

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COUNCIL

MINUTES

The 104th Meeting of the South Australian Heritage Council (the Council) was held on Thursday 13 February 2020 at Level 10, 81 – 95 Waymouth Street, Adelaide

Statement of Acknowledgement

The Council acknowledge this land that we meet on today is the traditional lands for Kurna people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country. The Council also acknowledge 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.

PRESENT

South Australian Heritage Council: Chair: Mr Keith Conlon OAM Members: Mr David Stevenson, Emeritus Professor Alison Mackinnon AM, Mr Marcus Rolfe, Ms Kate McDougall, Mr Jason Schulz, Ms Robyn Taylor and Mrs Deborah Lindsay.

Apologies: Ms Jan Ferguson OAM and Mr Michael Constantine.

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 104th meeting of the South Australian Heritage Council (the Council).

It was noted that there were apologies from Mr Michael Constantine and 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

Mr Schulz and Mrs Lindsay declared a conflict of interest re the following:

- Item 6.4 Planning and Design Code, as their firm has had input directly with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (the organisation responsible for implementation of the Code).

- Item 7.1 Salisbury Civic Centre, as their firm produced an independent professional report for Salisbury Council in relation to the heritage value of this nominated place.
- Item 8.1 Elders Pavilion, as their firm has been engaged professionally in relation to this place.

3 PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Council considered the minutes of the 13 December 2019 meeting and approved them without amendment.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Approved** the minutes of the 13 December 2019 meeting without amendment.

4. ACTION ITEMS

Ms Voigt spoke to the action list and Council noted the progress being made against particular items.


RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

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

5. IN CAMERA DISCUSSION

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



6. FOR DECISION / DISCUSSION

6.1 8th Report on Heritage Protection

Ms Voigt thanked Council members for progressing this document to a final draft out of session.

Council members considered the final draft and endorsed it subject to some minor amendments being made.

Action: Ms Voigt and Mr Hanna to finalise this document out of session and send to the Chairperson for signature.

Action: Council agreed to organising a meeting with the Minister to discuss the matters raised in this report. It was agreed that a meeting would be sought between the Chairperson and the Minister. It was noted that Mr Schulz and Ms Taylor volunteered to attend if the Minister's office is agreeable.

RESOLUTION:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **ENDORSED** the 8th Report on Heritage Protection subject to final amendments being made out of session.

6.2 South Australian Heritage Council Strategic Planning

Ms Voigt discussed the agenda paper on the 2020 strategic meetings of Council and tabled the progress report on the 12 month action plan. Council members were asked to consider a trip to the Flinders Ranges in June 2020 to visit the site of the World Heritage nomination. Council members tentatively agreed to a three day and 2 night trip, subject to further development of an itinerary. It was noted that departure on a Sunday was preferred.

Action: Ms Voigt, with the support of Ms Ferguson, to further develop the itinerary and circulate to Council.

Council members discussed its strategic priorities for 2020 and agreed that inviting guests to attend meetings to discuss relevant topics would be appropriate.

Action: Ms Voigt to poll Council members about the theme for discussion at its October 2020 strategic meeting.

Council agreed it needs to prioritise its strategic goals and actions for 2020/21. Action: Ms Voigt to draft a 20/21 action plan for the next Strategic Council meeting.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the Strategic Plan and Action Plan Status Update
- **Endorsed** a field trip to Flinders Ranges in (31 May -2 June), subject to a satisfactory itinerary.

6.3 Post-war Places of Worship – Built Heritage Research Project 2018-2019

Mr Conlon welcomed Dr Louise Bird, Heritage South Australia, to the meeting.

Dr Bird noted that in October 2018, Heritage South Australia commissioned a research project, through the Architecture Museum, University of South Australia, on the places of worship built in South Australia between 1946–c.1990. The purpose of the research was to identify places of worship built during the specified timeframe that may have State heritage significance; and, to assist with their assessment and consideration by the Council for entry on the South Australian Heritage Register.

