

PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C186: CENTRAL CITY (HODDLE GRID)
HERITAGE REVIEW

4 September 2012

Presenter: David Mayes, Manager Strategic Planning

Purpose and background

1. The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the recommendations in the report of the independent panel for Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186 - Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review - and to present the final draft of Amendment C186 (refer Attachment 2), which was revised in response to the Panel's recommendations.
2. The Panel's report was received by Council on 12 July 2012 (refer Attachment 3) and made available to the public on 6 August 2012 and all submitters to the Panel have been advised accordingly.

Key issues

3. The Panel commended the City of Melbourne for 'moving forward with local listings, including those of relatively modern buildings...'. They recommended Council adopt Amendment C186 with minor changes. These are mostly refinements which do not substantially alter the Amendment. Management's response to their recommendations is at Attachment 4. The key recommendations to note are:
 - 3.1. The Panel endorsed the application of the Heritage Overlay, to all properties nominated in Amendment C186 except for Rosati (Denniston and Co) at 95-101 Flinders Lane and the 12 nominated building interiors. Management has removed these from the amendment.
 - 3.2. The Panel recommended changing some of the Heritage Overlay boundaries and/or Statements of Significance for eight properties (refer Attachment 4). These changes are refinements based on further information that came to light at the hearing.
 - 3.3. The Panel recommended some changes to the structure of the Statements of Significance and that these be directly incorporated into the Planning Scheme (refer Attachment 2).
4. Management accepts all of the Panel's recommendations and all of these have been incorporated into the revised version of the Amendment at Attachment 2.
5. In addition to the recommendations specific to Amendment C186, the Panel recommended that following its adoption of Amendment C186 Council consider undertaking further specific heritage work.

Recommendation from management

6. That the Future Melbourne Committee recommend Council:
 - 6.1. adopt Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186 Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review at Attachment 2, pursuant to section 29 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*; and
 - 6.2. submit Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186 to the Minister for Planning for approval.

Attachments:

1. Supporting Attachment
2. Final Draft Planning Scheme Amendment C186
3. The Panel's Report
4. Managements Response to the Panel's Recommendations

SUPPORTING ATTACHMENT

Legal

1. Section 29(1) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* provides that after complying with Divisions 1 and 2 of the Act in respect of a planning scheme amendment, the planning authority may adopt the amendment with or without change.

Finance

2. Under Section 6 of the *Planning and Environment (Fees) Regulations 2000* Council is required to pay a fee when requesting the Minister approve an amendment and giving notice of approval of an amendment. Once the planning scheme amendment is approved Council will also be required to place a notice in a newspaper circulating in the local area. These costs are provided for in the 2012-2013 budget.

Conflict of interest

3. No member of Council staff, or other person engaged under a contract, involved in advising on or preparing this report has declared a direct or indirect interest in relation to the matter of the report.

Stakeholder consultation

4. Amendment C186 was on public exhibition between 1 September 2011 and 14 October 2011. A total of 28 (22 opposed and 6 supportive) submissions were received.
5. On 6 December 2011 the Future Melbourne Committee considered all written submissions and resolved to request the Minister for Planning to appoint an independent Panel to consider submissions to the Amendment.
6. The Panel hearings were held over nine days between 26 March and 20 April 2012 at Planning Panels Victoria. The Panel's report was released to the public on the Council's website on 6 August 2012.
7. Officers have advised the submitters to the Panel in writing that the Panel's report is available online and that the Future Melbourne Committee is scheduled to consider the Panel's report and a revised version of the amendment at its 4 September 2012 meeting.
8. No further consultation will be required on the revised amendment. Interest in the amendment is largely confined to the property owners and a small number of specialist heritage interests and the revisions to the amendment are in line with the Panel's recommendations.

Relation to Council policy

9. Amendment C186 implements the Heritage objectives of Council's Municipal Strategic Statement.

Environmental sustainability

10. The identification, conservation and integration of the heritage fabric can reduce building demolition and new construction waste and conserve the embodied energy of existing buildings.

Planning and Environment Act 1987

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME

AMENDMENT C186

EXPLANATORY REPORT

Who is the planning authority?

This amendment has been prepared by the City of Melbourne, the responsible authority for this amendment.

Land affected by the amendment.

The amendment affects land in the Capital City Zone as detailed in *Attachment 1*.

What the amendment does.

The Amendment includes ninety eight (98) additional heritage places in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay. External paint controls apply for the 98 heritage places but none of the other requirements in the schedule will apply.

The Amendment also alters the policy at Clause 22.04 - Heritage within the Capital City Zone, so that the *Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance* is considered when making decisions relating to any of the 98 places which are the subject of this Amendment.

The Amendment incorporates the document titled, *Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance*, into the planning scheme.

Strategic assessment of the amendment

• **Why is the amendment required?**

This amendment seeks to implement the recommendations of the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review to include 98 heritage places in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme. Inclusion of these properties in the Heritage Overlay is appropriate to recognise the local heritage significance of these places.

• **How does the amendment implement the objectives of planning in Victoria?**

By including buildings of historic and aesthetic significance in the Heritage Overlay, the proposed amendment implements the following objective under Section 4 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*:

(d) to conserve and enhance those buildings, areas or other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value

• **How does the amendment address the environmental effects and any relevant social and economic effects?**

The amendment is not expected to have any adverse economic or environmental impacts. The amendment will have positive social effects by recognising building fabric that represents the layers of development in the city. Heritage places also add character, appeal and interest to our city. Respect for our cultural heritage involves retaining and managing places that have importance to us as community. The inclusion of new places in the Heritage Overlay will ensure the conservation of Melbourne's history for present and future generations.

- **Does the amendment comply with the requirements of any Minister's Direction applicable to the amendment?**

The amendment is consistent with the Ministerial Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes under section 7(5) of the Act.

The amendment complies with Ministerial Direction No.9 – Metropolitan Strategy. The following aspects of the Metropolitan Strategy are relevant to the amendment:

The amendment is consistent with and supports Direction 5, *A great place to be* and seeks to implement Policy 5.4 - *Protect heritage places and values*.

- **How does the amendment support or implement the State Planning Policy Framework?**

This amendment supports the objective of Clause 15.03 of the SPPF to assist the conservation of places that have historical significance.

By including the identified places in the Heritage Overlay, Council will be fulfilling the State objective of identifying, conserving and protecting places of natural or cultural value.

- **How does the amendment support or implement the Local Planning Policy Framework?**

This amendment supports the objectives and implements the strategies of Clause 21.05-1 of the LPPF by conserving places of identified cultural heritage significance.

- **Does the amendment make proper use of the Victoria Planning Provisions?**

The Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is the proper VPP tool for the introduction of heritage controls over a place identified to be of heritage significance. The amendment addresses the requirements of the Planning Practice Note "*Applying the Heritage Overlay*".

This Practice Note states that places identified in local heritage studies should be included in the Heritage Overlay if the significance of the place can be established. The identification of heritage places using established criteria and documentation methods is an important consideration in proposing the inclusion of heritage places in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

- **How does the amendment address the views of any relevant agency?**

The views of relevant agencies can be gained through the amendment exhibition process.

- **Is the amendment likely to have a significant impact on the transport system, as defined by section 3 of the *Transport Integration Act 2010*?**

The Amendment is not likely to have an impact on the transport system.

- **Are there any applicable statements of policy principles prepared under section 22 of the *Transport Integration Act 2010*?**

There are no applicable statements of policy principles that apply.

- **What impact will the new planning provisions have on the resource and administrative costs of the responsible authority?**

The inclusion of 98 additional places within the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay may contribute to a minor increase in the number of planning permit applications on an annual basis. However, this increase can be accommodated within existing resources. These resource and administration costs will be off-set by a reduction in the need for individual responses to the possible demolition of significant heritage places which are not currently included within the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

Where you may inspect this Amendment

The amendment is available for public inspection, free of charge, on the City of Melbourne website and during office hours at the following location:

City of Melbourne
Level 3, 240 Little Collins Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

The amendment can also be inspected free of charge at the Department of Planning and Community Development web site at www.dpcd.vic.gov.au/planning/publicinspection.

Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186
Explanatory Report – Attachment 1

HO #	Property No.	Street
HO993	104	A'Beckett
HO994	111-125	A'Beckett
HO995	185-187	A'Beckett
HO996	160-162	Bourke
HO997	164-166	Bourke
HO998	168-174	Bourke
HO999	179-183	Bourke
HO1000	180-182	Bourke
HO1001	193-199	Bourke
HO1002	194-200	Bourke
HO1004	415-419	Bourke
HO1005	418-420	Bourke
HO1006	468-470	Bourke
HO1007	336-338	Collins
HO1090	340-342	Collins
HO1008	404-406	Collins
HO1009	409-413	Collins
HO1010	430-442	Collins
HO1011	433-455	Collins
HO1012	464-466	Collins
HO1013	615-623	Collins
HO1014	9-13	Drewery Lane
HO1015	21-23	Elizabeth
HO1016	215-217	Elizabeth
HO1017	299	Elizabeth
HO1018	303-305	Elizabeth
HO1019	351-357	Elizabeth
HO1020	380	Elizabeth
HO1021	384	Elizabeth
HO1022	441-447	Elizabeth
HO1023	453-457	Elizabeth
HO1024	463-465	Elizabeth
HO1025	473-481	Elizabeth
HO1026	30-40	Exhibition
HO1027	53-55	Exhibition
HO1028	309	Exhibition
HO1029	104-110	Exhibition
HO1030	61-73	Flinders Lane
HO1032	125-127	Flinders Lane
HO1033	141-143	Flinders Lane
HO1034	26-30	Flinders Street
HO1035	76-80	Flinders Street
HO1036	130-132	Flinders Street
HO1037	360-372	Flinders Street
HO1038	508-510	Flinders Street
HO1039	516-518	Flinders Street
HO1040	520-522	Flinders Street
HO1041	562-564	Flinders Street
HO1042	63-67	Franklin Street
HO1043	96-102	Franklin Street
HO1044	4-6	Goldie Place
HO1045	106-112	Hardware Street
HO1046	12-20	King Street
HO1047	115-129	King Street

HO1048	131-135	King Street
HO1049	284-294	La Trobe
HO1050	361-363	Little Bourke
HO1051	362-364	Little Bourke
HO1052	365-367	Little Bourke
HO1053	373-375	Little Bourke
HO1054	434-436	Little Bourke
HO1055	68-70	Little Collins
HO1056	392-396	Little Collins
HO1057	538-542	Little Collins
HO1058	25	Little Lonsdale
HO1059	194-196	Little Lonsdale
HO1060	198-200	Little Lonsdale
HO1061	372-378	Little Lonsdale
HO1062	523-525	Little Lonsdale
HO1063	326	Lonsdale
HO1064	439-445	Lonsdale
HO1065	14-30	Melbourne Place
HO1066	20-26	Queen
HO1067	37-41	Queen
HO1068	111-129	Queen
HO1069	118-126	Queen
HO1070	203-205	Queen
HO1071	217-219	Queen
HO985	316-322	Queen
HO1072	42-44	Russell
HO1073	288-294	Russell
HO1074	2-8	Spencer
HO1075	10-22	Spencer
HO1076	66-70	Spencer
HO1077	122-132	Spencer
HO1078	267-271	Spring
HO1079	135-137	Swanston
HO1080	163-165	Swanston
HO1081	309-325	Swanston
HO1082	401-403	Swanston
HO1083	407-409	Swanston
HO1084	411-423	Swanston
HO1085	427-433	Swanston
HO1086	22-32	William
HO1089	114-128	William
HO1087	259	William
HO1088	261	William

--/20--
C186

SCHEDULE TO THE HERITAGE OVERLAY

The requirements of this overlay apply to both the heritage place and its associated land.

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO993	104 A'Beckett Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO994	111-125 A'Beckett Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO995	185-187 A'Beckett Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO996	160-162 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO997	164-166 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO998	168-174 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO999	179-183 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1000	180-182 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1001	193-199 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1002	194-200 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1004	415-419 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1005	418-420 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1006	468-470 Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1007	338 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1090	340-342 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO1008	404-406 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1009	409-413 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1010	430-442 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1011	435-455 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1012	464-466 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1013	615-623 Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1014	9-13 Drewery Lane	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1015	21-23 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1016	215-217 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1017	299 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1018	303-305 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1019	351-357 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1020	380 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1021	384 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1022	441-447 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1023	453-457 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1024	463-465 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1025	473-481 Elizabeth Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO1026	30-40 Exhibition Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1027	53-55 Exhibition Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1028	104-110 Exhibition Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1029	309 Exhibition Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1030	61-73 Flinders Lane	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1032	125-127 Flinders Lane	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1033	141-143 Flinders Lane	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1034	26-30 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1035	76-80 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1036	130-132 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1037	360-372 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1038	508-510 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1039	516-518 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1040	520-522 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1041	562-564 Flinders Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1042	63-67 Franklin Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1043	96-102 Franklin Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1044	4-6 Goldie Place	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO1045	106-112 Hardware Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1046	12-20 King Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1047	115-129 King Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1048	131-135 King Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1049	284-294 La Trobe Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1050	361-363 Little Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1051	362-364 Little Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1052	365-367 Little Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1053	373-375 Little Bourke Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1054	434-436 Little Bourke Street.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1055	68-70 Little Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1056	392-396 Little Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1057	538-542 Little Collins Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1058	25 Little Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1059	194-196 Little Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1060	198-200 Little Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1061	372-378 Little Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1062	523-525 Little Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO1063	326 Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1064	439-445 Lonsdale Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1065	14-30 Melbourne Place	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1066	20-26 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1067	37-41 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1068	111-129 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1069	118-126 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1070	203-205 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1071	217-219 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO985	316-322 Queen Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1072	42-44 Russell Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1073	288-294 Russell Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1074	2-8 Spencer Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1075	10-22 Spencer Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1076	66-70 Spencer Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1077	122-132 Spencer Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1078	267-271 Spring Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1079	135-137 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1995?	Prohibited uses may be permitted?	Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO1080	163-165 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1081	309-325 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1082	401-403 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1083	407-409 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1084	411-423 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1085	427-433 Swanston Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1086	22-32 William Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1087	114-128 William Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1088	259 William Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No
HO1089	261 William Street	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No

22.04

/ 20
C186

HERITAGE PLACES WITHIN THE CAPITAL CITY ZONE

This policy applies to the Capital City Zone.

Policy Basis

The heritage of the Capital City Zone area, comprising individual buildings, precincts, significant trees, and aboriginal archaeological sites, is a significant part of Melbourne's attraction as a place in which to live, visit, do business and invest. It is also important for cultural and sociological reasons, providing a distinctive historical character and a sense of continuity. Much of Melbourne's charm is provided by its older buildings, which, while not always of high individual significance, together provide cultural significance or interest, and should be retained in their three dimensional form, not as two dimensional facades as has sometimes occurred.

The identification, assessment, and citation of heritage places have been undertaken over decades, as part of an ongoing heritage conservation process and their recognition and protection have been a crucial component of planning in Melbourne since 1982.

Objectives

- To conserve and enhance all heritage places, and ensure that any alterations or extensions to them are undertaken in accordance with accepted conservation standards.
- To consider the impact of development on buildings listed in the Central Activities District Conservation Study and the South Melbourne Conservation Study.
- To promote the identification, protection and management of aboriginal cultural heritage values.
- To conserve and enhance the character and appearance of precincts identified as heritage places by ensuring that any new development complements their character, scale, form and appearance.

Policy

The following matters shall be taken into account when considering applications for buildings, works or demolition to heritage places as identified in the Heritage Overlay:

- Proposals for alterations, works or demolition of an individual heritage building or works involving or affecting heritage trees should be accompanied by a conservation analysis and management plan in accordance with the principles of the Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance 1992 (The Burra Charter).
- The demolition or alteration of any part of a heritage place should not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that that action will contribute to the long-term conservation of the significant fabric of the heritage place.
- The impact of proposed developments on aboriginal cultural heritage values, as indicated in an archaeologist's report, for any site known to contain aboriginal archaeological relics.
- The recommendations for individual buildings, sites and areas contained in the Central City Heritage Study Review 1993 except for the buildings detailed in the incorporated document titled Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance, in which case the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance will apply. The recommendations for individual buildings and controls as detailed in the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010.

- All development affecting a heritage precinct should enhance the character of the precinct as described by the following statements of significance.
- Regard shall be given to buildings listed A, B, C and D in the individual conservation studies, and their significance as described by their individual Building Identification Sheet.

Statements of Significance and Key Attributes for Heritage Areas within the Heritage Overlay

Bank Place Precinct

Statement of Significance

The character of the intimate space within Bank Place is created by the architectural variety of the comparatively small, individual buildings that enclose it. They vary in style from the English domestic of the Mitre Tavern (1865), through to the Victorian facades of Stalbridge Chambers and the romanesque revival of Nahun Barnett's Bank Houses. The Savage Club, 12 Bank Place, was erected as a townhouse in the 1880s and is now on the Victorian Heritage Register. With its narrow entrances, flanked at the northern end by the impressive and ornately detailed Stalbridge Chambers on one side and on the other by a significant row of two-storey shops, representing the oldest legal offices in what was once Chancery Lane, it provides a pleasant and intimate space in the heart of the City. The area extends across Little Collins Street to include the Normanby Chambers, another sophisticated facade featuring Italian and English Renaissance design, another office long associated with the legal fraternity, and forming an architectural focus for Bank Place.

Key Attributes

- The intimate scale and character of Bank Place, as well as its strong social and traditionally pedestrian role.
- Architecturally interesting building facades and detailing throughout.

Bourke Hill Precinct

Statement of Significance

This precinct derives much importance from its association with Parliament House, which was built progressively from 1856. This 19th century complex dominates the Bourke Street vista from as far away as William Street, and is emphasised by the sympathetic scale of the buildings on either side of the Bourke Street Hill. The precinct also includes such stylish and prominent buildings facing Spring Street as the Princess Theatre (1886) and the Hotel Windsor (1883). These contribute to the high level of amenity of Spring Street and its gardens. The buildings on either side of Bourke Street reflect the variety of social activities that have taken place in this area since the mid-19th century. The scale of the City's buildings prior to the boom era of the 1880s is seen in the simple design and low scale of the two-storey Crossley's Building (1884-1853).

The area also comprises part of the entertainment precinct of the central city, and buildings such as the Salvation Army Temple (1890) reflect the interest of social reformers in the nearby 'back slums' epitomised by the nearby former Gordon House (1883-1884). A philanthropic venture built by a syndicate headed by the actor-manager and politician George Coppin, it was named after the martyr of Khartoum and was an ambitious venture intended to provide family accommodation for the respectable poor. However, the venture was not successful in achieving its purpose and Gordon House later became a shelter for homeless men and now a hotel. It survives as a unique social document in the narrow

confines of Little Bourke Street, and is complemented by the low-scale of surrounding red brick buildings.

The juxtaposition of the Parliament, the former deprived areas of Little Bourke Street and the style of Bourke Street gives the precinct an unrivalled historic texture and overall the theatres, hotels, cafes and quality bookshops contribute to the relaxed and elegant character of the eastern end of the city.

Key Attributes

- Low-scale Victorian buildings.
- The visual dominance of the parliamentary buildings on the Bourke Hill skyline, and the vista along Bourke Street to Parliament House.

Bourke West Precinct

Statement of Significance

Architecturally diverse but coherent in scale and picturesque setting, this precinct contains highly expressive elements of the late 19th and early 20th century city. Apart from containing a rare and interesting mix of diverse functions and building types, this precinct includes a range of government services located in the western quarter of the City. Some buildings such as Unity Hall (1916), Hudsons's Stores (1876-77) and the Old Tramways Building (1891) have important historical associations with transport and the Spencer Street railway yards. The comparatively low levels of even the tallest buildings contrast well with the single-storey structures on the southern side of Bourke Street, enabling the taller structures to be seen from their original perspective.

Key Attributes

- A group of architecturally diverse 19th and early 20th century buildings that are consistent in scale and associated with public services and warehousing.
- The dominance of the Tramways Building on the south side of Bourke Street and the Mail Exchange building on the north side.
- The amenity of the garden around St Augustine's Church.

Collins East Precinct

Statement of Significance

Collins Street has often been identified as Melbourne's leading street. This is due, in part, to the pleasant amenity and distinctive character of its eastern end. Its relative elevation and proximity to the Government Reserve and points of access to the City provided for its development as an elite locale. Initially a prestige residential area, the Melbourne Club re-established itself here in 1857 and by the 1860s the medical profession had begun to congregate. By the turn of the century it was firmly established as a professional and artistic centre of Melbourne, with part of its fame due to its tree plantations in the French boulevard manner (hence the 'Paris end'), which date from 1875.

A number of significant buildings come together in this precinct to form a series of prominent streetscapes. These include, at the western end, the Town Hall, Athenaeum, and Assembly Hall through to the Scots and Independent Churches, with the Regent Theatre through to the redeveloped T&G building opposite. The eastern end includes the early 19th century residential and artists' studio buildings at the foot of No. One Collins, with the

predominantly 20th century intact run to the north featuring Alcaston, Anzac Portland and Chanony Houses, and Victor Horsley Chambers plus the nearby Melbourne Club.

At all times until the post 1939-45 war period, redevelopment took place in a quiet and restrained manner with an emphasis on dignity, harmony and compatibility with the intimate scale and pedestrian qualities of the street. These qualities are still embodied in significant remnant buildings and other artifacts, despite the intrusion of large developments. The qualities of the street are also embodied in the social functions of the buildings which include elite smaller scale residential, religious, social, quality retailing and professional activities.

Key Attributes

- The buildings remaining from before the Second World War.
- The boulevard quality of this end of Collins Street with street tree plantations and street furniture.
- A consistent height, scale, character and appearance of the remaining 19th and early 20th century buildings.
- The historic garden of the Melbourne Club.

Flinders Gate Precinct

Statement of Significance

This precinct comprises the City's southern face, a major access point at Princes Bridge, and the specialised commercial district of Flinders Street. The area has been a gateway to the City from the south ever since the first Prince's Bridge (1841) and Melbourne's first railway were constructed, and Flinders and Spencer Street stations were linked by a viaduct in 1879. A grand new Princes Bridge (1886) confirmed the trend to redevelopment in the latter decades of the 19th century. The present Flinders Street Station (1906-10) also dates from this period. Proximity to the centre of Victoria's railway system explains the location and the size of the Commercial Travellers' Club (1899) in Flinders Street.

It was here, at Melbourne's southern gate, that the Anglican community chose to build their grand new St Paul's Cathedral (1880-91), replacing an earlier church on the same site. The choice was a logical one as many of them lived in the southern and eastern suburbs. More commercial motives saw the construction in Flinders Street of large retail emporia such as the former Mutual Store (1891) and Ball and Welch (1899).

This precinct offers evidence of all these changes, and also includes two of Melbourne's earliest and best known hotels, the Duke of Wellington (1850) and Young and Jackson's Princes Bridge Hotel (1854). An important feature of Flinders Street's southern face of buildings is their uniform height facing the station, Federation Square and the Yarra River.

Key Attributes

- The traditional gateway to the central city from the south and an area associated with retailing.
- Major 19th and early 20th century buildings including Flinders Street Station, St Paul's Cathedral and Princes Bridge.

Flinders Lane Precinct

Statement of Significance

Proximity to the Yarra River, Queens Wharf and the Customs House marked Flinders Lane as an appropriate location for the establishment of wholesaling businesses in the 19th century. Up until the 1870s and 1880s, Melbourne was the centre of the colonial re-export trade. Overseas cargoes were received, re-packed and distributed to the southern colonies and New Zealand. This trade created a demand for functional warehouses offering large areas of space close to the ground without any need for external display. This generation of buildings were plain brick or stone, up to three storeys in height, and limited to one commercial occupant.

The international exhibition of 1880-81 helped change this. International agents were introduced into the commercial economy, together with a system of indented goods sent direct from manufacturer to retailer. As this system took hold and the southern face of the city became more accessible to rail and road (with the development of Flinders and Spencer Street stations, and the construction of the new Princes Bridge), it became uneconomic to maintain large areas of warehouse space in Flinders Lane. The new wholesaler was able to store his goods elsewhere, requiring only a rented office and sample room in the city proper. However, clothing manufacturers and designers did find the larger floor areas to their liking and a number of 'Rag Trade' activities were established in the area.

An intense period of building between 1900 and 1930 resulted in taller buildings incorporating large showcase windows to both ground and basement floors, characteristically separated by a floor line approximately 1 metre from the ground. The new buildings of the 1970s and 1980s were even taller, more architecturally pretentious, and presented a display to the street. Flinders Lane retains buildings from all three eras, and presents a striking physical display of the changing pattern of trading activity in Melbourne.

Key Attributes

- The scale and character of the six and seven-storey office and warehouse buildings constructed in Flinders Lane before the Second World War and the predominant building forms and materials of the precinct.
- The traditional association with 'Rag Trade' activities, other creative professions, or dwellings.
- The large showcase windows at the ground and basement floors of the warehouse offices constructed before the Second World War.

Little Bourke Precinct

Statement of Significance

Chinese immigrants settled in Little Bourke Street as early as the mid 1850s. Chinese occupation in the city centre then extended north and west, creating a distinct enclave. The buildings that they occupied were not distinctively 'Chinese' in their appearance but were rather the typical small brick shops, dwellings, warehouses and factories of the less affluent areas of Victorian Melbourne (indeed the area was not known as 'Chinatown' until the 1970s).

A number of architecturally distinctive, community-oriented buildings were constructed in the heart of the precinct on Little Bourke Street. These included the Num Pon Soon Chinese Club House (1861) and the premises of leading Chinese merchant Sum Kum Lee (1888). However, the most obvious features of Chinatown were the Chinese themselves, their characteristic trades, and the often run-down general character of their quarter of the City. In the late 19th century, the overwhelmingly Anglo-Celtic community stigmatised both the Chinese and their portion of the city for an association with vice but, for many Chinese, Little Bourke Street was a centre of trade and community life. Today,

Chinatown's shops, restaurants and distinctive character are popular with many Melburnians and tourists as well as the Chinese community.

The precinct is bordered on its northern boundary by taller strip development fronting Lonsdale Street. Many Victorian and Edwardian buildings survive in this location and they provide an important contextual link between the 'back streets and lanes' of the heart of the precinct and the more public areas of the City. Since the Second World War, Lonsdale Street has become a centre for Melbourne's Greek community, further enhancing the cultural diversity of this cosmopolitan precinct.

Key Attributes

- The small low-scale Victorian and Edwardian buildings densely located along Little Bourke Street and the adjoining laneways.
- The traditional association with the Chinese community expressed through uses and signage.
- The focus for Greek commercial, entertainment, professional and cultural activities on the southern side of Lonsdale Street.
- The Swanston Street, Russell Street and Exhibition Street entry points to Chinatown.
- The prominence of Sum Kum Lee (112-114 Little Bourke Street) and Num Pon Soon (200-202 Little Bourke Street) within Little Bourke Street.
- The amenity of Little Bourke Street and the adjoining laneways for pedestrian use.
- The attractiveness of the precinct for tourism and recreation.

Post Office Precinct

Statement of Significance

For the immigrant community of Victorian Melbourne, dependant on the mail for news of all kinds, the General Post Office (GPO) was an important social institution. The present building reflects this social standing in its imposing architecture and occupation of a prominent corner site. The present building replaced an earlier structure of 1841 and was constructed in three stages between 1859 and 1907. The importance of the post office ensured a variety of other commercial attractions in the vicinity, many of them of retail character. The confluence of omnibus and tramway facilities assisted this.

Overall, this precinct has maintained its place as a major retail centre for the metropolis, surviving the challenges of such suburban centres as Smith and Chapel Streets and Chadstone. In the inter-war period, such establishments as Buckley and Nunn redeveloped their properties, the Myer Emporium put on its present face, and London Stores, the Leviathan Public Benefit Bootery, G J Coles and Dunklings all developed as substantial variety and specialist stores.

Important 19th century buildings such as the Royal Arcade and the GPO are now intermingled with the commercial gothic and art-deco characteristics of the 20th century shops and emporia to create a precinct characterised by glamour and variety. The precinct also contains sub-areas of great cultural value, such as the post office steps and arcades and Myer's windows (especially when decorated at Christmas time). The precinct's status as a meeting place has been recognised and enhanced by the establishment of the Bourke Street Mall.

Key Attributes

- The traditional character of the precinct as a major retail centre.

- The scale, form and appearance of the buildings constructed before the Second World War and of the surviving 19th century buildings.

The Block Precinct

Statement of Significance

Within this precinct may be found not only the heart of Victorian Melbourne's most fashionable retail area but also the beginnings of its 'Chicago end' along Swanston Street. 'Doing the Block', a term coined to describe the popular pastime amongst Melbourne's middle classes of promenading outside the plush retail and accessory stores, reached its height in the boom years of the 1880s. The tradition of arcaded shopping was borrowed from nearby Royal Arcade and became a marked feature of this precinct. Block Arcade (1891-93), Centreway Arcade (1913), Block Court (1930), Manchester Unity Arcade (1932), and the Century Arcade (1938-40) testify to the continued popularity of this form.

The precinct contains a great number of significant and architecturally impressive buildings dating from the boom years of the 19th century through to the period immediately prior to the 1939-45 war. The Elizabeth Street end is dominated by the smaller buildings of the earlier period whereas along Swanston Street may be found the Manchester Unity Building, the Capitol Theatre and the Century Arcade, all based on precedents found in Chicago at the time, and pushed to the maximum height limit of 132 feet that existed in Melbourne until the construction of the ICI building in 1958.

Key Attributes

- The historic character of the precinct as a retail area, characterised by a large number of buildings from the late Victorian and early 20th century periods and by the network of arcade shopping.
- The comfortable pedestrian movement within the precinct.
- The commercial and retail buildings of the Victorian and 1900-1940 periods.

The Market Precinct

Statement of Significance

The Queen Victoria Market is one of the great 19th century markets of Australia and the only such market built by the Melbourne City Council to survive. The complex of enclosed food halls, open sheds, shops and stores illustrate a complete mode of commercial transaction, which is today substantially similar to the pattern in 1878 when the main fruit and vegetable market was opened. The Market was the principle market of fresh fruit and vegetable produce in Victoria from 1878 to 1975 and had a profound effect on the whole system of growing, selling and distribution in the state. As a retail market, it has been an important meeting place for a large component of Melbourne's population and remains a vital link with a part of Melbourne's domestic life.

Key Attributes

- The historic character of the precinct as a retail area.
- The generally simple, low-scale and remarkably intact example of a utilitarian form from the period of its construction. Taken as a whole, the Market and its component

buildings are substantially intact in its 1923 form.

- The visual dominance of the Queen Victoria Market in the surrounding area.

Policy Reference

Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne 1985

Central Activities District Conservation Study 1985

Harbour, Railways, Industrial Conservation

South Melbourne Conservation Study 1985

Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011

[Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010](#)

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME

Incorporated Document

Central City Heritage Review 2011 Statements of Significance

This document is an incorporated document in the Melbourne Planning Scheme pursuant to Section 6(2)(j) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987

**Melbourne Planning Scheme
Incorporated Document**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Hoffman's flour stores, later Henry Box & Son Company offices and warehouse, 104 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, HO993	4
Commonwealth Motors, former, 111-125 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, H0994	5
Grange Lynne Pty Ltd, later White & Gillespie Pty Ltd. Building, 185-187 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, HO995	6
Exhibition Boot Company, 160-162 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO996	8
Barnett Building, 164-166 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO997	8
Australia Felix Hotel, later Alhambra, Stutt's, Morells', and Richardson's Hotel, and National Australia Bank, 168-174 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO998	10
Bourke House, 179-183 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO999	11
Norman's Corner Stores, former, 180-182 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1000	12
Carlton Hotel, 193-199 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1001	13
Hoyts Mid-City Cinemas, 194-200 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1002	13
Evans House, later Rochelle House, 415-419 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1004	15
Gothic Chambers (City Proprietary Company building), 418-420 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1005	15
London Assurance House, former, 468-470 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1006	17
Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store, 338 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1007	18
Burke later Burns House, 340-342 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1090	19
Atlas Assurance Co Ltd, later Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance building, 404-406 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1008	20
Commercial Union Building, later AUC Office, 409-413 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1009	21
Royal Insurance Group Building, 430-442 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1010	22
National Mutual Life Centre, 435-455 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1011	23
Huddart Parker Ltd Building, 464-466 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1012	24
State Savings Bank of Victoria, Western Branch, 615-623 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1013	25
Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory, 9-13 Drewery Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1014	27
Elizabeth Chambers, 21-23 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1015	28
Knight's shops and dwellings, later Hood and Co and Edinburgh Chambers, 215-217 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1016	29
Wilson's shop & residence, 299 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1017	30
Pynsent's store and warehouse, 303-305 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1018	30
Union Bank Chambers, later A.N.Z. Bank, 351-357 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, 3000, HO1019	31
Pattinson's general store, later Prince of Wales and Federal Club hotels, later Bulley & Co. Building, 380 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1020	33
Bank of Australasia, former 384 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1021	34
Royal Saxon Hotel, former, 441-447 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1022	35
English Scottish & Australian Banking Co., former, 453-457 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1023	36
Commonwealth Banking Corporation of Australia branch bank, former, 463-465 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1024	37
Currie & Richards showrooms & warehouses, 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1025	38
Alley Building, 30-40 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1026	40
Kevin Hall & Club, 53-55 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1027	40
Centenary Hall, 104-110 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1028	42
Fancy goods shop & residence, 309 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1029	43
Sargood Gardiner Ltd warehouse, 61-73 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1030	44
Higson Building, 125-127 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1032	45
Pawson House, 141-143 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1033	46
Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building, 26-30 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1034	47
Victorian Cricket Association Building (VCA), 76-80 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1035	48
Schuhkraft & Co warehouse, later YMCA, and AHA House, 130-132 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1036	49
Cobden Buildings, later Mercantile & Mutual Chambers and Fletcher Jones building, 360-372 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1037	50
Waterside Hotel, 508-510 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1038	52
Coffee Tavern (No. 2), 516-518 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1039	53
Savings Bank of Victoria Flinders Street branch, former, 520-522 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1040	54

Prince of Wales Hotel, later Markillie's Hotel, 562-564 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1041	55
Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co. factory, 63-67 Franklin Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1042	56
Keep Brothers & Wood workshop and showroom, later Stramit Building, 96-102 Franklin Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1043	57
Penman & Dalziel's warehouse group, part, 4-6 Goldie Place, Melbourne 3000, HO1044	58
Throstle's stores, 106-112 Hardware Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1045	59
Barrow Brothers warehouse, 12-20 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1046	60
Union Bond Melbourne Storage Company Ltd, 115-129 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1047	61
Peoples Palace, 131-135 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1048	62
Argus Building, former, 284-294 La Trobe Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1049	64
Russell's building, 361-363 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1050	65
Marks' warehouse, 362-364 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1051	66
Warburton's shops & warehouses, 365-367 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1052	67
Drayton House, 373-375 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1053	69
City West Telephone Exchange, 434-436 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1054	70
Bayne's shops and residences, later Little Reata restaurant, 68-70 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1055	71
Briscoe & Co warehouse, later EL Yencken & Co Pty. Ltd., 392-396 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1056	72
McCracken City Brewery malt store, later Ebsworth House, 538-542 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1057	73
Porta and Sons, Steam Bellows Works, 25 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1058	74
Collie, R & Co warehouse, 194-196 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1059	76
Cavanagh's or Tucker & Co's warehouse, 198-200 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1060	77
Women's Venereal Disease Clinic, 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1061	78
Cleve's Bonded Store complex, 523-525 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1062	79
Blessed Sacrament Fathers Monastery, St Francis, 326 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1063	81
Michaelis Hallenstein & Co building, 439-445 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1064	82
Watson's warehouse, later 3LO and 3AR studios, 3AW Radio Theatre, and Kelvin Club, 14-30 Melbourne Place, Melbourne 3000, HO1065	83
Yorkshire House, 20-26 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1066	85
Provident Life Building, 37-41 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1067	86
Royal Automobile Club of Victoria (R.A.C.V.) Building, former, 111-129 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1068	87
Australasian Catholic Assurance (ACA) Building, 118-126 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1069	88
Clarke's Shops & Dwellings, 203-205 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1070	90
Grant's factory-warehouse, 217-219 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1071	91
West Bourke Club Hotel, 316-322 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO985	92
Royal Bank of Australia Ltd, later English Scottish & Australian Bank Ltd., 42-44 Russell Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1072	93
Union Hotel, later Tattersalls Hotel, 288-294 Russell Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1073	94
Sir Charles Hotham Hotel, 2-8 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1074	95
McCaughan's Coffee Palace, later Great Southern Private Hotel, 10-22 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1075	97
Batman's Hill Hotel, 66-70 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1076	98
Hotel Alexander, later Savoy Plaza Hotel, 122-132 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1077	99
Elms Family Hotel, 267-271 Spring Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1078	101
Cann's Pty. Ltd. building, 135-137 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1079	101
Swanston House, Ezywalkin Boot shoe and Slipper Store, 163-165 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1080	103
George Evans shop and residence row, 309-325 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1081	104
Melbourne Democratic Club and shops & residences, 401-403 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1082	105
Druids House, 407-409 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1083	106
W.D. & H.O. Wills (Aust) Ltd tobacco warehouse, 411-423 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1084	107
County Court Hotel, later Oxford Hotel, Oxford Scholar Hotel, 427-433 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1085	108
State Electricity Commission of Victoria building, later Lyle House, 22-32 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1086	109
Dillingham Estates House, Former, 114-128 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1087	110
Spier and Crawford, warehouse, 259 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1088	112
James White's hay and corn store, 261 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1089	113

Hoffman's flour stores, later Henry Box & Son Company offices and warehouse, 104 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, HO993

What is significant?

