

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COUNCIL

MINUTES

The 125th Meeting of the South Australian Heritage Council (the Council) was held via electronic means on Thursday 17 February 2022.

Statement of Acknowledgement

The Chairperson acknowledged that this land that the Council members meet on today is the traditional lands for Kurna people and that the Council respect their spiritual relationship with their country. The Chairperson also acknowledged the Kurna people as the custodians of the Adelaide region and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are still as important to the living Kurna people today.

The Chairperson acknowledged that one of the Council members was connecting into the meeting from Port Lincoln, on the traditional lands of the Barngarla people.

Heritage Council: Chair: Mr Keith Conlon OAM Members: Mr Stephen Schrapel, Ms Eleanor Walters, Mrs Deborah Lindsay, Mr Marcus Rolfe, Ms Kate McDougall, Mr Gavin Leydon, Ms Peggy Brock AM and Mr Rob Donaldson.

Secretariat: Mr David Hanna, Executive Officer, Heritage South Australia, Department for Environment and Water (DEW) and Ms Beverley Voigt, Manager, Heritage South Australia, DEW.

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Mr Conlon welcomed all to the 125th meeting of the South Australian Heritage Council (the Council).

Apologies from Ms Jan Ferguson OAM.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Agenda

The agenda was adopted without amendment.

Declarations of conflict of interest

The following conflicts of interest were declared:

- Mr Marcus Rolfe and Mrs Deborah Lindsay declared a conflict in relation to a matter to be discussed In Camera. Their respective firms are involved in the matter and it was noted they would depart the meeting for that discussion.

3 PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Council considered the minutes of the 16 December 2021 meeting and approved them with minor amendments as follows:

- Note that Ms Peggy Brock AM had declared a conflict of interest in relation to the 92 Brougham Place, North Adelaide matter – discussed under ‘Any Other Business’
- Change the word ‘public’ to ‘private’ in second paragraph on page 14.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Approved** the minutes of the 16 December 2021 meeting.

4. ACTION ITEMS

Council noted the status of action items.

In discussing Leigh Creek, Ms Voigt noted that Heritage SA will ensure appropriate communication on heritage entries that impact mining or pastoral operations will be sent to the Department for Energy and Mines and Pastoral Board respectively.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the status of the action list.

5. IN CAMERA DISCUSSION

The Council had an in-camera discussion pursuant to section 7 (6) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

6 FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

6.1 Aboriginal engagement and reconciliation

Mr Conlon welcomed Mr. Mark Koolmatrie, Chair of the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee and Mr. Toby Forde, Manager, Aboriginal Affairs in Department of Premier and Cabinet to the meeting. Mr Conlon was pleased to note that this was a historic occasion as it was the first time that representatives of the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee had met with the full body of the South Australian Heritage Council.

Mr Forde thanked Mr Conlon and noted that two other employees with Aboriginal Affairs were pleased to join the discussion today – Ms Megan Tutty, Senior Information Officer (Heritage) and Dr Cherrie De Leiu, Senior Heritage Officer. Ms Tutty maintains

Aboriginal heritage records held on the Registrar, Central Archives on behalf of the Premier. Ms Tutty and Dr De Leiuen noted that it was excellent we are working together and that there is much overlap between Aboriginal cultural sites and archaeology.

Mr Conlon noted background to this discussion today, citing the work of the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand and Dhawura Ngilum (Remembering Country).

Mr Koolmatrie thanked the Council for the invitation to attend this meeting and said he was enthused that all of us can get together. He said it is about forging the way forward in this important reconciliation space. Mr Koolmatrie referenced the report from Dukan Gorge, the cultural significance of rockfaces and old mountains as impetuous to work together and protect what is precious.

Mr Koolmatrie referenced the tragic story of the Maria Shipwreck that occurred in 1840 as an example of the importance of truth telling. It was noted that some Ngarrindgeri elders are going to travel to the site of the wreck with some visitors when the weather conditions are right. The shipwreck was tragic for Ngarrindgeri people and also the people aboard the Maria. This was a powerful example of the importance of truth telling.