Mr Chris Burns was engaged to undertake the research and present his findings in a report and public presentation. The final report was provided for Council's consideration.

It was noted that Mr Burns found 406 extant places of worship were built in South Australia between 1945-c.1990. An unknown number have already been demolished.

Due to the number of places that need to be considered, Heritage South Australia is proposing a two phase process, whereby Heritage South Australia (Dr Louise Bird and Mr Hamish Angas) will create a shortened list of places with the assistance of Mr Burns and Dr Christine Garnaut. Dr Bird said that, with the assistance of the Council, Heritage South Australia will then create a list based on religion and denomination that would form the basis for assessment for entry on the South Australian Heritage Register.

Dr Bird requested the assistance of one or two members from the Council in the preparation of the short list for assessment. The estimated time commitment would be approximately 12 hours split over a number of meetings plus the time to read Mr Burns report.

The Council acknowledged the excellent work by Mr Burns and agreed that the Chair should send its congratulations to Mr Burns in writing. Action: Mr Hanna to draft a letter of congratulation.

Dr Alison Mackinnon and Ms Robyn Taylor volunteered to be involved in the out of session work on behalf of the Council.

Action: Dr Bird to liaise with Dr Mackinnon and Ms Taylor to further this project.

Council briefly discussed what other themes could be researched in the future to help ensure that the SA Heritage Register appropriately represents all themes that are important to South Australia through natural and built form. Ms Taylor suggested a need to be proactive and create a photographic record of our heritage timber buildings in the Adelaide Hills given the increased risk of fire.

RESOLUTIONS

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the completion of the report – Post-war places of worship in South Australia 1945 – 1990.
- **Determined** that Council members Professor Mackinnon and Ms Taylor will assist in the preparation of the short lists of assessment.

6.4 Planning and Design Code

Mr Schulz and Mrs Lindsay departed the meeting at this point given their declared conflict of interest.

It was noted that Phase 2 (Rural Areas) and Phase 3 (Urban Areas) of the draft Planning and Design Code (the Code) was released for public consultation on 1 October 2019.

The Council has provided a response to the State Planning Commission on Phase 2 (Rural Areas) of the Planning and Design Code. It was noted that comment on Phase 3 is due by 28 February 2020.

Mr Conlon noted that a letter had been received from the State Planning Commission advising that the deadline of 1 July 2020 for full implementation of the Planning and Design Code will be removed through a Bill to Parliament. This will allow Local Councils, industry and the community more time to understand and prepare for the Code's implementation in the rural and urban areas.

A draft letter relating to a submission on Phase 3 was provided to Council for comment. Mr Conlon thanked Mr Rolfe and Heritage South Australia for their work in preparing this draft for Council consideration.

The following comments were made:

- Local Councils need to be confident the planning portal will be operational when it goes live.
- Revised draft to note change of date to September to reflect the extension of time before E-Planning goes live.
- Council understands that a map on the E-Planning Portal will show the Certificate of Title for a State Heritage Place. Council has concerns that where allotments are enormous in size (ie pastoral properties), it will trigger the requirement for owners to submit development applications that have no bearing or impact on the fabric of the State Heritage Place and this has to be addressed.

- Council expressed concern that the definition for ‘irredeemably beyond repair’ may only relate to Local Places and not State Places.
- Noted that an economic test is in the Historic Area overlay. This is talking about demolition of a contributory place in a historic area. Council agreed to remove reference to this in the draft letter.
- Adjust wording to the Council ‘would like to provide advice’.

Mr Rolfe indicated he can support Heritage South Australia in finalising the draft letter.

Action: Revise draft based on the comments captured at this meeting.

Action: Invite Mr Michael Lennon, Chair of State Planning Commission, to attend another meeting of the Heritage Council.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Approved** the final submission regarding Phase 3 of the Planning and Design Code subject to amendments being made out of session.

6.5 Review of templates for Assessment Report / Summary of State Heritage Place

Mr Schulz and Mrs Lindsay returned to the meeting at this point.

