

HERITAGE STANDARDS FOR BURRA, MOONTA MINES & MINTARO STATE HERITAGE AREAS Interim YourSay Engagement Report (June 2024)



HERITAGE STANDARD FOR THE BURRA STATE HERITAGE AREA

GENERAL COMMENTS

What We Heard

- Detailed comments on the Heritage Standard for the Burra State Heritage Area (SHA), in particular providing additional information on the heritage/ history of Burra and advice on the images used in the Heritage Standard, were provided.
- The Heritage Standard needs to ensure that development has an acceptable impact on the heritage values of the Burra SHA but is not too limiting so that new buildings cannot realistically be built. There needs to be some flexibility.
- The Heritage Standard needs an 'action plan' and there is no outline in the Heritage Standard to how the development application process works or associated penalties. While an 'action plan' may not be appropriate to be included in the Heritage Standard, the process and penalties should be clear on the Heritage South Australia website and the PlanSA Portal. Goyder Council is working to make the system clearer for people wanting to do works in the Burra SHA.
- Where possible, the retention of the unique nature of the Burra's heritage is important. Allowances should be made in the application of Design and Safety Standards which are inconsistent with that heritage. Examples are over-engineered guardrails over bridges.

How We Responded

- The additional information on the heritage/ history of Burra and advice on the images has been used to inform revisions to update the Burra SHA Heritage Standard.
- Future 'public realm' works are referenced in the Burra SHA Heritage Standard, noting that Goyder Council will consult more closely with Heritage South Australia to ensure 'public realm' works conform with the Standard.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. BACKGROUND

Section 1.1 – Burra State Heritage Area

What We Heard

- The plan 'Burra State Heritage Area' on Page 2, which is the first image in the document is a very basic plan with a lack of street names for ready interpretation.

How We Responded

- The plan 'Burra State Heritage Area' is a simple boundary plan of the Burra SHA and is consistent in format with other SHA Heritage Standards. Other more complex maps including those on the South Australian Property and Planning Atlas website provide further information as required.

2. HERITAGE VALUE

Section 2.1 – Statement of significance (Burra State Heritage Area)

What We Heard

- Heritage South Australia, DEW is to complemented for the inclusion of the history of Burra and the Statement of Significance. Provision of context and explanation of what features are of importance within the State Heritage Area is a welcome addition and one that will assist the community.

How We Responded

- The Burra SHA Heritage Standard provides information about the significance of the Burra SHA, the features of importance and how they should be managed. Heritage South Australia, DEW welcomes the support of the community for the Heritage Standard. More extensive histories for the Burra SHA may be found in the 2021 Conservation Management Plan for the Nationally-listed Australian Cornish Mining Site: Burra, prepared by Swanbury Penglase.

Section 2.2 – What is of heritage significance?

What We Heard

- Photographs used to highlight architectural features should be reviewed to provide greater clarity of the element being discussed. For example, the photographs utilised to illustrate streetscape character, lean-to additions, outbuildings and fencing do not appear to be the best examples available in Burra.

How We Responded

- Labels and photographs in the Burra SHA Heritage Standard have been reviewed and changed, where necessary.

3. HERITAGE STANDARDS FOR DEVELOPMENT (BURRA STATE HERITAGE AREA)

Section 3.1 – Purpose of Heritage Standards for Development

What We Heard

- There is a plan on Page 19, with no context, introduction or discussion, regarding this plan which is extremely confusing. Discussion regarding the context of the plan, its clear purpose and terminology should be reviewed in finalising the Standard.

How We Responded

- The plan in [Section 3.1 – Purpose of Heritage Standards for Development](#) has been reviewed and simplified, as suggested. Precincts set out in the plan are defined by land use and have different development requirements to manage their particular heritage values.

Section 3.2 – Land Use

What We Heard

- Should the Heritage Standard try and discuss land use when there are significant and appropriate policies with the Planning and Design Code which do this more appropriately?
- Additional clarity should be provided in relation to land uses and applicable areas.

How We Responded

- Discussion and cross-referencing in the Burra SHA Heritage Standard will clearly respond to the simplified plan and precincts.

Section 3.2.2 – Land use planning

What We Heard

- This Acceptable Standard is poorly written and should be revised with a clearer intent. Why should non-residential development only occur within existing sites? What is a site?

How We Responded

- The Acceptable Standards in [Section 3.2.2 – Land use planning](#) have been reviewed and revised, where necessary, including flexibility around adaptive reuse.

Section 3.3.1 – New buildings (Siting of new buildings)

What We Heard

- Terminology should be consistent and also reflect that utilised in the Planning and Design Code.

How We Responded

- Terminology in [Section 3.3.1 – New buildings \(Siting of new buildings\)](#) have been reviewed for consistency and changed, where appropriate.

Section 3.3.1(a) – Street and side boundary setbacks

What We Heard

- A number of the statements within the Acceptable Standards appear to inform both dwellings and non-residential buildings, but are located as the last paragraph in the Standard. If there is a general applicability of the Acceptable Standard to various forms of development, it should be the first sentence/paragraph under the Acceptable Standard. Currently there are several Acceptable Standards that may be interpreted to only apply to non-residential buildings, but should apply to both dwellings and non-residential buildings e.g. repeating of existing setbacks.