Mr Conlon and Mr Koolmatrie agreed it was important to work together to finalise the thematic framework that the Heritage Council had begun drafting.

It was noted that Aboriginal Heritage and Heritage SA were part of the same Department in the 1980's. There is a good history of cooperation between the two departments.

Mr Koolmatrie flagged a possible need for a partnership agreement between the two Councils. It was agreed that we need a clear understanding of what we require from each other.

DEW Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan

Council acknowledged the DEW Stretch - Reconciliation Action Plan and indicated it was an excellent document.

Council decided not to adopt this document in its entirety, noting that it was prepared for a department of approximately 1500 staff and many of the actions are not relevant for a small membership base such as the Council. Instead Council acknowledged the document, committed to the vision of it, and adopted the actions specifically designed for Boards and Councils.

Council indicated it will report progress on its on actions through appropriate means.

Draft Statement of Intent

Council discussed a draft Statement of Intent that had been provided through their agenda package. The objective behind the Statement of Intent is to set out the intention of Council in the reconciliation area through a public expression.

Council discussed the strong language that had been used in describing the colonisation of South Australia by British settlers.

Mr Koolmatrie noted that trans-generational trauma is real for Aboriginal people and it is important we don't shy away from the truth of the past.

Action: Council agreed to reconsider the draft Statement of Intent out of session. Mr Hanna to coordinate.

It was noted that Mr Forde or Ms Tutty can support the Council in ensuring it acknowledges the appropriate Aboriginal nation group related to a State Heritage Place.

Reconciling with the Frontier project

Council noted the update provided by Mr Hanna within the agenda paper about progress with the Reconciling with the Frontier project.

Council noted that Stolen Generation sites are important sites as well as sites of conflict. The Reconciling with the Frontier project is focussing on sites of conflict, though Council will look to tell the Aboriginal story whether it is conflict or something different.

Council agreed to invite Dr Skye Krischauff and an Aboriginal member of the group for a further update when it meets in May 2022.

Action: Mr Hanna to invite Dr Krischauff and another representative to the May 2022 meeting.

At this point in the agenda, Mr Koolmatire, Mr Forde, Ms Tutty, and Dr De Leiuen departed the meeting. Mr Conlon thanked them all very much for attending and the very useful discussion and partnership building that had resulted. Mr Conlon hoped we could catch up face to face in the near future and promised cake!

Draft letter to DEW Executive re resourcing Aboriginal Engagement

Council discussed a draft letter to DEW requesting a funding base to enable it to engage with Aboriginal organisations to ensure it is telling the Aboriginal story appropriately.

Mr. Conlon noted that securing a funding base is fundamentally important in enabling the Council to do this work. Without it, the Council will not be able to meet its commitments around truth telling.

It was agreed that the letter be reworked so that it discusses the Reconciliation Action Plan at the beginning. Mr Donaldson suggested that the letter itemise a couple of practical outcomes that would be the result of additional funding. Examples included Aboriginal Country of each State Heritage Place being reflected on the SA Heritage Register, and Aboriginal story related to each assessment going forward.

Council endorsed the letter to be sent out of session, based on a review as described above and to be approved by the Chairperson.

Action: Mr Hanna to review letter and send to Mr Conlon for endorsement and signature.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Acknowledged** and **Committed** to the Vision and relevant actions within the DEW Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan
- **Agreed** to finalise a Reconciliation Statement of Intent out of session
- **Considered** a way forward relating to the advice received from the Crown Solicitor on including the Aboriginal Country in the Address line of a listing
- **Approved** the letter of request to Ms Cate Hart, Executive Director regarding for funding for Aboriginal engagement subject to some minor amendments.
- **Discussed** a partnership approach with representatives of the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee including a commitment to completing the thematic study.
- **Noted** the update on the Reconciling with the Frontier project and agreed to invite Dr Skye Krischauff and an Aboriginal member of the group to its May 2022 meeting.

6.2 Heritage Tourism Implementation Plan and Alliance

Mr. Conlon welcomed Ms. Linda Lacey to the meeting. Ms Lacey works within a designated tourism team in Department for Environment and Water, and is working mainly on supporting tourism ventures on Kangaroo Island associated with National Parks.