Dr Louise Bird noted that Council members had been provided updated templates for Assessment Reports and Summary of State Heritage Place for endorsement.

It was noted that an assessment report provides a standard framework for providing evidence when considering each of the heritage criteria to enable the Council to make an informed determination of when it is considering a place for entry into the SA Heritage Register.

The document that describes the State Heritage Place that is being entered in the Register is called “A Summary of State Heritage Place”.

A small working group of Council has met twice to discuss and review the templates relating to these two documents - on 17 October 2019 and on 22 January 2020.

An outcome of the review of the assessment report was to ensure there is enough rigour to demonstrate evidence based decision making that could be defended in court.

An outcome of the review of Summary of State Heritage Place was to improve the Register Entry where possible to give greater certainty and clarity for owners given recent challenges within the ERD Court for recent listings, including St Peters Big Quad Precinct.

People involved in the review were Mr Keith Conlon, Mr Marcus Rolfe, Mrs Deborah Lindsay, Mr Michael Constantine, Mr Michael Queale, Mrs Anna Pope, Dr Louise Bird, and Mr David Hanna.

Council considered and endorsed both templates for use. The working group were thanked for their time.

It was noted that some of the information regarding the site plan that formally resided in the ‘Commentary on the Listing’ has been brought into the Register entry description. This can provide more certainty to owners but also means it provides less flexibility in terms of the ease of updating information on a site if information comes available at a later date.

RESOLUTIONS

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Approved** the amended template for the Assessment Report.
- **Approved** the amended template for the Summary of State Heritage Place

6.6 Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand – Indigenous Forum Report (2019)

The Chair of the South Australian Heritage Council received a letter from Hon David Kemp AC, Chair of the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand (HCOANZ) in December 2019, enclosing a copy of the report of the HCOANZ Indigenous Forum, held in Canberra between 14 & 15 October 2019.

At the May 2018 meeting of the HCOANZ in Darwin it was agreed to share the ‘comprehensive’ Australian heritage story, inclusion and engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Dr Kemp’s letter encouraged state jurisdictions to review their heritage registers to consider whether they are representative of the ‘comprehensive’ Australian heritage story, paying particular attention to the preservation, protection and memorialisation of sites associated with frontier conflict.

In relation to the Frontier Wars the HCOANZ Indigenous Forum discussed the appropriate ways to advance cultural heritage management and recognition with regards Frontier Wars and massacre sites and recommended that by the end of 2020 the Australian Heritage Council and heritage councils in all other Australian jurisdictions are to:

- review currently listed places for frontier conflict values;
- prioritise sites of conflict and frontier violence, for preservation and protection (as per the Northern Territory model); and
- augment list and develop strategies for possible national heritage recognition.

Council members were provided with a summary of twenty four State Heritage Places entered in the South Australian Heritage Register, that had a Traditional Owner connection, with the majority associated with mission sites. There appears to be no State Heritage Places in South Australia that relate to sites of Aboriginal conflict or frontier violence. Of those identified there maybe a couple of places that warrant consideration for National heritage-listing such as:

- Point McLeay (Raukkan) Settlement
- Daisy Bates Campsite

It was recommended that any consideration for inclusion of conflict or frontier violence should be done in partnership with the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee.

Council considered the recommendations and noted that South Australia's review does not have to be limited to conflict sites. Council was very supportive of this work and agreed that it should work with the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee on furthering this matter.

Ms McDougall noted that Finniss Springs should also be considered for State Heritage listing.

RESOLUTIONS

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **NOTED** the report of the October 2019 HCOANZ Indigenous Forum and its associated recommendations/actions;
- **RESOLVED** how the Council would like to respond to the recommendation of the HCOANZ Indigenous Forum in relation to the recognition of frontier conflict and contact sites in South Australia; and
- **RESOLVED** to collaborate with the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee to identify frontier conflict and contact sites in South Australia and establish a process of recognising the Traditional Owner stories where appropriate within the assessment and Summary of State Heritage Place.