This site is part of Crown Allotment 8, Section 41 parish of North Melbourne, being a land package of Elizabeth and A'Beckett Street frontages sold to Port Phillip pioneering merchant and speculator William Hoffman in 1851-2 for £580. Builders Simmie McLaughlin & Adamson erected two stores near the corner of Elizabeth and A'Beckett Streets in 1853 for William Hoffman. The architect HDG Russell called tenders for the construction of two stores for Hoffman in Elizabeth St in the same year, suggesting he was the designer. The property was described in the 1860s as two stone flour mill complexes, one occupied by Wright, as stone flour mills and engine off A'Beckett, and as Finlayson & Co, at 6 A'Beckett St, with stone mill and engine. Later, one building was termed as a stone brewery occupied by Woolf Isaacs.

In the Edwardian-era, the estate of William Hoffman commissioned architect W Knight to design the basalt and brick warehouse facing A'Beckett Street; W.B. Cooper of Hawthorn was the contractor. It appears that the A'Beckett Street stone façade of one of the 1853 stone buildings was reused in the new façade, with existing openings refashioned and the parapet built up using red brickwork. The second 1850s blue stone mill or store remained behind and adjoining the new brick section of the front structure. The nationally known Henry Box & Son Company and later, A Pardy & Company, both importers of carriage building materials, were long-term occupiers of what was termed as a workshop or factory. Hurst Bros., wire mattress and bedding manufacturers, had the northern stone store and stable adjoining at the rear, accessed from the pitched side yard east of 104.

This complex is an example of the concentration of the 'metals and engineering' trades in this part of Melbourne in the late Victorian-era, as observed by historian Graeme Davison and as also evident in the subsequent rise of the related motor trade there by the 1920s. Carriage building merged into car building. This transition was complete by the advent of the firm Geo Morgan & Co Ltd motor accessories at the complex that remained there from the 1930s into the 1950s. This historical perpetuation and concentration of uses has been identified as one of the contributory elements in the significance of the Capital City Zone.

The A'Beckett Street elevation of the southern two-storey warehouse has distinct Edwardian-era character achieved by the segmental archways on both levels as red brick infill within a more conservative stone façade of axed and quarry faced blue stone. The arches spring from stone haunches and the thick timber sections used in the window and doorway joinery take on a typical muscular Edwardian form. The pressed red brickwork is strongly modelled by use of bullnose, squint and regular profile bricks used to form a bold keystone over the entry. The building plinth is fine axed stone with radiused and battered sills. Corbelled ovolo profile terracotta mouldings provide a string mould at first floor level and a cornice at the parapet.

This combination of stone and red brick is very effective as an expression of contrasting natural materials with uncommon but simple detailing which distinguishes this from other similarly scaled Edwardian-era warehouses or the early Victorian-era stone examples. The façade design also possesses the honesty of materials sought after in the contemporary Arts & Crafts influenced approach to architecture. The warehouse behind the façade is basic red brick with concrete lintels over segmentally

arched openings, some infilled with brickwork. A new matching entry has replaced the former window at the west end of the ground level façade and the existing entry doors on the east appear to be sympathetic replacements of the original.

The southern half of the northern or rear 1853 store and stable survives with a gabled roof and rubble bluestone façade walling set within a dressed stone framework of piers, string-moulds and parapet mouldings. A similar string mould (semi-circular in section) is used at the parapet to that used on the A'Beckett Street façade. Stone quoining and lintels are set over double-hung quoined sash windows, flat-arched on the upper level and fully-arched on the lower. Keystones and margin tooling of the architraves adds a custom design aspect that suggests an architect's involvement. This façade is a highly valuable part of City's history which is complemented by the infill brickwork of the rebuilt southern store.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates (1853, 1901), and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Hoffman's warehouses are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The southern Hoffman warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically for the distinctive combination of dressed and quarry-faced blue stone and shaped red brickwork in the A'Beckett St façade, the use of brick allowing formation of the Edwardian segmental arch in the existing stone façade openings but also providing a distinct architectural Arts & Crafts character from the use of moulded brickwork and its juxta-positioning with another natural material, such as the stone; and Historically as a well-preserved exemplar of the transition of the carriage building in the northern part of the City into buildings used by the emerging motor trade. The southern warehouse also has some historical interest from a long and early association with the Henry Box & Son company of carriage building suppliers.

The northern Hoffman warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically for its articulate stone façade and detailing which is uncommon in the Capital City Zone for that date.

The stone parts of both Hoffman warehouses are significant:

Historically, for their great age, as part of a small group of stone flour mills, breweries and stores from the 1850s in the Capital City Zone, a period which meant massive growth of service industries such as these as a result of the gold rush.

Commonwealth Motors, former, 111-125 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, H0994

What is significant?

Camberwell architect, Lionel San Miguel, designed this Moderne style motor showroom and offices for the Catholic Church in 1936. Rispin Brothers tendered £4,100 for its erection for a motor-oriented use that continues today.

Motor car registrations had increased eightfold in the decade 1917-1928. The City saw new building types arrive as motor showrooms and garages. These were located typically along the northern edge of the City close to the main vehicle thoroughfare to Melbourne, the Sydney Road and its southern extension, Elizabeth Street.

The design concept consists of a vertical entrance feature (with three ribs, flag pole, central window strip) terminating the bold horizontal massing to the east. Commonwealth Motors, with its long glazing strips with steel-framed multiple panes, curved glazing at the corners, cantilevering showcases, terracotta and brick wall finishes, faceted rainwater heads, and opulent curves is highly representative of this minority style in Victoria; a style that was nearly terminated by the advent of the Second War in 1939.

Set on a corner site to a lane the building's three dimensional design concept is clearly evident. The horizontal main elevation springs from the stair well on the west and terminates on another vertical element set down the east side lane, followed there by plainer rendered walls with amply sized steel-framed windows facing the lane.

The façade's tapestry brickwork and moulded terracotta has been sand-blasted which has reduced the integrity of the materials used but not changed their form.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1936, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Commonwealth Motors is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

The Commonwealth Motors is significant:

Aesthetically, as a successfully designed and near externally intact building in the Moderne style which reflects relatively new retailing techniques (continuous, large areas of plate glass, ground level) as well as being a good adaptation from the internationally important European Modern movement showcased here on a corner site; and

Historically, as evocative of the transition from a hardware and carriage building part of the City to that of a motor transport centre, located along the streets at the northern flanks of Elizabeth Street, then the main motor way to northern Victoria and Sydney. The building's development parallels with a massive growth in Melbourne car ownership.

Grange Lynne Pty Ltd, later White & Gillespie Pty Ltd. Building, 185-187 A'Beckett Street, Melbourne 3000, HO995

What is significant?

Former Burley Griffin associate, Edgar Fielder Billson, designed a factory and offices for this site in 1937. Replacing two residences, it was built as ground and first floor accommodation for Grange Lynne Pty Ltd. Another firm, White and Gillespie Pty. Ltd. commissioned the addition of a matching floor in 1943 under the supervision of the Moderne style design specialists, R.M. & M.H King.

Hawkes Brothers Pty Ltd wholesale homeware merchants, and White & Gillespie (Melb.) Pty Ltd, electrotypers, occupied the building over a long period, the latter being part of a concentration of printing and linotype companies around the north-western edge of the City, in areas such as Lonsdale Street, in the inter-war period.

Billson, the first student to enrol and graduate in Architecture at the University of Melbourne, had worked in the office of Walter Burley Griffin as a student and graduate, and established his own practice in the 1920s. By the mid-1930s he was acknowledged as a leading architect on the Melbourne scene.

In this factory the long horizontal windows and window ledges of the ground and first floors, emblematic of contemporary International modernism, were juxtaposed against porthole stairwell windows and a rounded vertical element suggestive of the romantic sculptured work of the Wendingen School. The use of dark brown textured brick reinforced the Wendingen association. The composition of the façade as a whole was distinctive for this fusion of the modern and the romantic.

Beyond these elements, the distinctive tapestry and heeler brickwork gives way to common reds and a saw-tooth roof profile facing south at the rear. Concrete sun control hoods act as eyebrows to the facade window strips, curving back onto the wall against another curved vertical element which is an impressive amplification of that on the west-side. This element curves around on to the stair shaft and overshoots the parapet at its top, matching the stair and the other fin in height. Six port holes lend modish light to the stair between the upper window hood and entrance. Set under the semi-circular concrete hood at the stair entry are the street address numbers, floating in boldly executed metal flats tacked to three steel bars behind. Inside, the metal stair handrail shows similar convoluted curves.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates, 1937, 1944, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Grange Lynne Pty Ltd building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

The Grange Lynne Pty Ltd building is significant:

Aesthetically, as a successfully designed and highly representative example of the Moderne style, as applied to a City commercial building, which counteracts curved verticals with horizontal elements to achieve a balanced, three-dimensionally perceived design. The decorative aspects of the dark brown brick façade, such as the vertical fin and round windows of the stairwell, are particularly noteworthy. While the skilful addition of a similarly detailed third storey by the firm of R & M King has changed the proportions of the façade, this has detracted little from the integrity of the initial concept, showing the respect held by these architects for the earlier design; and

Historically, as a well-preserved inter-war City workshop and warehouse and one of a small number of surviving designs from the noted architect, Edward F Billson, a former pupil and associate of Walter Burley Griffin. The building is also a reflection of long-term industry and warehouse concentration in this part of the City and, in particular, the printing industry grouping near the new Argus newspaper building, showing the historical grouping and evolution of similar uses that have been assessed as significant elements of the City's development.

Exhibition Boot Company, 160-162 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO996

What is significant?

This shoe retailing shop was created in the Edwardian-era for the well known Exhibition Boot Company, an old colonial boot manufacturer with many shops across Victoria. The shop was later occupied over a long period by successive generations of the Coon family also as a shoe shop. The designer, William Webb had a prolific career creating many houses in the northern suburbs during the Victorian and Edwardian-eras. A distinctive and visually related tile design within the tympanum, depicts a broad rising sun with yellow rays and a tiled blue sky above, a motif used in the Arts & Crafts movement. Bartizan elements flank the façade in shaped red brickwork while boldly modelled cement work adorns the upper-level. The street facade has English Queen Anne revival façade styling, with red brickwork and Arts & Crafts cement detailing featuring the broad arch across the shopfront.

The building has an early and significant metal-framed shopfront, with tiled plinth, and pressed metal sheeting is evident in the shop entry and interior which has a coved roof lantern over the main shop area. Victorian and Edwardian-era shopfronts are now rare in the Capital City Zone.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1904, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Exhibition Boot Company is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The former Exhibition Boot Company is significant:
Aesthetically, for its distinctive architectural detailing and early shopfront form that is now rare in the Melbourne Capital City Zone context; and

Historically, for the shop's association with a prominent boot company in Victorian and Edwardian-era Melbourne and served as a boot retail outlet for some 80 years.

Barnett Building, 164-166 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO997

What is significant?

Robin Boyd described this building as '...with its blue metal spandrels and white trims, was the most honest and happy city building ever to be despoiled by terrible advertisements'. Now, stripped of the stylishly Moderne style and muscular Weber and Rice mural and the 1350mm tall letters of the 'Barnett's' sign (the 'terrible advertisements'), Barnett Building has achieved greater respectability in the eyes of Modernists for its architects, Seabrook and Fildes, but lost some of the albeit superficial

traits of its construction period. Louis Barnett & Sons Pty. Ltd., hairdressers and perruquiers (wig maker), owned and part occupied the new structure.

Designers Seabrook (and Fildes from 1936) had won fame with the premiated girls' secondary school design at Albert Park. Phillip Goad has described the Barnett Building as 'A technically unusual design...an early example of a curtain-walled, high-rise building with a roof-top squash court and gymnasium...' in his Australian Dictionary of Biography entry for Seabrook. The Barnett Building was publicised in the RVIA and Architects' Registration Board of Victoria, Guide to Victorian Architecture 1956.

Contemporary descriptions termed the Barnett Building as 'severely functional' although its bright blue porcelain enamelled spandrels, used for the first time in Australia, more than compensated for this severity. It was Weber and Rice's Health and Strength College squash court which had contributed a further peculiarity to the building. Located at the building's top the extensive windowless upper walls it created, badly needed the mural for relief, hence the vigorous graphics that have since been removed. Column-free space was also a fitness parameter and another plus claimed for the design: this was ably served by the concrete frame. Location of the lifts at the rear had originally determined a shop-lined corridor on the ground-level, since combined as one tenancy.

Stripped to the aluminium-framed curtain wall and stuccoed concrete essentials, the innovation of the Barnett Building's original façade is now clarified. The fluting of the metal spandrels on the Barnett Building was originally repeated as reeding in the glass to suggest a continuum of glass and glossy spandrel to make one glass facade.

The Barnett Building is a precursor to the many glass curtain walls of the 1950s in the City with their similar opaque spandrel panels alternating with glass between aluminium framing members but the aluminium mullions of this façade are not continuous as in the glass boxes of the 1950s.

The ground floor top-lighting has been covered with a new spandrel and the shop fronts replaced in a bland form. The reeded glass has been replaced with clear and the murals on the upper-level are gone. The building is related to parts of the adjoining streetscape, with some stylistic affinity to the Moderne styled building further to the east.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1938, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Barnett Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Barnett Building is significant:

Historically, as the oldest known example of a rationalist Modern commercial glass and aluminium-framed curtain wall design in the Capital City Zone, preceding by 17 years the profusion of multi-storey aluminium and glass curtain walls in the 1950s, with their similarly brightly coloured spandrels. The building was also one of the key works of the renowned proto-Modernist designers Seabrook & Fildes and was cited in the 1956 Olympics Melbourne guidebooks prepared by the architectural profession as a good example of modern commercial building; and

Aesthetically, for its architectural simplicity which underscores its pioneering Modernist concept and contrasts markedly with its contemporaries, such as the adjoining decorated Jazz Modern style example of Patersons Pty. Ltd.

Australia Felix Hotel, later Alhambra, Stutt's, Morell's, and Richardson's Hotel, and National Australia Bank, 168-174 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO998

What is significant?

The Australia Felix Family Hotel was first opened in Bourke Street in 1847 by Robert Sawyer: it was shown on the Melbourne Roll Plan 12 (1856) as a substantial building. The hotel was rebuilt in 1862 as dining room, bar, parlour, 19 sitting & sleeping rooms and a cellar, with adjoining shops. It had an upper-floor dance hall called the Alhambra Dancing Saloon. It was renovated again in 1870-1 before opening with Frederick Stewart as the hotelier. Collins Street architect, Peter Matthews, called tenders in 1876 for alterations to what was by then Stutt's Hotel, in Bourke Street, possibly creating some of the existing architectural character.

From 1884 it was owned by Esteban Morell and became known as Morell's Hotel. James Richardson, a young Scottish barman from the Old White Hart Hotel, became friends with Morell, who in 1893 financed Richardson's lease of Morell's Hotel. Within six years Richardson had purchased the freehold. After Richardson's death at the hotel in 1951, the building was purchased by the National Bank, opening as a branch in 1954. It was classified by the National Trust in 1991.

This two storey Italian Renaissance revival corner building resembles a Leonard Terry designed bank rather than an early Victorian-era City hotel. The elegant aedicules framing upper-level windows vary from bracketed concave hoods to the segmental arch over the corner window; windows are double-hung sash timber framed. Above the dentilated heavily moulded cement cornice is an unusual shallow attic level with applied pilasters on each side of wall panels, as also for the façade upper-level, with small window openings, each surmounted by a victory wreath.

Two extra bays once extending up Bourke Street (replaced by Barnett's Building) and openings at ground level have changed but the classical orders are still applied to frame each opening in a manner that is related to the upper-level. The bank tenancy is echoed by the overnight safe in the west ground floor plinth and perhaps the panelled entry doors at the splayed corner and on the west façade.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates, 1860-61 and 1876, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Australia Felix Hotel is historically and aesthetically significant to the Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Australia Felix Hotel is significant:

Historically, as one of the earliest group of corner hotels in the City dating from the financial boost just after the first wave of the 1850s gold rush. Over time the building

has held many gatherings and performed a key social role in the area, particularly for theatre goers and performers. The former hotel also has a long association with the noted hotel entrepreneur, James Richardson; and

Architecturally, the former hotel shows the elegant restraint of early Renaissance Revival designs in the City with subsequent ground level changes being carried out in manner that is related to the original upper-level.

Bourke House, 179-183 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO999

What is significant?

Bourke House, a six-level reinforced concrete framed and walled office building, was erected for the Posner Brothers, jewellers of Bourke Street, in 1922-1923. The building design was by concrete specialist architect, Leslie M Perrott and the structural engineering was by the Australian Reinforced Concrete Engineering & Co Pty. Ltd. (WW Robertson, chief engineer). Initially, the ground floor was occupied by shops.

Leslie M Perrott promoted his firm with self-published works on reinforced concrete and its use in building.

Showcased by the corner site, the two rendered street facades take on an abstracted Modernistic Greek Revival character that provides a precursor to the Moderne style and later stripped Modernist office blocks that were to follow after the Second War. The simple Bourke House design can be compared to the contemporary but highly ornate Nicholas Building as a pure example of Neo-Grec or Greek Revival, as applied to a commercial City building. At Bourke House, gabled parapeted forms surmount the two main vertical elements, centred on each street façade, acting as simple classical pediments. Projecting spandrel panels are symbolic balconettes and quoining on each vertical façade strip implies classical pilasters. Steel-framed windows take on a stylised multi-paned character, with fixed top lights and casement lower lights. The original 'Bourke House' sign has been preserved at the ground level entry surrounded by new tiling and the lobby stair survives with wrought iron and brass balustrade and terrazzo lobby floor paving.

The upper-levels have a high integrity to the construction date although typically for the Central Business District the deep ground-level showcases have gone and new unrelated but transparent canopies added.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1922-1923, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Bourke House is historically, aesthetically or architecturally significant to the City of Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

Bourke House is significant:

Aesthetically for its early progression to a Modernistic façade design, with the simple but effective abstraction of elements of prevailing Greek Revival style commercial City architecture. Bourke House also provides one of a pair of similar designs at the Russell and Bourke Street corner; and

Historically, as an early and well-preserved multi-storey example from the design office of reinforced concrete specialist, Leslie M Perrott, who was to make his reputation in large city hotel buildings in the following decades.

Norman's Corner Stores, former, 180-182 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1000

What is significant?

Architects Sale & Keague (designed the remodelling of an existing warehouse with three levels and a basement (see brickwork on north elevation) to form one occupation for Norman Sharpe in 1932 (Sharpe was the manager of Norman's Corner Stores). Three years later an estimated £8000 was spent on alterations and additions to the design of Marcus Barlow; which added 3 floors, mezzanine, and a pent house to the existing arcuated façade. This completely transformed the building to Moderne Gothic, in the manner of Barlow's earlier Manchester Unity Building but in this case the façade was pressed cement not the more expensive terracotta. Norman's Corner Store, drapers were the main occupiers of the building from the 1930s well into the 20th century.

The two street elevations rise six storeys with vertical faceted ribs following the Perpendicular Gothic style inspiration. Pressed cement detailing in the spandrels and at the parapet take on a geometric Jazz-Moderne character with paired scrolls in bas-relief for each. The parapet has the geometric zigzag modelling associated with jelly-moulds or Art Deco objects.

The ground level shopfronts (once deep showcases with island displays facing Bourke St) and canopy have been changed and the street awning rebuilt.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1932-35, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Norman's Corner Stores is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Norman's Corner Stores is significant Aesthetically for its Jazz-Moderne styling which is best expressed on the upper levels of the building in the pressed cement façade detailing and three-dimensional parapet forms. The building continues Marcus Barlow's keynote Modernistic stylism seen in the Manchester Unity (earlier) and Century Buildings (later) in Swanston Street and their use of Jazz Moderne detailing in either terracotta or pressed cement; and

Historically, as a major retailer in the inter-war and post World War Two era within the Capital City Zone when Melbourne City was the predominant retailing centre in metropolitan Melbourne. Major retail outlets benefited from corner sites and a Bourke St location such as is exemplified well by this building.

Carlton Hotel, 193-199 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1001

What is significant?

Reconstruction in 1936 of the Queensland Hotel, an old landmark in Bourke Street, meant an expenditure of nearly £14,000 on this building. The new five-level hotel, on the south side of Bourke Street between Swanston and Russell Streets, was renamed the Carlton Hotel. The freehold of the hotel had been purchased about two years earlier by Carlton and United Breweries Limited. Hotel specialist designers, Sydney Smith, Ogg and Serpell, were the architects and Thompson and Chalmers Pty. Ltd. the builders.

The new hotel was of steel frame construction with fireproof reinforced concrete floors. The façade was finished in textured tapestry bricks and described at the time as 'a modern treatment of the Renaissance style of architecture', meaning perhaps the Palazzo form. More Moderne than Renaissance, the façade is composed of simple vertical piers with windows separated by brick spandrel strips recessed between. The stepped cement rendered parapet (still unpainted) is stylised in the Moderne manner but with Greek revival motifs such as the bas-relief urns and parapet frieze. The suspended street awning (replaced in a massive rendered and steel terrace form) was similarly Moderne in style with fluting and bold imposed metal lettering. A vertical neon sign completed the up-to-date imagery needed for a City hotel where most of the existing hotels there had been built in the Edwardian-era or 1920s. The ground level has also been replaced but dividing piers are similar to the original.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1936, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Carlton Hotel is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Carlton Hotel is significant

Historically and socially as one of the small number of hotels built in the Capital City Zone in the inter-war period, as a community gathering place since the 1930s, and as a design by hotel specialist Sydney Smith Ogg and Serpell who had created a large number of significant hotel buildings within the City and inner suburban Melbourne; and

Aesthetically, as a well preserved example (upper-levels only) of the minority inter-war Moderne style in the City and complements the similarly styled former Commonwealth Bank building, the Normans Corner Store and Bourke House at the Russell Street corner.

Hoyts Mid-City Cinemas, 194-200 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1002

What is significant?

Hoyts Pictures formed in 1909, commenced screenings at St. George's Hall, Bourke Street, (later on, Hoyts De Luxe), and gradually built up their empire of cinemas.

Architect and entrepreneur, Gordon Banfield, and the Company, Ralton Holdings, developed two cinemas (932, 250 seats), a shopping arcade and a car park (entered from Little Bourke St) to the 1969 design of Bogle and Banfield, as constructed by E.A. Watts, Pty. Ltd.. The Hoyts company was approached as potential lessees and after fitting out the interior, opened there with a crowd of 5000 in November, 1970; the Hoyts Cinema Centre had already opened the year before, almost completing the company's rationalisation of their city cinemas from old venues to new.

Expectations that a third cinema would be incorporated in the complex were realised in December, 1975, when part of the once vast upper level foyer space was taken up for an 'intimate' 220 seat venue. Bogle and Banfield and Dolphin were the architects and builders, respectively. Superficial renovations were made to the design of Melbourne architect, Ronald Fitch, in 1979, while the retail arcade, which had never been prosperous, was refurbished in 1977-8.

Mid-City was sculptural and used the then modish exposed off-form concrete finish. An early use of the now ubiquitous trowelled-on aggregate finish, Mid-City used a strident red oxide applied front and back (Little Bourke St) instead of the more monotonous buff-coloured layers poured over scores of investment buildings, and flourished a rich burst of colour in contrast to the natural concrete of the side walls. Where needed, windows were recessed behind concrete louvres at the top and bottom of each elevation, which formed textural relief from the boldly chamfered concrete forms. The Bourke Street awning was supported on two deep beam pairs, accentuating the muscular design.

Mid-City compared with contemporary Brutalist off-form designs, such as Princes Hill High School (1972), the Amalgamated Metal Workers & Shipwrights Union (1973), the Plumbers & Gasfitters Employees Union (1971 and the similarly formed Y.W.C.A., Elizabeth Street (1975). Although more decorative than functional in its use of bold geometric forms, Mid-City was an early (if not the earliest) large scale commercial design to utilise the now familiar splayed and chamfered forms.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates, 1969-1970, 1975-76, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Hoyts Mid-City Cinemas is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Hoyts Mid-City Cinemas is significant; Aesthetically, as a successful blend of traditional romantic cinema design with modern functionalist requirements in an early use of Brutalist large scale commercial architecture in the State. Both this and Cinema Centre are stylistically distinctive designs which are outstanding among the small number of new cinemas built since World War Two; and Historically, the occupation of Mid-City (and the Cinema Centre) marked a turning point for Hoyts to more modern and intimate cinemas, from the huge picture theatres of pre World War Two. The Bourke Street location of the cinema followed over one hundred and twenty years of tradition of theatre placement in Melbourne.

Evans House, later Rochelle House, 415-419 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1004

What is significant?

The canvas goods retailer (tent, tarp and flag makers.), Thomas Evans Pty. Ltd., commissioned this six level (plus basement) reinforced concrete framed factory and office building (with ground floor retail) as Evans House, to the design of architects, Hare Alder Peck & Lacey, architects and engineers, in 1929. It was erected by George Prentice Pty Ltd. Thomas Evans Pty. Ltd. remained there over a long period.

The façade, clad with steel trowelled cement render and detailed in terra-cotta faïence, has a distinctive bowed centre bay divided into four recessed vertical glazing strips, with spandrels set between windows, and flanked by vertical elements at each end of the façade. The façade render was finished with a coat of Sanduski white cement mixed with a buff sand to achieve the desired freestone colour. Terra-cotta detailing has been applied around openings and at the parapet level using uncommon motifs within the Melbourne context, including two large green urns at the parapet and spiralled vine motifs along window architraves. Large steel-framed windows have been used to provide ample natural light in the north facing façade. The ground and first levels of the street elevation have been given special treatment to underscore their podium role, with bronze joinery, showcases and balconettes. The overall effect is as an early application of the Moderne style with stylised ornament and façade composition departing from direct commercial palazzo or classical precedents. The complex of deep display windows and showcases, with their leaded transom lights, set either side of the lift-foyer and ground floor entry passageways have been removed, along with the suspended street awning, but generally the changes at ground level are visually related to the character of the building; the upper-level is well preserved.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1929-1930, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Evans House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Evans House is significant:

Historically as a well preserved City retailer and manufacturer from the inter-war period when the Central Business District was the paramount retailing centre for the State, as evoked by the scale and finish of this building; and

Aesthetically, as a particularly well preserved façade for a retailing premises and contains a high grade of finish and ornament in the Moderne style.

Gothic Chambers (City Proprietary Company building), 418-420 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1005

What is significant?

Designed by the eminent architect, Charles D'Ebro in his favoured Venetian Gothic manner, Gothic Chambers was one of the small number of large commercial designs to use the Gothic style instead of following the prevailing Italian Renaissance derivatives favoured for most city businesses. The building included a Bourke Street shop and three warehouses, with upper-level offices.

Other key examples of the style included the Metropolitan Tramways Building, the Olderfleet (1891), the Rialto (1890), the Stock Exchange (1891) and (to a lesser extent) the Wool Exchange (1891). Gothic Chambers was, however, constructed to a budget and compares more favourably with the nearby Tramways Building (1880) than the richly detailed and highly significant Olderfleet Building. Terry & Oakden's Gothic banks had been an exception in the mid to late Victorian period but the emerging Medieval or Queen Anne revival preoccupation in the 1890s was cut off abruptly by the financial crash of 1893.

An exposed gabled roof (instead of hipped), a gabled parapet (instead of corniced parapet), face brickwork (instead of stucco) and pointed arches (instead of rectangular window openings) were the main contrasting elements in the Gothic Chambers design compared to the more typical classical revival street facades. Eclectic detail followed, with the parapet corbel table and arcade, the label-moulds over windows and the Romanesque inspired frieze within the iron balustrade (with iron sun flowers) and impost moulding, all supporting the stylistic shift away from classical revival architecture. The letters 'CPC' (City Proprietary Company) are entwined on moulded cement shield at the top of an ecclesiastical window. A cantilever canopy has been added and new shopfronts but the framing ornamented pilasters at ground level remain.

At the rear in Kirks Lane, the building presents a sheer red brick façade with surviving timber loading doors and a hoisting gantry at the top. Some of the openings have been sheeted over or bricked in but this elevation is surprisingly well-preserved.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1890-1891, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Gothic Chambers is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Gothic Chambers is significant:

Aesthetically as a competent if restrained design in a minority Victorian-era commercial Gothic style, which retains some notable detailing and finishes. Its designer, Charles D'Ebro produced a number of significant Gothic or medieval character designs during his career with Gothic Chambers as one of the earliest; and

Historically, as one of the few well preserved late Victorian-era office buildings in the Capital City Zone to adopt a Gothic style for its façade and from the long association with saddler Alex Morrison on the ground floor recalls the massive and historic Kirks horse bazaar that was located next door.

London Assurance House, former, 468-470 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1006

What is significant?

With the announcements in 1959 of stone facing to facades proposed on the new Colonial Mutual Life and Guardian Insurance buildings, came the completion of this highly successful glass curtain wall on London Assurance House.

The professional journal 'Architecture and Arts' noticed the new building and observed that the London Assurance company had been operating since it received its Royal Charter from King George I in 1720. The new building however was totally modern, with use of light-weight building techniques such as open web floor beams protected by vermiculite. One upper level had been set aside for car parking accessed from the rear (changed since) and the latest elevators were installed and despite the hopper sashes on the façade, all floors were air-conditioned by a high velocity medium pressure double duct system.

The entrance attracted attention with its travertine faced walls, green marble insets, gold ceramic tile panels, and marble stairs and floors (modified since). It also had an illuminated ceiling that was then a very new concept (removed). The service core ran down the east side of the building.

The periodical 'Building Ideas' created a special edition to display the City's architectural wealth, London Assurance House was listed among the showcase of modern and heritage architecture in the 1965 guide to Melbourne's best architecture prepared for the architectural profession. London Assurance House was created in an era of the 1950s and early 1960s that saw a major development surge in insurance or assurance architecture in the Central Business District, cementing Melbourne's preeminent role in the state for financial institutions.

An aluminium and glass curtain wall is set back within the building's façade to create a picture frame effect, bordered by stone facing to the perimeter frame. Slim black-framed hopper-sash windows open unexpectedly from alternate mid-points of the window glazing. By contrast, the curtain's frame is natural aluminium and is proud of the glass, tracing a fine Mondrian pattern of squares across the glazing. The much favoured mushroom colour had been chosen for the spandrel glass (since modified).

Completing the illusion of total transparency, an almost mullionless glazed entry screen fills the whole gap left by the structure with little fuss. This was the ultimate aim of International Modern, transparency to structure and a lightness of street facades, as a clean break from the monumental revivalist elevations of the inter-war period. The Wolfgang Sievers' image of the building in 1959 shows very little change to its existing form, with the removal of the serifed building name from the first level fascia the only major difference.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction date, 1957-1959, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

London Assurance House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

London Assurance House is significant:

Aesthetically, as a well-preserved, elegantly transparent all-glass curtain-walled office building which was begun only three years after Melbourne's first city examples of the international Modernist 'glass box'. The building's design value has been identified by at least two key architectural publications; and

Historically, as representative of the rapid growth of the 'insurance architecture' of the 1950s-1960s continuing the expansion of large insurance companies opting for construction and naming rights of new City office buildings as a form of promotion and fund investment. This was when Melbourne was the financial capital of Australia.

Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store, 338 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1007

What is significant?

Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store was erected in 1933 to the design of the prominent commercial architect Marcus R Barlow at an estimated cost of £7600. John Hardy traded as 'Hardy Brothers' from his rooms in Sydney from 1853. Hardy opened a Brisbane showroom in 1894, followed by one at Melbourne, 298 Collins Street, in 1918, and at 338 Collins St from 1933. As 'Silversmiths by Appointment to the Queen' Hardy brothers claim the only Royal Warrant in Australia and manufactures the Emirates Melbourne Cup.

Conceived as a modest two level shop, the terra-cotta clad street elevation had a Moderne styled archetypal stepped profile with central flagpole and the firm's initials set out on a stepped motif centrally located on the upper-level wall. The main façade plate-glass window spanned the two floors as a vertical feature, with ribbing and fluting using terra-cotta and chromium plated steel.

Chrome was also used on applied 'Hardy Bros' façade lettering. Flood lamps were carefully concealed in the façade elements to allow innovative street lighting as promotion for the firm. Since replaced, the main ground level display window was also framed with chrome and based on polished black marble. The single width entry door also held the firm's name in metal lettering stepped down from one corner. The Collins Street elevation as original was masterly but understated Moderne style example.

Today the ground level has been changed but remains visually related with its polished black stone finish and a street awning has been added. The firm has absorbed the adjoining architecturally related inter-war Burke House, 340 Collins Street, as part of the business. The building remains as one of a relatively small group of inter-war Moderne style buildings in the Capital City Zone.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1933, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store is historically and architecturally significant to the Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store is significant:

Architecturally as one of a relatively small group of inter-war Moderne style buildings in the Capital City Zone designed by one of the style's distinguished practitioners, Marcus R Barlow. The terracotta façade is an additional distinction; and

Historically, as associated with the firm Hardy Brothers, and remains as one of the key names in jewellery and silverware retailing in the Capital City Zone and Victoria.

Burke later Burns House, 340-342 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1090

What is significant?

Nationally known estate agent, businessman and philanthropist, Thomas Burke (1870-1949) commissioned architects Schreiber & Jorgensen to design this seven-storey (plus basement) reinforced concrete office building in 1929. The Reinforced Concrete & Monier Pipe Construction Company was the builder, with the estimated cost of the project being £25,000.

. As with his other ventures, Burke took advantage of the Great Depression to erect this building as his head office in times of cheap labour and materials costs. The building's architects, Schreiber & Jorgensen, were at their peak of achievement having just completed the magnificent Xavier College chapel design as well as a number of outstanding domestic commissions that illustrated their ability with both Arts & Crafts and classical oriented designs.

The façade was clad with terra-cotta faience in highly fanciful Gothic design that was intricately detailed in the architects' drawings. The name Burke House was placed in a panel above the window display and entry, these having copper clad timber tracery and ogee-arch heads to provide a fully medieval character. Burke (and others) occupied the building in the inter-war period.

The street elevation of Burke House is extravagantly modelled as commercial Gothic as applied to narrow frontage. The parapet is particularly ornate and massive in comparison with the relatively plain façade between it and the first floor balconettes and bartizans. Recently cleaned the façade still has the sandstone character of the faience veneer. The ground level has been integrated with Hardy Brothers next door and an unrelated canopy added.

How is it significant?

Burke House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Burke House is significant:

Aesthetically as a well-preserved commercial Gothic style office building erected at the height of the Great Depression to the design of the then prominent architects Schreiber & Jorgensen and showcasing the historicism of the style and its realisation with the terracotta faience acting as a traditional stone cladding; and

Historically, as closely linked with the nationally known estate agent, businessman and philanthropist, Thomas Burke, whose skill in financial investment is epitomised by this building.