Council noted that the 'Growing Our Heritage Future: a 10-year strategy for growing heritage tourism in South Australia' (GOHF) was released to the public on 30 April 2021.

Ms Lacey said that a significant achievement of the Strategy is the establishment of a \$250,000 heritage tourism grants program pilot for 2021/22. The program is an extension of the successful Heritage Conservation Grants program with funding targeted to projects and activities that activate heritage specifically for tourism purposes.

Ms Lacey noted progress of conservation works to State Heritage Places impacted by fire on Kangaroo Island and commented on the massive impact COVID has had on the tourism industry here in South Australia.

Mr Conlon noted that he has the role of Chair of the Heritage Tourism Alliance and was pleased to note that the Heritage Tourism Action Strategy has motivated Government initiatives such as tourism grants.

Ms Lacey noted that it is her aim to establish a Reference Group to follow in the footsteps of the Alliance in 2022. Hoping to have three meetings this year and noted the membership base will be smaller than that of the Alliance.

Council discussed a possible Heritage Tourism Ambassador program. Mr Donaldson noted that there are some individuals connected with history in Port Lincoln that would be well suited to the role but would need to be approached to see if they are interested.

Council discussed Granite Island and its future with the new causeway now completed. The visitor experience can be improved but will be done sensitively in a park setting. It was noted that it is vital that the Ngarrindjeri connection with Granite Island is made clear.

Mr Conlon thanked Ms Lacey for her contribution.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Notes** the 'Growing Our Heritage Future' and Action Plan implementation update report.

6.3 Heritage Places Act Legislative review enhancements

The Chairperson welcomed Ms. Justine Wilson, Heritage SA, to her first meeting of Council. It was noted that Ms. Wilson prepared the paper that Council received on this matter.

Ms Voigt noted that Heritage South Australia is of the opinion that the Heritage Places Act only requires minor refinement, not a complete 'reworking', as was the case with the *Development Act 1993*, resulting in the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* (the PDI Act).

It was noted that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament's Inquiry into Heritage report, completed in April 2019, acknowledged there was a need for better alignment between the pathways for State and local heritage listing.

Heritage SA said it was timely to consider reviewing/ improving the Heritage Places Act, particularly as the PDI Act has now been implemented, with the introduction of the Planning and Design Code.

It was acknowledged that Heritage SA still needs to review Crown Solicitors Office advice received since 2005, and include any relevant recommendations within this work on legislative review.

Ms Voigt noted that Heritage SA will wait the outcomes of advice to Government by the Heritage Reform Advisory Committee before broadening its scope of the legislative review.

Mr Conlon indicated that, as Acting Chair of the Heritage Reform Advisory Panel he had presented the report to the two Minister's representing the Environment and Planning portfolios.

The following matters were discussed:

- Council noted that it would be appropriate for there to be an examination of its role in relation to Local Heritage listings and also the role of the HERCON Criteria, with possible thresholds for State and Local. It acknowledged however that the review conducted by Heritage SA was limited to ways to amend the current legislation. It was suggested that Heritage SA look to note this in its paper and suggested paragraph # 10 could be appropriate place for it.
- The role of Council in pursuing its own nominations under section 17 of the Act.
- Expertise in cultural landscapes and Engineering Heritage could possibly be included under section 14 of the Act.
- On permit matters it queried whether the archaeological provisions need strengthening?
- Dr Bird noted that documenting evidence of the social importance of a place is difficult and discussed variables such as whether a group has ongoing importance or is of fleeting importance and is the community important in the context of the place. It was noted that intangible heritage is difficult to assess and often requires time consuming and expensive grass root research that is very labour intensive.
- Ms McDougall noted that there is an Australian Heritage Commission paper on social value.
- It was noted that the HERCON criteria includes the word 'social', whereas the criteria the Council works with under the Heritage Places Act only reference 'cultural' and 'spiritual'. Council suggested that Heritage SA indicate a stronger desire to align with HERCON criteria under # 10 in the paper presented to Council.
- It was suggested that Heritage SA examine definitions of Place, Precinct and Area and how this may be worked into a review of the legislation, or through associated guidelines.
- Council noted there is a weakness in the relationship between archaeology and development.
- Mrs Lindsay queried whether the Statement of Significance for a State Heritage Area could somehow be linked to the Heritage Places Act, given it is currently declared under Planning legislation.

