braworth@netspace.net.au on 05/09/2000 23:56:46

To:

Bronwyn Brown/StonccN@StonccN

CC:

Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.

```
bronwyn
I think these two buildings are meant to go together - while
clear informatino about the smaller red brick building, its
generall
appearance and proximity to the salvo building both suyggest
that it was
built as an adjunct to the original citadel - on this basis it
should remain
listed.
cheers
bryce
ps see guidelines attached
>From: Bronwyn.Brown@stonnington.vic.gov.au
>To: braworth@netspace.net.au
>Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
>Date: Sun, 3 Sep 2000 10:59 PM
>
> for your advice
> ----- Forwarded by Bronwyn Brown/StonccN on
04/09/2000 08:58
> -----
> Geoff Hutton
> 01/09/2000 12:23
> To:
       braworth@ozemail.com.au
> cc:
       Bronwyn Brown/StonccN@StonccN, Rosemary
Lynch/StonccN@StonccN, Marco
       Negri/StonccN@StonccN
> Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor. (Document
link: Bronwyn Brown)
> Bryce
> I am currently preparing a 'minor adjustments and technical
corrections'
> amendment to the planning scheme (Amendment C11) and would
like to round off
> those matters to be included in it by the end of next week
(Sept. 7-8).
```

```
> This is to enable me to complete the documentation for
exhibition.
> The various map alterations are being prepared by DOI - I
have a batch of
> with them at the moment and any others I'd like them to have
as soon as
> possible.
> It seems this requested review on 24-26 Victoria Street
could involve a
> 'technical correction' variation to HO113. If this is the
case, I'd like to
> include it as part of Amendment C11.
> How quickly can you complete this review? The next general
amendment (if we
miss
> C11) is 3 months off, and it's not clear if DOI is to
prepare the maps for the
> next one. I have agreement with DOI to prepare the maps for
Cll at no cost to
> Council.
> Please advise.
> Thanks
           Geoff.
>
> Bronwyn Brown
> 27/07/2000 09:46 am
> To:
        braworth@ozemail.com.au
> cc:
        Rosemary Lynch/StonccN@StonccN, Geoff
Hutton/StonccN@StonccN
> Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
> Bryce, I would like you to review the property at 24-26
Victoria Street,
Windsor
> which was included in the Heritage Overlay. The question I
have is in
relation
> to the property and whether the significance relates only to
the Citadel on 24
> or whether it relates to both buildings on 24 and 26
Victoria Street.
                  I'll
put
> in the post all the information I have about the site.
> Bronwyn
              ----- Forwarded by Bronwyn Brown/StonccN on
27/07/2000 09:37
```

```
>
> Rosemary Lynch
> 27/07/2000 09:25
        Bronwyn Brown/StonccN@StonccN
> cc:
>
> Subject:
            Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor. (Document
link: Bronwyn Brown)
> Thanks Bronwyn, I agree as we are not certain ourselves if
the citation was
> meant to cover both buildings or just one - hence our
enquiry.
> We'll look forward to Bryce's comments.
>
>
> Bronwyn Brown
> 26/07/2000 13:25
> To:
        Rosemary Lynch/StonccN@StonccN
        Geoff Hutton/StonccN@StonccN, Marco
Negri/StonccN@StonccN
           Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
> Subject:
link: Rosemary Lynch)
> I just walked down to have a look at the site. There would
appear to be 2 old
> buildings on the site. From the very brief citation, it
would appear that the
> larger cement covered building at 24 Victoria Street is the
more important,
> however I think the matter should be referred to Bryce for
his comments before
> making any decision to divide the lot into 2.
>
>
> Rosemary Lynch
> 25/07/2000 16:56
        Bronwyn Brown/StonccN@StonccN
> To:
        Marco Negri/StonccN@StonccN, Geoff
Hutton/StonccN@StonccN, Peter
        Angwin/StonccN@StonccN
> Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor. (Document
link: Bronwyn Brown)
>
> Thanks for your comments,
> I assume from the response this means the HO covers both 24
and 26 Victoria
> Was this what it was meant to cover.ie Both buildings or
just one.?
```

```
> If it was meant to be just one building, we will be guided
by Planning on
which
> way they would handle the amendment.
> Rosemary
> Bronwyn Brown
> 25/07/2000 16:30
> To:
        Rosemary Lynch/StonccN@StonccN
        Geoff Hutton/StonccN@StonccN, Marco
> cc:
Negri/StonccN@StonccN
> Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
> I note the property is described as 24-26 Victoria Street
but can be easily
> isolated to one allotment if appropriate - perhaps it can be
arranged as a
> technical amendment or a C1 to the new scheme.
                                                 If the HO
covered only one lot
> i.e. 26 Victoria Street then obviously there would be no
unnecessary controls
> applying to the extraneous lot!
> ----- Forwarded by Bronwyn Brown/StonccN on
25/07/2000 16:20
> -----
> Geoff Hutton
> 25/07/2000 15:59
        Marco Negri/StonccN@StonccN, Bronwyn
> To:
Brown/StonccN@StonccN
> cc:
> Subject: Re: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor. (Document
link: Bronwyn Brown)
> Bronwyn
> Could you help Rosemary on this issue please.
> Marco
> I think it might be timely for me to have the GIS (thus the
planning scheme)
> my computer. What do you think? Who should I chase this
with?
> Thanking all in anticipation and cheers
' > gch.
```

```
> Marco Negri
> 25/07/2000 03:50 pm
        Michael Dietrich/StonccN@StonccN, Geoff
Hutton/StonccN@StonccN
> cc:
> Subject:
           24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
> Michael,
> Can you provide Rosemary with an answer on the planning
controls issue (i.e.
> what permits would be required.
> Geoff
> Could you please provide an answer on the issue of the
"extent of the
controls".
            ----- Forwarded by Marco Negri/StonccN on
25/07/2000 03:45 pm
> Rosemary Lynch
> 25/07/2000 03:43 pm
        Marco Negri/StonccN@StonccN
> To:
> cc:
        Peter Angwin/StonccN@StonccN
> Subject: 24-26 Victoria Street, Windsor.
> Marco,
> I note from the GIS that the Council owned property at 24-26
Victoria St
Windsor
> (the Migrant Resource Centre) is located in two zones - a B1
Zone and a R1
Zone.
> The site is made up of two Titles and it would appear that
one title is in one
> zone and the other title in the other zone.
> I also note that there is a Heritage Overlay Control on the
site - HO 113.
> This I understand refers to "Salvation Army Citadel 24-26
Victoria Street."
> My understanding is that the Citadel is located at 26
Victoria Street and not
> Victoria St however the overlay control on the maps shows
this control to be
> over both buildings.
```

```
> Council is looking at the future of these properties and we
are seeking advice
> as to the extent of the control.
> What does the control mean and is it over both buildings? Is
a permit required
> for demolition, painting etc.
> It appears that the map is wider than the written
description
> Cheers
> Rosemary
>
>
>
     guidelines final
```