**Atlas Assurance Co Ltd, later Guardian Royal Exchange
Assurance building, 404-406 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000,
HO1008**

What is significant?

The Atlas Company was a successful insurance company founded in Britain in 1808, with international branches to follow. This steel-framed and reinforced concrete building was erected for the Atlas Assurance Co Ltd by builders EA Watts Pty. Ltd., initially as basement, ground, mezzanine and six upper-levels, to the design of architects and engineers H Garnett Alsop & Partners in 1957-8. Within two years of completion, another four levels were added to take it to just over the limit height of 132 feet. The same architects and builder were commissioned.

The façade curtain wall system was anodised aluminium framed with marble spandrels and Polyglass (originally specified as Thermpane) double glazed polished plate window units (78x39") placed by glaziers EL Yencken & Company Pty Ltd. The building was fully air-conditioned and the marble and granite work alone were to cost over £24,000, including the ground level and Assurance Chamber wall linings. All of this meant that this building was among the most expensive per unit area among the 30 buildings erected in the City 1955-1958. The progression from all-glass curtain walls with opaque glass spandrels to those with stone spandrels such as this example eventually provided reconstructed pseudo-structural stone facades such as that used on the Colonial Mutual Life building, Collins St, 1963. This transition was remarked upon in the architectural periodical 'Cross-section'.

Inside, the service core was arranged along the west wall with stairs at either end, and a light court midway on the east wall. Suspended plaster ceilings were used throughout with air-conditioning (as an advance on the natural ventilation of the City's first glass box, Gilbert Court) and the floor slabs turned up at the facade edge to provide back-up fire-rated spandrels to sill height, the sills finished in reconstructed granite.

This was the company's head office for both New Zealand and Australia: they were the sole occupiers of the building. The building coincided with the erection of a number of large insurance and assurance company offices nearby in what was Melbourne's and therefore Victoria's financial centre.

The ground level had a grand folding glass door set across the entry at the west end of the façade, leading to a glass lobby screen and beyond, all with terrazzo paving. The statue of Atlas that once sat on top of the earlier Atlas Assurance Building on the site was reused in the new building but at ground level, set on one end a granite-faced base wall extending for the eastern half of the street ground level façade, and also bearing the incised name of the building and address.

The ground level interior and façade were changed in the 1980s and the statue Atlas relocated to a niche at the west end (but a panel on the wall states that the statue is in its original position). However the upper-level façade remains generally as built.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates, 1957-1958, 1960-1961, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Atlas Assurance Co Ltd is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Atlas Assurance Co Ltd is significant:

Historically as a good reflection of the growth of insurance and assurance companies in Victoria during the 1950s-1960s resulting in many company-named buildings erected in this, the financial centre of the State. This was the Australian headquarters of a major international company; and

Aesthetically as a slick and sealed aluminium-framed curtain wall façade just a few years after the first multi-storey glass box was built in Australia with its natural ventilation and differing aesthetic. The use of stone on the curtain wall and granite at the base of the building emulated in a modern manner the stone clad classical facades favoured by financial institutions in the pre Second War Era. With its marble spandrel panels, this building marks a transition from the all-glass wall to the pseudo structural reconstructed stone and precast concrete facades of the 1960s and later.

The Edwardian-era Atlas statue is also significant, aesthetically and historically.

Commercial Union Building, later AUC Office, 409-413 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1009

What is significant?

This nine-level reinforced concrete building was constructed in 1939-40 for the Commercial Union Assurance Company Ltd. and designed by Peck, Kemter & Dalton, in association with co-designer of the Shrine of Remembrance (1934) and Alkira House (1937), Phillip B. Hudson.

This is a symmetrical multi-storey elevation clad on the upper level with Sydney sandstone and polished granite at the base. Composed in a Palazzo form, with the high plinth and seemingly diminishing façade storey heights, the façade utilises the new Jazz-Moderne ornamentation at the top, creating the familiar stepped profile of side piers and central window bay. Gothic ornament is also used as a deliberate gesture to the adjoining Modern Gothic Aldersgate House and Goode House at the corner, highlighting the emphasis on street architecture by architectural practices of the era. Window frames are in bronze and detail sparsely applied, including grooved friezes surmounting the implied podium. Wardrop, as one of the designers, was adept at this form of detailing and composition.

The development was on the site of the company's previous offices and continued a long tradition of occupation in the insurance centre of Melbourne. The inter-war period saw a growth in insurance companies along with other financial institutions.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1939-40, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Commercial Union Assurance Company Ltd. building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Commercial Union Assurance Company Ltd. building is significant:
Architecturally as a good example of modern commercial Gothic design, with a deliberate street architecture response typical of the period; and
Historically, as an important member of the significant group of early 20th century financial houses between Market and Queen Streets, evocative of Melbourne's continuing role as the finance centre of the State and Australia and this part of the Capital City Zone as the insurance centre of Victoria.

**Royal Insurance Group Building, 430-442 Collins Street,
Melbourne 3000, HO1010**

What is significant?

The Royal Insurance Company Ltd. had come to Melbourne from England in the 19th Century, having been established there in 1845. They had built up national head offices and a host of branches and subsidiaries by the 1960s. The Melbourne head office designers were Yuncken Freeman Architects Pty. Ltd.

The RAI gave it the General Buildings Award for 1967.

Reconstructed black granite gave the tower its characteristic dark profile but here the stone grains are cast into pre-glazed concrete panels with structural ribs at the vertical joints. However, at the Royal Insurance Building, the separation of each component, by detailing, follows the Modernist principle of the building as an evident assembly of functional parts rather than a decorated monolith, although here the dark concrete cladding could easily have been mistaken for one.

Because the façade's intermediate ribs did not continue to the ground and hence did not perform as primary structure, was no reason for concern: they were still needed for the lateral strength of each panel and enabled panel thickness to be reduced to the required fire rating's minimum. Neither was the building free of the podium principle, used in the city since the Renaissance revival of the mid 19th century, although the giant colonnades at the Royal were detailed as smooth transitions from the main façade. Internally, however, the lofty space created was used skilfully to accommodate a mezzanine.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1962-1965, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Royal Insurance building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The Royal Insurance building is significant:

Aesthetically as the most elegant, early pre-cast concrete clad International Modern office design in the city, providing a massive prelude to the similarly black-clad commercial designs by the same firm; and

Historically and socially, for the award of the 1967 RAI (Vic) Victorian Architectural Medal as an indication of high regard by architectural peers and the community.

National Mutual Life Centre, 435-455 Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1011

What is significant?

This was the era of civic development where the new vision of the Central Business District was one of elegant office tower blocks that because of their greater height, allowed adjacent landscaped forecourts. To this end the Western Market site, having been considered for near 100% site coverage in the late 1950s, was reconsidered in the role of half investment office tower and half public plaza set over a large area, larger than any previous city green space.

Godfrey Spowers, Hughes, Mewton and Lobb, and Leith and Bartlett, were the joint architects and engineers (termed the National Mutual centre Architects), with E Hughes as the project architect. The client was National Mutual Life Association of Australasia Ltd and the contracting builders were EA Watts Pty Ltd.. As with other recent insurance office towers the gold-anodised aluminium framed curtain façade walls were augmented with stone, in this case 1.1/4 inch thick white marble (requiring a modification of the Uniform Building Regulations). Initial plaza plans (232 x 150 feet in area) showed more paving than eventuated, seating and planting area on the east and west sides, and a large central fountain area.

There were two levels of shops facing the gallery and concourse or north plaza and an internal arcade. The first three occupied levels covered a larger area than the tower above (which had a 150 feet setback from Collins St), with two and three parking and service levels below. Of the total gross building area of 536,200 square feet, some 186,840 square feet was devoted to housing the car. The first floor held ample staff facilities including a large cafeteria, a library, lounge, games and billiard rooms. There was also the encircling balcony which was rare among city buildings but allowed for easy window cleaning and shading of the glass facade, avoiding the cracking problems experienced by the ICI Building in 1960.

The completion of the project coincided with the Fourteenth Australian Architectural Convention and the periodical 'Building Ideas' created a special edition to display the City's architectural wealth, with tour guides compiled by architect and academic Neville Quarry and others.

He wrote:

'.. The creation of a much needed open plaza in the heart of the office district was made possible by the City Council's move in buying the whole block and leasing it back to National Mutual, with the requirement that only half the area should be built upon and the other half be paved and planted for the use of the public, with parking underneath. Accommodation for 512 cars is provided, 93 with access from Market Street and the rest from Flinders Lane.

The plaza, 228 feet x 150 feet, is paved with hexagonal Mintaro slate and a 60-foot-high piece of sculpture, with its associated fountain and pools, will be placed off-centre near Market Street. Planting beds round the edges of the plaza are raised, with a broad wall for sitting on and there is a patch of lawn at the southern end, backed by planting intended eventually to serve as protection from southerly winds up William Street from the river....'

Thirty years on, Professor Miles Lewis wrote in *Melbourne the City's History and Development*:

'..... But the dramatic aspect was the creation of a large forecourt to Collins Street, unparalleled in any other commercial development in the city. The development was open on three sides, with a freestanding tower slab set back on the southern most part of the site overlooking the landscaped plaza. The implications for the city were potentially dramatic. The modernist vision of a city of high rise towers set amidst landscaped greenery at ground level seemed imminent, provided that major corporations were able to purchase large city sites or consolidate a number of titles...'¹

The building and plaza are general well-preserved with the exception of a four-level discrete glass clad box abutting the south lower level podium that has adopted some of the fenestration patterns of the existing building. This addition has been set in from the podium perimeter and is bland in its general effect.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1962-1965, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The National Mutual Life Centre is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The National Mutual Life Centre is significant:

Historically as a landmark private development within the City's history, distinguished by its scale and combination of office and retail uses, providing for the first major public plaza within the Central Business District, along with a major new underground car parking area. The development is also part of the boom eras of post-Second War insurance-linked architecture that helped make this part of Collins Street the financial centre of Victoria; and

Aesthetically it is a well preserved and large example of curtain wall architecture of the time but is distinguished by its free-standing site, the high degree of external finishes and the encircling balconies, one on each floor that had not been achieved previously for an office tower in the City.

**Huddart Parker Ltd Building, 464-466 Collins Street, Melbourne
3000, HO1012**

What is significant?

¹ *Melbourne the City's History and Development*: 136

The building at 464-466 Collins Street, was constructed 1908 by FE Shillabeer, as a three storey office building for the land owner, St James Church of England trustees.

The principal tenants of the new building and their head office were steamship owners, Huddart, Parker and Co., while the Orbost Shipping Co maintained offices on the second floor. The company's initials may still survive on the shield held by the scrolls over the central ground level window (covered by a Makers Mark 'M.M.' panel). Founded in the 1870s, Huddart Parker & Co, were one of the seven major coastal shippers, when this was the principal means of interstate transport.

This distinctive symmetrical façade was partitioned into bays by elegant fluted pilasters rising through the full height of the building. The entry was surmounted by an ox-bow moulded cement motif reiterated over the window on the other side. At the top floor is an unusual moulded cornice as a series of connected segmental arches. Façade windows are set out in a Tudoresque manner with bevelled mullions and decorative sills at the lower level. The parapet and pediment above are of particular interest, featuring foliation and tendril designs derived from Art Nouveau or Arts & Crafts sources.

The ground floor openings have been changed and enlarged, with large expanses of glazing and an unrelated but simple modern portico, and the upper level spandrel finishes altered (painting of tile and brickwork) but the building nonetheless remains in good and largely original condition. Early images of the building allow easy restoration.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1908, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Huddart Parker Ltd Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Huddart Parker Ltd Building is significant:

Aesthetically, for its unusual façade composition, combining a variety of contemporary decorative elements into an uncommon and well resolved composition. The façade, drawing on Art Nouveau and other sources, is unusual within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, for the long association with the nationally prominent shipping firm, Huddart Parker & Co., built in an era when shipping was the only form of international commerce transport and a major source of local recreation which is underscored today by the building's relatively high external integrity.

**State Savings Bank of Victoria, Western Branch, 615-623
Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1013**

What is significant?

The basis of the State Savings Bank was formed by the amalgamation of the private Port Phillip Savings Bank (1842) and the government Post Office Savings Bank (1852) in 1896.

Architects, Billing Son and Peck or Billing Peck and Kemter, designed other branches prior to Peck and Kemter's involvement with this, the City's western branch, in 1927.

Following the detailing of the Neo-Grec movement, the former bank and four office levels above were clad in stucco and rested on a quarry finish Harcourt granite base, taking the form of a grand commercial Palazzo. Saltire-cross bronze framed windows light the monumental space of the former banking chamber and nail-head mouldings, both large and small, make up the stylised capitals on the similarly stylised, Tuscan order pilasters which support the exaggerated Doric cornice above. A smooth rusticated base storey completes the graduation of texture from the smooth upper levels to the roughness of the plinth.

This stylistic combination was commonly used in the 1920s for financial and commercial buildings. Early and relatively conservative use of the Greek Revival style reached the height of its popularity in the late 1920s imparting a suitable imposing temple-like air to, what is this case, almost symmetrical facades which remain substantially intact. As one contemporary description noted, the building was considered to have 'sufficient dignity to be counted among our notable buildings and is a striking note in our civic architecture'.

As a Neo-Grec design, the bank compares with Deva House, Bourke Street and to a lesser degree with Temple Court, Collins Street (qv), both 1924 also the Nicholas Building (1926): it is an early example of the style and the corner siting aids in the showcasing of the style.

This is a major corner building which relates well to the similarly styled former Batman's Hill Hotel (1926) adjoining in Spencer Street. The State Savings Bank contributes significantly to a streetscape interspersed with similarly classically detailed buildings such as the Mail Exchange Building, the former Alexander, later Savoy Hotel, and the former Victorian Railways Building.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1923-1924, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The former State Savings Bank of Victoria is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The former State Savings Bank of Victoria significant:
Aesthetically, as an early and good neo-Grec design. The building is a fine and prominent example of the combination of a restrained Renaissance Palazzo form with elements of the Greek Revival style - a combination commonly used in the 1920s for financial and commercial buildings which reached the height of its popularity in the late 1920s. The style imparts a suitably imposing temple-like air to the almost symmetrical street facades which remain substantially intact. As a prominent building on one of Melbourne's major intersections the former State Savings Bank building contributes significantly to a streetscape interspersed with similarly classically detailed buildings such as the Mail Exchange Building, the former Savoy Hotel, and the former Railway Building; and

Historically, as the first major city office built for the State Savings Bank of Victoria since the 1896 amalgamation, paralleling with its expansion into a new home finance

role, post war. The building also evokes the supremacy of the Melbourne banking industry within the State and the nation.

Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory, 9-13 Drewery Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1014

What is significant?

The established and eminent cigar and cigarette manufacturing firm, Sniders and Abrahams Pty Ltd. commissioned architect Nahum Barnet to design two factories in Drewery lane, erected in 1890. Snider & Abrahams was to erect a number of large buildings in this locality.

The Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory is in the English Queen Anne revival style, with the recent painting of the red brickwork only slightly diminishing the power of the elevation in its confined lane-way siting. Taking on the basic Palazzo form of podium base and deeply modelled cornice, the building rises four levels, with deeply recessed window strips as pilaster motifs and scrolled Queen Anne detailing in cement under window cills and a crowning central parapet pediment. The entry facing Drewery Lane has the distinctive bracketed pediment that is also seen in Barnet's King Street warehouse for Spiers and Crawford in 1889. Designed just at the decline of the Victorian-era boom period, the building follows only a few other early Queen Anne examples such as the residential Queen Bess Row, East Melbourne, and the Oxford Hotel, Swanston Street, before the cessation of building caused by the great financial depression of the 1890s.

Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory forms an invaluable precinct with surviving examples from the Sniders & Abrahams' occupation such as Drewery Place, the five level American Romanesque style former cigar factory facing Lonsdale St (268-270) of 1904.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric of the two factory wings from the construction date 1890, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory is aesthetically and historically significant to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory is significant:
Aesthetically for its early and successful use of the English Queen Anne revival style in a City factory building, as the precursor to many other examples to follow after 1900. The expression of the style is made more distinct by the confined lane setting and the large scale of the building. It is also part of an immediate warehouse building cluster in little Lonsdale St and Drewery Lane and is opposite the highly significant reinforced concrete warehouse built for the same firm; and

Historically, for its role in the development of a cigar and tobacco manufacturing and warehousing precinct in this part of the City and its association with the eminent firm Sniders & Abrahams and Nahum Barnet, a noted architect and specialist in tobacco and cigar oriented architecture.

**Elizabeth Chambers, 21-23 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000,
HO1015**

What is significant?

Elizabeth E Barker, pork butcher, claimed a large clientele, serving pork patrons in Adelaide and Sydney and, since 1880, she had been appointed to the special post of pork purveyor to Her Majesty's representatives in the colony. She was also a donor of choice pork pies to the Melbourne Immigrants Home. Elizabeth expanded her Elizabeth Street premises to four-storeys of shops and offices, in 1889-1890, aided by Elizabeth Street builders, Martin and Peacock, and the architectural skills of William Salway. She was dead within a year of its construction.

With Elizabeth Chambers, Salway had extended his commission from the new warehouse to the north (25, since defaced) which he had designed for Mrs William Hordern in late 1888. Salway was also responsible for Dr Beaney's house (133-139 Collins Street), in the previous year, and the imposing Dr. Snowball's residence at the Victoria and Drummond Streets corner (1889) as well as many other commercial projects.

Elizabeth Chambers is distinguished by its ornate stucco ornament, the facade rising through three levels of highly enriched Italian Renaissance revival ornament into a fourth crowned by a bold foliated Elizabethan gable housing the building's name. A pronounced cornice divides the two style sources but commonality of the profuse stucco detail unites the facade. A canopy and shopfront have been added. Elizabeth Chambers adjoins an altered design by the same architect and relates well to the neo-classic styling of Excelsior House on the south.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1889, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Elizabeth Chambers is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Elizabeth Chambers is significant:

Aesthetically as a skilfully and ornately ornamented classical revival façade which because of its florid detailing is particularly expressive of the Melbourne's Victorian-era property boom and is a contributory part of a significant Victorian-era commercial streetscape; and

Historically the scale and design of the building recalls the success of a locally prominent pork butcher, Mrs Chambers.

Knight's shops and dwellings, later Hood and Co and Edinburgh Chambers, 215-217 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1016

What is significant?

Knight's shops and dwellings were constructed by Richmond builder, George Freeman, for Andrew Knight in 1869 as three storey retail premises on a prominent corner site.

John Allison and Andrew H Knight, as Allison and Knight, had many interests in the colony, including the first commercial flour mill in Melbourne erected at Flinders Lane west 1840-41. Allison & Knight were no longer milling flour in Melbourne by 1849, having become general merchants and investors there, and opened a new flour mill near Port Fairy (Rosebrook) in 1847.

The architect of the shops and dwellings is unknown but the architecture suggests the notable designers, Reed & Barnes. The building features elaborate polychrome brickwork around window openings and at the cornice. The building is contemporary with, and stylistically related to, Joseph Reed's polychrome works throughout Melbourne in the 1860s (see St Jukes Anglican Church 1866-67, and Collins Street Independent Church, later St Michael's Uniting Church, Melbourne 1867). Knight's buildings are of a similar age to Reed's earliest work in the polychrome mode, and hence are among the earliest polychrome commercial buildings in the Capital City Zone.

In addition to its use of coloured brickwork, the building is further distinguished by its uncommon decorative details. The ground floor has been altered but the upper storeys retain elaborate window groupings (pairs, triples) with dog-toothed arched heads, associated voussoirs, stop-chamfered reveals, splayed cills, and either bold decorative columns drawn from eastern or Lombardic Gothic sources (north) or uncommon corbelled dividing piers (east). The eaves have bracketing and a moulded terracotta cornice with a scalloped frieze under, as echoed more simply by the string mould. Each chimney has a bracketed and corbelled cap and a squinted base.

Openings in the rear elevation to the lane appear well-preserved in part with the shape of some suggesting use as upper level loading doors but the rear façade has been refinished. The brick facades have been painted over in the relatively recent past (reversible).

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates 1869-1870, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Knight's shops and dwellings are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Knight's shops and dwellings are significant Aesthetically and historically, for their skilfully and elaborately ornamented polychrome brickwork facades and their status as the earliest known commercial examples of the Lombardic style and associated coloured brickwork in the Capital City Zone.

Historically for the link with the locally prominent investor, Andrew knight, of the Colonial pioneering flour factors, Allison & Knight.

Wilson's shop & residence, 299 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1017

What is significant?

Wilson's shop & residence was created by and for Charles Wilson in 1884-5 to the design of JW Roberts & Company.

Rising three levels the upper-levels evoke a conservative Italian renaissance revival character in moulded cement, set out with pilasters on either side of the facade supporting the raised segmentally arched entablature and cornice of the parapet which has the words 'Estab'd 1859'. Twin arched openings at the first floor level, with bracketed sills, deeply moulded architraves, keystones, and foliated capitals, progress to rectangular openings at the top level with bracketed sills, and label moulds for diversity of ornament. The ground floor has been changed and a suspended canopy added. Judged within the inner Melbourne context, the three-level scale of the building is uncommon among other Victorian-era commercial places.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1884-1885, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Wilson's shop & residence is aesthetically and historically significant to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Wilson's shop & residence is significant:

Aesthetically significant as a conservative but well executed Italian Renaissance Revival design evocative of the architectural restraint offered in the pre boom era, as applied to a medium sized Victorian-era commercial building; and

Historically, as among a relatively small early to mid Victorian-era shop & dwelling group within the Central Business District.

Pynsent's store and warehouse, 303-305 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1018

What is significant?

The brothers, James & Charles Webb called tenders in 1853 for the erection of this bluestone warehouse in Elizabeth Street for Burton Pynsent. James Webb had retired from the building trade and with his brother, Charles Webb (who had just arrived from England in 1849), commenced business as Architects & Surveyors in August 1849.. The Webbs were pioneering architects in Melbourne and designed many of its early buildings.

The store was located in Elizabeth Street or the Sydney Road, then the main commercial strip of Melbourne. Pynsent was well located for a wine and spirit merchant, starting a long trend of licensed grocers in this building that ended in the 1930s, overtaken by another land-use evolution that saw engineering and transport oriented businesses locate in the north and north-west of Melbourne town from the early Victorian-era onwards. This use remains in the area and in this building.

The Pynsent store Elizabeth Street façade has an Edwardian-era origin (1917) as designed by the architects Kempson & Conolly for owners, Mr & Miss MacDonald, and expressed by the broad central archway and face brickwork (painted over) with quoining. An aerial view shows a new hipped roof at this point, as part of the new street façade. The ground floor has been replaced and an awning added. The segmentally arched raised entablature with its scrolling is an Edwardian-era addition to what was a gabled parapet like the rear elevation with perhaps some dressed stone quoining and mouldings. However, the rugged rear elevation is that of a well-preserved and early quarry-faced basalt coursed rubble warehouse which remains highly representative in scale, form and materials of Melbourne's warehouses of this period, despite the new opening at ground level. One archway has been blocked but the voussoirs and keystone remain as does the cathead seen in the 1881 image.

Pynsent's Elizabeth Street and Heape Court stores give this area (particularly along the stone paved Heape Court) a distinctive early Victorian-era character with the brick and stone warehouses and narrow lanes demonstrating the scale, and form of warehouse districts of mid nineteenth century Melbourne. The Pynsent stores were the first in this area while the warehouse at the rear of 359 Little Lonsdale Street was built in 1887 as a typical medium scale brick warehouse building of Melbourne's Boom years.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates 1853-, 1917, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Pynsent's store is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Pynsent's store is significant:

Historically as one of the earliest group of stores in the Central Business District and for its location in the City's first commercial strip along the Sydney Road. It is distinguished by its basalt construction and well-preserved rear elevation to provide a strong expression of the area in combination with the stone lane and nearby warehouses; and

Aesthetically, for the early and bold use of stone construction facing Heape Court, as a design by pioneering architects, the Webb brothers, in combination with the contribution of the later, but visually related, Elizabeth Street upper level.

Union Bank Chambers, later A.N.Z. Bank, 351-357 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1019

What is significant?

This basement and five storey branch of the Union Bank was completed 1927 on the south western corner of Elizabeth and Latrobe Streets at a cost of £30,000, replacing an earlier bank. The building was constructed by Thompson & Chalmers, to designs by

noted architects W & R Butler and Martin. Clive Steele was the engineer for the project. The Union Bank occupied the building until the name change to the parent company, the Australian and New Zealand banking company (ANZ) in 1951.

'The Argus' noted the modern reinforced concrete fireproof construction, the corner site that allowed good natural light and ventilation, and the generous banking chamber of 55'x22' (rest of the ground floor leased as a shop allowing for expansion). The bank fittings were to include Australian marble on chamber walls, stair and entry dado, rubber or wood block floor finishes. The facades were simply treated in buff shade of cement render (to harmonise with the new Argus building opposite) above a shallow granite plinth, with balconettes extending the full length of both frontages. Embellishment included the iron railing at first floor and the iron lamp standards at the corners of the building.

The bank is a handsome and substantially intact example of the interwar Commercial Palazzo style. Key features of the style found here include the division of the façade into a heavy stone-clad base with strong horizontal render banding in the form of smooth rustication, and neutral intermediate floors with vertical window strips (multi-pane, steel framed), all surmounted by a prominent and stylised classical cornice and detailing. The prominent corner location allows for an appreciation of the palazzo form. The entry recess has ornamented borders and panelling and the shopfront at 351 has elements of the original such as the bronze finish framing.

The building remains in good and near original condition despite application of a large boxed sign over the two facades at the first floor line in place of the corner lamp standards, changes to the entry and addition of air units at upper levels. It has remained in continuous use as a bank since its construction. The bank is contemporary with and visually related to the landmark Argus building on the opposite corner.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1927, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The former Union Bank is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The former Union Bank is significant:
Aesthetically, as a handsome and substantially intact example of a Commercial Palazzo within the Capital City Zone; and

Historically, for the long association with banking in the northern part of the City (specifically the now defunct Union Bank) and parallels the emergence of a new motor trade in this area requiring larger banking facilities. This was an era when Melbourne City was the nation's capital of finance. The bank is also contemporary with and visually related to the landmark Argus building on the opposite corner.

Pattinson's general store, later Prince of Wales and Federal Club hotels, later Bulley & Co. Building, 380 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1020

What is significant?

The first stage of this building appears to have been constructed in the 1850s when in 1853 builder, John Snowball of Little Collins St east applied to build a store and dwelling in Elizabeth St north, on the east side, for the Jamieson Brothers. Initially listed in rate records as a brick house and store, with 3 rooms above, it was later described as a six-room two storey shop and dwelling. Early occupiers included J & W Pattinson, general merchants, and Edward Petheridge, an outfitter, and the electoral register of the nearby St Francis church. The building operated as a hotel during the latter part of the nineteenth century (10 then 17 rooms) before its eventual delicensing around 1918.

During the hotel period the existing Italian Renaissance Revival façade was created by the architect Thomas J Crouch in 1888 for its freeholder, Jamieson, increasing the room number to seventeen. It was described in the 1880s as '...a substantial brick and stone building'.

Shortly after delicensing, Frederick Bulley and his son Charles Frederick transferred their well-known Little Bourke Street leather shop to 380 Elizabeth Street. The Bulleys adapted the front part of the building's ground level and some other internal spaces in 1920 to suit the requirements of their workmen and the firm traded from this location until c1990. The street awning, with its patterned soffit, is from 1920.

The Crouch design for building is inspired by the architecture of the late Renaissance and distinguished by an unusual decorative parapet in which a curved pediment is raised high above the parapet line on elongated ornamental consoles. Much of the ornamental detail at the parapet is reiterated at first floor windows as aedicules. A distinctive cruciform design in sgraffito, or incised render, is located between the upper floor windows. The rear wing, as seen from the lane, is constructed from machine-made pressed red brickwork with an earlier brick section in front and the old 1850s section at the street frontage: this has been rendered and may be stone. The ground floor has been rebuilt between the remaining Victorian-era pilasters to either side of the façade but the upper storey retains a high level of integrity to its early state.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates 1853-, 1887, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The former Federal Club hotel is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The former Federal Club hotel is significant:

Aesthetically as a distinctive example of late nineteenth century hotel façade in an Italianate mode within Melbourne's Central Business District. The decorative treatment at the upper sections of the façade is of particular note, including the sgraffito between the upper floor windows and the aedicule treatment of these windows; and

Historically and socially as a hotel since the 1850s and as a long-term gathering place into the 20th century.

Bank of Australasia, former 384 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1021

What is significant?

The architectural firm of Reed and Barnes and all its progeny, (Reed, Henderson and Smart, Reed Smart and Tappin and Henderson) designed near to all of the 28 known banks built for the Bank of Australasia until 1939. Reed and Barnes designed this city branch in 1882; the contractor being Stephen Armstrong. The Bank of Australasia became the ANZ in a merger with the Union Bank, 1959.

Two-storeyed stuccoed and Italian Renaissance derived, the bank resembles generally many later designs by this firm and contemporary bank designs by other architects (refer to the arcuated design of Reed and Barnes' Williamstown branch, 1876). However the Corinthian pilaster trabeation, applied at first level, is an early use of trabeation and arcuation. The smooth rusticated ground level is more typical. A more richly decorated but similarly trabeated façade is the Oakden Addison and Kemp former Northcote branch of the London Bank, 342 High Street. It was 8 years after the Elizabeth Street building and has been recently altered. Cast-iron balconettes at Elizabeth Street, a central raised pediment and balustraded parapet are contributory details to this bank example.

Changes include the addition of a pediment into the first floor cornice, the removal of urns from the parapet balustrade, repositioning of the entry door to the centre of the façade on Elizabeth Street and the replacing of panellised pilasters at ground level with smooth rustication. Casement sashes and glazing appear to have been introduced over the hung sashes on most windows and trim colours (façade cement mouldings) are inappropriate.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1882-1883, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Bank of Australasia is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

This Bank of Australasia is significant:

Aesthetically, as among the earliest trabeated Renaissance Revival branch bank designs in Melbourne and it was the second built for the Bank of Australasia in the metropolitan area and is their earliest near original Melbourne city bank; and

Historically, as one of the early Bank of Australasia branches built in an era when the bank was the foremost in the Colony, also as a prototype for later branch bank designs by the eminent architectural firm, Reed and Barnes (and later manifestations) who designed near to all of the 28 known banks built for this company until 1939.

Royal Saxon Hotel, former, 441-447 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1022

What is significant?

Built by Samuel Cliff in 1858 for William Mortimer, the Royal Saxon Hotel is a two and three-storey, brick and stone Regency style² hotel building with a carriageway through to the former rear stabling and was once flanked by two two-storey stone wings (the southern one having been demolished). As a major hotel building on the then main northern approach by road to Melbourne via Elizabeth Street, the hotel was the venue for many key events in early Melbourne history, including for the meeting that established the nearby Queen Victoria Vegetable wholesale market, as part of its evident lasting connection with the produce market sector at the top of Elizabeth Street. The architects, Henry Shalless (1879); and William Wolf (1889) designed modifications to the building complex in the Victorian-era³.

The ground floor walls are of coursed rubble bluestone construction, while the upper two floors of the main building are faced with red brick (now painted) with carved stone dressings and those of the main side building, of stone. The building's façade reveals simplicity and symmetry of design, with four double-hung sash windows on each of the upper two floors. Each window of the hotel façade is crisply delineated by moulded relief, with more elaborate carved stone decoration on the first level, enriched with key-stones. Each floor level is distinguished by a string course stone moulding above the window line on the façade and the building is capped by a short parapet above a heavy projecting stone cornice. The original distinctive framing quality of the rectangular blocked corner facings has unfortunately now been obscured by their being painted in the same colour as the main body of the façade.

The façade at ground floor level has undergone some alteration since the 1950s. A photograph of the Royal Saxon Hotel in 'Early Melbourne Architecture' depicts the building close to its appearance when built. A central ground floor window, with a wood-panelled lower section, was flanked by twin arched doorways, framed with columns, which provided entry into the front bar. This area has now been separated from the hotel proper and converted into retail space. The northern door was originally covered by a verandah according to MMBW maps.

The timber-ceilinged, pitched carriageway, above which the upper two floors of the hotel were constructed, originally provided access to extensive stabling facilities behind the hotel. This carriageway is now a shop and enclosed but the stone side wall is publicly visible through the shopfront. The western rubble blue-stone wall of the stables which was a common wall with a neighbouring timber yard has survived.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1858, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

² Colonial Georgian as optional style name

³ Upper level side walls are brick so possible top floor matching addition in brick with cement quoins.

How is it significant?

Royal Saxon Hotel is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The Royal Saxon Hotel is significant:

Historically and socially, as one of Melbourne's earliest surviving and continuously occupied hotels, it is one of a small number of 1850s hotels within central Melbourne to have survived with a relatively original exterior. A rare and distinctive feature is the pitched carriage lane off Elizabeth Street over which the first and second floors of the hotel have been constructed. It was the venue for the meeting that established the Queen Victoria vegetable wholesale market, as part of its evident lasting connection with the produce market sector at the top of Elizabeth Street; and

Aesthetically, for the three-storey Victorian Regency style elegantly simple and symmetrical facade composition of bluestone and brick construction.

**English Scottish & Australian Banking Co., former, 453-457
Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1023**

What is significant?

In the Frank Lloyd Wright, 'Falling Water' mode, the familiar structural pi-sign thrusting cantilevered balcony and roof slab, rough stone cladding and geometric precast screens provided for a design which was unusual for the city but not for its designers, Chancellor & Patrick who specialised in reinterpretations of the Wright oeuvre. The influential periodical Cross-section published illustrations of the existing 1st stage and the proposed 2nd stage of 9 additional floors to the limit height of 132 feet (as existing in 2010). The report notes that the 1st stage looked monumental because of the missing 2nd stage, dominating its surroundings. It was a 'clear statement of opposition to the glass house idea'.

The innovatory nature of the design also had roots in the E S & A architectural department's products at Ringwood (1954) and Malvern. The bank's Collins Street head office (qv) had also been progressive, for a bank (1941) but in a different mode.

Recent major upper level additions have interpreted the proposed second stage of the original design, completing the project in a similar architectural character to the Hoyts Cinema Centre. The additions have reduced the integrity of the building to its construction date but not to the original intent and have not removed the significant elements cited above.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1958-1960, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The English Scottish & Australian Banking Co. is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

English Scottish & Australian Banking Co. is significant:

Aesthetically as a successful interpretation of the Prairie School style, achieved against the economics and architectural precedents of prevailing city architecture by the style's most proficient Australian exponents of the period; and

Historically, with the Commonwealth bank on the opposite corner, exemplifying the new branches in the City perimeter, to serve the post Second War expansion. The bank was also the subject of professional periodicals and cited in the 1965 'Building Ideas' guide to Melbourne architecture.

Commonwealth Banking Corporation of Australia branch bank, former, 463-465 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1024

What is significant?

This Commonwealth Banking Corporation Elizabeth Street North branch was opened on 12 Nov 1956 just in time for the Melbourne Olympic Games. The architect was the CBA Bank Architect F J Crocker, Architect- In- Charge Bank Section – Department of Works, having prepared the plans in 3 Nov 1955. The contractor was E A Watts Pty Ltd.

When completed the new bank had a distinctive buttressed skillion form with the battered Elizabeth Street façade reminiscent of the angled walls of the McIntyre Stargazer House, North Balwyn, of the same period. This boldly faceted façade abutted a sturdy vertical pier on the north side.

The side upper level was clad with a freestone tile, each corner pinned to the wall by polished metal decals, while on the Elizabeth Street elevation, mosaic tiles were used below the awning highlight windows. The company name was attached to the upper level discreetly in the form of individual metal letters.

Inside, an elegant open stair with metal balustrading floating concrete treads, ascended to the upper level. The banking chamber was ceiling was also angled, aligned with the underside of the skillion main roof. The overall effect was very modern, casting aside the conservatism of inter-war banking architecture. The significant but altered Chancellor & Patrick design on the opposite corner was two years after this pioneering concept and took a different branch of the Modern style.