Heritage SA indicated it would consider the comments made by Council members and Council members were thanked for their input.

Council agreed that the paper included a very good collection of suggested amendments to pursue and congratulated Ms Wilson on a well prepared paper.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Discussed** the Ideas for Proposed Amendments report and identifies gaps and priorities for improving the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

6.4 External Heritage Advisory Service

It was noted that a working group of Council met on 15 February 2022 to discuss the need for and proposal for an expanded Heritage Advisory Service.

Council noted that further work is required and therefore discussion on this important matter will be postponed until its next meeting.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** that this matter will be postponed until its April 2022 meeting.

7 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PROVISIONAL ENTRY ON THE SA HERITAGE REGISTER

7.1 St Margaret Mary Catholic Church, 286 Torrens Road, Croydon Park

Mr Chris Burns introduced this matter to Council. Mr Burns indicated that on 15 November 2021 he undertook a site visit.

The Heritage Assessment report recommends that the St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church meets s16 criteria (a), (d), (e) and (g).

Mr Burns noted that on 18 February 2021, the Council considered the assessment of Holy Cross Catholic Church and determined that more than 650 churches were constructed in South Australia between 1945 and 1990 and due to the prominent role they played in South Australia's physical, cultural and spiritual development, post-war churches are a place of cultural significance.

Mr Burns recommended that St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church demonstrates the same level of outstanding qualities of the class of place as the previously State Heritage listed Holy Cross Catholic Church (SHP 26498) and Our Lady of Mount Carmel Catholic Church (SHP 26520).

Led by the Chairperson, the Council discussed each criterion in turn and debated whether they reached the threshold for listing at the State level.

Council focussed their discussions on the criterion recommended in the assessment report provided by DEW, agreeing that the place did not meet criteria b), c) or f).

Criterion a) *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State's history.*

Council debated whether the place met the test for listing under this criterion. Council agreed that while post-war migration expanded many Catholic congregations in the years after the Second World War, and sometimes resulted in the construction of new churches,

St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church has particularly strong and direct associations with the theme due to the high concentration of new and expanding industry and the extensive and diverse migrant communities the church supported and continues to do so.

Few places survive that represent post-war migration at the State level. It was noted that only Our Lady of Mount Carmel Catholic Church is listed.

Council voted and a majority agreed that Criterion a) was met.

Criterion d) *It is an outstanding representative of a particular class of places of cultural significance*

Council agreed that St Margaret Mary's Church is an outstanding example of a post-war church as it retains a high degree of integrity and intactness, and displays many of the principle characteristics of the class at a higher quality than many other examples. St Margaret Mary's demonstrates many of the principle characteristics of the class in a way that allows the class to be readily understood and appreciated.

Council agreed that criterion d) was met.

Criterion e) *It demonstrates a high degree of creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment or is an outstanding representative of particular construction techniques or design characteristics.*

Council agreed with the assessment that St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church articulates many key attributes of late-twentieth century ecclesiastical architecture including:

- a radical plan-shape responding to liturgical change, designed to facilitate active participation in worship by bringing people as close as possible to the altar, in this instance by wrapping the pews in a fanned configuration around the peninsula-like sanctuary,
- unbroken straight lines emphasising verticality,
- clerestory windows, flooding the sanctuary with daylight,
- inverted V shapes reminiscent of Gothic pointed arches, notably in the main and clerestory gables,
- an element reminiscent of a Gothic flèche, pointing 'heavenward,' in this case a slender, metal-clad spire over the sanctuary,
- architectural 'distinctiveness' employed to denote the purpose of the building as a place of worship,
- community integration achieved through the use of familiar, 'humble' materials with connotations of domesticity, in this instance face-brick, unpainted concrete, clear-finished timber, terracotta tile and Stramit board,
- a steel and reinforced concrete frame allowing the expansive ceiling and clerestory roof to float above the sanctuary without vertical column supports,
- the seamless integration of art into the building is outstanding.

