritage Inventory, Local Heritage Overlays or any other relevant heritage listing.
c) A clear description of the cultural heritage values of the study area based on collated existing data;

c) An objective assessment of the potential impacts of proposed works on identified cultural heritage values;

d) An appraisal of any implications for the project arising from relevant State and Commonwealth legislation or policy; and

e) The formulation of clear recommendations regarding the scope of any further research that may be required.

Methodology

The consultant will review existing records contained within the following primary data sources (accessible via Heritage Victoria’s Heritage Management Electronic System HERMES):

- Victorian Heritage Register
- Victorian Heritage Inventory
- Heritage Overlays (Local Government Authority Planning Schemes)

The consultant will also review Heritage Victoria’s mapping layer which shows Heritage Register and Heritage Inventory places (as well as Heritage Overlay places) at:


The consultant will also review other registers that may be relevant including (but not limited to):

- National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register.
- Victorian War Heritage Inventory
- National Heritage List.
- Commonwealth Heritage List.
- World Heritage List.

The consultant must also review the following:

- Any relevant reports from previous heritage surveys or heritage studies undertaken in the region or on any relevant cultural heritage matters, including the previous historical heritage report prepared for the Western Port Highway Corridor;
- Any published works about cultural heritage in the region generally, and in study area in particular;
- Any relevant community feedback / information received by VicRoads;
- Available records at: Land Victoria; The Public Records Office of Victoria; The State Library of Victoria; and other relevant archives where these exist (e.g. local historical societies).

Report

The consultant shall prepare a report that summarises the nature and significance of historical archaeological values within the study area and clearly outlines whether any sites are currently listed (or recommended for listing) on the Victorian Heritage Register, Victorian Heritage Inventory, Local Government Heritage Overlays or any other relevant heritage listings. The implications of any such listings must be clearly outlined (e.g. summarise any processes to be followed and approvals that may be necessary before the project can proceed).

NOTE: The report produced for this Assignment shall comply with the Whole of Victorian Government (WoVG) Accessibility Standard. The consultant should ensure that Accessibility
requirements are incorporated as documents are being written and not leave this as a separate task to be carried out when finalising documents.

**Meetings**

a) Inception meeting VicRoads/PoHDA- Venue TBC - Max. 2 hours, date TBA

b) Review meeting at completion of draft report VicRoads/PoHDA- Venue TBC - Max. 2 hours, date TBA