Since it was constructed the bank's side street glazing and upper level tile and stone facing (Franklin St) have all been painted over, the highlight windows covered with metal grille, together making for a major if easily reversible visual change in character. Part of the ground floor shopfront has been changed, engaging the rear of the angled façade buttresses. Visually unrelated illuminated signs have been added.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1956, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

This Commonwealth Banking Corporation of Australia branch bank is significant aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Although superficially altered, this Commonwealth Banking Corporation of Australia branch bank is significant:

Aesthetically, for its innovatory design in an architectural field that had been dominated by conservative design during the inter-war period. It was only one of only two banks erected in the Capital City Zone immediately after the Second War.

Currie & Richards showrooms & warehouses, 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1025

What is significant?

The grantee of CA9/2 was Charles Rochford, paying £710 for the land in 1852. He mortgaged the land in 1853 to Samuel Ramsden for a significant £2000, indicating that the core of the complex arose in that year. Michael Shanaghan eventually owned both allotments nine and ten by 1865 when Shanaghan's 14 room hotel was described as adjacent to a row of three four-room (two-storey) brick shops. Adjoining on the south was Mr. Comte's coal yard, offices, etc., and three brick and stone shops (467-71). The northern part of today's showrooms and warehouse row was part of a shop row attached to the Royal George (later Limerick Castle) Hotel that stood to the north of this site.

The hardware firm, Currie & Richards (commenced in 1869) began leasing land on this site c1871-2. Builder, Walter Webster, applied to build 'Addition to premises' on their behalf in 1874 at 305-7 Elizabeth Street. Currie & Richards later leased Grant's brick and iron store there. Today's carriage way was then access to the Royal George Hotel Livery Stables as well as the other stores at the rear. The first entry for the two-storey brick workshop at the rear of 481 was in 1899-1900 when it was listed as Miss E Bowden's underclothing manufactory, soon to be occupied by Currie & Richards.

The brick and iron stores fronting Elizabeth Street (473-477) and those at the rear were built in 1908 to the design of Oakden & Ballantyne for Ellen Grant of Clutha, East Melbourne. It is probable that 481 was refaced in conjunction with the construction of 473-7 Elizabeth Street, all in a style vaguely similar to the Italian Renaissance revival architecture used in the 1874 Franklin Street (79-81) sheet metal workshop building acquired by Currie & Richards c1904-5. Ellen Grant owned all of 473-491 Elizabeth Street. The carriageway continued to be used for the livery stables well into this century, as did the Currie & Richards' occupation of both the street frontage and most of the rear stores.

Further works on the complex included minor alterations to the warehouse at 473- 77 in 1924, alterations to the store⁴ in 1936 and work on the shopfront to 473 in 1937. Currie & Richards remained there until relatively recently, being succeeded by Stramit Industries also builders sheet-metal suppliers.

This is a two storey rendered showroom row (473-477, 481) with warehouses (479) and carriage-way at 479 Elizabeth St leading to the rear courtyard. The carriageway wall of the adjoining 481 is part stone rubble but most of the rear courtyard buildings are face brick. Within the rear courtyard are brick gabled one and two level stores or warehouses and the rear wings to the shops facing Elizabeth Street. Of the two single level gabled brick warehouses (1908) on the south side of the courtyard, the eastern warehouse has a new opening but presumably once resembled the smaller warehouse on the west which has an arched opening. The third warehouse (1899-1900) is on two

⁴ new doorway to eastern store at rear?

levels with a deep quarry faced bluestone plinth (4 courses) and an added balcony to what was the upper level loading door (cathead over, since removed).

The upper level parapeted Edwardian-era street façade is near intact and rendered as smooth rusticated ashlar and divided with low relief bays or pilasters, the bays resting on panelled plinths with Queen Anne scrolls either side. The main cornice is dentilated but the parapet wall above is plain. Basalt is also used in the yard as bollards and rubbing strips. The wrought and cast iron carriage gates appear of recent construction.

Shopfronts survived in the 1980s on 473 - 477 Elizabeth Street but have since been replaced; a related early 20th century shopfront is at 481 which is probably original. In the 1980s the warehouses had timber frames, with stop-chamfered columns as well as overhead travelling gantries, used for lifting the builders' materials once stored there by Currie & Richards. There is also evidence of a stone pitched yard but this has been replaced.

One other early City complex (also in Elizabeth Street) has a similar carriageway but no associated warehouse buildings facing onto it. This complex is the only one of its type in the central city in this respect. Although of mixed development eras the courtyard and carriageway layout derives in part from the 1850s. The shops and warehouse row relate closely to the altered stone shop pair at 469-471 Elizabeth Street.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates 1853, 1900, and 1908, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

This showroom & warehouse group is significant historically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

This showroom & warehouse complex is significant: Historically, as an extensive Victorian and Edwardian-era complex built up over some 60 years, which nevertheless presents an homogenous 19th century warehouse character and contains elements and land use patterns created in the 1850s by the original grantee.

The combination of Edwardian-era showrooms facing Elizabeth Street, stores at the rear, a Victorian-era workshop, the courtyard and the carriageway which served them is not repeated as a courtyard-oriented complex in the City of Melbourne, although once more common in the early Victorian-era, and is now uncommon in the state.

With the Franklin Street building, this complex remains as a good representation of the firm Currie & Richards' extensive hardware business, particularly the carriageway and private internal courtyard. It also contains relatively well-preserved if austere examples of the work of the noted architects, Oakden & Ballantyne, as applied to a show room and warehouse complex within a traditional courtyard.

Alley Building, 30-40 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1026

What is significant?

Preceded by fire in both stages of the Alley Building Flinders Lane and Exhibition Street development, the first stage was a brick and cement rendered building of 4 storeys and Greek Revival in character, as designed by Percy A Oakley, FRVIA. The next was the addition of two floors and a penthouse to the design of Oakley & Parkes, giving the building a new Jazz Moderne styling. Oakley & Parkes were noted for their Moderne architectural landmarks such as Kodak and Yule House, the taxation office in Lonsdale St and others such as Anzac House, Collins St. and the Equity Trustees building. The owners, Alley Brothers, were long-term Flinders Lane clothing manufactures and formed part of the dominance of this industry in the immediate locality.

The street elevations have a classical order, with a ground level plinth and applied pilasters. The cladding is face brick (since painted) with concrete or cement spandrels and multi-paned steel-framed windows set between pilasters and separated by the spandrels. The Exhibition Street elevation is framed by vertical elements at each end which rise above the parapet in a Modernistic design with applied chevrons and jelly-mould forms. Windows are multi-paned and steel framed. Floors were constructed with hollow terra-cotta blocks as sacrificed formwork and concrete. The entry to upper-levels was from Flinders Lane (75-77) with a cantilevering canopy adorned with Neo-Grec details. The foyer is timber panelled with early brass fittings and a jarrah main stair protected by use of pressed metal sheeting on the soffit.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates, 1923, 1936, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Alley Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The Alley Building is significant:
Architecturally as a Modern style warehouse and factory designed by one of the key practitioners of the style, Oakley & Parkes, and

Historically as a representative building of the clothing trade dominance in this part of the City up until World War Two.

Kevin Hall & Club, 53-55 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1027

What is significant?

After several years of discussion three professional institutes (Architects, Engineers and Surveyors) agreed to form the Allied Societies Trust Limited to allow acquisition of a building for the use of its member bodies. Other bodies joined them, such as the Australian Chemical Institute. A block was purchased, Godfrey and Spowers produced

a design, and in 1927 the members of the Allied Societies Trust Limited moved into their own building, which they named Kelvin Hall. For over forty years they remained there until in 1969 when the Allied Societies Trust was disbanded.

Kelvin Hall was also a venue for various music competitions and serious professional work such as AJ Keast's Melbourne address delivered at meeting of members of the Institute of Industrial Management at Kelvin Hall, 1945, which was also launched as a book. There was also the presentation of the RVIA architecture medal by the Lord Mayor of Melbourne at Kelvin Hall to Miss Ellison Harvie in 1942 for the 1941 King George V. Jubilee Maternal and Infant Welfare Pathological Building, Women's Hospital, Carlton.

Kelvin Hall was sold to Melbourne architect and developer Gordon Banfield who suggested entrepreneurs Kenn Brodziak and Harry Miller take it on as a licensed theatre project, successfully making the first application for a theatre liquor licence in Victoria. A remodelled Kelvin Hall was renamed the Playbox Theatre to stage a contentious play about homosexuals, 'The Boys in the Band', in 1969. In 1984, the theatre was destroyed by fire. The building nevertheless has long-term associations with creative life in Melbourne.

Kelvin Hall is a tall and elegant Greek Revival cemented façade set on a classically detailed Ionic order podium, with twin pediment openings either side of one with a small balconette. The upper level is arranged symmetrically with punched multi-paned windows set out under a deeply bracketed parapet cornice supported on four bracket pairs. The top-level has another central balconette also set on bracket pairs. Ornament is sparingly but skilfully applied as one would expect for a building created for the Victorian institute of architects. It is comparable with the VCA Building and Druid's House.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date (s) (1927), and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Kelvin Hall is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Kelvin Hall is significant:

Historically as symbolic of a near 60 year association with intellectual life in Melbourne, as well as a close link with many of its professional bodies. Kelvin Hall is also cited in the history of live theatre development in Australia, albeit no longer functioning as such; and

Architecturally, as a fine and well-preserved Greek revival façade created by a prominent local design firm for the Institute that represented them professionally. The refined restraint of the façade reflected the Institute's attitude towards 'good mannered' City architecture: an assembly of sophisticated streetscape elements, as seen in the prevailing Street Architecture Awards.

Centenary Hall, 104-110 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1028

What is significant?

Arising from a 1933 competition for a new concert hall for the Victorian Protestant Hall Co. Ltd., this six storey reinforced concrete building with basement, first floor public hall, rehearsal and lodge rooms, rooftop caretakers residence, and upper-level residential and offices was completed as 'Centenary Hall' in 1935 to the design of prize winning architects, Hugh Philp and Geoffrey Bottoms.

It replaced a highly decorative French Renaissance Revival Protestant Hall designed by WH Ellerker in 1881 which in turn replaced the first hall on the site, designed by Robert Meredith and built in 1847 on land purchased specifically for a Protestant Hall in 1846 by the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria. This site was dedicated in perpetuity as the site for a Protestant hall.

'The Argus' reported that the new building was 'expected to cost £30,000' and it would be raised to the limit of 132ft allowed by the City Council. On the first floor would be a hall with seating accommodation for 600. Administrative offices would occupy the second floor and lodge rooms would be provided on the third and fourth floors. A rehearsal room would be on the fifth floor. A modern façade with simple lines was a feature of the chosen design.

Once open, the hall was the venue for Christian revival meetings and a number of local and visiting speakers.

Moderne in style the two cemented street facades have multi-pane steel framed windows set in vertical recessed strips between fluted ribs, pressed cement grooves to spandrel panels, pylon motifs at either end of the two facades and, on the Exhibition St elevation, a podium or piano-nobile is implied by a change in fenestration and application of ornament. There is a projecting balconette at first floor level adorned with intricate pressed cement detail depicting the thistle and scrolls placed between grooved buttresses as continuation of the facade ribbing.

Basement lights and the former showroom showcase window base underpin a new but neutral shopfronts facing Little Collins and Exhibition Streets with moulded bronze joinery still evident at ground level, particularly around the public hall entrance from Exhibition Street. The building is an uncommon combination of uses (see also Kelvin Hall) and well preserved externally.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1934-1935, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Centenary Hall is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Centenary Hall is significant

Aesthetically, as a good and well preserved example of the Moderne style which is uncommon among Central Business District buildings; and

Historically, as an unusual building type combining residential, clubrooms, offices and a meeting hall. Buildings of this type are rare within the central city and as a development on the site of two previous Protestant Halls, perpetuating a tradition commenced in the 1840s during the foundation of Melbourne itself. The hall has been the venue of many public events, particularly associated with Christianity and Protestantism in this City since the 1930s.

Fancy goods shop & residence, 309 Exhibition Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1029

What is significant?

This two storey brick shop and dwelling was erected for Saith Khuda Bukhsh, a fancy goods importer, by builder AE Timms to the design the architect, a Mr WH Smith in 1902-3. The shop was next used by J Lee Yen, cabinetmaker, and was then located among other fancy goods outlets populated by Indian, Pakistani and Chinese shopkeepers as part of the exotica that prevailed within Greater Chinatown in streets such as Little Bourke, Bourke St east, Little Lonsdale and Exhibition Street north.

Designed in the English Queen Anne revival style, the street elevation is clad with shaped red brick and surmounted by a boldly modelled entablature, cornice and raised entablature, ornamented with cement mouldings. The first floor window is deeply bracketed with the cast-iron balconette railing adding to the ornate detailing.

The metal framed shopfront is particularly well preserved and has glazed blue tiles to piers at either side of the ground floor, a recessed entry and a deep transom light with significant coloured leadlight detailing. An image from 2000, shows that the formerly tiled shopfront plinth has been reclad, albeit in a neutral manner.

This shop and dwelling has been assessed as locally significant by three Capital City Zone heritage reviews (1985, 1993, 2002), following identification by one of the first Melbourne City conservation studies of the 1970s. This is a demonstration of continued heritage value of the property over a near 30 year period.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1902-1903, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

This fancy goods shop & residence is aesthetically and historically significant to the Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

This fancy goods shop & residence is significant:
Aesthetically for its well preserved brickwork and cement detailing in the Queen Anne revival style, with a strong Arts & Crafts character exhibited by the early shopfront with its lead lighting and tiles; and

Historically, as commissioned for a use synonymous with the extended Chinatown District of the Melbourne Edwardian-era and for its high integrity to its creation date and thus is a good demonstration of the once typical two-storey Edwardian-era shop and residence type now rare in the Capital City Zone.

Sargood Gardiner Ltd warehouse, 61-73 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1030

What is significant?

Architects Godfrey & Spowers designed this initially seven storey (plus basement) steel-framed and concrete floored warehouse for Sargood Gardiner Ltd of 238 Flinders Street and builders Hansen & Yunken erected it in 1928-9. Another floor was added by 1936 designed by Godfrey & Spowers but built by Swanson Brothers. The distinctive ground level giant-order loggia facing Flinders Lane was built as a light well for the basement for goods storage and delivery only (there was large loading dock onto the rear lane). The company claimed a great saving in being able to store oversized and bulk goods there instead of at South Melbourne. .

When the main building opened in 1930 it was described as 'dazzling white' and conspicuous, rising high above the adjoining Alley Building which by then had not received its extra level. This dazzling appearance was achieved using Goliath cement and selected sand to achieve a 'Sydney stone' colour. In the new enlightened age of staff facilities, there was a rooftop staff dining room with magnificent views to the gardens and river.

Like Sargood's previous warehouse buildings the Flinders Lane elevation utilised giant order architectural elements to great effect but is distinguished among Sargood buildings and others in the Capital City Zone by its giant order colonnade that creates a second façade set back behind the tall rusticated piers, each with a stylised capitals in pressed cement and polished granite ground level facings. Above this podium base the main elevation rises in three pilistraded bays, with deep primary and secondary cornices. Vertical fenestration strips house metal framed windows and recessed spandrel panels. The impressive central main entry is elevated over street level and approached by a terrazzo-paved stairway with an Egyptian character custom designed entry portal with dentilated cornice and roundels set into architraves. Perhaps contrary to the stipulation made when the warehouse was built, the lower levels (basement and 'intermediate floor') have been since utilised for commercial activity with associated shopfronts on the intermediate or sub-basement level, stairways and modification of the curved wrought-iron balustrading. The upper level steel-framed windows have been replaced with simpler but similar, visually related multi-pane glazing. The firm's name, once faced with gold with vermillion edges, has been removed from the podium fascia. The Sargood Gardiner warehouse is part of a good inter-war warehouse streetscape extending to the Exhibition Street corner.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates, 1928-9, 1936, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Sargood Gardiner Ltd warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Sargood Gardiner Ltd warehouse is significant:

Historically for its evocation of the continuing major role played by the nationally prominent Sargood firm and its affiliates from the 19th into the 20th century and with its well-preserved exterior the building exemplifies the key warehousing function of the

Capital City Zone in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The shift in location for the firm from near to the old swinging basin on the Yarra to a more elevated site on the eastern hill of Melbourne highlights the change in transport modes needed for warehousing in the City; and

Aesthetically, as a fine architectural composition using both classical and Egyptian revival motifs in the arrangement of a distinctive street elevation, made more so by its colonnaded lower levels.

Higson Building, 125-127 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1032

What is significant?

Established in 1885, John Higson and Sons made all descriptions of leather goods, particularly saddles. They also provided tents and tarpaulins, whip thongs and laces, fishing lines and cricketing materials. In return, they purchased beeswax, horsehair and skins.

Billing, Peck and Kemter designed this five-storey warehouse with basement in 1912. Higsons remained as the major occupier for many years, sharing the building with the clothing manufacturers and milliners, more typical of the lane, such as Alley Brothers.

American Romanesque revival in style, the elevation follows an established warehouse formula with its giant arcade, attic arcade level and foliated column capitals. Bayed and bellied windows and a distinctive segment arch trio at ground level combine with its overall high integrity to make this one of the most successful examples of the style, despite its relatively late date. Of note are the unusual brackets supporting the applied piers, at the sides of the elevations and the trellis pattern to the window spandrels.

Although a late example of this style introduced to Melbourne by the 1890s, this building incorporates the main stylistic elements in a strongly individual manner and is significantly intact externally.

The Flinders Lane facade is divided into three bays and features a giant order arcade over four storeys with a unifying attic level above divided into a run of smaller arcading. A heavily toothed and moulded cement rendered cornice caps the top of the building. At ground level the entrance doorway is emphasised by a distinctive segment arch, and flanked on either side by windows also headed by segment arches. The first and second floors of the facade feature two-storey high oriel windows to the side bays only, separated by trellis-patterned, cement rendered panels. The windows to the central bay are separated by plain cement rendered panels. The third storey features arched windows highlighted by cement rendered mouldings. The capitals to the main piers are foliated, and applied piers to either side of the Flinders Lane facade are supported just below first floor level by plain curved brackets.

Although constructed on a relatively narrow site, the corner position enabled the architects to give the building greater prominence by extending the detailing of the principle facade to the first bay of the building's Higson Lane frontage. The facade thus wraps around the corner but unlike the Metcalfe Barnard warehouse at 147-149 Flinders Lane, on the corner of Russell Street. The rest of the side elevation is of plain unrendered brick with no decoration since it only faces a minor lane.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1912-1913, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Higson Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Higson Building is significant:

Architecturally as among the best preserved and most successfully designed of the American-derived Romanesque Revival style tall-arched warehouse facades in Victoria. Intact externally the building contributes individually to the streetscape through its strongly modelled facade and the extension of the detailing of the main facade to one bay of the side elevation. The Higson Building also contributes strongly to the general precinct, particularly in Flinders Lane where such factory warehouses are still prominent; and

Historically the building is closely associated with the Higson firm which pioneered this part of commercial Melbourne and won renown and prosperity in their field as well as the long association with the clothing trade which helped form the early history of Flinders Lane.

Pawson House, 141-143 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000, HO1033

What is significant?

Pawson House was erected for clothing manufacturers Pawson and Company in 1935 to the design of the prolific commercial architects, HW & FB Tompkins. Built of reinforced concrete its structure was designed by the pioneering reinforced concrete engineer, HR Crawford. In 1935 it was promoted as '...This splendid building is the last word in modern construction perfect natural light central heating and hot water service. Floors 2400 sq ft or subdivide to suit tenants'.

Typical of this part of Flinders Lane, the tenants were mainly from the clothing industry.

Initially planned as four floors above ground and basement, a floor was added during construction. Inside, the three upper levels were originally planned as factory spaces and the three lower, as showrooms. A small entry lobby was served by the stair and a lift, repeated at the escape stair at the other end of the building onto Oliver Lane.

The building façade is composed of vertical elements with recessed panels for windows, each panel divided vertically by a rib. Windows either side are a vertical multi-pane glazing format, with grooved spandrels between. At the parapet the recessed panels cascade into Moderne style moulded and bifurcated facets, set in fours either side of the central rib. The elevation reverts to plain walls and steel framed windows down the side lane after one return façade bay. The entry has a terra-cotta tiled surround with the street number set into a recessed panel. A fluted pressed cement frieze with a central keystone marks the stylised termination of the façade panel above which traces the path of the stair well up the building, lit by a continuous metal-framed and glazed slit. The double polished timber entry doors have been replaced with a glazed screen. A flagpole once adorned the parapet at the crown of this

panel. The simple Moderne treatment used here is another example of the preamble to Modernism in Melbourne commercial building.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1935, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Pawson House is historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Pawson House is significant:

Historically, as a well-preserved factory warehouse that symbolises the dominance of this part of Melbourne by clothing manufactures since the late Victorian-era; and

Aesthetically it is a well-preserved example of the Moderne style by the prominent commercial architects, the Tompkins Brothers.

Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building, 26-30 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1034

What is significant?

Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building was designed by architects Ward & Carleton in 1899 and built by H Henningsen of Hawthorn for this firm of tea and coffee merchants in 1900. It was a new store and sales room for teas, coffees and cocoas. With other examples like Ball & Welch and the Commercial Travellers Association buildings this warehouse supported a group of innovative Edwardian-era buildings eventually to front the new railway station (1910). City plans of 1910 show the Griffiths Bros building as on five levels, divided with six compartments on either side of the ground level, a stair and a lift. A six stall stable was at the rear and beside it was the Australian Church.

James Griffiths had migrated to Australia in 1873 and founded this successful tea business. Griffiths and his wife were committed to Christian missionary work and in 1902 Mrs Griffiths was appointed President of the Women's Missionary Council. In the 1960s the business was taken over by the Robur Tea Company Limited.

After a lease to Verona Press in the 1940s, the building was acquired in the mid 1960s by the Herald and Weekly Times who renamed it Gravure House and was occupied by various subsidiaries including Colorgravure Publications, United Press and Home Beautiful. It was then leased as a billiard and snooker centre, from 1973 to 1988, by Dolly Lindrum and named after her famous uncle Walter Lindrum. The Hotel Lindrum opened here the 12th of July 1999 after conversion by Swaney Draper Architects.

Elevated in red brick with pressed cement Arts & Crafts ornament, the façade follows the American tall-arched Romanesque revival manner that had evolved in Melbourne during the late Victorian-era into a distinctive style for warehouses built in the Edwardian-era. Framed by foliated bartizan motifs, the middle façade has a series of oriels windows projecting out over the street above a secondary set of broad arches to give it a great richness of form and materials. Down the side lane the austere brick façade is well-preserved but has been painted over. The ground level has been modified (originally had two stairway entries and windows either side) but has some

generously sized polished stone plinths, columns and moulded cement capitals framing the new entry.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1899-1900, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building is significant:

Historically for its close link with a tea and cocoa marketing firm that was nationally known in the early 20th century and specifically to James Griffiths who was active in charity and evangelistic works; and

Aesthetically it is superb and relatively well-preserved example of the Tall Arched American Romanesque revival which with other similar sites located in Flinders Street and Lane provides one of Melbourne's key architectural characteristics.

Victorian Cricket Association Building (VCA), 76-80 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1035

What is significant?

The Victorian Cricket Association (VCA) had been formed as early 1875 The association had purchased a City allotment for £11,000 and intended to build, despite misgivings from some members. Once the building was underway, 'The Argus' of 10 December 1924 observed:

'Second in height in Flinders street only to the Commercial Travellers' Association's building, this imposing seven story reinforced concrete building is nearly completed at the corner of Collins place and Flinders street for the Victorian Cricket Association'.

The association had commissioned architect, H. Croxton Davey, to design this reinforced concrete, seven-storey building in 1924, as erected by Walter E Cooper by 1925. The VCA occupied the top floor, sharing its "splendid view" across the King's Domain to Government House with the Victorian Football League, renting out the remaining office and retail spaces.

The VCA eventually became Cricket Victoria, as the current governing body for cricket in Victoria, and the building, like the nearby Herald Sun building has been converted to apartments. The main entry, that was central in Collins Place under a suspended street awning, has been replaced and duplicated with the conversion of the building in 1993. A plaque in the foyer commemorates the opening of the building as apartments by Cr Desmond Clark: 'further enhancing the life of the city...' The architects for this conversion were David Earle & Associates.

The perspective published in 'The Argus' 1924 showed a rendered corner office building in the commercial Renaissance Palazzo format of podium base, middle façade and deeply bracketed cornice, with entablature beneath. Balconies, seemingly held by deep bracket pairs, protruded from both street facades at two floor levels and an arcaded attic storey sat under the cornice within the entablature. Arcade spandrels are

ornamented in pressed cement in a reference to the Romanesque revival style of the Edwardian-era.

Upper level windows have been changed from multi-pane glazing to single pane and the transom lights sheeted over, but ground level copper framed shopfronts survive in Collins Place although not on Flinders Street.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1924-5, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Victorian Cricket Association building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Victorian Cricket Association building is significant:

Historically for its link with the then paramount sporting association in Victoria, an association with sufficient capital to develop a major commercial city building, and an uncommon form of developer in the Capital City Zone. The building has been the administrative vehicle for sporting groups in the State over a long period; and

Aesthetically as a well-preserved and well designed office tower in an early form of the commercial Renaissance Palazzo style that is showcased by its corner site and open vista to the south.

Schuhkraft & Co warehouse, later YMCA, and AHA House, 130-132 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1036

What is significant?

Wholesale stationers, paper merchants, printers, lithographers and paper bag makers, Suzannah Schuhkraft & Co., engaged architect W H Ellerker to design this brick warehouse in 1885. The prolific builder, Charles Butler was the contractor. In the Edwardian-era the Civil Service Co-operative Society of Victoria Ltd (managed by J Featherstone) had the building and by 1910, the building had become the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) until the association moved to City Road in 1925.

The building returned to its warehouse role in the 1920s when acquired by Perdriau Rubber Co Ltd (car and bike tyre suppliers, formerly of 122 Flinders St) who commissioned architect Alec Eggleston in 1925 to convert it to a showroom and warehouse with drive-through access to the tyre changing department. To this end, the rear elevation was provided with folding driveway doors and ramp entry provided from Flinders Street on the east side of the building but little further change occurred to the street façade except for a new set of grand polished timber doors on the west side of the ground level and two large display windows adjoining. The Perdriau Rubber Company was established at Birkenhead Point, NSW, in 1904. In 1929 the Company merged with the Dunlop Rubber Company of Australia Ltd., forming the Dunlop Perdriau Co. Ltd. As a result of the merger the building was used as the bulk store for Dunlop and offices for Latex Products, furniture makers, in the World War Two era.

A spectacular and near intact contemporary design from Ellerker & Kilburn (in association with others) is the Queen Anne styled City of Melbourne Building, Elizabeth

Street (1888). Other comparable works by Ellerker included Montgomerie's brewery, Jeffcott Street (1884), Victorian Permanent Fire Insurance Co offices Collins Street (1870) and, with Kilburn & Pitt, the important Federal Coffee Palace and Victoria Finance Guarantee and Share Co., Bourke Street West: most of these have been demolished.

Schuhkraft & Co warehouse is an Italian High Renaissance revival warehouse design which has been altered at ground floor during its conversions to new uses. The façade possesses a trabeation layer that includes stylised classical order super-posed piers or pilasters with increasing ornament with that of façade height. There is the traditional marking of each storey with a cement string mould and the graduation of window opening size, with increasing height, culminating with an arcade motif at the top or attic level. The fenestration is both arched and rectangular and the cement ornamentation includes segmentally arched pediments applied to the smooth-rusticated main pilasters framing the façade. At ground level, the large bordered glass panes are from in the 1920s.

However, the upper level street elevation is a skilful combination of trabeation and arcuation, showing relatively greater sophistication than many surviving classical revival elevations in the Capital City Zone.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1885-1886, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Schuhkraft & Co warehouse, later AHA House, is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Schuhkraft & Co warehouse, later AHA House, is significant:
Historically as a well-preserved late Victorian-era factory-warehouse; and

Aesthetically for the successful combination of façade trabeation and arcuation with distinctive applied cement detail in the Italian Renaissance revival manner by the well known architect, WH Ellerker.

Cobden Buildings, later Mercantile & Mutual Chambers and Fletcher Jones building, 360-372 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1037

What is significant?

The Cobden Buildings were constructed here for James (Junior) & Robert Dickson Jackson by Taylor & Duguid in 1872 as offices in place of the pioneering 1840s soap & candle factory and residence of James Jackson and Co (later Jackson Rae & Co and finally Rae, Dickson, & Co. from 1852). The site was advertised to be cleared in 1872 in preparation for erection of the Cobden Buildings but it is possible that the coursed rubble blue stone western wall may date from one of the earlier Jackson Rae & Co structures. Historian, William Westgarth and others have noted that James Jackson was there at the beginning of Melbourne town when Flinders Street had few other residents. Rae, Dickson, & Co. failed financially in the post Gold recession of 1860,

leading to the eventual redevelopment of the site. Dead by 1851, James Jackson senior had already begun to build what became the 'largest mansion in Melbourne', Toorak House, by the end of the 1840s.

Facing busy Queen's Wharf, the Cobden Buildings were used to service key maritime trade figures as well as government, including from 1874 Commissioner of Trade and Customs Chief Harbourmaster, Chief Inspector of Distilleries and the Immigration Agent, and Steam Navigation Board. It was also the office of a range of prominent private enterprises. Later owners Mercantile Mutual Insurance Company Ltd carried out some minor changes in 1939 when plans show the large ground level window openings as existing but with timber mullions.

The Cobden Buildings are shown in early views of the area in their intact form as elegant Italian Renaissance revival in style, two-storey, rendered and parapeted, and similar in character to the fine 1860s-1870s bank designs of Leonard Terry. There are also similarities with the significant Goldsbrough Mort Building at Bourke and William Streets (1862) designed by architect John Gill (the parapet and ground level openings).

The ground floor has smooth rustication with one remaining arched opening (of originally many); both levels are divided with superposed pilasters, each engaging with parapet, string and entablature mouldings. Upper level window have aedicule detailing and the parapet is balustraded with a raised entablature central to the south elevation.

Changes to the building include: new window glazing to the new ground floor openings (initially multi-paned and framed in timber) and a cantilever awning addition (1955). The 1955 plans show the now concealed eastern upper level façade. A partial upper storey addition was made in 1970 and a screen erected covering the east upper level elevation. These changes resulted from a long occupation by the iconic Victorian clothing firm of Fletcher Jones & Staff Pty Ltd. who has added their own character to the building with trousered men in bas-relief on the upper level façade. Much of this change appears to be reversible given the eastern upper level survives as shown in the 1955 plans and other documentation shows the form of the original ground level openings. The early photographs and existing fabric allows for potential restoration of this historically significant building.

Despite the changes, the building is a good and early example of an Italianate Renaissance revival privately owned (as compared to government) office building design within the Capital City Zone, with small numbers of this building type surviving from the 1870s as compared to shops or warehouses.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1872, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced. Also contributory are any remnant external stone walls from Rae, Dickson, & Co. occupation and the trousered men in bas-relief on the upper level façade added by for the iconic Victorian clothing firm of Fletcher Jones & Staff Pty Ltd.

How is it significant?

The Cobden Buildings are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Cobden Buildings are significant:
Historically for their key role in early maritime commerce and governance of Melbourne's ports, with links via the James Jackson family ownership to the very

beginnings of Melbourne town and Queens Wharf which once stood opposite these buildings; and

Architecturally, although modified, the upper level is a good and early Italianate Renaissance revival style as applied to an office building, then an uncommon building type in a City of warehouses, residences and shops.

The Fletcher Jones statuettes on the upper level are of historical interest for their depiction of the essence of this famous firm of trouser makers.

Waterside Hotel, 508-510 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1038

What is significant?

Architect Harry Raymond Johnson (son of the town hall design specialist, George R Johnson) designed a new three level brick hotel for the site, with structural engineering advice by Clive S Steele. True to its name, the hotel's opening hours (6.00am - 6.00pm) reflected its original purpose to serve waterside workers.

Downstairs there were three bars (private, saloon and lounge) and a private dining room at the north end of the building. Upper levels held accommodation, potentially for railway travellers visiting the metropolis.

The hotel adopts a simple design with an octagonal tower at the corner of Flinders and King Street providing much of the visual interest. The tower is constructed in cement rendered concrete and rises through the full height of the building to terminate in a cupola. The tower base is reiterated along each street façade in the form of implied primary and secondary pavilions at corners and central to the Spencer Street elevation, with applied quoining and raised parapets. Diamond pane windows (upper sash only) were utilised at first and second levels, while half - glazed doors (pairs or single) were distributed around the ground level. Segment arches mark the residential entry and one of the public bar entrances, while the corner tower directs traffic to the main bar entrance, at the corner splay.

The building's towered form and details are typical of contemporary hotel designs, most notably the work of the Carlton and United brewery architects, Sydney Smith & Ogg. The hotel demonstrates the emerging tendency towards a greater austerity, found in hotels such as the Yorkshire Stingo and Retreat Hotels in Abbotsford. The design relies considerably less upon ornament than the nearby Markillie's Hotel completed less than a decade earlier in a vigorous Edwardian Baroque Manner.

The building relates to the adjacent similarly scaled Edwardian and Victorian-era commercial buildings west along Flinders Street and the significant Edwardian Baroque and historically linked Melbourne Steamship Company building, north along King Street. The line of warehouses and stores on the east side of King Street also evoke the former proximity to Melbourne's port.

The hotel is externally well-preserved.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1926, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Waterside Hotel is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Waterside Hotel is significant:

Aesthetically as a well-preserved inter-war, corner-towered hotel which follows an established aesthetic for corner hotels designed in this period; and

Historically, the hotel promotes a seafaring image and hence evokes the former dominance of waterside trade in this part of the City. Although today it is physically remote from shipping wharves, the hotel is part of a historically significant group of offices and stores related to early maritime trade in the Victoria.

Coffee Tavern (No. 2), 516-518 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1039

What is significant?

Coffee Tavern (Number Two) was erected in 1878-1880 by H Beecham & Co. to the design of Lloyd Tayler, architect, for the Coffee Taverns Company (Limited), as one part of the rising temperance movement in the Colony. The Coffee Taverns company had been formed by some of Melbourne's more distinguished figures to promote venues where working men could gather without the lure of alcohol.

' As testimony to the importance of the movement, the new coffee tavern in Flinders Street was opened in January 1880 by the Mayor of Melbourne, in front of His Hon Sir WF Stawell and Mr Arthur Barnett after laying the foundation stone in August 1879:

'The new building which is to be constructed of brick, is to be three stories high frontage to Flinders street of 33ft by a depth of 40ft It will contain on the ground floor a coffee room 30ft x22ft, 14ft in height, a serving room, and an ample lavatory. On the first floor there will be a billiard room 30ft x 20ft and a smoking room 17ft square. On the second floor there will be a Ladies coffee room, a sitting room, and a kitchen besides accommodation for the manager. The front of the building will be finished in Portland cement and will be decorated with pilasters panels and cornices It will be 50ft high and when completed should form an attractive addition to the architecture of the street. The amount of the contract for the erection of the building is £1736 exclusive of fittings.'

Number Two Coffee Tavern has a mannered Italian Renaissance Revival style cemented façade over three levels, with single and grouped arched window openings, each with applied colonettes. Atypically, the top level only has imposed classical order trabeation. The parapet has parapet piers of differing heights and, centrally placed, is the segmentally arched raised entablature with anthemion atop. The rear elevation is in austere red brick and relatively well-preserved with a central line of loading doors and a gantry over.

A new upper level has been added recently that forms a bland rendered attic-like structure in place of the parapet balustrade, reducing the integrity of the building at a key point. Images from the 1970s-1990s show the parapet balustrade, allowing for its reconstruction. The ground level and street awning are new: early views show two street entrances with windows either side.