Council agreed that it met criterion e).

Criterion g) *it has a special association with the life or work of a person or organisation or an event of historical importance.*

Council agreed that this Church has significant associations with the life, work and Catholic faith of notable South Australian émigré artist Voitre Marek, who served as artistic consultant during construction and designed all and created many of the church's original sacred artworks and liturgical fixtures.

With his brother Dušan, Voitre Marek 'set in motion a surge of new ideas and controversies that challenged the conventions of Australian art.' He was South Australia's best-known and most prolific religious artist practising between 1948 and the late 1970s.

The St Margaret Mary's commission represented one of only a few instances where Voitre Marek was able to offer a complete artistic service. Marek collaborated closely with the architects and clergy during the design and construction of the new church, and in particular, Marek's involvement in the design process helped determine the layout, form, fittings and materials of the sanctuary, the focal point of the church interior.

Council agreed that this place met criterion g).

Review of Summary of State Heritage Place

Council discussed the following with Mr Burns:

- There is a need to reconsider the description for criterion a) out of session.
- The final two sentences of the last paragraph under criterion a) and whether they add appropriate value. It was agreed they could be deleted.
- The way the geographical area of Croydon is defined, noting the parish boundary is bigger than the suburb. It was accepted that the Parish boundary is the geographical area of relevance.
- It was noted that the red line boundary around the Church on the Site Plan defines the extent of the Elements of Significance for the State Heritage Place. Council expressed a desire to recognise the land in front of the Church as being part of the Elements of Significance as it gives sight lines to the Church.
- It was noted that Heritage SA indicated it is not possible to list sight lines as part of the extent of listing.
- The elements of heritage significance on page six is an abridged list of the full list on page ten.
- Whether there would be value in listing the industries names and it was agreed they would remain under the description for criterion a).

Action: Mr Burns to amend the Statement of Heritage Significance and arrange for Council endorsement out of session.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Provisionally entered** the St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church, 286 Torrens Road, Croydon Park (CT 5710/844, CT 5726/535, CT 5385/507, CT 5824/99, CT 5840/399

F117834 A52, D333 A72, D3333 A4, F117831 A49, D3332 A5 Hundred of Yatala) in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place, as it is deemed to fulfil criteria (a), (d), (e) and (g) for State heritage listing under section 16(1) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

- (a) It demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State's history;
 - (d) It is an outstanding representative of a particular class of places of cultural significance;
 - (e) It demonstrates a high degree of creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment or is an outstanding representative of particular construction techniques or design characteristics;
 - (g) It has a special association with the life or work of a person or organisation or an event of historical importance.
- **Approved** the Summary of State Heritage Place, subject to minor amendments being endorsed out of session, for the St Margaret Mary's Catholic Church, 286 Torrens Road, Croydon Park.

7.2 "Aviemore" 158 Stephen Terrace, Gilberton

Mr Conlon welcomed Mr Mark Hamilton as an observer, noting that Mr Hamilton had no problem being identified as the person who wrote the nomination. Mr Conlon also welcomed Mr Con Vanco, owner of the property and his brother Mr George Vanco.

Council heard that on 18 January 2022, Heritage South Australia received a public nomination for 'Aviemore' (dwelling), 158 Stephen Terrace, Gilberton. Mr Hamilton recommended that 'Aviemore' meets criteria (a), (b), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of s16 of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* for listing as a State Heritage Place in the South Australian Heritage Register.

Mr Hamilton indicated that the place is under imminent threat of demolition and requested that the Council provisionally enter the place in the Register using the provisions under s17(2)(b) of the Act to protect it while an assessment takes place.

It was noted that Mr Keith Conlon, Chair of the Council, considered the nomination and triage information provided by Heritage South Australia and determined that the place did not need to be provisionally listed under s17(2)(b), though he did request the assessment occur as quickly as practical.

