

Summary and Analysis of Submissions to 50 Oatland Road - Potential Heritage Overlay

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Format	Support or Object	Key Points
1		Written submission	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer a functional dwelling. • Restoration would be prohibitively expensive and the current owners bought intending to demolish. • First became aware of Council's interest when demolition order suspended. • The property is of limited heritage value and changes to the site mean that there is very little of the early farming settlement story visible on this site, other than the existence of the old house. • The proposal for heritage protection of a disused, unlivable dwelling shell is not warranted and is not an appropriately balanced outcome. • The building report attached confirms the current uninhabitable state of the building as an empty shell. It also highlights major structural deficiencies requiring significant maintenance or replacement work, if the building were to be brought back to habitable condition. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is simply a prohibitive cost proposition that will not deliver the type of functional wheelchair accessible dwelling they require for their son. • The heritage overlay should be removed completely but if it must be applied the area of coverage is considered excessive and reduced extent is proposed.
2		Written submission	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous owner not made aware of potential heritage overlay. • Contacted Council prior to purchase not informed about potential heritage overlay. • As a potential purchaser no information was given regarding this issue.

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Format	Support or Object	Key Points
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor Statement and Heritage Register were checked and neither made mention of any potential heritage overlay. • Current house not suitable for the specific needs of the family. It is derelict and completely useless. • Independent building adviser recommended demolition. • In 2016 the investigation referenced a 'farm complex' with the associated outbuildings. Most of these have now been removed and it is the house itself that is the subject of the 2020 report. • House is hard to see from the road. • If the heritage overlay does have to be applied, does it have to be so large? Currently suggested to go boundary to boundary. • Don't have to keep the house to still have the history. • Will suffer significant financial loss if the heritage overlay is applied.
3		Written Submission	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers the process to have been an injustice and that Council should address. • No information on the Vendor Statement to suggest that Council had an interest in the property. • States that the owners contacted Council and were informed that there was no interest in the property and that no decision to pursue a planning scheme amendment had been made. • The current owners also checked with Heritage Victoria – not realising that this would not include any information of potential overlays. • Council should have been aware that the property was for sale and notified prospective owners of the potential heritage overlay. • Suggests notion that individual loss does not outweigh collective gain in heritage matters is wrong.

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Format	Support or Object	Key Points
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should retract heritage overlay on natural justice grounds. • The property is on private land, with a very limited view from the public realm. • The house has been stripped and is structurally compromised. • The house is of no use to the owners who cannot afford to rebuild it or to anyone else. • The initial citation references a 'farm complex' however a number of the outbuildings have been removed. • Considers other options: transfer of house to another location or historical plaque which the owners would maintain through s173 agreement.
4		Written submission Petition	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not believe that there was any intention to place a heritage overlay on the property when the current owners purchased the property. • Notes the very poor condition of the property. • Should have kept Plenty School- much better example of heritage • Devaluation of other properties by claiming derelict buildings have heritage value.
5		Written submission Petition	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property is uninhabitable and has no original features. • Currents owners checked Vendor Statement and S32 – neither mentioned the heritage overlay. • Notes the assessment was based on a drive by.
6		Written submission	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house is in very poor condition and cannot be renovated to the requirements needed for a disabled person. • Council should allow the property to be demolished and a suitable dwelling built.

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Format	Support or Object	Key Points
7		Written submission	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The house is in very poor condition and cannot be renovated to the requirements needed for a disabled person. Council should allow the property to be demolished and a suitable dwelling built
8		Email Petition	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions who is expected to pay for the preservation and restoration of the property. She believes that if Council wants to preserve it then Council should pay for it and that Council should compensate the current owners for any expenses related to the heritage overlay being applied. The house is in very poor condition and will require many man hours to restore.
9		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
10		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
11		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
12		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
13		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
14		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
15		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
16		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
17		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
18		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
19		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
20		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
21		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
22		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
23		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
24		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Format	Support or Object	Key Points
25		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
26		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
27		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8
28		Petition	Object	Pro forma as per submitter 8