The upper level façade remains as an elegant composition for a medium scale mid Victorian-era building but has been compromised by the roof addition. It relates well to its Edwardian character neighbours, the former State Savings Bank and Waterside Hotel and is historically linked to this former port location.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1879-1880, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Coffee Tavern (No. 2) is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Coffee Tavern (No. 2) is significant:

Historically, as a purpose-built coffee tavern created by concerned Melbourne citizens, rather than an investor. It was purposely located at the riverside to attract seafaring clientele, next to other maritime structures, as a convenient alternative to alcoholic refreshment. This is the earliest and only purpose-built coffee palace in the Capital City Zone as an exemplar of the temperance movement that swept the Colony in the 1870s-1880s. It is also historically linked to Melbourne's first riverside port; and

Aesthetically, in its original form, the building was a significant and elegant design in a developed form of the Italian Renaissance revival style as applied to a medium scale commercial building. Although altered the façade still possesses these qualities. The designer, Tayler, was one of Melbourne's more prominent Victorian-era architects.

Savings Bank of Victoria Flinders Street branch, former, 520-522 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1040

What is significant?

This former State Savings Bank building, was reconstructed in 1912-13 as a two storey banking premises from a two storey brick and stone waterfront store. Part of the axed bluestone façade has become visible at the western corner and stone quoining remains on the rear elevation.

The first Government controlled savings bank in Victoria had been established in 1842 under New South Wales legislation. It was known as the Savings Bank of Port Phillip. The financial depression of the early 1890s led to a Royal Commission on Banking (1895) with one recommendation being the *Savings Banks Act 1890 Amendment Act 1896* (No.1481) that among other things amalgamated the Commissioners of Savings Banks and the Post Office Savings Banks across the Colony. This played an important role in extending long-term, low interest rate loans (credit foncier) to home builders as well as to farmers. In this way, the bank developed a reputation as an institution for working class Victorians. Between 1896 and 1912 the independent Savings Banks of Victoria merged to become a single institution, the State Savings Banks of Victoria, as ratified by the 1912 *Savings Banks Act*.

Probably designed by architects, Sydney Smith & Ogg, the former Flinders Street branch is a good and early example of the Edwardian Baroque architectural style applied to a small to medium scale building. The once symmetrical façade comprised a muscular arrangement of Classical decorative elements including a boldly modelled

entry surmounted by a triangular pediment, arcuated windows at the first floor level, inset with bold keystones, and smooth rusticated pilasters rising to a unusually ornate parapet with pediment. The split pediment features a complex rendering of the State Savings Bank logo and the words 'State Savings Bank' in raised lettering below. The bank complements the former coffee tavern adjoining on the east and relates to the strong Edwardian Baroque styling of the Markillie's Hotel to the west, also designed by Smith & Ogg.

The eastern ground level window was once identical to the existing western opening, with its Arts & Crafts inspired wrought iron railing and moulded plinth. The window joinery was typical of the Edwardian-era with stout timber sections for mullions and rails. This eastern window had been changed to a vehicle entry but has since been infilled with a more sympathetic shopfront. The central entry door has been replaced. An unusual element that has also been removed was a gabled timber framed post-supported central portico over the street, with a fretted scroll motif in the gable end (see VPRO image c1914).

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates of pre 1866 and 1912 (refaced), and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

This former Savings Bank building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The former Savings Bank is significant:

Aesthetically, as a good and well preserved example of a vigorous application of the Edwardian Baroque style to a small scale building within the Capital City Zone; and

Historically, as among the first group of branch banks created under the newly constituted State Savings Bank of Victoria and was part of a rapid expansion of branch offices across the State. The building is also of historical interest as potentially holding significant fabric (stonework) from the 1850s, when occupied by ship's chandlers, Inglis, Smith & Co.

Prince of Wales Hotel, later Markillie's Hotel, 562-564 Flinders Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1041

What is significant?

The Prince of Wales Hotel was built on this site, in 1915. The new hotel was designed by Sydney Smith & Ogg for the Carlton Brewery Ltd. with the Richmond builder, C F Pittard as the contractor. Bertha A Brown was one of the early licensees. The Carlton Brewery Ltd and architects, Sydney Smith & Ogg, had been a proven combination since around 1900 in many significant Edwardian-era hotels.

An energetic Edwardian Baroque design, the cemented façade is deeply modelled with bas-relief detail, heavy mouldings and a skilful combination of mass and void. Ox-bow pediments over the intermediate and uppermost windows are echoed laterally by a wide bow-fronted balcony which surmounts a series of superposed columns which terminate at first floor levels. A major part of the central balcony recess is the broad opening arch, with its richly foliated spandrels. It is a perfect counterpart for the bow of

the balcony. A sizeable parapet cornice and brackets accentuate the highly moulded façade character of the building, together with the more traditional device of pavilion-like bays, expressed with heavily ruled smooth rustication.

Perhaps the most richly detailed and moulded of the Edwardian Baroque hotels, this design has precedents in British work by John Belcher, Pite, and the more conservative Sir Aston Webb. In Victoria, it parallels with the Abbotsford Yorkshire Stingo and other Baroque designs by the same architects. However, despite its impressive façade, it is at a disadvantage when compared to what are mostly corner hotels and hence perfect vehicles for towered, highly modelled designs.

The nearby State Savings Bank, also thought to be designed by Sydney Smith & Ogg, has the same deeply modelled cement work while the existing Victorian and Edwardian-era hotel group in Spencer Street and their proximity to transport hubs such as the wharves, and railways all played a role in this hotel's creation and success.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1915, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Markillie's Hotel is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Markillie's Hotel is significant:

Aesthetically as among the most richly ornamented of the Edwardian Baroque hotel designs in Victoria ; and

Historically, as an excellent example of the work of Sydney Smith & Ogg for the Carlton Brewery Ltd during the brewer's expansion in the period after WWI: this combination produced many significant hotel buildings. The hotel's location next to the wharves and Spencer Street railway station and among other hotels is indicative of the effect of transport nodes on development in the Central Business District in the Victorian and Edwardian-eras.

Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co. factory, 63-67 Franklin Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1042

What is significant?

Constructed from 1906 by builder C H Moscop for Messrs. L T Chambers & W A Thompson, the Cyclone Fence Gate Company complex was essentially complete by 1925 with matching additions for new occupiers HW Gossard of Asia Pty. Ltd. by 1931-1932. It is likely all stages were designed by Arthur Purnell.

Components include:

Factory C (Franklin & Stewart Streets corner): c1906-1915

Factory A (Swanston & Franklin Streets, north wing) c1913, attic addition probably carried out in the 1914 works by builder F Cockram.

Factory B: (Swanston Street, south wing) c1906-1915 (not part of heritage place).

Cyclone Pty Ltd was incorporated in c1914-15, just before World War One. The firm's name had changed by 1927 to Cyclone Fence & Gate Co. and by 1948, to the Cyclone

Company of Australia. The firm was an icon in farm and domestic fencing but eventually became associated with chain wire security fences.

The red brick complex has been constructed in two main stages. The earlier two-storey section, facing Franklin Street, is distinguished by brick pilasters or piers rising through the full height of the building to a large rendered cornice. Timber-framed windows typical of the Edwardian-era are used in punched openings within the pilaster recesses, separated by brick spandrels. This façade is generally without decorative detail except for a rendered oxbow shaped canopy to the ground floor entry. This and the exaggerated cornice provide the stylistic signature of Edwardian Baroque. The complex is reminiscent of factory design work by A & K Henderson in Collingwood and Clifton Hill.

The third level addition has been completed in a visually related style and is distinguished by its dentilated cornice and monumental parapet wall, with ogee profile return down Stewart Street. A sawtooth roof line on the western wing is visible from the south. The Swanston Street (Factory A) wing is similar three-level scale with two cornice lines but the brickwork has been painted, obscuring the patina of the brickwork evident in the Franklin Street wing.

The Franklin Street wing provides a visually related complement to the significant 1870s Currie & Richards building to the west.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from pre 1926 at Factories A & C with key construction dates being 1906, 1913, and 1925, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co. factory is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co. factory is significant:

Aesthetically, as a generally well-preserved example of an Edwardian factory complex design within Melbourne's Central Business District; and

Historically, as closely linked with the rise and fall of the well known Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co. in the first 20 years of the 20th century, and the entrepreneur, William E Thompson.

Keep Brothers & Wood workshop and showroom, later Stramit Building, 96-102 Franklin Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1043

What is significant?

The wholesale ironmongers and coach builders, Keep Bros & Wood, commissioned this workshop in 1903 from builders, Murray & Crow of East Melbourne, to a characteristically bold classical revival design by architect David C Askew. From the role of carriage builders, the firm entered the motor trade in the early 20th century as agents for a number of locally made cars, Trumbull being one, and were also producers of the Hallmark bicycle.

Keep Brothers & Wood's association with carriage and later motor car fabrication and selling, is expressive of the transition of this part of the Capital City Zone from the

typical late Victorian-era uses of metalwork and engineering. This evolutionary grouping of similar land uses in the City has been identified as a significant feature of Melbourne's business district historical development.

Rising to five levels (three upper levels and attic), the workshop façade is composed in three parts, each having a deeply moulded gabled pediment at the parapet level. The central and largest bay rises above the others to form a strongly shaped façade silhouette. The flanking pediments are set on three parapet piers.

Ground floor Tuscan order pilasters frame a central entry (with related panelled entry doors), deeply set display windows and an altered vehicle entry. Upper level windows are closely spaced and deep-set, each with timber double-hung sashes. The structural frame is of iron columns and girders.

The street elevation is little changed with the addition of the roller shutter at the carriage way being the main alteration.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1903, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Keep Bros & Wood workshop and showroom is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Keep Bros & Wood workshop and showroom is significant:
Aesthetically as a well-preserved and boldly executed Mannerist cemented façade, characteristic of David Askew's work; and

Historically, for the long association with the rising firm of Keep Brothers & Wood and their association with carriage and later motor car fabrication and selling, as part of the transition of this part of the Capital City Zone from its late Victorian-era use pattern of 'metals and engineering' to that of the motor trade.

Penman & Dalziel's warehouse group, part, 4-6 Goldie Place, Melbourne 3000, HO1044

What is significant?

John William Dalziel sailed from Liverpool to Melbourne in 1892, joining Penman 17 years later in a furniture making business located in Lonsdale Street West. The firm won recognition at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, held in London during 1886, and completed new premises in Post Office Place in the following year. These five warehouses, two in Goldie Alley (later Goldie Place) and three in Hardware Street (back to back) were erected by 1888, replacing Post Office Place as the firm's primary address. Penman & Dalziel are claimed by one source as among the Colony's best furniture makers.

The architect was the prolific and gifted church designer, Alfred Dunn, and the builders, William Thomas Hosking & Sons. Dunn had designed the highly significant Commercial Bank of Australia (Dome & Chamber) 335-339 Collins Street in the same era, 1891-1893.

Provided with parapeted and gabled facades in the traditional, medieval-based style used for Victorian-era warehouses, these factory-warehouses or stores express their use and age by the wall materials chosen (red and cream brick and basalt). Symmetrically placed arched openings, two windows each side of the landing doors, comprise the fenestration with ornamentation in the form of cream brick banding or terracotta mouldings. Chunky arch keystones and wide architraves are joined by impost bands and mouldings and the cornice mould that follows the parapet edge.

Openings vary from rectangular, arched to basket-arched, offering a textural variation of light and shade in combination with the rusticity of the wall materials. Timber joinery is near complete which is rare for this building type within the State. The buildings are particularly well preserved.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1887-1888, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Penman & Dalziel's Warehouses are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

Penman & Dalziel's Warehouses are significant:

Historically as exceptionally externally complete and hence epitomise well the growth of small secondary industry along lanes within this part of the Capital City Zone during the late 19th century; and

Aesthetically, as highly distinctive and excellent examples of the Victorian-era warehouse typology, evoking the utilitarian function by use of face brick but in a way and architectural form that adds functional ornament and texture to the façade in the combination of stone and brickwork placement. The companion Hardware Street warehouses, backing onto this pair, have been altered and are indicative only of the former group but provide some streetscape support for the notable Victorian-era warehouse row to the north.

Throstle's stores, 106-112 Hardware Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1045

What is significant?

In May 1889 builder Charles Nott, of Grandview Ave, Prahran applied to erect these two stores in what was then called Burns Lane for Frederick Throssell. The designer was probably George Wharton. .

These two parapeted and gabled brick stores have recently been gutted and integrated into an unrelated adjoining development but the glass atrium link allows visibility of their former north wall. All glazing and loading door joinery has been replaced but restoration options exist using 1985 images of the stores which show them at a high integrity.

Nevertheless their street façade is an impressive combination of rugged quarry-faced basalt plinth and two colour brickwork reds, cream) with a succession of arch forms up

the elevation, full arched to segmental and then flat-arched at the top. The four-storey height of the stores is uncommon for their frontage width and lane location.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1889, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Throstle's stores are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Although altered externally in detail Throstle's stores remain significant: Historically as exemplars of warehouses sited close to what was then the hardware merchandising centre of Melbourne town, near the mammoth Kirk's Horse Bazaar; and

Aesthetically, as an uncommon combination of building height and siting as well as an impressive juxta-positioning of rugged quarry-faced basalt (plinth) and two colour brickwork (red, cream) with a well-chosen succession of window arch forms ascending the elevation.

Barrow Brothers warehouse, 12-20 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1046

What is significant?

Barrow Brothers (John William and Herbert Thomas), dairy and produce merchants were the first owner-occupiers of this two level brick showroom, warehouse and basement, built at the front and side of their existing stores facing King Street and Highlander Lane. The architect was Christopher Cowper. The builder was Harry Chaplin of Balwyn and the estimated cost £4000.

The complex included a cart way or carriageway on the north side leading to a cage-lined "fowl sale yard" at the rear, past a series of stores (some new, some existing), the front office area and the meat and butter sale rooms behind. Upstairs and in the basement, there were two main storage areas. The internal structural frame and floor were mainly timber.

A matching new 2 level brick store was added for the Western District Co-Operative Producers & Insurance Co. Ltd. at the rear of the 1917 wing to the design of Twentyman & Askew in 1928. Old stone and brick stores were replaced to complete a major renewal of the building complex. The cost was estimated at £8000 and the builder, Hansen & Yuncken Pty Ltd. William Osborne as managing director of the Western District Co-Operative Producers & Insurance Co. Ltd. was an important figure in primary production marketing within Australia.

Comprising two storeys and basement with a facade of face brick and rendered details, the building is in the Edwardian Baroque style. The symmetrical composition consists of three boldly modelled pavilion forms linked by two simple intervening bays. The central pavilion of the facade has a gabled pediment, adorned at the upper levels, with a cornucopia device and wreath within the tympanum providing a visual link to the primary produce marketed by the firm. A segmentally arched pediment set on consoles above the main entry is bold and stylish. The Barrow Brothers warehouse aligns with

earlier stone and rendered warehouses along King Street and Highlander Lane to provide a remarkable collection of structures from different eras of primary produce marketing and storage.

The original carriageway has been absorbed into the main body of the building, the ground floor window joinery has been modified and the rear store windows replaced or blocked but the building retains its early form, face brickwork and a wealth of rendered detail. A late Victorian-era austere and vast three-level brick warehouse is adjoining (part of 22-24 King St) set hard onto the rear stone lane with loading doors. This and the former Barrow building provide for a distinctive warehouse streetscape in the lane.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction dates, 1917 and 1928, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Barrow Brothers warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Barrow Brothers warehouse is significant:

Historically, as a near externally complete, if stylistically conservative, warehouse and office building which has been long associated with the marketing of primary produce and particularly of the once prominent firm, Barrow Brothers and the Western District Co-Operative Producers & Insurance Co. Ltd whose manager William Osborne used this premises as the foundation of a nationally important enterprise; and

Aesthetically, as a stylistic variation within the City warehouse idiom and complements the notable earlier warehouses in King Street, both in use and in general form, detail and finish.

Union Bond Melbourne Storage Company Ltd, 115-129 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1047

What is significant?

Colonial magistrate and St Kilda councillor, William Welshman, commissioned prominent architects Crouch & Wilson to design these bonded stores in 1881 to be erected by Martin & Peacock.

Crouch & Wilson designed many significant buildings in the colony such as Kilmore District Hospital, Victorian Deaf and Dumb Institution; Ensor & Ardee, East Melbourne; Terrace at 128-132 Grey Street (all on the Victorian Heritage Register); Leicester House, Flinders Lane 1886; and Glenmoore, at 1 St Georges Road, Elsternwick.

The Union Bond Melbourne Storage Co (Ltd) and later the owners of the stores on the opposite corner, Wrigley & Scales, occupied the stores and called them the Federal Bond. As a mark of free trade, import duties on many items in the new Colony were reduced in 1853 to only wines, spirits, tobacco, tea and coffee. Bonded stores held goods with import tariffs owing.

The Union Bond is a three-level parapeted and rendered warehouse, elevated in a simple classical revival style, with segmentally-arched raised parapet entablatures at intervals along both street facades. Each parapet entablatures is surmounted by an

anthemion. The double-hung sash window have either cemented label moulds, linked with an impost wall moulding, or moulded cement architraves with small brackets under each sill. Pedestrian entry was from the splayed corner while a carriageway or archway travelled through from King Street to the yard behind. The two main facades are clad with dressed stone up to window sill height with three quarry-faced stone layers acting as a plinth. Basement lights penetrate the stone at intervals, each in shaped basalt with finely tooled margins.

Adjoining on the west is a classical revival former print works, later merchant's warehouse, which relates closely to the architecture of the bond store. The west wall of the bond store itself is very well-preserved face red brick with voussoirs and stone sills. Semi-circular stone rubbing strips are attached as large dado moulds to the west wall. What remains of an old stable and loft is at the west end of the stone paved inner courtyard once shared by the bond store.

Ground level openings have been changed in an empathetic manner but overall this bonded store is exceptionally well-preserved for its age and scale. The design and finish are also of a high standard as an indication of the designer's skill and supervision, with fine stone detailing at ground level.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date, 1882-3, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Union Bond is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Union Bond is significant:

Historically as a superb example of an architect designed bonded and free store within the well-defined and prosperous mercantile district of western Melbourne Town. These stores are large and combine with others along King Street as a highly significant collection of early stores devoted to the shipping trade and nearby wharves; and

]

Aesthetically, as a simple but rugged design treatment appropriate for a store given by one of the Colony's foremost architectural firms of the era, Crouch and Wilson, with well considered elevations, stonework, finishes and detailing.

Peoples Palace, 131-135 King Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1048

What is significant?

The Salvation Army's Sydney People's Palace opened in 1899, providing cheap accommodation for travellers and visitors to the City away from the environment of liquor and gambling found in many hotels. The enterprise was so successful that the concept was eventually extended to other capital cities in the Commonwealth. The three storey Workmen's Metropolis later People's Metropole in King Street was one such building. It was built by the Salvation Army in 1901.

At the end of 1924, the Workmen's Metropolis was demolished and a new seven storey People's Palace was erected on the site. The palace could hold 500 persons, it had a trafficable flat roof to overview the populace, a palm court, and several ` spacious

lounges' including the large dining saloon on the ground floor. This saloon could seat 200, with its lead light dome, panelled walls, hexagonal tables, and imitation marble columns. The building cost was £72,000 but the total cost complete was thought to be about £100,000. The travelling public were catered for in the first floor refreshment room with its soda fountain, grilles for quick meals and accordion doors to allow 2000 square feet of contiguous floor area.

Bedrooms were single, double or family size but each had an openable window for light and ventilation. Two electric elevators and three wide staircases traversed the height of the building while the 750 feet length of passages were fitted with 'silent tread' linoleum; the combined floor area was a massive 2 acres. Fire prevention relied on the concrete construction, fire underwriter escape doors and partitions of coke breeze blocks. Chemical extinguishers were placed at each floor and a high pressure fire water service allowed brigade access. The construction was by day labour supervised by Mr L Pinemi. It was opened by the Lord Mayor, Sir William Brunton, 3 November 1926, with a luncheon and speakers.

Designed by Adjutant Percival Dale of the Salvation Army property department and constructed in rendered reinforced concrete, the building is a bold and unusually mannered composition of abstracted Classical elements. The building comprises two large pavilions which flank a five storey canted bay containing a vertical array of balconies. This central bay is supported on oversized consoles and features smooth rusticated pilasters which rise through its full height. The pavilion elements are simpler but rise to abstracted cornice elements supported on more oversized brackets. The deep balconies central to the seven level façade are unlike any other 20th century building in the Capital City Zone (see Markillie's Hotel balcony).

The building is currently used as a restaurant with hotel accommodation above. The hotel entry is denoted by a small but unsympathetic added canopy and signage which detracts from both the symmetry of the composition and obscures the single-purpose nature of the original building. Nonetheless, the building has retained its early character and detail and the upper levels are well preserved.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1925-1926, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Peoples Palace is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The former Melbourne People's Palace is significant:
Historically, as a good example of specialist accommodation within the City of Melbourne in the long tradition of similar lodging places located in Bourke Street, Lonsdale Street (as the Princess Mary Club), Coppin's Our Improved Dwelling & Lodging House in Little Bourke Street and on this site as the Model Lodging House. This specialised use is made particularly relevant given the building's location near Spencer Street railway station along with the other major private hotels built along this street in the late Victorian, Edwardian and inter-war periods. The Peoples Palace is also significant for its long association with the work of the Salvation Army in the City of Melbourne during the early part of the twentieth century; and

Aesthetically, as a well preserved Greek-revival design that is made more distinctive by its residential multi-storey use and the associated location of deep balconies up the seven level façade unlike any other 20th century building in the Capital City Zone.

Argus Building, former, 284-294 La Trobe Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1049

What is significant?

The Argus' daily newspaper was launched in 1846 and a little over 100 years later (1957) ceased to exist.

The Argus Building was designed by Godfrey & Spowers in association with WH Buck (see also Kelvin Hall) and constructed by Swanson Brothers 1924-1926. When complete the whole of the Argus Building was occupied by staff of either the Argus' or Australasian' except the Elizabeth Street ground level and part of the top or 5th floor where the Paton Advertising Service, the Melbourne offices of the Sydney Morning Herald' and the Sydney Mail', the Sydney Evening News', Women's Budget', the Hobart Mercury' and the Illustrated Tasmanian Mail' were located. Shops on the ground floor fronting Elizabeth Street were occupied by a tobacconist, tailor, cleaners and dyers; jeweller; and confectioners.

The Argus Building was considered to be quite advanced by the Sydney periodical, Building'. Unlike the new Herald building, it was multi-storey and hence used valuable city real-estate more efficiently while allowing intra-office circulation to proceed more effectively.

The Argus Building is a grand if incomplete example of the neo-Baroque style as popularised by British Edwardian classicists such as Sir Reginald Blomfield, J.J. Joass and Ernest Newton. The Morning Post newspaper offices (1907) in London, by Mewes & Davis, or the War Office in Whitehall (1906) by William Long may have been influential on the design of this building. Each possessed corner towers and giant order colonnades similar to those of the Argus office. Elsewhere in Melbourne there is the T & G Building, and more distant, Moore's Corner Store in Prahran, which also utilized these elements.

Rising six main levels in a parapeted ruled stuccoed form, the two street facades differ markedly as a gesture to a modern interpretation of the classical style. The more embellished frontage is to Elizabeth Street (65m long), with its giant Corinthian order colonnade, garlanded pier capitals, secondary cornices, panelled spandrels and the façade bays at either end. Egyptian ornament on the coved papyrus cornice of the giant colonnade and as a frieze to the main cornice, add a contemporary element paralleling with Harold Carter's opening, in November 1922, of Tutankhamen's tomb. The bowed corner and associated balconette rounds onto the more austere Latrobe Street elevation (31m long) but this is counterpoint to the ornate fenestration of the Baroque tower plinth and the tower itself (still without spire). The tower has the characteristic Baroque concave corners (as seen in Thomas Archer's St Philip, Birmingham 1709-15), paired column bays and a richly detailed cornice. The western façade is also rendered and enriched, with only the north as plain, as a reflection of the new building towering over its surroundings when built. This combination of architectural elements is not a faithful revival of Baroque precedents but instead a successful and creative assembly of traditional forms and elements that take full account of the corner site. This dominant corner building is made more so by its corner tower and giant stone column rows.

Alterations include the new glazed entrance screen and opening created onto Latrobe Street in 1959-60, to the design of the long-time architects for the Herald & Weekly Times, Ltd., Tompkins & Shaw. Replacing a group of 'punched' window openings similar to that surviving on the west of the new entrance, some attempt was made to integrate the large new opening with the surrounding architecture by simple repetition of mouldings around the reveals. The render finish has been changed superficially.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1924-1926, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Argus Building is significant socially, historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Argus Building is significant:

Aesthetically, as is one of the major interwar office buildings in the City, given particular prominence by its location amongst much smaller buildings on the edge of the city. The still unfinished tower and the giant order stone columns on the Elizabeth Street façade, lend an imposing quality suitable for a major metropolitan newspaper. This is a landmark design which lacks the finesse of the T & G Building or detailing of the Nicholas Building, but nevertheless is a dominant corner presence in a fluently executed Baroque revival manner. The Argus Building received critical acclaim for its innovative design for its use, in contrast to the massive reconstruction programme then being undertaken by the Herald & Weekly Times Ltd. in a more conservative classical manner; and

Historically and socially, as the home of the Argus newspaper for 30 years, and represents its major physical legacy. The Argus was one of Melbourne's three leading newspapers, all established in the founding years of the City.

Russell's building, 361-363 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1050

What is significant?

The building at 361-363 Little Bourke Street, was completed in 1939 as a three storey brick building to the design of architects Arthur & Hugh Peck of 99 Queen Street for the Repco entrepreneur, Robert Geoffrey Russell.

By the mid 1930s, the company dominated the Australian automobile spare parts market, with more than 500 employees. The Little Bourke Street building was developed at a time of major company growth leading up to the Second War, after the advent of Repco Ltd. on the Australian Stock Exchange.

The architects, the Peck brothers, were associated with a number of significant designs within the central City such as Capitol House (with Burley Griffin), the Moderne style Commercial Union Building, and the classical revival State Savings Bank of Victoria, 615-623 Collins Street, of 1924.

The building adopted the style of contemporary European Modernists most notably Willem Dudok, Director of Public Works for Hilversum in Holland from 1915. Dudok exerted a powerful influence on local architectural discourse in Australia during the interwar period although a relatively small number of buildings drawing on his work were constructed locally.

The asymmetric façade of Russell's shop & office building comprises a tower at one end, containing the entry and stairwell which terminates a large horizontal window group at each floor level. Each window strip is set under concealed concrete lintels detailed as slim projecting hoods.

The building has a reinforced concrete frame, a timber trussed roof, and cream and red brick external walls; the facade being finished in cream face brick with face red brick walls along the lane. Contrasting panels of brown heeler bricks are adjacent to the upper windows to accentuate the horizontality of the fenestration. The cream brickwork, glass bricks to the stairwell and steel framed windows elsewhere, are hallmarks of Dudok's work. The Modernistic façade is an effective stylistic appliqué to what is otherwise a conventional interwar building.

Some brickwork has been painted and the ground floor former café shopfront has been modified, albeit for another café, but the building as a whole retains a high degree of integrity to its early state at the upper levels.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1939, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Russell's building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Russell's building is of significant:

Aesthetically as a good example of a City building after the Modernistic style of Willem Dudok. Buildings in this mode are relatively uncommon within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, for its association with the noted entrepreneur Robert G Russell, built at a period of major growth within his new Repco company.

Marks' warehouse, 362-364 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1051

What is significant?

This warehouse was constructed for Jacob & Benjamin Marks, Elizabeth Street jewellers, by Thomas Sanders, in 1889. It was a four-level warehouse to the design of the important architect, George DeLacy Evans, who had already designed the highly significant warehouse group in nearby Niagara Lane for the Marks family. AG Fullager & Co, a china and glass importer was among the first occupants, followed by other importers and a hardware merchant.

Marks brothers warehouse is a good example of a boom period development and illustrates the exuberant modelling and eclectic mannered character frequently associated with designs of the period. The Queen Anne Revival style façade comprises a gable-ended parapeted form in face brick with rendered details drawn from classical and medieval sources in the manner of the style.

Decorative pilasters rise through the full height of the building, capped by small pediments, to an ornate Roman arch set above a highly modelled cornice. Bartizan motifs, surviving parapet orbs, and a highly mannered pilaster bifurcating the surmounting pediment scrolls, are all part of the highly inventive assembly of architectural elements. The tiled spandrel panels are particularly notable. The wall facing Warburton Alley is of plain red brickwork with paired window openings.

The Queen Ann Revival style was introduced in the mid to late 1880s in Melbourne, making this building one of the key examples. The recession of the early 1890s brought an end to decorous designs. Although understated by comparison, the design draws on the same boom period spirit as George De Lacy Evans' Sum Kum Lee building (1887-8) at 112-114 Little Bourke Street and also compares with the significant warehouse group in nearby Niagara Lane.

There is a roof addition to the rear, the original face brick character of the building has been masked by painting and the modification of ground floor fenestration but the building remains, at the upper levels, near to its original state.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1889, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Marks' warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Marks' warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically as a good example of a boom period Capital City Zone warehouse, distinguished by its unusual and particularly flamboyant façade and its early use of the Queen Anne Revival style; and

Historically, as one of the significant developments in this part of the City for the Marks family.

Warburton's shops & warehouses, 365-367 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1052

What is significant?

Warburton's shops & warehouse building was constructed in 1887 as a three storey warehouse for Joseph Warburton at the corner of Warburton Lane, the location of Thomas Warburton's iron merchandising business, and east of the gigantic Kirk's Horse Bazaar that attracted this type of hardware business. The designers were Twentyman & Askew who specialised in warehouse architecture in the late Victorian-era and the builder, William Radden of Rae St, Fitzroy.

Thomas Warburton arrived in Melbourne in 1853 and once in business advertised his wares from the early 1860s typically as 'Corrugated and Plain Iron all lengths and gauges... Warburton's 11 Little Bourke street west.' Warburton built a machine for producing spouting based on an American design and the company soon became the major supplier of these products for the colonies of Australia and New Zealand. By 1866 they moved into larger premises, buying up the block at 23 Bourke Street West, running from Bourke Street right through to Little Bourke Street. The family company remained there for some 108 years until 1966 when the business relocated to Kavanagh Street in South Melbourne.

A representative example of an early warehouse in an Italian Renaissance Revival mode, Warburton's shops & warehouses building has a rendered classical revival façade to Little Bourke Street and dichrome face brick to Warburton Lane. Segmental window arches are used on the façade top level and full arches on the first level, each with heavily moulded architraves and impost mouldings. Pilasters and quoining trim either end of the main elevation. Key decorative elements include the architraves with keystones to arcuated windows and a decorative main cornice.

The first warehouse wing in Warburton lane has a distinctive raised parapet section central to the pair with scrolls either side, while the third of the warehouses has a lower eaves line and grouped window openings in the Venetian manner. Adjoining on the south is a tall-arched Edwardian-era (or later) warehouse which relates well with the earlier building, probably as part of the Warburton empire.

The dark paint colour on Little Bourke Street façade and return wall has masked the early character of the building but the Warburton Lane façade retains most of the dichrome brickwork and openings of the original design, with their corbelled arch heads. The main ground floor elevation has been modified with large openings and existing openings on the lane have also been closed-in and services, new large unrelated openings and upper level balconette added. However the building has retained its early warehouse character, particularly the Warburton Lane façade.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1887, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Warburton's shops & warehouse building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Warburton's shops & warehouses building is significant:
Aesthetically as a good example of an early dichrome brick and render warehouse in the Italian Renaissance Revival mode within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, as part of the extensive Thomas Warburton metal merchandising complex as the forerunner of a large hardware supply enterprise that remains active today.

Drayton House, 373-375 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1053

What is significant?

Architects RM & MH King designed this four-storey reinforced concrete building in 1937 for the Equity Trustees Ltd., acting for the John Donne estate. The Kings were known for their Moderne style design work during the inter-war period with many significant domestic commissions that survive but also some commercial city work, including 370 Little Bourke Street opposite. This refacing of a Victorian-era warehouse in the Moderne style (altered) adjoins the existing John Donne & Son retail outlet at 372 Little Bourke Street.

Building permit applications were made for this site in February for 'erection of a building' estimated to cost £8000 and in March for a shopfront and a cantilevering awning. A typical floor had a concrete encased stair at each end, one with a lift and lobby adjoining and the other with toilets; both stairs had slim steel flat balustrading. The floor system was hollow terracotta block work, as permanent formwork. The ground level shopfront had showcases either side of a central recessed entry, with fully glazed timber framed doors.

Moderne in style, the building has horizontal metal-framed glazed strips (reglazed) abutting the stairway vertical feature at the lane. This element has three vertically aligned port holes and a centrally placed vertical glazing strip terminating on three 100mm concrete fins at the parapet. The spandrels between the glazing strips are now rendered in a ruled tile pattern with supporting concrete 100mm deep slabs under each and over the top window strip as a shallow hood. The building permit application drawings showed the spandrels finished with 9x9" terracotta tiles. The remaining building facing the lane is plainly treated.

Works have been done in 1965 to the shopfront and entry, \$500,000 spent on upgrading the façade tiles and foyer in the late 1980s along with a later shop fit out. The shopfront and awning are new and glass bricks have been added to the foyer lane wall. Various painted and three-dimensional signs have been added.

Like key Modernistic designs such as the earlier Yule House, also set in a narrow City Street, Drayton House is a minority style within the Capital City Zone.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1938-1939, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Drayton House is significant aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Drayton House is significant:

Aesthetically, as a well executed Moderne Style design on a modest scale and at a discrete site. The architects, RM & MH King, are well known for this architectural style and this is a good example of the commercial side of their work which is not well represented elsewhere.

City West Telephone Exchange, 434-436 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1054

What is significant?

In January 1923, Harry Percy Brown was appointed Director General of the Post Master General's department. Among the many innovations introduced to this country by Brown was the promotion of automated telephone exchanges, eliminating the need for an operator. Nationally, twenty-two such exchanges were constructed or designed between Brown's appointment and June 1925. The Melbourne City West Exchange was designed but not constructed just after this spate of activity.

As the effects of the Great Depression waned, the Postmaster General's Department commenced an extensive building campaign. Caulfield was the first to be completed, in 1935, coinciding with the start of the City West Telephone Exchange.

The City West Telephone Exchange ('alterations and additions' to the rear of the existing Lonsdale Street exchange) was contract number 73, signed in March 1935, for a sum of £58,965. Victorian Works Director, H. J. MacKenna, countersigned the contract drawings, while Architect Grade I, Harry Hughes, appears to have amended them. The highly notable Commonwealth Director-general of Works JS Murdoch had signed the initial drawings in 1929: the Victorian office had finalised the drawings to allow construction once the economic climate allowed. The 'alterations and additions' were extensive, dwarfing the earlier saw-tooth roof exchange building abutting at the rear.

The ground-level lobby hardly fulfilled the promise of the grand elevation but still retains valuable wall and floor finishes. Occupied mainly by plant (battery, air-conditioning, filter, boiler and main-frame rooms included), this entrance was into an open stair well (with central lift) which ascended through three levels of switch rooms to the Trunk Exchange where a jarrah floor (built on the concrete slab), sound-absorbing plaster ceiling and wall panels indicate some human activity. The floor above (sixth) was devoted to staff facilities (telephonists' and mechanics' lunchrooms, sick and rest bays, locker areas) and then there was the flat roof, close at hand for outdoor recreation.

Despite the building's largely non-human occupation, it was designed externally in the manner of a typical major public building of the period.

Modern Georgian revival in character and Commercial Palazzo in form, the 'addition' comprised six large reinforced concrete floors (held by a concrete encased steel frame), ground and basement. Parapeted in form and clad with face red brick, the historicism of the design was implied rather than replicated, with the major openings, the three bayed elevation and lofty 'rusticated' ground level all boldly stated in a typical manner for the period. The vertical tripartite division of the façade includes a heavy rusticated base and neutral intermediate floors surmounted by a prominent rusticated cornice. The building is further distinguished by two-storey arched windows and entry elements on the ground floor.

Details are suggested, with recessed, brick-on-edge or brick-on-end bands or corbelled panels, and directly stated with carved stone architraves, masonry and string moulds at major façade openings, the basement cladding and storey divisions. Window panes were metal framed and possessed borders.