The assessment found that the place does not meet any of the s16 criteria for listing as a State Heritage Place.

Mr Conlon talked through the nomination provided by Mark Hamilton noting the large amount of detail provided about the Ross and Keith Smith association.

Council then discussed each criterion in turn, except for criterion c), as there was no evidence to suggest 'Aviemore' will yield information that will contribute meaningfully to an understanding of the State's history, and in particular the Smith brothers and their epic flight, beyond what is extensively documented elsewhere.

It was noted that 'Aviemore' has a link with Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith, who are believed to have lived at the property between 1911 and 1914 (Ross) and c.1916 (Keith). It was in their parent's possession from 1911.

Criterion a) *It demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State's history.*

The majority of Council members agreed with the Heritage SA assessment that 'Aviemore' has only incidental associations with Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith and their historic flight from England to Australia.

The period of association between the brothers and 'Aviemore' is brief and there are a number of other places and objects that have substantially stronger associations with the brothers and their flight, notably the Memorial to Sir Ross Smith, Creswell Gardens and the Vickers Vimy G-EAOU aircraft.

It was noted that the childhood home of the Smith Brothers was Mutooroo Station.

Council agreed via majority vote that this place did not meet criterion a).

Criterion b) *It has rare, uncommon or endangered qualities that are of cultural significance.*

Council agreed that numerous places and objects are associated with Sir Ross and Keith Smith and therefore 'Aviemore' cannot be considered rare for this association, nor rare as an example of a house nor rare for its construction techniques.

Council agreed that it did not meet criterion b).

Criterion d) *It is an outstanding representative of a particular class of places of cultural significance.*

Council noted that 'Aviemore' is a 1900s house with substantial 1920s additions and so demonstrates characteristics of both eras. It is in poor condition and structurally compromised. Council agreed that it is considered to be neither an outstanding representative of an early twentieth century house, nor an outstanding representative of an inter-war house.

Council agreed it did not meet criterion d).

Criterion e) *It demonstrates a high degree of creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment or is an outstanding representative of particular construction techniques or design characteristics.*

Council noted that the original house with its later additions lacks distinctiveness and demonstrates a mixture of architectural styles. It does not represent an outstanding degree of creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment. In addition, the 1920s additions do not demonstrate a high quality of design or construction, being constructed of cement on expanded metal lath, nailed to a timber frame.

Council agreed it did not meet criterion e).

Criterion f) *It has a strong cultural or spiritual associations for the community or a group within it.*

Council noted that Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith are admired by organisations such as the Aviation Historical Society of South Australia and their importance is recorded by the History Trust of South Australia.

While 'Aviemore' is important to some individuals within these groups for its associations with Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith, the place has a comparatively low significance to these individuals when compared with other places and objects more directly associated with Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith, such as the Vickers Vimy G-EAOU aircraft. These individuals do not have any regular interactions with 'Aviemore'.

Council agreed that it did not meet criterion f).

Criterion g) *It has a special association with the life or work of a person or organisation or an event of historical importance.*

Council noted that Heritage SA contend that 'Aviemore' no longer demonstrates reasonable evidence of any association.

The report from Heritage SA indicates that there is no specific physical evidence identified to demonstrate the celebration that was held there after the brothers' return to Adelaide in March 1920. Meanwhile, there are other places in South Australia that better demonstrate the brothers' significance to the State.

Mr Conlon noted that there is no question at all about the role of Sir Ross and Sir Keith Smith in our history, but Council needs to ascertain whether there is evidence of a special association with place, in addition, as stated in the Council's guidelines on the criteria.

Council discussed the demands of the benchmark to meet the threshold for listing.

It was noted that 'Aviemore' is where the brothers celebrated their flight achievement. It was noted that it was a family celebration with a small number of invited guests and not a mass celebration involving large numbers of the South Australian public.

It was noted the brothers were knighted in the eastern states on the way back to South Australia.

Council also noted that the Heritage SA report lists a number of other unlisted places that have an association with the Smith brothers.