How We Responded

- The text discussing setbacks in [Section 3.3.1\(a\) – Street and side boundary setbacks](#) have been reviewed for consistency and clarity and changed, where appropriate.

Section 3.3.2 – New buildings (Form and design of new buildings)

What We Heard

- Within this and other principles, there is reference to '*buildings in Burra are of heritage value, demonstrating Cornish mining practices, construction techniques and culture*'. We question whether all of the building demonstrate "mining practices" and whether this wording should be removed.

How We Responded

- The wording in [Section 3.3.2 - New buildings \(Form and design of new buildings\)](#) have been reviewed and amended to clearly reflect heritage values and period of heritage significance.
- The wording in the Heritage Standard has been modified and references to Cornish mining practices and culture removed.

Section 3.4.1 – Alterations and additions (Site and location of additions)

What We Heard

- The principles in this section seek to maintain historic allotment patterns. This intent is supported, however, alterations and additions do not generally impact the subdivision pattern. This principle should be further reinforced in Section 3.6 (Land division).

How We Responded

- The wording in [Section 3.4.1 - Alterations and additions \(Site and location of additions\)](#) have been reviewed and changed to clarify the heritage value of land divisions.

Section 3.4.2 – Alterations and additions (Design of additions)

What We Heard

- As per Section 3.3.2 (New buildings - Form and design of new buildings), do the Acceptable Standards in relation to alterations and additions only apply to mid-Victorian era buildings?

How We Responded

- The wording in [Section 3.4.2 - Alterations and additions \(Design of additions\)](#) have been reviewed and changed, where necessary.

Section 3.4.2(a) – Scale

What We Heard

- The Acceptable Standard seeks to reflect typical site coverage on existing allotments. Within Burra there would be a range of site coverage and therefore to satisfy this standard may require extensive analysis to determine the site coverage.

How We Responded

- The wording in [Section 3.4.2\(a\) – Scale](#) have been reviewed and changed, where necessary.

Section 3.4.2(d) – Alterations to original building features

What We Heard

- Why does this principle reference 1845-1915 period. when other principles refer to 1845-1877 era?

How We Responded

- The date range in [Section 3.4.2 \(d\) - Alterations to original building features](#) have been reviewed and changed to be consistent throughout the section.

Section 3.5.3 – Ancillary development (Signage)

What We Heard

- Pre-existing signage exceeds these standards, and if these standards were to apply, it would make it very difficult for tourists and travellers to locate our property given the location of our specific property, and lack of street illumination in Burra generally.
- The signage standard, it needs to be a little more flexible in its application with consideration as to whether or not proposed signage would detract from the heritage values in a given instance when taking into consideration location, purpose, community value etc.

How We Responded

- The signage restrictions in [Section 3.5.3 - Ancillary development \(Signage\)](#) have been reviewed and changed to be more flexible, if appropriate.

HERITAGE STANDARD FOR THE MOONTA MINES STATE HERITAGE AREA

GENERAL COMMENTS

What We Heard

- The Heritage Standard document is far too complex and has far too many regulations that will not encourage residents to look after their property.
- Both the Yelta Mine at the northern end should have been included & also the Wallaroo Mine site within the Moonta Mines SHA, as this mine was in the last 23 years. 1900 - 1923 far more important than the Moonta Mines.
- Just check for cut and paste errors regarding locations, ie Hahndorf SHA is referred to in Moonta Mines SHA Heritage Standard?
- The content of the Heritage Standard is generally good and essence of what is trying to be achieved.
- The public realm section in the Heritage Standard needs to include the rail history and its tracks as part of the history.
- Sometimes development happens without approval and there should be assurances that this doesn't happen in the Moonta Mines SHA.
- The proposed bid for World Heritage listing of Moonta Mines was raised and the grant funding this listing may bring.
- How will people be aware of the Heritage Standard? Some people might not know they need approval and many people don't have internet. How did we let people know what we are doing?

How We Responded

- The General Comments on the Moonta Mines Heritage Standard have been noted, but for most of them no action is required, except the language used in the Heritage Standard has been revised in some instances.
- With respect to making people be aware of the Heritage Standard and the requirement for development approval for 'development' within the Moonta Mines SHA, changes to DEW's communication protocols are being considered.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. BACKGROUND

Section 1.3 – History - Moonta Mines

What We Heard

- Miners couldn't afford to buy in the formal town and this should be clear in the Heritage Standard's history.
- The history doesn't refer to the interface with the farmers with the clearing of land for farming helping to fuel the mine engines.
- Under Nharangga ownership and dispossession section, it should be noted that Aboriginal people worked for food in the Wallaroo mines, but not in Kadina mines. The reference to 'some European settlers' is a bit loose.
- Under Decline and closure of Moonta Mines section, there are generalisations about the Moonta Town. There should also be mention that mining was re-visited in the 1980s in the Moonta Mines SHA, but make it clear it was outside the town.

How We Responded

- Comments have been noted and the section 1.3 (History – Moonta Mines) revised.