City West Telephone Exchange is generally original externally and is near to the similarly styled elevation of the Murdoch designed former High Court (later Federal Court), both recognizably Commonwealth public buildings of their period.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1935-1937, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The City West Telephone Exchange is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

City West Telephone Exchange is significant Aesthetically, as a well preserved, large and a distinctive Commonwealth Government design, a typical and a major example of the limited number of government inter-war designs outside Canberra. The building was designed by the first Commonwealth Government Architect, John Smith Murdoch, and is therefore complementary to his similarly styled High Court building adjoining. It is a rare example of this unusual building type within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, as one of the early major purpose-built automated exchanges to be built in Victoria.

Bayne's shops and residences, later Little Reata restaurant, 68-70 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1055

What is significant?

Builder, John Bayne, of nearby Stephen (Exhibition) Street, owned and built these two shops and residences in the period 1857-1858. Mrs Bayne, milliner and dressmaker, was among the first occupants of one of the Little Collins St shops. A wide variety of small businesses followed.

This is a two level shop and dwelling in a Colonial Georgian style, walled in coursed basalt rubble with dressed freestone quoins and architraves, and a dressed stone plinth. The former shops and dwellings possess display-windows, with probable early glazing frame remnants, and are relatively well-preserved externally for their age. A central door, top light and matching window in the upper level (sheeted over) appears to have served as a residential entrance, complementing the two shop entrances either side. The façade is demarcated horizontally with a plain parapet cornice, first storey string-mould and the chamfered stone plinth at ground level.

Comparable early stone-faced shops and residences are few in the metropolitan area (i.e. 1-3 Chetwynd Street, West Melbourne, 1867); earlier houses, warehouses and offices faced with stone being more numerous. This is one of the earliest groups of two-storey stone shop and residence pairs in the State. The shop pair relates in period detail, siting and scale to adjoining buildings.

Light fittings and signs have been added. Openings sheeted over and the show-windows reglazed and rebuilt in part.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1857-58, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Bayne's shops and residences are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone and Victoria.

Why is it significant?

Bayne's shops and residences are significant:

Historically as among the earliest group of stone-faced, two-storey shop and residence pairs in the State. Constructed in the aftermath of the gold rush to serve a growing metropolis, the shops are reminders of this significant period in the City's development history and were more recently the setting for the revival of folk music in the City in the 1960s; and

Aesthetically, for the successful use of the combination of rubble, dressed basalt and freestone in a classical revival façade is rare in a building of this scale, as is the high integrity.

Briscoe & Co warehouse, later EL Yencken & Co Pty. Ltd., 392-396 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1056

What is significant?

George Robertson & Co, stationers, publishers and booksellers, were located in Little Collins Street West during the 1880s. Robertson reconstructed much of this side of Little Collins St, between McKillop and Queen Streets, during this period: building a speculative four-storey warehouse pair in Brown's Lane (now Penfold's Lane) in 1882 and this five level warehouse in 1882-3. .

Briscoe and Co., wholesale ironmongers, were the first and most long-lived tenants of this building, having moved from Collins Street to be nearer their iron yard in Queen Street. By then Briscoe had been established in England for over 100 years. Having first opened in Melbourne at Elizabeth Street during 1853, by the late 1880s they had branches in New Zealand and New South Wales. It was claimed in 1887 that Briscoe and Co. was the largest wholesale house in the colonies.

Briscoe's warehouse was also in the midst of a traditional concentration of hardware merchants and wholesalers in this part of the City. The Little Collins Street premises were claimed as '...classed with the finest of the Melbourne Stores'. The basement was a bonded store, holding oil and nails; the ground was divided as offices and a large show room. The first level was a single space, furnished with racks for stock and also accommodating the manager. The second and third levels were large bulk stores.

Architect, Edward Twentyman, had designed Briscoe's Queen Street premises while, in 1882-3, the new firm of Twentyman & Askew were responsible for this building. The builder was Harry Lockington. Twentyman had already proved himself as the ironmonger's architect, executing the design for McLean Bros. and Rigg's Bourke Street West store.

By 1904 both warehouses at 384-90 and 392-96 Little Collins Street, were occupied by E L Yencken & Co., importers of oils, colours and plate glass (a forerunner of today's glazing firm) until the 1940s. Edward Yencken had risen in the 1890s to dominate the

hardware business and by the turn of the century Yencken was honoured as 'father' of the Melbourne hardware trade.

This brick, former wholesale and retail warehouse has an Italian Renaissance revival façade which is distinguished by a vigorous fenestration pattern and the type of ornate cemented detailing typical of Twentyman & Askew's work and later that of David Askew. The street façade is in three parts with the central projecting bay extending over the side bays with an ornate corbel table. Each bay has three levels of double-hung sash window pairs, each window topped with deep label moulds and embellished with foliated cemented capitals to the piers and colonettes between.

Openings alternate as either full or segment-arched and there is a deep cornice, supported by closely spaced brackets. The building base has smooth rustication extending down the side lane but the side elevation brickwork, with its deep set windows and loading doors, has been painted. The ground level in Little Collins Street has been changed, another level added behind the parapet, as also have some balconies on the lane elevation, a canopy and signs.

Briscoe's building can be viewed favourably with the highly significant, grander and more ornate but later Stalbridge Chambers also by Twentyman & Askew.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1882-3, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Briscoe & Co warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Briscoe & Co warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically as a well-ornamented Renaissance Revival former warehouse design which, despite ground level alterations, possesses the distinctive and rich cement detailing and design characteristic of the architects, Twentyman & Askew; and

Historically, as a reminder of two important Victorian ironmongery firms, Briscoe & Co. and EL Yencken & Co, both major hardware businesses in this former hardware precinct of the City as well as within Victoria.

McCracken City Brewery malt store, later Ebsworth House, 538-542 Little Collins Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1057

What is significant?

McCracken's City Brewery was one of the country's leading brewers during the late nineteenth century. The brewery's Melbourne complex occupied a 200' (61m) frontage to Collins Street and the full depth of the block to Little Collins Street. It provided employment for about 110 people and contemporary accounts noted that the plant was fitted out for the latest modern brewery requirements. McCracken & Co became a part of Carlton and United Breweries in 1907.

Although situated on the opposite side of Little Collins Street to the main McCracken complex, this three storey building was constructed in two stages as a store for the

brewery in 1878-1879. The designer was William Elliott and builders were Thomas Walker & Co for stage one and Taylor & Duguid for stage two. The warehouse resembles Elliott's warehouse designs for Corrs Lane and the Currie & Richards' warehouse (1875) also Porta and Sons Steam Bellows Works. The building is one of only two brewery buildings surviving in the Capital City Zone (see rear of 104 A'Beckett St) and the only remnant of the giant McCracken complex.

The brewery warehouse design took the form of a small Italian Renaissance palazzo with two main levels and an attic, set out in the graduated proportions typical of the style. The expression of this domestic style is made more convincing by its free-standing site, adjoining Gallagher and (formerly) Victoria Lanes. The ground floor is expressed as a heavy base with rustication emanating radially from arcuated windows. The upper floors are generally less ornate with the exception of unusual raised architrave mouldings around the windows at first floor level. The façade terminated in a boldly modelled bracketed cornice. The face brick walls onto the lanes have been painted as have the quarry faced plinth with its segmentally arched basement vents.

Sometime in the 20th century an additional third and part fourth floor have been added to the building with their own boldly modelled cornice which has modified the vertical proportions of the façade. Minor modifications at ground floor level and external painting of the building's face brickwork have been undertaken but, the Little Collins street façade remains in good and fairly original condition. The secondary Gallagher Place façade has been extensively modified with large modern window openings throughout.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates 1878-1879 and 1909, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

McCracken City Brewery malt store is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

McCracken City Brewery malt store is significant:

Aesthetically, as a good example of a free-standing form of the Victorian-era Renaissance Revival palazzo type within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, as one of only two brewery buildings surviving in the Capital City Zone and the only remnant of the giant McCracken brewing complex, once of national prominence and the largest industrial complex ever to exist in the Capital City Zone.

Porta and Sons, Steam Bellows Works, 25 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1058

What is significant?

This warehouse was constructed for Joseph Porta, then of Porta & Sons bellows makers, to the design of William Elliott in 1883. The elevation resembles a simplified version of the McCracken Brewery malt store also designed by Elliott in Little Collins Street in the late 1870s, his warehouse designs in Corrs Lane and the Currie & Richards' warehouse of 1875.

Joseph Jeremiah Porta (1820-98) and his descendants conducted a successful bellows making business in the Little Lonsdale precinct and nearby for over ninety years, commencing at least as early as 1866 and concluding in 1959.

.By the 1880s the Porta firm was one of the Colony's foremost bellows manufacturers and exhibited along with only one other bellows maker at the Melbourne International Exhibition of 1880-1, as only the second international exhibition to be held in Australia. The firm was given the First Order of Merit and a silver medal in the machines and machine tools class but had already entered four products in the prestigious 1875 Inter Colonial Exhibition.

The original parapeted and skillion-roofed structure was extended to its present size in the twentieth century. In 1940, the building's roof was damaged by fire and reinstated by builders, Messrs Hollows & Sons. This meant reconstruction of the first floor, parapet and hipped roof of the rear wing, with the front skillion roof section untouched externally. This front section was converted for use as an entry and stair lobby for the wing behind while the old stair in the rear section was removed.

The former factory is a simple parapeted skillion roof structure with a ruled rendered façade and decoration limited to a simple string courses and cornice. Fenestration is regularly arranged with arcuated windows and door openings. Unusual original or early window joinery appears to have survived in the front wing. The rear addition is clearly distinguishable in roof form and the use of machine made pressed red brickwork: it appears to date from the Edwardian-era when used for cabinet making with the 1940 repairs confined to the parapet and change to upper level window sills.

It is a good example of an early factory warehouse building and illustrates the gradual shift from mixed residential to factory uses which occurred in this part of the City during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with occupation by Chinese in the Edwardian-era as Melbourne's Greater Chinatown. The building façade retains a high degree of integrity to its early state.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1883-4, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Porta and Sons, Steam Bellows Works is significant historically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Porta and Sons, Steam Bellows Works is significant:

Historically, as an excellent and early example of a small factory-warehouse within Melbourne's Central Business District, as demonstrated by its small scale and limited window area. It illustrates the shift from mixed residential to factory uses in this part of the City during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The building's close association with the successful manufacturer, Joseph Porta is also significant as is the long use as a Chinese cabinet making premises, a link to Melbourne's Greater Chinatown of the Edwardian-era.

Collie, R & Co warehouse, 194-196 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1059

What is significant?

Designed by RH Pearson, the workshop and warehouse at 194-196 Little Lonsdale Street, was constructed in 1903 by Hawthorn builder, H Henningsen, for the printers supply firm, R Collie & Co. Robert Collie and Co, and remained in this location into the 1950s. The firm was a long-time member of the Victorian Master Printers and Allied Trades Association, along with household names such as Sands and McDougall Pty. Ltd. McCarron, Bird & Co, Spicers and Lamson Paragon, and was a consistent government supplier of printing and bookbinding materials.

This is a two storey tuck-pointed red brick factory-warehouse with rendered classical revival details combined in a free and non-academic fashion. Stylistically, this is referred to as Federation Free Classical: its proponents sought to combine a Classical sense of repose and harmony with a modern simplicity. The use of classical proportions without the full panoply of columns pilasters entablatures and pediments was seen as an advance from the Victorian-era. The building rises from a heavy red brick base containing basement windows, with rendered pilasters, stripped of their usual decorative detail, rise superposed through the full height of the building to a bold pedimented parapet. The pilasters and cornices at parapet and first floor levels divide the façade into a series of bays, each containing a large segmentally arched window with timber joinery.

Original joinery appears to have survived throughout. The side and rear elevations are also well-preserved, the latter in a gabled parapeted form and the former, with unusual recessed windows, loading doors and a gantry. This loading bay was the scene of a fatal accident in 1914. The building is in excellent original condition, but has added unrelated services on the east wall to the lane.

This warehouse is a contributory part of a highly significant group (194-200 Little Lonsdale Street) of similar Edwardian-era 2 storey warehouses, terminated on the east by the John Knox church complex (1863-). Nearby Drewery Lane and similarly scaled buildings in Swanston Street provide period character to the area.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1903, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Robert Collie & Co warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Robert Collie & Co warehouse is significant:
Aesthetically, as a good and well-preserved example of an Edwardian factory-warehouse with a stripped Edwardian-era classical revival style façade, distinctive within Melbourne's Capital City Zone. The building contributes to a highly significant warehouse streetscape believed to be among the most intact within the Capital City Zone, and is part of a valuable Victorian-era enclave including the adjoining Knox Church and Sunday school, and Evans' row houses in Swanston Street; and

Historically, for the long association with a prominent firm within the local printers supply industry, Robert Collie & Company.

Cavanagh's or Tucker & Co's warehouse, 198-200 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1060

What is significant?

Built by F B Sewell for the Cavanagh Trust and to the design of J E Burke, this two storey warehouse and basement was commenced in 1904 and completed in the following year. Major tenants include the hardware importing firm, Robert Tucker & Co who was there into the 1930s.

By 1940 it served as storage for the Orient Home Publishers and more recently as offices for Taxation Services of Australia, probably coinciding with a major renovation of the interior for offices. This change reflected the gradual shift from this once important hardware merchandising centre, first, to the city's northern and western boundaries and, finally, into more distant industrial centres like Footscray, Sunshine and Newport.

The building is a free adaptation of the Romanesque revival, popular in Melbourne Edwardian warehouse designs, with bold brick arches either side of the entrance. The symmetrical façade, realised largely in red brick, comprises a slim vertical entry element with a rendered and scrolled pediment. The entry is flanked by two bold brick arches set deep within red brick pilasters. Large rendered balls surmount the pilasters above the broad cornice, further accentuating the vigour of the forms used in the composition. A range of decorative devices including foliated collars to the pilasters at first floor level and vertical banding to the underside of the cornice introduce a level of complexity to the façade which would rarely reappear in commercial buildings of the twentieth century.

The former warehouse contributes to an important early warehouse streetscape at 194-196 and 202 Little Lonsdale Street. The latter building is another designed by J E Burke. Nearby is the early Knox Church, Evans' row houses and the significant tobacco buildings in Drewery Lane.

The building appears to have retained its early fabric virtually intact including original or early window joinery and decorative detail.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1904-1905, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Cavanagh's warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Cavanagh's warehouse is significant:

Historically for its reflection over time of the gradual shift from this once important hardware merchandising centre first to the City's northern and western boundaries and finally into more distant industrial centres like Footscray, Sunshine and Newport; and

Architecturally, as an excellent example of a free adaptation of the Romanesque revival, popular in Edwardian warehouse designs. Bold brick arches further accentuate the vigour of the forms used in the composition, together with the strong detailing of the Romanesque inspired cement foliated capitals. The building is a major streetscape element in this important commercial building group.

Women's Venereal Disease Clinic, 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1061

What is significant?

Venereal disease (V.D.) was one of the most deadly infectious diseases internationally early in the 20th Century. As a consequence, a pact was formed by the League of Nations which obliged the Commonwealth to provide treatment for sailors at every major port in the country.

Figures in Victoria showed a severe increase of V.D. at the end of World War One, presumably one of the legacies of wartime overseas service. The yearly number of Melbourne's reported cases, in 1917, was 4252. Two years later it was 7560, coinciding with the erection of this building to supplement the men's V.D. Clinic at 440 Lonsdale Street (now demolished).

A 'Clinic for Woman' was erected as Public Works Department contract 81, signed October, 1918, with builder, R. P. Brady and Public Works Chief Architect, S C Brittingham. It was to cost £6,772 and various minor additions (verandah and balcony at rear, 1924) and alterations (1929, 1930) followed. In the same era Brittingham was responsible for the Old Arts Building (Melbourne University) and the around the same time, the similarly brick Georgian, Melbourne University School of Agriculture. After Brittingham, the next Public Works Chief Architect, E Evan Smith, was to promote a recognisable government style using Georgian as the basis for buildings such as University High School Parkville 1929 (Victorian Heritage Register) and the Emily McPherson College of Domestic Economy, Melbourne (1926, Victorian Heritage Register) which won the RVIA Victorian Street Architecture Medal for 1930.

This is an early Georgian revival design prepared immediately after World War One after considerable public pressure to combat a major health threat. It has a parapeted two-storey red brick façade to Little Lonsdale Street, a parapeted gabled profile above the main cornice, and a long hipped roof elevation extending into the block. A single level entry porch, with balcony over, communicates with a hall and a long passage to the rear of the building. Consulting, dressing and examination rooms, plus a staircase, opened off the hall, while a large waiting room, staff facilities and the Superintendent's Office lay beyond, off the passage. Upstairs were four wards, bathrooms and patients' and staff sitting rooms fronting the three balconies provided, to face the street.

Ornament to the façade was restricted to the pronounced cornice dentillation and saltire-cross wrought iron balcony panels. The fenestration was symmetrical, but the exposed end-gable parapets were neither typical of the style nor in harmony with the exposed hip-roofs elsewhere. A reinforced concrete basement under part of the building may have been intended as an Air Raid Shelter.

Additions at the rear are visually related but not part of the main design. The building is generally original externally but openings have been sheeted over for security as part of a 'mothballing' program for Commonwealth owned buildings. The building is part of a government built precinct, relating closely to the adjoining single storey brick T.B.

Clinic (q.v.) and the more distant Telephone Exchange in Little Bourke St. The building is close to the former mint building and is part of the large former government office group including the former health department building to the east (later Victoria University).

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1919, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Women's Venereal Disease clinic is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The Women's Venereal Disease clinic is significant; Historically for its construction to serve an almost bygone infectious disease and located centrally within the now dissipated 'back slum' brothel district of Little Lonsdale, La Trobe and Lonsdale Streets, to best serve its purpose. The creation of this building was the result of sustained public pressure to grapple with the spread of the disease; and

Aesthetically, as an early if modest Georgian revival design under the Government Chief Architect SC Brittingham and a contributory part of a small Victorian Government-built health precinct (with the TB Bureau to E Evan Smith's design), other earlier government offices, and close to the significant Georgian Revival Commonwealth telephone exchange, providing for a government building enclave built within a confined period and to a recognisable government style.

Cleve's Bonded Store complex, 523-525 Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1062

What is significant?

The merchant, Charles Cleve (of Cleve Brothers), owned the store initially, (1854-1859): commissioning a 'stone and iron store' in Little Lonsdale Street West, near William Street. The builder was Amess & McLaren, Melbourne. The stone store at the rear of this warehouse complex was shown in the DeGruchy & Leigh 1866 isometric, as part of a larger store consisting of a transverse gabled wing (iron clad) at the frontage to Little Lonsdale Street and adjoining two simple gabled stores which extended eastwards along an 'L-shape' right-of-way. Melbourne Roll Plan 12 (1856) shows a similar outline.

Cleve Brothers' main stores of 1858 were at the Lonsdale and King Streets' corner (234-244 King St, Victorian Heritage Register) owned by them until 1870 and continuously occupied until 1888. Cleve's Lonsdale Street store operated as a bonded store for goods with import tariffs from 1859 to 1888, whilst the King Street buildings operated as a Free Store between 1856 and 1888. Bonded and free stores that operated under the colonial tariff system before Federation in 1901 were located close to the docks on the Yarra River, where most inter-colonial and international goods were landed in Victoria. This type of store is a reminder of the historic mercantile importance of this part of Melbourne.

The red brick wing facing the street at 523-525 Little Lonsdale Street was added 1899-1901, for Frederick Tate, to the design of Thomas Dall and built by Thomas Mclean. This was Edward Smith's fender factory early this century, Frater's French Polishers in the 1930s, and storage space for Milledge Brothers around World War Two.

The rear 1850s wing is a simple, gabled-ended and coursed basalt rubble store, built with one main level and a low basement. Stone lintels are used at openings. Internally, there were the typical heavy timber beams and columns with shaped timber cross-heads as capitals. Windows are barred and a cat-head survives at the south end over a partly bricked-in loading bay.

The Edwardian-era red brick Little Lonsdale Street wing is a gabled, parapeted and designed after the Queen Anne style, with a raised gabled pediment, segmentally arched façade openings with stylised cemented keystones, stone cills and a stone plinth. It now provides the northern wall of the old store. The Queen Anne style was to prevail in commercial architecture, and later residential, throughout the following Edwardian-era.

The stone store and brick warehouse are generally externally original, except for changes to the loading doors at the south end of the 1850s store and new joinery to the façade openings of the brick warehouse. Bordering a stone pitched lane off one of Melbourne's little service streets, the store and warehouse are typically sited. A significant Victorian-era warehouse and the 1850s former corn store in William Street back onto the site.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates, 1854 and 1899-1900, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Cleve's Bonded Store complex is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Cleve's Bonded Store complex is significant:

Historically as, in part, an early stone bonded store in the Capital City Zone and among the earliest group of relatively original stone stores in Victoria, with a long association with the pioneering Cleve Brothers. Bonded and free stores that operated under the colonial tariff system before Federation in 1901 were located close to the docks where most inter-colonial and international goods were landed in Victoria. This type of store is a reminder of the historic mercantile importance of the western part of the Capital City Zone; and

Aesthetically the red brick wing is a good example of the Queen Anne revival style as applied to a small scale store, in a style that would dominate local architecture after the turn of the century.

Blessed Sacrament Fathers Monastery, St Francis, 326 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1063

What is significant?

Built at the rear of the old St Francis presbytery in place of the Catholic Free Press Building, this was the new brick and concrete St. Francis Monastery of the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, sited next to the north extension of St. Francis's Church. It was built by General Construction Co Ltd. to the design of architect O H Jorgensen and steelwork was designed and supplied by Johns & Waygood Ltd. The foundation stone of the monastery was laid in 1937. The firm Schreiber & Jorgenson had previously designed the highly significant Xavier chapel building in Kew.

This five storey brick monastery had 40 rooms, a frontage of 110ft. to Lonsdale Street and a depth through to Little Lonsdale Street. Ground level held a series of parlours, a visitor's public hall and smoke room, guests dining, porter's office, chambers, a refectory, stairway and kitchen. This level communicated with the church on the west and faced the north garden with a colonnade along its north side lined with pressed cement columns. Another courtyard garden was on the south adjoining the distinctive arcaded porch entry and the Monstrance wing.

The basement had bulk and wine stores and a boiler room. The first floor had the Superior's chamber and office, a chapter room, guest's chambers with en-suite, and the library. On the second floor were the treasurer's chamber, general chamber groups, all with en-suite bathroom, recreation area, and scholastic study area. A hatchway led to the flat roof. The building was well appointed and planned, with a direct connection to St Francis. Feature parquetry flooring was used inside, with polished ash body timber and jarrah borders. Terrazzo was used at the entry.

The first Australian priests were ordained here in the early 1940s. Other novitiates followed in other states and missions extended from Australia into Asia.

Designed in an Italian Palazzo style the building has a ground level podium built from dark brown bricks with arcaded porches and classically styled Wunderlich Ltd. terracotta aedicules around main windows. The three upper-levels are clad with cream brick with projecting quoining and a deep and enriched pressed cement parapet cornice. Upper-level double-hung sash windows are flat-arched for two floors and segmentally arched on the top floor.

The podium has segmentally arched basement lights, with expressed voussoirs, and multiple string moulds of various depths, all expertly conceived and executed in common and shaped or special Hoffman brickwork. The complex has a north garden surrounded by a high brick garden wall utilising similar materials and ecclesiastical detailing to the main building.

An extensive visually unrelated verandah has been added in steel framing on all upper-levels of the central facade bay to face north sun. Another visually unrelated but light-weight addition has been made to the roof (reversible) behind the parapet. What may be a lift overrun extends out of the top of the penthouse that is set back behind the centre bay parapet of the main west façade. Despite these changes the essence of the building's worth is unchanged, centring on excellent brickwork and detailing of the elevation using a strong elevation treatment in a traditional style.

There is no other Catholic monastery or former monastery in the Capital City Zone for comparison but architecturally it relates to the strong classically styled brick architecture of the City West Telephone Exchange and other government designed inter-war buildings such as the former High Court and Female VD clinic, Little Lonsdale Street.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1937, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Blessed Sacrament Fathers Monastery, St Francis, is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Blessed Sacrament Fathers Monastery, St Francis, is significant: Historically as the first purpose built monastery for the Blessed Sacrament Congregation in Australia and is closely associated with the continuing presence of St. Francis church within the City of Melbourne. In this supporting role to St Francis, it is the only Catholic Monastery in the City; and

Aesthetically, for the strong elevation treatment and excellent use of brick cladding, pressed cement and terracotta mouldings distinguishes the building from any other in the Capital City Zone.

Michaelis Hallenstein & Co building, 439-445 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1064

What is significant?

The four storey warehouse at 439-445 Lonsdale Street, was constructed by Shillabeer & Sons for Michaelis Hallenstein & Co to the design of the Tompkins Brothers in 1923-1924 at an estimated cost of £33,000.

Started at Footscray in 1864 by Isaac Hallenstein, Michaelis Hallenstein & Co grew to operate tanneries in Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and Dunedin: the business handled leather, grindery, saddlery, canvas, sports goods and other lines as created by their subsidiary factories.

The building is of note for its unusual façade, as an example of the Neo- Baroque mode which continued in Melbourne after the Edwardian Baroque examples of prior to WWI. These were largely from designs by the Tompkins Brothers such as the Commercial Travellers Association buildings in Flinders Street. The building façade adopts a vertical tripartite Palazzo arrangement: the heavy ground floor is rusticated and springs from a fine rock face bluestone plinth with an ox-bow awning above the principal entry. The intermediate floors are divided into vertical window strips (metal-framed) by abstracted Ionic order columns, with spandrels containing understated decorative panels. The composition is surmounted by a prominent dentilated classical cornice and balustraded parapet above. The entry has original lacquered joinery (inner and outer door suites), a grand white marble stair and polished marble wall or dado linings.

At the rear is a more austere red brick parapeted warehouse wing, abutting a lane, which once connected with an earlier company building at the rear (since demolished). The building is in good and near original condition externally with some minor changes only to openings at ground level.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1924, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Michaelis Hallenstein & Co building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Michaelis Hallenstein & Co building at 439-445 Lonsdale Street is significant: Aesthetically, as a good and distinctive example of the Neo-Baroque style within the Capital City Zone showing the transition in its application by the eminent Tompkins Brothers from the ornate Edwardian-Baroque revival manner to this Modernistic form. The building shows a later classical revival phase of the extensive work of the Tompkins brothers, the best known commercial designers in Melbourne of the Edwardian-era and inter-war periods; and

Historically, for its close association with the nationally prominent tannery firm of Michaelis Hallenstein & Co.

Watson's warehouse, later 3LO and 3AR studios, 3AW Radio Theatre, and Kelvin Club, 14-30 Melbourne Place, Melbourne 3000, HO1065

What is significant?

The Watson's warehouse was constructed in 1871 for John Boyd (JB) Watson (1828-1889), a nationally prominent mining magnate and investor, by builder, Edward Delbridge. The designer is thought to be Thomas Watts. When this building was constructed Watson had become one of the Colony's richest men from his gold enterprises in Bendigo, investing in property across Victoria and New South Wales.

The first occupants of the two-storey premises in Melbourne Place were Stanford & Co, printers, followed by others in the trade, such as H.W. Mills & Co. and F.T. Wimble & Co., *The Worker* newspaper; also N.S. Morrey Pty. Ltd., blouse & costume manufacturers, were there in the early 1920s.

In the late 1920s the building was occupied by the Broadcasting Company of Australia, as Australia's first networked 'A-class' radio station 3LO (operating from 1924). The upstairs floor was the studios of radio 3LO, originally designed in 1927 for the days when music was broadcast live to an audience. In 1928, the company was acquired by the Sydney-based Australian Broadcasting Company and, after an Act of Parliament, by the Australian Government. The Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) continued there from July 1932 as radio stations 3LO and 3AR until Broadcast House was erected in Lonsdale Street, 1941.

Robert Menzies used these studios to declare war against Germany in 1939. Images of the upper level interior, in its broadcast studio days, show exposed roof trusses.

By the mid 1940s, the upper level had become the 3AW Broadcasting Company's Radio Theatre or Studio One. Architect Charles N Hollinshed acted for 3AW Broadcasting Company Pty Ltd. for the 1944 planned alterations.

From 1946 the Kelvin Club rented the ground floor of 3AW and commissioned changes designed by Bernard (later Sir Bernard) Evans. The club was formed in 1927 as a private member's club with membership drawn from the academic, corporate, legal, medical, arts, public service and private business communities. The Kelvin Club was named in honour of Lord Kelvin, the Scottish physicist.

Around 1950, the Club purchased the building freehold for £25,000, continuing in the ground floor with 3AW as its tenant upstairs. In 1956, 3AW moved out, and after extensive alterations, the Kelvin Club occupied the whole building.

This is a two storey face brick row of warehouses or workshops, with a deep cemented cornice, terminated by bracketed blocks, and a brick string course at the first floor level. Window openings are segmentally arched on both levels with deep voussoirs and keystones and doorways have flat arch heads, all with stop-chamfered reveals achieved with squint bricks. Quarry faced bluestone with tooled margins is used for the wall plinths.

The southernmost façade bay has been clad with smooth, deeply rusticated render, with a deep ogee-profile cornice at the first floor level, and an impost mould that rests on stylised near flat modillions or banners on each side of the double entry doors. This created a grander entry in a Modern Georgian style typical of the 1920s, indicating that the façade changes were made for the new radio station use of that period.

Some windows at ground floor level have been enlarged and the façade painted, presumably over coloured brickwork.

The building is uncommon in the Capital City Zone because of the use of face brick (see more typically rendered and stone finished warehouses of the early Victorian-era), the length of the building and the back lane siting.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates 1873-1874, c1927, 1944-6 and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Watson's warehouse is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Watson's warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically, as a representative and relatively early example of a brick warehouse building (probably dichrome) which is also distinguished today by its façade length and uncommon (but appropriate for workshops) back lane siting; and

Historically, for its association with the millionaire investor JB Watson, and later the beginnings of both public and commercial radio in Australia which is exhibited on the

façade as a single bay of the Modern Georgian style. The former warehouse is also of interest as an inner city 'gentlemen's club', the Kelvin Club, since the 1940s.

Yorkshire House, 20-26 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1066

What is significant?

The former Yorkshire Insurance Company Building was constructed in 1922-1923 as a ten storey office development at an estimated cost of £564002. It was designed by the noted local architectural firm of HW & FB Tompkins for the Yorkshire Insurance Company who had occupied an earlier building on the same site by 1912.

The Yorkshire Insurance Company Building grew with Adelaide, Brisbane, Perth, and Sydney branches created from the early 1900s and the new Melbourne building as its first purpose-built office in Australia. The construction of the Melbourne building is indicative of the growth of financial institutions in Melbourne in the inter-war period, then as the financial capital of Australia.

The Tompkins Brothers continued to work in a related Neo- Baroque mode after WWI, also employing a modern classical revival based on a Commercial Palazzo form. The Yorkshire Insurance Company Building (1922) is an example of the firm's work in this style. The firm is perhaps the most prominent among Central Business District designers in the 20th century.

The building adopts an elegant commercial palazzo form characterised by the tripartite division of the façade into base, intermediate floors and attic level. The heavy, rusticated base is finished in granite and distinguished by bold consoles to sculptural awnings above the principal windows. The intermediate floors are understated with ornamentation limited to rustication and decorative sills. The composition is completed by a prominent classical cornice. The firm's many commissions from this period include the Herald and Weekly Times Building (1921) and the London Stores building on the corner of Bourke and Elizabeth Streets (1921), both of which are executed in a similar style to the Yorkshire Insurance Company Building. During the mid to late 1930s, along with many other designers, the Tompkins discarded the historical styles in favour of a more Modernistic form of expression.

Window joinery throughout the building has been altered and an unsympathetic awning constructed at ground level but the building is otherwise in good and near original condition.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1922-1923, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Yorkshire House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Yorkshire House is significant:

Aesthetically, as a good example of an understated Commercial Palazzo style by the distinguished and prolific architectural firm of HW & FB Tompkins as applied to a major City office building; and

Historically, as indicative of the growth of financial institutions including life insurance companies in Melbourne during the Edwardian and inter-war periods, Melbourne then being the financial capital of Australia.

Provident Life Building, 37-41 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1067

What is significant?

The former Provident Life Building was designed in 1937 by architects AS & RA Eggleston as part of the ongoing boom in insurance architecture within Victoria from the Edwardian-era into the inter-war period; Melbourne was then the financial capital of Australia.

Built on the north-western corner of Queen Street and Flinders Lane, this limit-height company headquarters building for the Provident Life Assurance Co. consists of twelve storeys and a basement. Bounded by streets on three of its four sides, much was made of the opportunity for natural lighting in the building's planning. All services such as lifts stairs, ducts and lavatories were placed on the attached north wall thus dispensing with light courts and maximising the lettable floor area. The structural beams were designed with particular care to permit the future installation of air conditioning ducts without interfering with the ceiling levels.

The Provident Life Building attracted the attention of architectural critic and award winning designer, Robin Boyd in his 'Victorian Modern' (1947) as an example of the turning point from the all-pervading commercial classical revival towards functionalism (here showing Frank Lloyd Wright's influence as well). Noting with approval the plain spandrels, regular and continuous window strips, free internal planning and bright and colourful interior, Boyd queried the need for the 'weighty pi-sign' cornice applied to the otherwise strictly functional elevation; and it was clad with stone. Boyd also commented on the glass entrance screen which gave a sense of transparency with the building name on the wall slipping through from inside to out. Boyd noted that, along with Barnetts Building and McPhersons in Collins Street, the Provident Life Building was one of the few City commercial buildings constructed during the 1930s to employ the visual and functional principles of European modernism.

Although it still possessed the implied classical podium (high ground level, separately expressed), the austerity and functional nature of the façade above resembled on the one hand, the later column and spandrel-born elevations of the precast facades of the 1960s and, on the other, the reversion to massive pseudo-structural expression used in the late 1960s, early 1970s commercial designs (i.e. MMBW Building). It was neither a revival or in the expressive Moderne style as seen at Alkira House, Queen Street. Instead, it foreshadowed (particularly the south face) the later preoccupation with regular fenestration based on the structural grid and the shunning of all classical trappings such as implied cornices (the corner piers bypass the almost floating 'cornice' and hence do not support it), architraves and punched fenestration. Another adventurous attribute was the full-height glazed screen set inside the otherwise monumental ground floor lobby which apparently achieved near invisibility, forsaking the heavy surrounds typical of the formal ground floor entrances created in the period.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1936-1937, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Provident Life Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Provident Life Building is significant:

Aesthetically, for its recognition as one of the few influential pre-war proto-Modern commercial multi-storey designs in Melbourne's Capital City Zone. The Provident Life Building was one of a small number of commercial buildings in the Capital City Zone constructed during the 1930s to employ the visual and functional principles of European modernism which in turn reflects the general trend towards emphasised verticality in a number of city buildings in the 1930s, notably HW and FB Tompkins' Myer Emporium and Marcus Barlow's Manchester Unity and Century Buildings. While the polished granite facing and abstracted neo-classical podium of the former Provident Life Building creates a formal elevation to Queen Street, the Flinders Lane elevation is articulated by a simple repetitive rhythm of piers and spandrel panels more typical of 1960s high rise construction. Open planning, the evident flow of interior to exterior space achieved through the use of a large glass entrance screen placed midway across the entry, and the provision of space for future air conditioning are further significant features of the building; and

Historically, as evocative of the boom period of insurance buildings in the Capital City Zone during a time when Melbourne was the financial capital of Australia.

Royal Automobile Club of Victoria (R.A.C.V.) Building, former, 111-129 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1068

What is significant?

The RACV Club was erected in 1959-61 for use by members of the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria. It was constructed by Lewis Construction Co to designs by Bates Smart McCutcheon.