Council agreed by majority vote that the place does not criterion g).

Council agreed that the nomination is rejected as the place does not meet any criteria for listing.

Council agreed to add both the Vickers Vimy G-EAOU Aircraft and the John Dowie sculpture at its current home at the Adelaide Airport for assessment as possible State Heritage objects.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Rejected** the nomination for State-listing of 'Aviemore' (Dwelling), 158 Stephen Terrace, Gilberton (CT 4244/536 D15207 A1 Hundred of Yatala), as it does not meet any of the s16 criteria in the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.
- **Added** the Vickers Vimy G-EAOU Aircraft to the Assessment List for future consideration for listing as a State Heritage Object, as it is intrinsically associated with the Memorial to Captain Sir Ross Smith, Creswell Gardens (SHP 16181).
- **Added** the John Dowie sculpture to the Assessment List for future consideration for listing as a State Heritage Object intrinsically associated with the Memorial to Captain Sir Ross Smith, Creswell Gardens (SHP 16181).

8 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR INTENTION TO DESIGNATE

8.1 Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve, Hallett Cove

Mr Conlon welcomed Ms Megan Thomas to the meeting. Ms Thomas prepared the paper on this matter for Council's consideration. Ms Thomas and Dr Louise Bird both addressed the Council on this item.

Council noted that the Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve (SHP 14033), Clifftop Crescent, Hallett Cove, was entered in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place in 1993, under the *South Australian Heritage Act 1978*. At that time, there was not yet provision for designation and permit protection for State Heritage Places.

Further investigation and review of the site indicates that it is highly geologically significant and retains a high level of intactness.

DEW recommended that the Council consider designating Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve as a site of geological significance under s14(7)(a) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

Furthermore, a proposed template for the Summary of State Heritage Place – Designation was provided for the Council’s consideration and approval.

In relation to the template, the Council requested Heritage SA change the word “report” in self instructions in template and this was agreed.

Change ‘man-made’ additions to ‘built’ additions on page 2.

It was agreed that there ought to be a reference back to the Aboriginal Heritage Act within the report.

Dr Bird noted that she would engage with Mr Toby Forde and Ms Megan Tutty in Aboriginal Affairs to discuss what Aboriginal cultural information could be made publically available.

It was noted that Heritage SA would work actively to consult with Kaurna Yerta in relation to the intent to designate Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve over the next 12 months.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Approved** the proposed template for Summary of State Heritage Place – Designation, subject to the minor amendments described above.
- **Considered** the Summary of State Heritage Place – Designation for Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve (SHP 14033).
- **Agreed** that there is an intent to designate the Hallett Cove Conservation Park & Sandison Reserve (SHP 14033) as a place of geological significance, pursuant to section 14(7)(a) of the Heritage Places Act 1993 and following endorsed procedure 14.7 Procedure: Designation .
- **Approved** the proposed contents of the Summary of State Heritage Place – Designation for Hallett Cove.
- **Approved** a 3-month consultation period for the general public, Field Geology Club, and the Geological Society.
- **Approved** an extended engagement and consultation period with Kaurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation.

9 ITEMS FOR NOTING

9.1 Chairperson's Report

Mr Conlon noted that he had accepted an invitation for a meeting with Mr Craig Holden, the newly appointed Chair of the SA Planning Commission. It would occur on line.

In relation to that meeting, Council briefly discussed how Heritage Area Overlay items are represented in the Planning and Design Code.

It was noted that third parties have been removed from the consultation process.

Action: Council requested information on the detail in the Planning and Design Code regarding the test. Mr David Hanna to circulate.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- Noted the report provided by the Chairperson, Mr Keith Conlon OAM.

9.2 DEW Report

Noted.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- Noted the status of assessment reports.

9.3 Correspondence

Noted.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- Noted the correspondence sent and received since the last meeting

9.4 Delegations Report

Noted.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the delegations report.

10 Any Other Business

Nil.

CLOSE OF MEETING

Mr Conlon closed the meeting at 1:45pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Keith Conlon', is enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Mr Keith Conlon OAM
Chair

Date: 7 April 2022