6.7 State Heritage Places damaged by recent SA Bushfires (Yorketown, Cudlee Creek and Kangaroo Island)

Yorketown Bushfire (November 2019):

The Yorketown bushfire in November 2019 is known to have had a significant impact of the State heritage-listed Dry Stone Walling, Honiton-Edithburgh Road, via Yorketown. While some can be repaired it is likely that the most severely damaged of the 5km of stone walling will be granted demolition approval.

Cudlee Creek Bushfire (December 2019):

It has been determined that three State Heritage Places have been impacted by the Cudlee Creek bushfire of December 2019, as follows:

1. Klopsch Farm Complex, Neudorf Road, Lobethal (SHP 14735);
2. Heritage Farm (former Nitschke Farm Complex) comprising timber-framed cottage, timber-slab barn, stone and timber cellar with loft and a slab cellar and loft, Cudlee Creek Road, Lobethal (SHP 18495); and
3. Mount Torrens Gold Battery, Cyanide Road, Mount Torrens (SHP 13288).

The first two were completely destroyed by the fires with the third site only losing one building. Michael Queale will work with the owners of each of these properties to determine a way forward for each State Heritage Place, which in the case of Klopsch Farm and Heritage Farm may involve formal requests to the South Australian Heritage Council for removal of each of these State Heritage Places from entry in the South Australian Heritage Register.

Kangaroo Island (Ravine) Bushfire (December 2019 / January 2020):

The Kangaroo Island (Ravine) bushfire in January 2020 destroyed nearly half of the Island, at its the western end, including the majority of the Flinders Chase National Park.

Considering this bushfire was only brought under control in late January / early February 2020 and access has been limited and coordinated across Government, the Department for Environment and Water has not fully established the full extent of damage to infrastructure on Kangaroo Island, including State Heritage Places.

It has been determined, however, that May's and Postman's Cottages at the State heritage-listed Rocky River Homestead in the Flinders Chase National Park have been seriously affected by the bushfire. It was noted that the Cape Borda and Cape de Couedic Lighthouse Complexes and the Harvey's Return Cemetery were not affected by the Kangaroo Island bushfire.

The status of some of the remaining State Heritage Places located within the Kangaroo Island fire ground are yet to be determined. Council discussed the opportunities in the repair of these places and the potential benefit communities and skilled trades.

Australia ICOMOS /Blue Shield Australia - Simple Rapid Assessment Form

It was noted that Helen Lardner, President of Australia ICOMOS, sent an email to the Chair of the Council, on 20 January 2020, enclosing a 'simple' Rapid Assessment Form for heritage places impacted by the recent bushfires in South Australia and designed to be used by heritage professionals or local Council officers undertaking an assessment of damage to those places.

Ms Lardner has also sent her email to John Schutz, Chief Executive, Department of Environment and Water.

The Rapid Assessment Form has been prepared by Australia ICOMOS in association with Blue Shield Australia.

Heritage South Australia has recommended to the Chief Executive, Department for Environment and Water that it adopt the Rapid Assessment Form for assessing the impact of the recent bushfires on State or local heritage places on Kangaroo Island, but also in the Adelaide Hills, which are located on land owned by DEW.

Council noted its appreciation to Australia ICOMOS for providing the Rapid Assessment form.

Action: The Council recommended that Heritage SA staff make contact with fire impacted owners as quickly as possible to provide them with support.

Ms Voigt noted that Government has a disaster management procedure and agencies need adhere to the procedure in a coordinated approach.

Council suggested that places on the Heritage Register that have a higher risk of being destroyed by a disaster be identified and a mechanism by which they might be recorded digitally be established. Action: Suggested that the 8th Report on Heritage Protection to the Minister include this as recommended advice.

RESOLUTIONS

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **NOTED** the impact of the Yorketown, Cudlee Creek and Kangaroo Island bushfires on State Heritage Places entered in the South Australian Heritage Register; and
- **RESOLVED** to support the use of the Australia ICOMOS/Blue Shield Australia's Rapid Assessment Form if and where useful in assessing the impact of the recent bushfires on State or local built heritage places in South Australia.