Believed to be the first building in Melbourne to employ the fast track or staged approach to design and construction, the massive structure was completed in 1961 and incorporated both an office and a club building each serviced by separate entries and lifts to meet the strict licensing requirements. The club offered accommodation, bars, billiard rooms, lounges and dining facilities for members all accessible directly from the basement car park or via a well-appointed lobby. Then regarded as a quiet tree-lined street, the architects provided a first floor terrace to overlook the sylvan scene in Queen Street; balconies like this being now an uncommon element in the Capital City Zone. The terrace would be off the dining and lounge areas and 'a beautiful summer rendezvous before lunch or for after dinner coffee'. Although a romantic concept that may not have lived up to its promise, the internal courtyard and flexible spaces of the lounge and dining areas, were thought to be new to Melbourne at the time. The building was claimed as setting a new accommodation standard for Melbourne.

Although the building was not unduly tall by local standards (215m), the façade width and floor plan were exceptionally large and provided for a typical floor area of almost 20,000m² where half that figure was regarded as a good sized area for City office use. The club comprises a three storey transparent cantilevering podium, clad in elegant aluminium framed glass, and polished black granite and with its own (added) canopy, surmounted by a fifteen storey manganese brick clad tower free-standing on three

sides. The tower is distinguished by a rigidly regular arrangement of formerly brass-framed windows (now white painted reveals) repeated at each floor level that echoes the adjoining Perpetual Trustees Building 100-104 Queen Street.

This elevated masonry clad block rests on stilts above the podium as discrete and well formulated massing, the stilts or columns being visible as they pass through the podium on the south side. Not easily seen from ground level, the roof over the tower block has a butterfly form that floats above the façade which, combined with the glazed podium, gives the lightness and clarity of purpose sought by Modernist designers.

The first floor level has an undercroft that houses shops and allows the two exposed entry stairs to float from ground to first floor. River stones fill the paving strip between footpath asphalt and shopfront entry. On the south side a hit and miss upper-level brick screen masks services, as a textured foil to the other all-glass cladding. The basement was equipped with a car lift and the entry foyer is multi-level. Externally, the building survives largely in its original form.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1959-1961, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The R.A.C.V. Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The R.A.C.V. Building is significant:

Aesthetically and historically, as a substantial and well-preserved example of elegantly massed post-war Modern architecture and an early example of fast-track design and construction within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, for its close link with the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria as custom-built premises for new much expanded club functions, some of which like the first level terrace, being uncommon in the Capital City Zone as is the building type (private club) for that period. The Royal Automobile Club of Victoria was then the State's premier road lobbyist and a major tourism promoter: many of its members were highly influential within Victoria society.

Australasian Catholic Assurance (ACA) Building, 118-126 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1069

What is significant?

Penfold House and the Gordon & Gotch buildings were replaced by a new Australasian Catholic Assurance Company building, designed in 1934-35 by the Sydney architects and engineers Hennessy & Hennessy and Co. and R Morton Taylor of Melbourne, architects in association. Melbourne builders, Lewis Construction Company Pty. Ltd. were the contractors and the building completed by early 1936.

No later than the cement rendered Myer Bourke Street facade, the ACA Building could at least boast a 'Benedict Stone' facade, a cladding block which could be produced in a variety of colours, and in a colour similar to the terra-cotta faience of G.J. Coles Bourke Street store (1928-), the forerunner of the modern Commercial Gothic or Jazz Moderne

style in Melbourne city. Although examples of the style used in the ACA Building are earlier, such as the former Coles Building or Marcus Barlow's Manchester Unity Building (1932), the ACA building is faced with a different material and is detailed in a more ornate manner. The Roman Catholic Diocese of Brisbane appears to have acquired the Australian rights for the appropriately named 'Benedict Stone' and it was henceforth manufactured in Brisbane, where it was used for a number of significant buildings across Australia.

The ribbed and fluted facade rises through eleven levels from ground level and basement, either side of a central stepped tower, and is articulated by means of a number of stages and bays. The lower three storeys provide a podium above which rise a number of facade bays separated by moulded pilasters, with a dramatic increase in vertical emphasis. The façade steps back at the ninth storey and again at the eleventh storey, echoing the dramatic setbacks to upper storeys which characterise the stepped Manhattan's skyscraper profiles of the 1920s. All elements of the facade are detailed with commercial Gothic or Jazz Moderne incised or moulded ornament which reflects the influence of Gothic architecture, illustrating one of the most vital fonts of inspiration for the eclectic Jazz mode and the primary influence upon Jazz Moderne skyscraper design in America and elsewhere.

Window frames and spandrels are of bronze, incorporating multi-paned glazing and grilles, and the building's name is repeated in metal lettering, set as in a music score on a three line bar. Jazz Moderne to Queen Street but, glimpsed from Little Collins Street, the more contemporary Streamlined Moderne style occupies the building's rear façade as a series of horizontal window strips with rounded spandrel-ends. The Brooks Robinson shopfronts and lift lobby detailing, lighting, black marble and chrome are all vital accessories to the Moderne style and are all near original and significant.

The ACA building relates, across Queen Street, to the similarly styled and finished National Trustees Executors and Agency Co. Building also to the more recent but also significant Scottish Amicable Building, adjoining, because of the similar vertical fenestration.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1935-1936, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Australian Catholic Assurance Building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone and Victoria.

Why is it significant?

The Australasian Catholic Assurance Co Ltd (ACA) Building is significant Aesthetically, as a large, very fine and substantially externally intact example of the Gothic-influenced Jazz Moderne styled skyscraper mode. Although later than other important examples such as the former G J Coles Building, Bourke Street or the Manchester Unity Building the ACA Building is notable for its distinctive detailing, its dramatic stepped form and its facade of rose pink Benedict Stone, a concrete product developed in the 1920s in competition to terracotta faience; and

Historically, as a key part of the inter-war boom, when finance institutions (banks and insurance companies) built headquarters and branch offices in the Capital City Zone when Melbourne was the financial capital of Australia. The use of Benedict Stone in the ACA Building is also illustrative of the strong and unusual association between the

Catholic Church, this new concrete product and the design firm of Hennessy & Hennessy.

Clarke's Shops & Dwellings, 203-205 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1070

What is significant?

Williams John Turner (Big) Clarke, the colony's most prominent pastoralist and landowner, commissioned architects Browne & Howitz to design this pair of shops and dwellings in 1869, a few years before his death. The builder was Charles Brown. Long term occupiers were the saddlery supplier, Thomas Eyton, and a variety of other small business, including drapers, dressmakers, a poultry exchange and a patent medicine vendor.

This parapeted two-storey pair of rendered shops and dwellings is designed in the Italian Renaissance revival style for a corner site with a splayed corner entry. The two street facades are trabeated, with stone pilasters, string and cornice moulds, dentils, and the upper-level double-hung sash windows have moulded cement architraves and bracketed and moulded sills. The timber-framed display windows appear to be of an early design and have stone plinths. Chimneys have moulded cement cornices with at least one terracotta chimney pot and the rear walls are typically of face brick. Stone-bordered basement lights or vents are set into the pavement. The rear fence is of early bricks and basalt but has been changed with openings infilled. The designer, George Browne, is responsible for a number of significant structures, many linked with Clarke.

One display window (205) and two doors (203, 205) have been replaced; the stone has been painted; and changes have been made to the single storey rear wing and fence. A canopy has been added to 205. Many intrusive services have been added to the rear upper-level.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1869-1870, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Clarke's Shops & Dwellings are significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

Clarke's Victorian-era shops & dwellings are significant: Historically, as a well preserved example of their type within the Capital City Zone context, as distinguished by the survival of the shopfronts and stonework; they are also linked with the highly significant WJT Clarke; and

Aesthetically, as a good and early example of trabeated Italian renaissance style applied to a medium sized Victorian-era commercial building in the Capital City Zone and designed by a locally prominent architect of the era, George Browne.

Grant's factory-warehouse, 217-219 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1071

What is significant?

This three storey factory-warehouse was constructed by James SG Wright in 1904 for the estate of well known Melbourne solicitor Alexander Grant to the design of architects, Gibbs & Finlay. Grant died just before the application was lodged with his son Frederick E Grant, also a solicitor, taking over the project. The first occupant was Paul C Grosser, a lithographic printer, who leased the brick factory at £135 per annum. Gibbs & Finlay also designed the notable Druid House, Swanston Street, and neo-Grec styled National Bank of Australasia Bank branches in the 1920s.

The building is an unusual example of the relatively small catalogue of works ornamented with Art Nouveau detailing within Melbourne's Central Business District. The building also recalls the local tall-arched American Romanesque style buildings such as, the Ball and & Welch building, (1906-) by the Tompkins brothers.

Below a cemented cornice at the top of the façade, semicircular cemented and ornamented arcading is carried on giant order red brick piers, with Romanesque cushion capitals and Art Nouveau influenced whip-lash motifs in the arcade spandrels. Below the first floor string mould are tiled panels and cemented tendril devices while spandrel panels at the first floor and at the arches are decorated with floral stalks and undulating wave motifs. Above a pronounced cornice, a profusion of leaves, buds and other plant motifs, abstracted from the natural world feature within a large scrolled parapet. This building is distinguished from similar designs by the extent and vigour of its ornament. The building is an uncommon and distinctive example of Art Nouveau ornament within Melbourne's Central Business District.

The rear lane elevation is well-preserved in a tall-arched red brick form with catheads above each arch but the building has been modified at ground floor level (new shopfronts) although stone pedestals survive either side of the central entry. These support the giant red brick piers of the façade above, with their carved dado mouldings, panelling and quarry faced plinths with tooled margins. The upper storeys are largely intact to their original state.

The Traegerwellblech corrugated iron vaulted fire-proof roofing to the ground level main chamber is of special interest. Developed in Melbourne from the 1880s, this form of construction is now rare in the Central Business District.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1904, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Grant's warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Grant's warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically, as an unusually ornate well-preserved example of the noted American Romanesque revival warehouse style and one of the relatively small body of Art Nouveau ornamented architecture within Melbourne's Central Business District; and

Grant's warehouse is of historical interest for possessing a rare if late example of the Traegerwellblech corrugated iron vaulted fire-proofing.

West Bourke Club Hotel, 316-322 Queen Street, Melbourne 3000, HO985

What is significant?

The former West Bourke Club Hotel was built to the design of eminent architect, George R Johnson, for Port Phillip pioneer, George Evans, in 1876 by the Fitzroy builder, James Greenlaw. Built as two-storeys it received another matching level and added facade bay on the east end late in the 1920s.

Designed in the Italian Renaissance Revival style the former hotel has a highly detailed, rendered classical facade divided into bays by Corinthian order pilasters rising, storey by storey, through the full height of the building. Ground level vermiculated panels to the pilasters (Gibbs surrounds) and gabled pediments to entrances lend richness to the façade. A distinctive mannerist window treatment with a bracketed awning motif is used throughout the upper floors. The richness or detail is consistent with Johnson's work and resembles in part the windows details of the contemporary Hotham town hall.

The original cornice is visible at the third floor level while the sympathetically added top level has been scaled with a lesser floor to floor height, as a typical classical attic level.

Built in the 1870s, the hotel is evocative of the growth of the richly cemented Italian style in the City at the start of a major building boom that would last until the late 1880s. The ground level has been recently reinstated and is remarkably intact compared to other City Victorian-era hotels. The former hotel is a good corner element at the commencement of a significant Victorian-era government building precinct, extending to the south-west.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include 19th century external fabric, consisting of external walls and finishes, parapeted form, mouldings, fenestration, pilistrade, along with any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced and including the 1920s top level and added bay at the east end.

How is it significant

The former West Bourke Club Hotel at 316-322 Queen Street is significant aesthetically and historically to the City of Melbourne.

Why is it significant

The former West Bourke Club Hotel at 316-322 Queen Street is significant:
Historically:

The former hotel still possesses that characteristic form of mid Victorian-era commercial Melbourne derived from the growing effect of Italian Renaissance revival architecture as applied at first to two-storey buildings at the beginning of two decades of massive growth in Melbourne City. The relative integrity of the façade ground level is high adding historical value to the place as expressive of this era. The historical link with Port Phillip pioneer George Evans is also notable as one of his last major projects in his transition from pastoralist to City developer. Evans was among the first settlers to set foot in what was to be Melbourne town in the 1830s.

The hotel is of added interest historically as the home of the Celtic Club for the past 55 years.

The activities within and around the hotel have been documented over time, allowing a depth of interpretation of the building's history and that of its setting of significant Victorian-era government buildings; and

Aesthetically:

The 1870s ornate classical façade is very detailed for its construction date judged within hotel examples of the 1870s, and earlier, in the Melbourne City and metropolitan context. As the work of the eminent architect, George R Johnson, well known for his town hall designs in a rich Italian Renaissance revival style, the hotel offers breadth to examples of his work. The former hotel and its setting evoke an aesthetic linked with early Victorian-era architecture in the city.

Royal Bank of Australia Ltd, later English Scottish & Australian Bank Ltd., 42-44 Russell Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1072

What is significant?

Richmond builder, Clements Langford constructed this 'new banking premises' for the Royal Bank of Victoria at an estimated cost of £14,000 from 1923. This project involved retention of the existing Russell Street ground floor banking chamber (to the extent of 5 window bays from Russell Street) to allow banking business to carry on throughout the construction phase and the addition of a separate bay on the east end of the site, with three added upper levels over all. The architects were the Tomkins Brothers who had been responsible for many significant commercial buildings in the Capital City Zone. 'The Argus' noted the construction of 'these modern premises' in 1923.

Starting in Australia in 1840, the Royal Bank of Australia's re-emergence in the mid 19th century culminated in major growth during the Edwardian-era. This local bank however was not to last, with a takeover by the English, Scottish and Australian Charter Bank (ES&A) in 1927, soon after the construction of this branch. The ES&A had also acquired the London Bank of Australia Ltd. and the Commercial Bank of Tasmania Ltd. 1921. A merger with the Australian and New Zealand Bank Ltd. in 1969 created the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd.

The Russell Street Royal Bank branch was built in a modern Italian Palazzo form with arched ground level fenestration and deeply rusticated stone-like render on the podium; a giant Ionic order pilistrade on the intermediate part of the façade; and an attic level set below the main cornice, with balustraded parapet. The upper level walls were finely ruled as stone and moulded architraves applied around the steel-framed windows, each separated by a spandrel panel. Fine axed Harcourt granite formed the plinth to the ground floor and stout panelled door pairs (doors at 105mm thick) were fitted to the entry points in Russell Street (2) and Flinders Lane (1) while the banking chamber walls were also panelled. A cart dock or loading bay was located at the east end of the ground level. Terrazzo with a key-pattern border was used at the side entry and on the walls of stairwells, with granite steps to doorways.

The exterior has been changed in detail only, at ground level (two new aluminium glazed doors), with unrelated signs applied at the upper level. The building is on the opposite corner to the significant American Romanesque revival style warehouse at 145 Flinders Lane.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1923-1924, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Royal Bank of Australia is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Royal Bank of Australia is significant:

Historically as the only surviving purpose-built bank erected in the Capital City Zone for one of the colony's own early banking companies. It subsequently served as a banking chamber, within what was then the financial centre of Victoria, for a long period to follow; and

Architecturally, as a well-preserved and good example of the Tomkins Brothers classical revival stylistic phase as applied to the incorporation of an existing building into a major new project. The conservatism of the design also catered for the needs of a company reliant on a traditional architectural image.

**Union Hotel, later Tattersalls Hotel, 288-294 Russell Street,
Melbourne 3000, HO1073**

What is significant?

This two-storey corner hotel was built by Lawson & Richards for Mrs Mary Quirk, wife of James Quirk Esq, to the design of architects Hennessy & Lalor who had called tenders in 1872 for the erection of hotel and 2 shops, at the Russell & Little Lonsdale Streets corner. This had been the site of hotels since the 1850s.

Quirk's new hotel had a bar, cellar and 9 rooms; it was also one of three Union Hotels in the City. Occupiers of the shop attached on the north included a tailor, bootmaker, and more recently the successful Levingstons Poster Advertising Company. James Quirk was prominent in Port Phillip society, as club and investment company member, and an early land holder in the City. Mary Quirk continued her husband's role as a property investor until her death in 1883.

The hotel building served as offices in later years.

This two-storey rendered and face brick hotel is in the Italian Renaissance Revival style with applied Ionic order trabeation over arched fenestration. The building has the traditional splayed corner former bar entry, double-hung sash window openings, moulded architraves, impost moulds and cornices at first and parapet levels, and a moulded cement chimney is visible above the parapet. The east wall facing the lane is plain and of face brick (painted since), with three courses of quarry-faced basalt as a plinth.

Openings have been closed-in on the east lane elevation and a two-storey addition made to the north-east corner of the building. Segmental arched openings have been added at the bar and the small shop in Little Lonsdale Street while an arched window opening and wall panel between the pilasters has been removed to create a lobby entrance for office use; another window has its sill dropped to plinth level. Three aluminium shopfronts have been introduced on the Russell Street façade, the corner

bar entry changed and the remaining bar window sill facing Russell Street dropped to plinth level. The hotel relates to the 3 storey Victorian-era pair on the north.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1873-1873, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Union Hotel is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Union Hotel is significant:

Historically and socially for its extended use as a public gathering place on a hotel site that goes back to pre gold-rush times. It is associated with the James Quirk family, as locally prominent investors of the time; and

Aesthetically, as an early combination of trabeation applied to an arcuated Italian Renaissance Revival facade which retains only a fair integrity at ground level and excellent upper-level integrity to its creation date.

Sir Charles Hotham Hotel, 2-8 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1074

What is significant?

From 1855 the Charles Hotham Hotel, in different forms, has graced this corner. With increasing room numbers over the latter part of the 19th Century. The new Sir Charles Hotham Hotel was built during the State's economic recovery after the 1890s depression. It remains the largest hotel built in that period within the Central Business District. Expanding to a frontage of some 132 feet down Flinders Street, the Charles Hotham was erected to the design of the prolific William Pitt by builder, Clements Langford, for the owner, Jane Hall, as 'a hotel and two shops' in 1912-1913.

When erected the hotel was described as follows in the daily press:

'...newly erected and one of the largest in this part of the City..' Includes cellar, ground floor with large public bar, private bar, billiard room, four bar parlours and offices; three storeys and open flat on roof; first floor has large dining room, and services, drawing room, reading and smoking rooms, nine bedrooms with linen press, bathrooms and lavatory accommodation; second floor has private sitting and dining rooms, bedrooms servants bedrooms and facilities; third floor has 14 bedrooms, servants dining room, modern kitchen; cellar one of the largest and best in Melbourne; passenger and goods lifts, electric lighting. '

The architect, William Pitt, was well known in the Colonies for hotel and theatre design. In 1900, Pitt entered a partnership with Albion H Walkley which appears to have endured until Pitt's death c1918, but with each partner taking separate commissions such as this one. The design for the Sir Charles Hotham Hotel dates from the closing years of Pitt's association with Walkley and the building application was made in Pitt's name only.

The composition of the Sir Charles Hotham Hotel centres upon a lofty corner entry element with three storey bay window rising to a prominent belvedere. Along each of the ground floor facades, large arched windows with radial rustication denote the hotel sections of the building while simpler recessed entries are used for the shop fronts along Flinders street. The shops are separated from the hotel by a gated carriageway to a yard at the rear.

Pitt's street elevations are arranged as a series of alternating vertical piers, fenestration strips and tall archways, which find a focus at the corner tower. At the first floor level, along the main Spencer Street elevation, the tower is replicated (in part) within each fenestration bay as oversize window bays protruding over the street. Above the parapet is a terra-cotta tiled mansard roof, the tiles being a sign of the times, replacing the slate of Pitt's favoured late Victorian-era mansard roof forms.

As if the archways of a medieval city gateway, the giant ground level openings span from pier to pier, balancing the minor oriels and window strips above at each keystone. Within each arch a central doorway, with a Queen Anne style scrolled pediment, provides an opening through the dado-like moulding (taken through at each arch centre-line) and rough stone plinth. Now obscured by various shades of paint, the juxta-positioning of these rugged natural finishes concurs with the vigour of the design itself. Arts and Crafts dado tiling and quarry floor tiling of entry hallways add to this character, along with remnant polished timber stair joinery.

Of the many notable suburban Edwardian Freestyle or Edwardian Baroque hotels and commercial buildings which utilize the corner tower motif, this is not the earliest, but perhaps the largest example. Perhaps because of the importance of the hotel, and hence the excellence and solidity of its ground level design, the distinctive treatment at this level has survived, relatively unchanged, as a contrast to the many altered and initially more simple ground-levels of suburban examples. English examples include Townsend's 1896 design for the Whitechapel Art Gallery, the cement detailing (gum nuts) of this building deriving from similar Arts and Crafts inspiration.

Sir Charles Hotham Hotel acts as a corner pivot to an important Edwardian and late Victorian-era commercial streetscape in Flinders and Spencer Streets, including a number of former and existing hotels, a former bank and one former coffee tavern. The Victorian Railways administrative building on the opposite side of Spencer street gives focus to the positioning of these buildings beside a major transport hub, first by water and then by rail.

The stone and brickwork have been painted, intrusive signs added, and minor alterations made to openings.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1913, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Sir Charles Hotham Hotel is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Sir Charles Hotham Hotel is significant:

Aesthetically, as a large, well preserved and successful corner hotel design in the Edwardian Freestyle, by the important architect, William Pitt, and is a major part of a

notable Edwardian and late Victorian-era commercial streetscape in both Flinders and Spencer Streets, consisting mainly of hotels; and

Historically, for its location with other Edwardian-era and late Victorian-era hotels near the wharves and railway that served them, underscoring the major means of travel at that time. The new Sir Charles Hotham Hotel was built during the State's economic recovery after the Great Depression of the 1890s and remains the largest Edwardian-era hotel built within the Central Business District.

McCaughan's Coffee Palace, later Great Southern Private Hotel, 10-22 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1075

What is significant?

This was originally a coffee place, built in the mould of the nearby Federal Coffee Palace (demolished) and close to a railway terminus. Temperance hotels or coffee palaces were seen as a distinctive Melbourne phenomenon and lauded by the daily press for the civility they brought to the City.

Patrick McCaughan of the Rialto commissioned his Rialto architect, William Pitt, in partnership with the adjoining Melbourne Wool Exchange designer, Charles D'Ebro, to prepare a scheme for the proposed palace and at least two shops. William Hearnden, from Princes Hill, was the contractor.

With the exception of the giant gabled pediment set above the parapet and the Queen Anne details, the three-bay four-storey rendered symmetrical façade of the building presents as a mainstream Italian Renaissance revival street elevation with regular window placement, moulded architraves, dentilated cornice, giant-order trabeation with Queen Anne style scrolls as capitals, and rustication to pilaster bases. The more contemporary Queen Anne style is again expressed by the broken pediment at first floor level, cement scrolls and ox-bow cement mouldings over windows.

Although conservatively classical below the facade's cornice level, D'Ebro's influence can be seen in the massive central gabled pediment (originally with its overblown antefix on the apex). Similar facade compositions, with three bays and a gabled central pediment may be seen on Angus & Robertson's Building, Elizabeth Street, and George & George's in Collins Street: both are D'Ebro designs. Pitt had designed Melbourne's first coffee palace in Bourke Street in 1879, followed by his collaboration with Ellerker & Kilburn to design the five hundred room Federal Coffee Palace in Collins Street. His design for the adjoining Edwardian-era Sir Charles Hotham Hotel dates from another phase of Pitt's career.

The former coffee palace is integral in scale, general ornament and use to the later Charles Hotham Hotel and is part of a transport oriented building group with the Markillie's Hotel, and Victorian Railways offices nearby, and the Batman's Hill Hotel to the north.

The pediment detailing has been changed; double-hung sash windows reglazed; signs attached, the ground-level altered, and a street canopy added.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1890-1891, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

McCaughan's Coffee Palace is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

McCaughan's Coffee Palace is significant:

Aesthetically, as an austere but prominent Queen Anne revival façade design by the important architects, Charles D'Ebro and William Pitt, with D'Ebro's involvement characterised by the massive central gabled pediment and facade details; and

Historically, as expressive of the rise of the railway coffee palace at most busy termini. The coffee palace was a distinctively Melbourne phenomenon that was looked upon by Victorian-era society as an indication of the City's civilisation. This is Melbourne's second oldest purpose-built coffee palace that faces the railway lines which gave them custom. Other key examples, such as the grand Federal Coffee Palace, have been demolished.

Batman's Hill Hotel, 66-70 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1076

What is significant?

The first Batman's Hotel operated here in the 1860s to be replaced by the Batman's Hill Hotel in the 1870s. Inter-war renovation and additions to the Victorian-era three-storey brick Batman's Hill Hotel were constructed 1926-8 at an estimated cost of £11,000 by Ivanhoe builder, George Andrew. The client was Mrs A A Riley and the design from architects and engineers Greenwood Bradley & Allen working in association with hotel specialist architects, Sydney Smith & Ogg. The decision to add to the old hotel rather than redevelop the site was based on its remarkable sound condition. Apart from the façade design every effort was made to complement the existing building during the project.

The design had a sober Greek Revival façade designed solely by Greenwood Bradley & Allen. Additions were made at the rear of the hotel on all existing levels and the two added floors and roof level on the front existing wing followed the existing T-Shape plan which allowed for light courts on both sides of bedrooms either side of a central passage. Because the partitions were brick throughout, the existing Baltic pine floors were able to be retained and extended despite regulations requiring fire proof construction between floors.

The cement rendered Batman's Hill Hotel façade is parapeted with a classical cornice and central raised pediment in the Greek Revival manner, complete with acroteria and flagpole (removed). Reeded pilasters rise from the ground level podium to allow for window strips between, with matching timber-framed windows separated by cemented spandrels (windows replaced with similar joinery sections, fine balustrading added since). At the façade centre is a series of balconies, some with cemented balustrading and one with a wrought-iron Regency style balconette at the second floor level. The ground level has changed but when built it was a series of stout panelled timber doors with fine-axed basalt thresholds leading into the dining room, public and saloon bars. Parts of the cast cement colonettes and brick dadoes remain. A metal clad cantilevering awning, with ornamented soffit, was erected over the street and held the hotel's name and some Greek revival ornamentation (replaced in 1973).

The hotel complements the Greek revival detailing of the former State Savings Bank at the Collins Street corner and is one of a series of Victorian, Edwardian-era and inter-war hotels along Spencer and Flinders Streets fed by river and railway traffic.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1926-1928, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Batman's Hill Hotel is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Batman's Hill Hotel is significant:

Historically and socially as a well-preserved long-term hotel use, possessing elements from the Victorian-era to the inter-war period, and has acted as a social gathering place since its inception; and

Aesthetically as a well-preserved and good example of the Greek Revival style as applied to a City hotel building. The hotel complements the Greek Revival detailing of the former bank at the Collins Street corner and is one of a series of Victorian, Edwardian-era and inter-war hotels along Spencer and Flinders Streets, fed by river and railway traffic. .

Hotel Alexander, later Savoy Plaza Hotel, 122-132 Spencer Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1077

What is significant?

C. Alexander was the owner and occupier of a brick and stone 'house' being constructed in 1865-6 at this site. A three storey hotel known as Alexander's Family Hotel remained here into the 1920s when it was changed to the Sunshine Hotel. By 1929 Alexander Hotel Pty. Ltd. owned a brick hotel, of eleven floors on the site, with an annual value of £ 7,500 pounds. Hotel entrepreneur, James Richardson, was a key figure in the company that erected the hotel.

Opened by the Premier of Victoria early in 1928 the Hotel Alexander was immediately the newest, largest and most modern hotel in town with views out over bay shipping. Visiting dignitaries were entertained there as a matter of course. It was deemed the largest hotel in Australia and built to Melbourne's height limit of 132 feet. The contractor was T. Shillito.

Leslie M. Perrott designed the Alexander Hotel, Australia Hotel and the Chevron. The hotel's lobby was described as magnificent, '...entered by a wide flight of stairs from Spencer Street and filled with light through tall windows, it occupied the entire first floor.' 'The Argus' noted later that it was the first hotel in Melbourne to include en-suite bathrooms to rooms when built.

After its sale in 1952 to the rival Federal Hotel Ltd. for £450,000, Hotel Alexander was converted into one of the finest luxury-hotels in the Commonwealth and renamed the Savoy Plaza. Its Rainbow Room and maître d' Albert Argenti became renowned in Melbourne over the next decade, hosting a who's who of international show business including Louis Armstrong, Nat King Cole and Ella Fitzgerald. Some young Australians, such as John Farnham, Rolf Harris and the Seekers, began careers there. Frank

Sinatra, performing at nearby Festival Hall, was a guest, as were Ava Gardner, Fred Astaire, Anthony Perkins and others during the filming of "On the beach".

The hotel as later purchased by Spencer Investments and rebuilt internally as the Savoy Park Plaza Hotel to designs by McIntyre & McIntyre and reopened May 1991. Later owners included Tobar Holdings Pty. Ltd. from 2004 when the name changed again to the Vibe Savoy Hotel.

Designed in the Modern Palazzo style, the Alexander was built from reinforced concrete, the speciality of Leslie M Perrott, with identical facades to Spencer and Little Collins Street. Façade embellishments included a projecting cornice at third floor level which marked the top of the podium, with a matching parapet cornice and balconettes at the second and tenth floors. Podium level windows were more elaborate reflecting the internal use for public function rooms.

The Hotel Alexander compares with other Palazzo style city buildings such as the more ornate and highly significant former AMP Building, 425 Collins Street (1931) but is earlier than most and some observed that the simpler detailing reflected a more Modernist approach to architecture. Its near island site allows full expression of the style in a similar manner to the AMP example, while other Palazzo examples were more typically street facades only.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1928, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Hotel Alexander is significant historically, socially and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Hotel Alexander is significant:

Historically and socially as one of the great Melbourne Hotels of the early 20th Century bringing modernity to City accommodation in a new era of hotel construction. It was located close to the City and country rail termini and reached new building heights for hotel use. The Hotel Alexander was where visiting dignitaries and personalities were housed and entertained as Melbourne's best of the 1920s-1930s. This was the first 20th-century American-style hotel in Victoria, with en-suite bathrooms and a controlled temperature environment. Reborn as the Savoy Plaza the hotel took on a further persona associated with international lifestyles and entertainment post Second War; and

Aesthetically, as an early, well-preserved and good example of the commercial Palazzo style in the city, the simple detailing reflecting a more Modernist approach to architecture. Its near island site allows full expression of the style.

Elms Family Hotel, 267-271 Spring Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1078

What is significant?

This two storey corner hotel was designed by the architect, Harry James, and built by W.B. Harford for Emma Elms in 1924-1925. It replaced an earlier Elms Family Hotel and, before that, Heffernan's Old Governor Bourke Hotel.

This two storey pressed red brick and render hotel is designed after a stylised Old English or Neo-Tudor mode, with twin high cemented gabled parapet to each street façade, flanked by brick bartizans surmounted by cast cement balls on piers. Upper-level windows are configured as T-shaped pairs with a common lintel over a recessed pair of steel-framed casement windows, each with deeply corbelled brick sills. Cast cement victory wreaths have been applied to panels below each window pair and the parapet panels have diamond motifs. The splayed corner rendered panel bears the hotel name in bas-relief with scrolls top and bottom. Remnant leadlight glazing on the Little Lonsdale Street façade includes coloured and clear lozenge and rectangle shapes arranged in an Arts & Crafts manner. Inside the hotel bar, glazed tiled dadoes possess the original character of the hotel.

The hotel design is stylistically similar to some Sydney Smith & Ogg hotel designs of the era, and the integrity is high despite changes to ground level joinery (doors, windows), the openings themselves remain unchanged. Given the high integrity, the hotel has social significance for its public use since the 1920s.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the hotel construction date 1925, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Elms Family Hotel is significant socially, historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

Elms Family Hotel is significant:

Socially and historically for its long use as a public house within the City and its relatively high integrity to that use; and

Aesthetically the hotel design is significant as a well preserved and successful custom design in a prevailing architectural style of the inter-war period.

Cann's Pty. Ltd. building, 135-137 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1079

What is significant?

This originally five-level retail and office building plus basement was constructed in 1919-1920 by the Reinforced Concrete & Monier Pipe Co Pty. Ltd. for drapers Cann's Pty Ltd. to the design of prolific commercial architect, Nahum Barnet. The ground level was a series of showcases and there was a mezzanine floor, with an open light well to the ground level retail floor. Stair and lift shafts were located at the back or west wall,

freeing up the typical floor for subdivision; an extra storey was added during construction.

Two additional storeys were added in 1934, this time to the design of the eminent designer, Marcus Barlow, who created a major and nearby part of Swanston Street to the south with his highly significant Manchester Unity (1932) and Century Buildings (1938), both on the Victorian Heritage Register. His addition for Cann's was in his trademark Jazz Moderne style but nonetheless is sympathetic to the original neo-Baroque character design. Vertical ribs or streamlines on spandrels replace the original cement Baroque motifs, with a zigzag parapet profile, and there is the archetypal flagpole at the corner. Staff luncheon rooms were located in a pent house on the new roof. The additional storeys are indicative of the quick recovery of commercial building in the City after the Great Depression.

Cann's building is a good example of a retail and office development, executed initially in a neo-Baroque mode. The building is rendered and rusticated throughout, being originally finished in a natural cement grey, similar to the existing. The design centres upon a curved corner bay-window element, with some multi-pane glazing, set above the intersection of Swanston and Little Collins Streets with further canted bays or oriels along the Swanston Street facade. Curved spandrels at each corner bay are adorned with decorative rectangular panels in a stylised Baroque fashion. A horizontally undulating cornice with cement scrolls ties the composition together at the original roof line. Original glazing and joinery appears to have survived throughout the upper storeys as does the cast-iron balconette balustrade at first floor level. The west elevation onto the lane is plainly treated.

Barlow specialised in tall thin sometimes corner (Altson's Building) City buildings achieving a deal of publicity for his narrow frontages in the national 'Building' periodical, particularly in the Edwardian-era. He was also a devotee of reinforced concrete construction, as in this building.

Marcus Barlow's adjacent Century Building has been described as his finest Streamlined Moderne example, cementing his reputation as one of Melbourne's most prominent commercial architects of the inter-war period and as one of the leading exponents of Jazz and Streamlined Moderne as seen in Cann's and the Century Buildings.

The ground floor has been altered but the building's upper level is very intact to its 1930s state at the upper levels. Largely concealed roof top additions and a new awning undertaken have been added in the recent past.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the key construction dates 1919-1920, 1934, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Cann's building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Cann's building is significant:

Aesthetically as a retail and office development in a successful fusion of the neo-Baroque and Moderne styles within Melbourne's CBD, as part of a triptych of Marcus Barlow designs along Swanston Street and as part of a highly significant Edwardian-era and inter-war commercial streetscape that extends from the Leviathan Building at

the Bourke Street corner, down Swanston Street to the Nicholas Building at Flinders lane; and

Historically, for the close association over a long period with Cann's Pty Ltd, one of the household names in drapery retailing of the inter-war and immediate post-Second War period when Melbourne City was the retail centre of Victoria. The staged construction of the building is also a testimony to the boost in retail sales in the 1930s after the Great Depression.

Swanston House, Ezywalkin Boot shoe and Slipper Store, 163-165 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1080

What is significant?

Swanston House was constructed by AB Robertson at an estimated cost of £18,000 for the shoe retailer, Ezywalkin Company Pty Ltd, in 1921 to the design of the prolific and important commercial architect, Nahum Barnet. The reinforced concrete building had six upper-levels, ground floor and basement. Each floor was served by a concrete encased lift, entry stair and concrete encased timber escape stair at the rear corner of the building that also provided lavatory access. The ground level had deep retail show cases with a recessed entry to allow after hours shopping via a maximised glass display area. Pavement lights offered daylight to the basement and a cantilever awning gave shelter over the pavement. An internal balcony ran the full length of the ground level as a mezzanine or 'Gallery' leading to superintending office space at the rear that overlooked the retail floor. The roof was flat and accessible. Indicative of the minor boom in retailing at this immediate post First War period were the planned extra two levels that were never built.

including Walter David Cookes established the Ezywalkin Shoe Company Pty Ltd in 1901. The Melbourne factory was established in 1910 and in 1912 the first Ezywalkin boot and shoe store was opened in Melbourne. The Ezywalkin factory was in Clifton Hill and in time there was an extensive network of Ezywalkin shops throughout Australia. The firm continued until Coles entered the footwear business by purchasing Ezywalkin in 1981.