7 ITEMS FOR PROVISIONAL ENTRY IN THE SA HERITAGE REGISTER

7.1 Salisbury Civic Centre, 12 James Street, Salisbury

Mr Schulz and Mrs Lindsay departed the meeting given their declared conflict of interest for this item and the following item.

Mr Conlon welcomed Michael Pilkington (the nominator) and Nigel Dickson to the meeting. Mr Conlon also welcomed Mr Gavin Leydon, Chris Zafiroopoulos, Greg Ratsch and David Holland representing the City of Salisbury. Mr Conlon also welcomed Dr Louise Bird and Mr Michael Queale from Heritage South Australia to introduce the assessment.

A nomination for the Salisbury Civic Centre, 12 James Street, Salisbury, was received on 6 January 2020. The nominator suggests that the place meets all seven criteria under section 16 of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* (the Act) for listing as a State Heritage Place. The nominator also identified that the place is under imminent threat of demolition.

An Assessment Report prepared for the Council's consideration recommends that the place does not meet any of the s16 criteria for listing as a State Heritage place.

Dr Louise Bird contacted the City of Salisbury to inform them of the nomination and to ascertain the level of threat of demolition. Confirmation was received that demolition approval had been granted c2017 as a part of the building approval for the newly constructed Salisbury City Centre Community Hub that opened 1 December 2019. The assessment was fast tracked as a result.

Dr Bird and Mr Michael Queale undertook a site visit of the Salisbury Civic Centre on 16 January 2020. The Assessment Report was prepared by Dr Bird with architectural analysis and peer review by Mr Queale and recommends that the place does not meet any of the criteria for listing as a State Heritage Place.

Dr Bird provided a summary of the assessment which provided reasoning against each criteria explaining why it did not meet the threshold for listing. Mr Queale provided supplementary information around criterion (e), noting that loss of integrity due to subsequent additions and additions meant it did not meet the threshold in his opinion. Mr Queale talked about the style and condition of the building, the exposed concrete, informal planning, integrity and intactness matters. Mr Queale and Dr Bird acknowledged that Robert Dickson was a notable and influential South Australian architect, but noted, however, that there are many other buildings that better represent his work.

Council discussed the idea that the Salisbury Civic Centre was important in the continuum of design progression in Mr Dickson's work.

Mr Gavin Leydon, representing the City of Salisbury was welcomed to the meeting and was invited to speak. Mr Leydon noted the following:

- This nomination has been made at the 11th hour and caused great angst for the City of Salisbury.

- The City of Salisbury has already received approval for demolition to improve accessibility and activation of the street centre and was conditional as part of the approval process for the build of the new Civic Hub nearby.
- In 2015, the City undertook a feasibility study of the former civic centre and the report signified that it was totally unfeasible to retain it from a financial perspective.
- Pointed to the consistent and well-reasoned arguments by Dr Bird and in turn discussed each criteria under section 16 of the Heritage Places Act 1993 in turn, giving reasoning why it did not meet the threshold for listing against any criteria.
- Noted the court decision in relation to the pair of houses on Mackinnon Parade, North Adelaide. This related to the lack of integrity of heritage fabric and the decision to overturn the listing. Asked the Council to note Paragraph 38 in the Court judgement which determined that criteria e) needs to be based upon the integrity and intactness at the time of listing.
- Noted that the architectural merit the building once had has been compromised by additions and alterations.
- The place does have an association with renowned architect Robert Dickson, but not a special association.
- The Local Council consulted the community as part of the decision to build a new community hub and demolish the former one. This consultation was extensive. There were some members of the community that questioned the decision to build the new hub, but their argument came from an economic perspective and whether the Council should be spending so much money. It was not about saving the former civic centre.

Mr Conlon thanked Mr Leydon for his time.

Mr Michael Pilkington was welcomed to the meeting and was invited to speak to his nomination. Mr Conlon also welcomed Mr Nigel Dickson, son of Robert Dickson, to the meeting.

Mr Pilkington noted the following:

In relation to Criterion (a):

- The bringing together of a number of local government functions under one roof was not at all common at the time Salisbury was constructed. It is different from the other local government buildings listed in the report in that it was conceived and executed as one. The example given of Hindmarsh Town Hall was built between the 1870's and 1936, and this is probably the case with all pre-WW2 civic buildings.
- In addition, there are no post-WW2 civic buildings on the Register at present.
- Salisbury may well be very important as a key civic architectural project and in telling the story of Adelaide's post-WW2 northern suburban growth and development. Argues that the building is ground breaking in its functional provision of grouped, 'built-together' community facilities, including a local Council Chamber, the community library and council offices and community meeting rooms.

- It is a strongly planned form which comes to represent the ‘progress and advancement’ of the whole local community, and by extension, it becomes a key part of the State’s history.

In relation to Criterion (d):

- Disagreed with the conclusion of the assessment report that the project does not meet this criteria.
- Noted that his understanding from the report is that the original design intent was that it was always intended to be extended. The fact that this occurred so soon after could be due to a range of reasons that have nothing to do with its design – it could have been due to budget restrictions or that council activities grew so much more quickly than originally anticipated (if so, this could relate very strongly to the suburban growth of Salisbury - Criteria (a)).
- The fact that the range of internal changes could be accommodated suggests that the building was both very well designed and flexible enough to allow this, making it indeed completely fit for purpose rather than not.
- Dickson & Platten evolved and perfected a regional Adelaide style with this building involving not just a narrow, efficient material palette, but an intense consideration of location, local manufacturing, the efficient use of timber finishes and what we now call environmentally sensitive design. In this way, the work here is ‘cutting edge’.
- This suggests that it was not a ‘dead end’ but rather this project led to a number of subsequent buildings, and incorporated many ideas that became mainstream over the subsequent years.

In relation to criterion (e):

- This place does meet this criterion.
- The report does admit that the 1972-1975 portion of the building was of design merit but claims that these qualities are no longer intact due to the ‘incompatible’ 1981 additions resulting in loss of internal-external relationships, major changes to the ground floor public areas and loss of internal details and cabinetwork.
- Noted what the Guidelines for State Heritage Places say.
- This project received a number of awards at the time. The question therefore is: ‘*did the subsequent additions and changes reduce its design integrity to a level such that it has lost these qualities?*’.
- From what can be seen from the public spaces, and with the original drawings that we used for the *Dickson & Platten Architects 1950-2000* exhibition in 2017, where it featured, and the plans and images in the report he questioned this conclusion.
- It appears to him that the external form resulting from the additions has retained a common feel of the sweeping roof apparent on the south elevation, while the raking ceilings of the interior of these areas also has a similar feel to the interior of the earlier section with what appears to be very good levels of natural light and amenity.

- Saw tooth roof forms could be related to Dickson & Platten's work, and they don't conflict with their architectural design philosophy.
- Internal changes are not an argument to why it does not meet this criterion as they always appear to be intended to be modified.
- Dickson & Platten Architects are not particularly well represented on the Register at present, as, other than Union House, the other three listings are residential in nature.
- There appears a need to represent the extensive public and civic work of the practice.
- The Salisbury Civic Centre could be considered the Dickson and Platten mothership from which so many other designs have sprang. Could be considered the start of their genre of public work.
- Noted that a letter was received from the current president of the Architectural Institute of South Australia, Mr Tony Giannone, in support of this nomination.
- Dr Rachel Hurst from the University of South Australia worked closely with Robert Dickson and has said he was happy with the end result and the way the extension kept the scale, light and flexibility of the office spaces. They were refined from the original in order to reduce overhead glare in the open plan workplace, so that the general terrain and long views were able to be seen from anywhere without dazzling bands of bright light.

In response to questions from the Council, Mr Pilkington noted that the nature of this building was that there are always going to be changes to it to keep up with the times and with the growth of the Salisbury community.

Mr Conlon thanked Mr Pilkington for his presentation.

Mr Conlon led the Council through a discussion on whether the Salisbury Civic Centre met the threshold for listing against any of the criteria under section 16 of the Heritage Places Act. Council members:

- Noted that this is architecture for public civic places in the same form as people live in domestically (Adelaide Regional School of architecture).
- Noted that this place was designed with future additions in mind, however there is no evidence of a master plan.
- Noted there are 4 civic buildings that were designed by Platten.
- In relation to criterion (a), the Council agreed it did not meet the threshold for listing under this criterion.
- In relation to criterion (b), the Council agreed it did not meet the threshold for listing under this criterion.
- In relation to criterion (c), the Council agreed it did not meet the threshold for listing under this criterion.
- In relation to criterion (d), the Council agreed it did not meet the threshold for listing under this criterion.

- In relation to criterion (e), Council indicated that it did not believe this places showed a new development in the progression of the Dickson and Platten architectural style. Council noted that it would be beneficial to consider nominations that clearly represent the evolution of the style of Dickson and Platten. Council agreed it did not meet the threshold under criterion (e).
- In relation to criterion (f), Council noted that there was no evidence demonstrated of the community being attached to the Former Salisbury Civic Centre building and agreed it did not meet the threshold to be listed under this criterion.
- In relation to criterion (g) – Council discussed whether this building had a special association with work of Robert Dickson. Council noted it is a substantial work and project of Dickson, but agreed it did not have a particular special association with him. Council agreed it did not meet the threshold to list under this criterion.

Council agreed to reject the nomination on the basis it does not meet the threshold for state listing against any of the criteria.

Mr Conlon thanked the people in the public gallery for their attendance.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **REJECTED** the nomination of Salisbury Civic Centre, 12 James Street Salisbury for entry in the South Australian Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place, as it does not meet any of the criteria for State heritage listing under section 16 of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.

8 ITEM FOR REMOVAL FROM THE SA HERITAGE REGISTER

8.1 Elders Pavilion, Adelaide Showground

It was noted that the Council provisionally entered the Elders Pavilion, Adelaide Showground in the Register on 23 August 2018. Following the provisional entry, the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Inc. wrote to the Minister for Environment and Water on 27 November 2018, requesting that he intervene in this matter under section 18(7) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993*, by directing the Council to remove the provisional entry of the Elders Pavilion in the Register, in the public interest.

Due to the Minister (as the registered owner of the Adelaide Showground) having a conflict of interest, he delegated the decision in this matter to the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General met with the Council on 9 November 2019 to discuss the provisional entry of Elders Pavilion in the Register and to hear the Council's position about its heritage value. Subsequently the Attorney-General wrote to the Chair of the Council on 20 December 2019, directing the Council to remove Elders Pavilion from provisional entry in the Register, giving the

reasons why she considered the confirmation of the provisional entry would be contrary to the public interest.

The Council removed the Elders Pavilion from the SA Heritage Register as per the direction of the Attorney General.

Action: Write a letter to the Attorney to thank her for the detail and time she put into her correspondence with the Council.

RESOLUTIONS:

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **NOTED** the direction from the Attorney-General in relation to the provisional entry of Elders Pavilion, Adelaide Showground in the South Australian Heritage Register; and
- **RESOLVED** that Elders Pavilion, Adelaide Showground be removed from provisional entry in the South Australian Heritage Register, under section 18(7c) of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* and pursuant to the direction from the Attorney-General, under Ministerial delegation, dated 20 December 2019.

9 ITEMS FOR NOTING / DISCUSSION

9.1 Chairperson's Report

Mr Schulz and Mrs Lindsay returned to the meeting at this point.

Noted.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the written report from the Chair.

9.2 DEW Report

Noted.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the DEW Report.

9.3 Correspondence

Council noted the correspondence sent and received.

RESOLUTION

The South Australian Heritage Council:

- **Noted** the correspondence.

9.4 Delegations Report

Council noted the delegations report.

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.



Mr Keith Conlon OAM

Date: 9 April 2020

Chair