This retail and office development is notable for its boldly modelled rendered concrete façade distinguished by a central projecting oriel bay rising through the intermediate four storeys of the building to a novel arrangement of arches and projecting cornices at the roof line. The ruled cement façade also features unusual floral devices in the form of suspended garlands and the name of the building (Swanston House) in raised lettering midway up. The ground floor has been extensively modified but the building is otherwise in good and largely intact condition including the upper-level timber framed windows.

The Ezywalkin Building is complementary to the significant adjoining Leviathan Building, at the Bourke Street corner, as part of a highly significant inter-war streetscape that extends down Swanston Street to the Nicholas Building at Flinders Lane.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1921-2, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Swanston House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Swanston House is significant:

Aesthetically for its unusual modelled street façade and as a contributory part of a highly significant Edwardian-era and inter-war commercial streetscape that extends from the Leviathan Building, at the Bourke Street corner, down Swanston Street to the Nicholas Building at Flinders Lane; and

Historically, as a household name in retailing in Swanston Street when the Capital City Zone was Victoria's premier retailing centre. The building's creation also has close links to the personal history of noted businessman and rationalist, Walter Cookes.

George Evans shop and residence row, 309-325 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1081

What is significant?

This two-storey shop and dwelling row is on land first purchased by Port Phillip speculators TB Payne, Hugh Glass & JS Brodie, along with their purchase of many other nearby allotments. This corner allotment to Little Lonsdale Street (CA 9/28) sold for a large £270.

In 1847-8 Hugh Glass sold this site to pioneer Port Phillip District pastoralist George Evans who mortgaged the property from 1848 to 1852. Evans then sold the property for a substantial £5500, indicating that this building row was in place. The row was described in rate records of 1851 as seven 3 and 4-room brick houses, two as shop and house, and another with a 4 stall stable.

A Launceston builder, George Evans, co-founded the settlement that became Melbourne in 1835. At his death in 1876, Evans was described as one of the 'earliest pioneers of Melbourne'.

This shop and dwelling row is designed in a rare Regency style within the Capital City Zone. With cemented façade and face brick rear walls, Regency detailing on the row includes the shell motif in the tympanum of upper-level windows (some gone), inverse scrolls either side of the parapet orb, brackets at the top of the pilaster blocks at first floor level, inverse consoles terminating pilasters above the upper-level impost line, and boldly formed scrolling to the upper-level window architraves. The row is adjacent to the significant John Knox's Church, Charles Webb's design of 1863 (replacing an earlier church) and it backs onto the important Sniders & Abrahams factory warehouse complex.

All shopfronts have been replaced and a new shopfront introduced to the Little Lonsdale Street elevation. Some shell motifs have been removed from the upper-level windows. However, sufficient original fabric remains to allow restoration of this row.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date c1851, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Evans shop and residence row is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

The Evans shop and residence row is significant:

Historically as perhaps the earliest of its type in the Capital City Zone. The historical link with Port Phillip pioneer George Evans is also notable as one of his first major development projects in his transition from pastoralist to City developer. Evans was among the first settlers to set foot in what was to be Melbourne town in the 1830s; and

Aesthetically, for the rare Regency style cement detailing, as a precursor to the more mainstream Italian Renaissance revival of later cemented commercial façades in the Capital City Zone.

**Melbourne Democratic Club and shops & residences, 401-403
Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1082**

What is significant?

Architects Thomas Watts & Sons designed this three-storey building consisting of hall, shop and dwellings in 1890 described then as five shops and the Democratic Club rooms; the rooms were entered from a hallway at the north end of the building.

One of similar clubs formed across the nation, the Melbourne Democratic Club was formed in 1887 to provide a forum for various self education courses. The club was particularly active in the labour movement during the 1890s Depression when they acted as a vehicle for debates on how to fix the depressed Colonial economy. Indoor sport was another facet of the club's activities including national boxing championships. The aims of the club were stated in 1899 as: '(a) club, which is conducted for the political benefit enjoyment and improvement of the working classes'.

The architecture of this three storey brick and render building has been masked to an extent by the painting of the brick façade. However the cement mouldings and fenestration provide for an architecturally sophisticated Mannerist Italian Renaissance revival design with use of segmentally arched and gabled parapet pediments and acroteria on both street elevations. A parapet balustrade with unusual raised piers is set above the central Swanston Street façade pediment with other detailing including pairing of upper-level windows with attached Corinthian order pilasters, moulded architraves, deeply bracketed sills, and keystones; segmentally arched first level windows with architraves and keystones; bold vermiculated quoining at first level and smooth quoining at the second. The building makes a fine complement to the early Queen Anne revival style of the Oxford Hotel on the next corner north and is visually related to the inter-war classicism of Druids House adjoining.

The ground level to Swanston Street has been replaced except for the panelled timber door and doorway to the former club but part of the Little Latrobe Street ground level survives.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1890, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The Democratic Club building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

The Democratic Club building is significant:

Historically, as the result of an unusual commission by a private club, and intended as a vehicle for democratic activity and public education to be financed by commercial adjuncts to the building, such as the five shops. The Melbourne Democratic Club was a major venue for indoor sport, debate and public instruction of working people in Melbourne during the great Depression of the 1890s, playing a role in helping to chart recovery options for the Colony as well as promoting the cause and recreation of labourers. This was the only building erected for the club in Melbourne; and

Architecturally, as a well preserved and sophisticated stylistically as part of the shift to the brick aesthetic of the Queen Anne style via, in this case, a distinctive form of mannered Italian Renaissance revival architecture.

Druids House, 407-409 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1083

What is significant?

The Druids Friendly Society was founded in England in 1781. This institution was part of the nineteenth century friendly society movement in which the members of each society provided mutual assistance in times of need in areas of insurance, pensions or savings, loans or cooperative banking. In essence, the United Ancient Order of Druids was an early health insurance fund in which a regular, voluntary subscription entitled a member or his family to an allowance, medical treatment and medicine in the event of illness and a benefit in the event of a member's death.

Druids House, was built in 1926 as a seven storey headquarters for the Order, designed by the firm of Gibbs, Finlay, Morsby & Coates, and constructed by EA Watts. Druids House was located near to other friendly society buildings such as the Independent Order of Foresters Forester Hall in Latrobe Street and the Guild Hall and Manchester Unity Independent Order of Odd Fellows in Swanston Street. The Druids Friendly Society is still active within Victoria but has sold the Swanston Street headquarters.

Styled in the Greek Revival manner, Druids House is a unique architectural design in which the building façade serves as a physical expression of the august institution within. The street elevation takes the form of an abstracted temple front with a heavy, rusticated plinth treatment to the lowest two storeys, boldly abstracted columns with recessed window strips rising through the intermediate floors to a shallow pitched pediment device to the upper floor level. The building is further distinguished by its detailing and the sculptural relief to its summit. At the parapet centre a free-standing statue of a hooded Druid is housed within a recess as a significant and distinctive part of this building.

At ground level a major part of the original entry foyer and shopfront remain, with terrazzo and tiled floors, lift lobby, three colour Buchan marble wall facing, a significant stairway with pedestal lights, ornate metalwork, wall mounted directory cases, bronze and brass joinery and the street awning with its embossed soffit.

While temple fronted buildings are not uncommon within the Capital City Zone, the approach here is unusual for a buildings of these proportions.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1926-1927, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Druids House is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

Druids House is significant:

Aesthetically, for its distinctive Greek Revival façade and associated Druid statue, designed as a direct expression of the character and ideals of the United Ancient Order of Druids. The building has a high level of integrity and finish for the exterior, lift and stair lobby; and

Historically, as symbolic of one of the invaluable friendly societies active in Victoria during early settlement providing access to health and social benefits for the community.

W.D. & H.O. Wills (Aust) Ltd tobacco warehouse, 411-423 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1084

What is significant?

A prelude to construction this building was the partial collapse of the nearby reinforced concrete British-Australasian Tobacco Co building project at 435-445 Swanston Street inspiring Newspaper articles queried the use of this new construction technique for multi-storey work. The works had been designed by Francis J Davies.

The five-storey tobacco warehouse and basement at the corner of A'Beckett and Swanston Streets was erected September 1925. It was designed by the same architect, Francis J Davies, for tobacco company, W.D. & H.O. Wills (Aust.) Ltd.; the builder was Walter E. Cooper and the contract amount £39,000. The persistent use of reinforced concrete in this building is evocative of the need for fire proof construction in this industry despite the risks implied by the nearby building collapse in the same year.

The engineering was carried out by H.R. Crawford, who had designed the pioneering Snider & Abrahams building in Drewery Lane of 1908-9. The structure was the Claude Turner system of reinforcing column and slab connections, with half inch bar reinforcing rings at each chamfered column head and flat slabs beyond.

An upper level typical floor had four lifts and two concrete encased stair shafts, one serving as the lobby in the south-east corner of the building. A large men's lavatory block was near the main stairs while the 'Girl's' lavatories were in the far corner next to a single lift. At ground level six offices lined the Swanston and part of the A'Beckett Street frontages, with the entry lobby, ornamental stair and lift abutting a large strong room on the south wall. At the north-west corner was the goods entrance and there was liberal use of sliding fire shutters on fusible links throughout.

The building adopts a conservative style for an inter-war warehouse design with Edwardian Free Style pylon-towers with ox-bow parapets at either end of its otherwise plain rendered façade. It has a massive bracketed parapet cornice seemingly supported on piers that extend the height of the building, providing continuous strips for location of windows and intervening spandrel panels. The building has a similar but plainer elevation to A'Beckett Street. The imposing corner structure is realised in rendered reinforced concrete with multi-pane steel-framed windows throughout.

The building is in good and largely original condition although the cantilevering concrete canopy at the former lobby entry and associated joinery have been removed, as has the firm's name from the parapet panels at the north-west and south-east corners.

W.D. & H.O. Wills and its parent British American Tobacco were among the major tobacco companies active in Australia during the 20th century.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1924-1925, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

The W.D. and H.O. Wills building is significant historically and of aesthetic interest within the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

The W.D. and H.O. Wills building is significant: Historically for its long and close association with the tobacco firm W.D. and H.O. Wills within the Central Business District, as well as the controversy surrounding the architect, Davies, with another tobacco warehouse that collapsed shortly before the erection of this building. The early use of flat slab Turner reinforced construction method is also of historic interest.

The W.D. and H.O. Wills building is of interest: Aesthetically, as a prominent, well-preserved but conservative design more typical of the Edwardian-era and hence does not achieve the local significance threshold assessed within this value but it exemplifies the building type well.

County Court Hotel , later Oxford Hotel, Oxford Scholar Hotel, 427-433 Swanston Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1085

What is significant?

The County Court Hotel was constructed by H Maxwell, as hotel and two shops, for a Mrs Hill in 1887 to the design of eminent architect, Charles D'Ebro, and on the site of an earlier hotel of the same name. The hotel adopted the name, Oxford Hotel, in 1892 under licensee, Mrs M Norris. This was not long after the Working Men's College had opened opposite in June 1887 to take the first students and vastly extended its role in the following year. The hotel played a key role in student social life since that date.

The building presents a well-resolved English Queen Anne Revival parapeted façade to each of its street frontages, as expressed by the use of face red brick with cemented classical mouldings in contrast to the prevailing all-rendered hotel examples that also drew on classical detailing. The design centres upon a corner entry element rising to a

massive foliated, raised and gabled cement pediment at the parapet with the words 'erected 1887' in raised lettering. The parapet has a deep bracketed cornice, gablets set over façade bays, and a deep parapet entablature. Cemented red brick chimney pieces form a part of the picturesque building outline created by the gabled main pediment and parapet gablets.

The hotel ground floor retains early smooth rustication, arched window groupings within façade bays, ornate cemented architraves and the aedicules above many of the windows and doors provide for a high overall integrity for a City hotel. The upper storeys have also retained a high level of integrity with first floor level windows possessing decorative pediments while those at second floor level are simpler with a linking string mould and the signature Queen Anne scroll details to sills. New ground level openings have been created in a visually related manner along the Swanston Street north façade. A large development is underway (2011) adjoining the hotel, meaning demolition of rear service buildings.

The County Court Hotel is contemporary with another important Queen Anne pioneer design, Queen Bess Row in East Melbourne, which was built 1886-87 and designed by the Melbourne architects Tappin Gilbert & Dennehy.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1887, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

County Court Hotel, later Oxford Hotel, is significant socially and historically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone and aesthetically to Victoria.

Why is it significant?

County Court Hotel, later Oxford Hotel is significant:

Aesthetically, as an early, successful and well preserved example of English Queen Anne revival as applied to a corner Capital City Zone hotel. This is exemplified by the face brickwork which accentuates, by way of contrast, the high standard of cemented mouldings. The design is a precursor to highly significant designs executed by D'Ebro immediately before and after the 1890s depression; and

Historically and socially, as a building that has served continuously as a hotel since 1887, paralleling the development of the nearby Working Men's College and attracting public memories over an extended period, as meeting and community gathering place.

State Electricity Commission of Victoria building, later Lyle House, 22-32 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1086

What is significant?

In a policy speech in Castlemaine in June 1918, (later Sir) HSW Lawson announced his Government's intention to create a State Government power system.

It quickly became clear that suitable accommodation would be required for the Melbourne staff of the Electricity Commission and in November 1920 plans were prepared for an eight storey (with more to follow) office building to be erected at the corner of William Street and Flinders Lane. This was next to the Western Market, the

Melbourne Customs House, and the Port Authority Building (occupied by the SEC 1983 to 1987) as part of a government and local government building group. The building design was prepared by AR La Gerche, who was appointed architect to the Commission in November 1920 and served in that position until his retirement in August 1938.

The William Street building provided the usual clerical, administrative and engineering office areas required by a large utility, but was unique in that it housed the central control room of the Commission's power production pool. Data relating to generation and regulation was fed to the control room by land and radio lines and staff on duty would continuously regulate voltage, carry out system switching procedures, locate and rectify faults throughout the generating facilities, transmission lines, stations and substations that comprised the power production pool.

The building took the form of a large but simplified modern Commercial Palazzo form with restrained Greek revival detailing. Key features of the Commercial Palazzo style found here include the vertical tripartite division of the façade into a heavy rusticated base and neutral intermediate floors surmounted by a prominent classical cornice. Each of the two principal facades was distinguished by a central metal-framed and clad window panel rising through the full height of the intermediate floors. Two additional matching floors were added to the building 1948-1949 but few other external changes have been undertaken and the building remains in good and largely original condition. Details like the heavy panelled bronze clad door to the south William Street entry are notable.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1921, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

State Electricity Commission of Victoria building is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone

Why is it significant?

The former State Electricity Commission of Victoria building is significant: Aesthetically, as an early and good example of Greek Revival details applied to a Commercial Palazzo form within Melbourne's Capital City Zone; and

Historically, as one of a small number of 20th century multi-storey government offices erected in the pre World War Two era. The building has a long association with the expansion of the State Electricity Commission and development of the state power system.

Dillingham Estates House, Former, 114-128 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1087

What is significant?

Yuncken Freeman Architects Pty Ltd., were the designers of this 24 storey office building in the 1970s. The partner in charge was Barry Patten and the design architect, Llew Morgan.

The building, then called Dillingham Estates House, housed the Dillingham Corporation of Australia Ltd. a group of companies involved in building construction, engineering, dredging, ship building, mining, real estate, property development, earth moving, road building, quarrying and cattle stations. This building was a product of the 1960s, early 1970s mineral and energy boom of the time.

Placement of the service core centrally maximised the extent of full height glass windows on all four façades. This in turn allowed full expression of the archetypal commercial glass box but unlike the 1950s predecessors (such as 100 Collins Street), this was a 'skin' building that was not transparent and did not reveal its structure except as implied on the external walls. The windows were set in aluminium clad panels on a strict module, placing the aluminium and glass surfaces, seemingly into one gleaming plane or skin. There was no reference to a traditional window as a framed wall opening except for the chair or vertigo rail.

Fire separation between floors was achieved by turning the fire wall down below the floor level so rentable floor measurement was taken from the chair rail and not the typically thicker spandrel or fire wall which fell within the false ceiling space below. This achieved spectacular floor to ceiling glazing at dizzy heights over the street below. Unlike the naturally ventilated early 1950s glass boxes there was now a service chamber above the ceiling housing air-conditioning ducts. This chamber was, in turn, reflected on the external elevation as horizontal bands of aluminium and served to obscure part of the structure (floor slab) and, in effect, took its place. Hence the façade presents the impression of a structural grid rather than the transparent façade of the 1950s, revealing the structure behind.

Estates House is located in a paved and landscaped plaza of the same era shared with its architectural mentor, BHP House, to provide an unequalled grouping of this style of office block in its original plaza setting. A six-level parking block to the east is in a related minimalist style while a shuttered ramp leads to basement parking under Estates House itself. The ground level interior has changed with minor external additions and limited unrelated corporate signage

Although Estates House was superficially similar to Eagle Star and part of the Barry Patten stable of Mies Van der Rohe architectural inspirations, it nevertheless has the qualities of all of these buildings while having the advantage of a free standing site, like BHP, that displayed fully the shining glass and aluminium skin wrapped on a simple rectangular shaft. Yuncken Freeman had an unequalled national reputation for superb architectural detailing and classically simple forms. This building is well-preserved and a very good example of a distinct and valuable body of work within the commercial architectural idiom that has no equal in Victoria.

Estates House is a key part of a group of highly significant Modernist office designs in this part of the finance district of the Central Business District, including many by Yuncken Freeman: they include Royal Insurance Group Building, BHP Building, Eagle Star, the AMP tower and St. James building complex by Skidmore Owings and Merrill.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1973-1976, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Estates House is significant aesthetically to the Melbourne Central Business District and Victoria.

Why is it significant?

Estates House is significant:

Aesthetically as one of the three superb Yuncken Freeman International Modern styled multi-storeyed office buildings within the Central Business District which is distinguished by its flush aluminium and glass façade displayed to full effect on an island corner site within the financial centre of the Central Business District. The building is also part of a highly significant International Modern styled office group.

Spier and Crawford, warehouse, 259 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1088

What is significant?

Wine and spirit merchants, Spier and Crawford, commissioned architect Nahum Barnet to design this four storey brick warehouse and Smith and Upton of Collingwood to build it, commencing in mid 1888. New owners, liquor merchants Fogarty and Doyle Pty Ltd, remained there into the 1960s.

The designer, Nahum Barnet, was one of the most prolific architects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Barnet uses his favourite Victorian-era architectural vocabulary on this early commission. The English Queen Anne or Baroque period provided exaggerated classical detailing in this strongly modelled façade. The main architectural forms within the strong tripartite massing of the elevation include scrolls to the parapet, relatively restrained twin pediments beneath, and more impressive gables supported by Barnet's distinctive long consoles (see Moss White factory), near ground level. A ground floor window arch with foliated spandrels and an iron palisade fence are valuable period details.

Unlike many Capital City Zone warehouses from this period the ground level has not been drastically altered. At the rear however, the arched former loading doors are now long windows.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1889, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

Spier and Crawford's warehouse is significant historically and aesthetically to the Melbourne Capital City Zone.

Why is it significant?

Spier and Crawford's warehouse is significant:

Aesthetically for its well-preserved and strong architectural expression of Baroque and English Queen Anne revival forms by the eminent architect, Nahum Barnet, and Historically as a particularly well-preserved example of a commercial warehouse and offices long associated with the Melbourne and Victorian wine industry.

James White's hay and corn store, 261 William Street, Melbourne 3000, HO1089

What is significant?

This shop and dwelling was constructed in 1854-5 as, architecturally, a contiguous part of the Metropolitan Hotel (opened on this site in October 1854) but used as a separate retail shop at the south end, for James White, a hay and corn dealer.

An 1881 view shows the store with an entrance at the north end of the shop façade with a display window adjoining. The upper-level has a dressed stone string and parapet cornice mould and two double-hung sash windows each pulled half-way up; the roof, like that of the hotel, is hipped with a slate roof. The name 'A Harris' is placed above the display window and just under the parapet cornice on the upper-level: three suspended orbs denote that this was a pawn shop. Harris is noted for his house Rosaville (1882-83) now part of Medley Hall, Carlton and designed by Nahum Barnet.

The parapeted shop and dwelling is finished in dressed and tuck-pointed stone with slate to its hipped roof. The building is a typical example of a small early Victorian-era shop and residence, made distinctive by its dressed stone facade construction. The small scale of the building compared to the adjoining replacement hotel building is of note showing the evidently higher ceilings of the mid Victorian-era compared to this early colonial building.

The ground level wall has been rendered, the stone upper-level has been painted, the double-hung sash windows at the first floor have been sheeted over but their original dressed stone sills survive. The carved stone cornice and parapet are intact. Signs have been added.

Despite these largely reversible alterations and additions, the building remains legible as one of the oldest shops in Melbourne, made more distinctive by the dressed stone construction that is firmly linked with early Melbourne building. This was before the Italian influence meant cemented facades were used almost exclusively for City commercial buildings in the mid to late Victorian-era. The former hay and corn store retains its early form and much of its original detail and is generally in good condition.

Contributory elements

The contributory elements within this property include, but are not restricted to, external fabric from the construction date 1854-1855, and any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.

How is it significant?

James White's hay and corn store, part of former Metropolitan Hotel, is significant historically to the Melbourne Central Business District.

Why is it significant?

James White's hay and corn store, once part of the old Metropolitan Hotel, is significant:

Historically as one of the oldest group of shops and dwellings within Melbourne's Central Business District, in this case the remnant of the Metropolitan Hotel development which coincided with the opening of the first Melbourne Exhibition Building once located opposite in William Street. The building's small scale juxtaposed with the later rebuilt Metropolitan Hotel adjoining, and dressed stone construction remind us of how different early colonial buildings were from those of the Victorian-era,

post gold rush. The combination of a Colonial freehold shop & dwelling with a hotel development is also uncommon.

02/08/2012
C210

SCHEDULE TO CLAUSE 81.01

Name of document	Introduced by:
346-376 Queen Street, 334-346 LaTrobe Street and 142-171 A'Beckett Street Open Lot Car Park, Melbourne	NPS1
80 Collins Street Melbourne Development, June 2011	C182
Advertising Signs - Mercedes-Benz, 135-149 KingsWay, Southbank	C103
Big Day Out Music Festival, January 2006	C112
Building Envelope Plan – Replacement Plan No.1, DDO 20 Area 45	NPS1
Car Parking in the Capital City Zone, May 2002	C10
Car Parking in the Docklands Zone	C92
Car parking in the Special Use Zone Schedule 2 – Royal Melbourne Showgrounds	C8
Car Parking provision for residential development in specific inner city areas of Melbourne Parking Precinct Plan July 2009	C133
Carlton Brewery Comprehensive Development Plan October 2007	C126
Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance	C186
Charles Grimes Bridge Underpass, December 2011	C191
Cliveden Hill Private Hospital, 29 Simpson Street, East Melbourne, July 1999	C6
Crown Casino Third Hotel, September 2007	C136
David Jones Melbourne City Store Redevelopment, May 2008	C139
Dynon Port Rail Link Project	C113
Emporium Melbourne Development, July 2009	C148
Federation Arch and Sports and Entertainment Precinct Signs, April 2002	C66
Flinders Gate car park, Melbourne, July 1999	C6
Former Fishmarket Site, Flinders Street Melbourne, September 2002	C68
Former Herald and Weekly Times building, 46-74 Flinders Street, Melbourne, August 2002	C69
Former Olympic Swimming Stadium, Collingwood Football Club signage, April 2004	C91
Former Queen Victoria Hospital Site - Open Lot Car Park, Melbourne	NPS1
Former Southern Cross Hotel site, Melbourne, March 2002	C64
Former Victoria Brewery site, East Melbourne – 'Tribeca' Redevelopment October 2003	C86
Freshwater Place, Southbank, August 2001	C51
Hamer Hall Redevelopment July 2010	C166
Heritage Places Inventory July 2008	C134
High wall signs - 766 Elizabeth Street, Carlton	NPS1
Hilton on the Park Complex Redevelopment, December 2004	C101
Hobsons Road Precinct Incorporated Plan, March 2008	C124
Hotham Estate	C134
Incorporated Plan Overlay No. 1 – 236-254 St Kilda Road	NPS1

Name of document	Introduced by:
Judy Lazarus Transition Centre, March 2005	C102
Kensington Banks Development Plan (Subdivisions)	NPS1
Lynch's Bridge Development Plan, June 1995. Revised December 2001	C134
M1 Redevelopment Project, October 2006	C120
Major Promotion Signs, December 2008	C147
Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, Shrine Vista Details and St Kilda Road Preservation of Shrine Vista (Plans)	NPS1
Melbourne Aquarium Signs, July 2001	C11
Melbourne Central redevelopment, March 2002	C62
Melbourne City Link Project – Advertising Sign Locations, November 2003	VC20
Melbourne Convention Centre Development, Southbank and North Wharf redevelopment, Docklands, April 2006	C116
Melbourne Girls Grammar – Merton Hall Campus Master Plan, June 2002	C22
Melbourne Grammar School Master Plan - Volume One, Senior School South Yarra Campus, Issue Date 14 October 2003.	C90
Melbourne Park Redevelopment February 2010	C159
Melbourne Recital Hall and MTC Theatre project , August 2005	C111
Mirvac, Residential Towers, 236-254 St. Kilda Road, Southbank	NPS1
Moonee Ponds Creek Concept Plan	C134
Myer Melbourne Bourke Street store redevelopment, Melbourne, October 2007	C137
North West Corner of Mark and Melrose Street, North Melbourne	C134
Promotional Panel sign, Crown Allotment 21D, Power Street, Southbank, July 1999	C6
Rectangular Pitch Stadium Project: Olympic Park and Gosch's Paddock, Melbourne, August 2007	C130
Regional Rail Link Project Section 1 Incorporated Document, June 2012	C210
Rialto South Tower Communications Facility Melbourne, November 2002	C57
Royal Melbourne Showgrounds Redevelopment Master Plan – December 2004	C100
Royal Melbourne Showgrounds Redevelopment Project – December 2004	C100
Scots Church Site Redevelopment, Melbourne, August 2007	C129
Simplot Australia head office, Kensington, October 2001	C52
Sky sign - 42 Clarendon Street, South Melbourne	NPS1
Spencer Street Station redevelopment, August 2007	C130
Sports and Entertainment Precinct, Melbourne, August 2007	C130
State Coronial Services Centre Redevelopment Project, August 2007.	C130
State Netball and Hockey Centre, Brens Drive Royal Park, Parkville, May 2000	C26
The Alfred Hospital Helipad Flight Path Protection Areas Plan, Vertical View, reference No. AOS/00/015, dated 7-9-2001 and The Alfred Hospital Helipad Flight Path Protection Areas Plan, Profile View,	C18

Name of document	Introduced by:
reference No. AOS/00/016, dated 7-9-2001	
The Games Village Project, Parkville, September 2006	C115
The New Royal Children's Hospital Project, Parkville, October 2007	C128
Tram Route 109 Disability Discrimination Act compliant Platform Tram Stops, August 2007	C130
University of Melbourne Bio 21 Project Parkville, November 2001	C53
University of Melbourne, University Square Campus, Carlton, November 1999	C17
Yarra Park Master Plan Implementation September 2010	C158
Young and Jackson's Hotel, Promotional Panel Sky sign, Melbourne, July 1999	C6

Amendment C186

List of changes to the Melbourne Planning Scheme

Clause / Map Numbers	Change	Comment
PLANNING SCHEME MAP CHANGES		
Map No. 8H01	Amend Planning Scheme Map No8HO1, as shown on the attached map marked "Melbourne Planning Scheme, Amendment C186"	Amends the planning scheme maps to apply the Heritage Overlay to 98 new heritage places.
LOCAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK		
22.04	Amend Clause 22.04 by inserting the following wording under Policy after the words "...Review 1993": "except for the buildings detailed in the incorporated document titled Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance, in which case the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance will apply." Include the <i>Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review</i> as a Policy Reference.	Amends Clause 22.04, Heritage Places within the Capital City Zone, by requiring the incorporated document titled Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance to be taken into account and by including as a reference the <i>Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011</i> .
OVERLAYS		
Heritage Overlay Schedule	The Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended to include 98 new places. External paint controls apply but none of the other requirements in the schedule will apply.	Applies the Heritage Overlay to include an additional 98 new heritage places.
INCORPORATED DOCUMENTS		
Clause 81.01 Schedule	Insert: <i>Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance</i>	Introduces incorporated document
LIST OF AMENDMENTS (Information to accompany amendment)		
List of Amendments	Insert: Amendment number "C186", In operation from DATE with the brief description, "Amends Clause 22.04 and introduces 98 new heritage places to the Schedule to Clause 43.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme."	Updates list of amendments to the planning scheme

Planning and Environment Act 1987

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME

AMENDMENT C186

The planning authority for this amendment is the Melbourne City Council.

The Melbourne Planning Scheme is amended as follows:

Planning Scheme Maps

The Planning Scheme Maps are amended by a total of one attached map sheets:

Overlay Maps

1. Planning Scheme Map No. 8HO1 is amended in the manner shown on the attached map marked “Melbourne Planning Scheme, Amendment C186”.

Planning Scheme Ordinance

The Planning Scheme Ordinance is amended as follows:

2. In Local Planning Policy Framework – Amend Clause 22.04 as follows:
 - Insert the following wording after the words “.....Review 1993” in fourth dot point under the heading “Policy”: “except for the buildings detailed in the incorporated document titled Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance, in which case the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011: Statements of Significance will apply.”
 - Include the *Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011* as a Policy Reference.
3. In Overlays – insert the 98 new entries into the table to the Schedule to Clause 43.01 as shown on the attached document.
4. In Incorporated Documents – Clause 81.01, replace the schedule with a new schedule in the form of the attached document.

End of document

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

	HO	HERITAGE OVERLAY
--	----	------------------

AMENDMENT C186

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME - LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

 HO HERITAGE OVERLY

PREPARED BY: INFORMATION SERVICES
Statutory Systems
Planning, Heritage and Urban Design
Department of Planning and Community Development

AMENDMENT C186



MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

	HO	HERITAGE OVERLAY
--	----	------------------

AMENDMENT C186

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

 HO HERITAGE OVERLAY

AMENDMENT C186

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME - LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

 HO HERITAGE OVERLAY

PREPARED BY: INFORMATION SERVICES
Statutory Systems
Planning, Heritage and Urban Design
Department of Planning and Community Development

AMENDMENT C186

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

 HERITAGE OVERLAY

AMENDMENT C186

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME LOCAL PROVISION



Part of Planning Scheme Map 8HO2

LEGEND

 HO HERITAGE OVERLAY

AMENDMENT C186



Planning and Environment Act 1987

Panel Report

Melbourne Planning Scheme

Amendment C186

'Individual Heritage Places'

11 July 2012

Planning and Environment Act 1987 (the Act)

Panel Report pursuant to Sections 153 and 155 of the Act

Amendment C186 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme

'Individual Heritage Places'

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jennifer A Moles." The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'J'.

Jennifer A Moles, Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ray Tonkin". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'R'.

Ray Tonkin, Member



Contents

	Page
1 Amendment Summary	1
2 Background	4
2.1 Background to the proposed Amendment	4
2.2 Details of the Amendment	5
2.3 Processing by the planning authority	6
2.4 Panel processing and report	6
3 Policy context	9
3.1 Planning policy framework	9
3.2 Other Planning Scheme provisions	13
4 General issues	15
4.1 Adequacy of the 2011 Review	15
4.2 Other challenges to proposed listings	29
5 Places from the period to 1852: 'Frontier Town'	40
5.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment	40
5.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing	40
5.3 Written submission only	40
5.4 No submissions	40
6 Places from 1852-1859: 'Gold'	41
6.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment	41
6.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing	41
6.3 Written submission only	44
6.4 No submissions	45
7 Places from 1860-1899: 'Boom and Bust'	46
7.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment	46
7.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing	48
7.3 Written submissions only	54
7.4 Agreement at hearing	55
7.5 No submissions	55
8 Places from 1900-1929: 'The City Beautiful'	56
8.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment	56
8.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing	58
8.3 Written submissions only	75
8.4 No submissions	78



9	Places from 1930-1956: 'The New Image'	79
9.1	Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment.....	79
9.2	Places addressed at Panel hearing.....	80
9.3	Written submissions only.....	82
9.4	No submissions.....	82
10	Places from 1956-1975: 'The Urban Spurt'	83
10.1	Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment.....	83
10.2	Places addressed at Panel hearing.....	83
10.3	Written submissions only.....	99
10.4	No submissions.....	101
11	General conclusions and recommendations	102
11.1	Conclusions.....	102
11.2	Recommendations	103

Appendix A List of building proposed for inclusion

Appendix B Document List

1 Amendment Summary

The Amendment	Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186
Purpose of Amendment	Inclusion of an additional 99 places in the Heritage Overlay and inclusion of initiating study and one building investigation as reference documents
The Proponent	Melbourne City Council
Planning Authority	Melbourne City Council
Exhibition	1 September – 14 October 2011
The Panel	Jennifer Moles (Chair) Ray Tonkin Appointed 23 January 2012
Panel hearings	Directions Hearing 21 February 2012 Hearings 26 - 30 March and 2, 16 – 17 and 20 April 2012
Final Correspondence	26 April 2012
Site inspections	27 and 29 February, 16 March and 12 and 20 April 2012. The site inspections included all buildings for which interior controls are proposed (whether or not there was a submission) and all buildings for which only external controls are proposed where submissions were received.
Date of this report	11 July 2012
Appearances	<p>Mr Peter O’Farrell, barrister, appeared for the City of Melbourne by direct instruction. He called Mr Graeme Butler, Graeme Butler and Associates, heritage consultants, to give expert evidence.</p> <p>Mr Greg Tobin, Harwood Andrews, lawyers, and Mr Paul Roser, Conservation Manager for the National Trust, appeared for the National Trust of Australia (Victoria). They tendered an expert report by Mr Rohan Storey, heritage consultant, relating to most of the buildings in contention. Mr Storey was not called to give evidence due to ill health.</p> <p>Messrs Rupert Mann and Tristan Davies, both members of the executive of the group - Melbourne Heritage Action, appeared in person.</p> <p>Ms Susan Brennan, barrister, instructed by Norton Rose, lawyers, appeared for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vapold Pty Ltd, owner of 104 Exhibition Street ▪ Tackelly No 6 Pty Ltd, owner of 114 William Street ▪ ISPT Pty Ltd, owner of 433-455 Collins Street and 267-271 Spring Street. <p>She called the following expert witnesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professor Miles Lewis, architectural historian (re 433-455 Collins Street)

- Mr Mark Sheldon, structural engineer (re 433-455 Collins Street)
- Mr Peter Barrett, architectural historian (re 114 William and 104 Exhibition Street).

Ms Jane Sharp, barrister, instructed by Hansen Partnership, appeared for Goodyear Properties Pty Ltd, owner 441-447 Elizabeth Street. She called the Mr Michael Taylor, heritage architect, to give expert evidence. Ms Sharp also appeared on instruction by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd, the owner of 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place. She called Mr Peter Barrett, architectural historian, to give expert evidence.

Mr Andrew Walker, barrister, on instruction of Hansen Partnership, appeared for Ace Body Corporate Management, the Owners' Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street. He called Mr Peter Barrett, architectural historian, to give expert evidence.

Mr Gary Testro, lawyer, appeared for the Law Institute of Victoria Ltd, the owner of 468-470 Bourke Street. He called Ms Helen Lardner, HLCD Pty Ltd, heritage architect, to give expert evidence.

Mr Phil Bisset, Minter Ellison, lawyers, appeared for the Celtic Club, owner of 316-322 Queen Street. He called Mr Peter Lovell, Lovell Chen, heritage consultants, to give expert heritage evidence.

Mr Dominic Scally, Best Hooper, lawyers, appeared for Waynesbury Pty Ltd, owner of 99-101 Flinders Lane. He called Mr Peter Lovell to give expert heritage evidence.

Sandra Rigo, Hansen Partnership, appeared for Victoria University, owner of 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street. She called the following expert witnesses:

- Mr Michael Taylor, heritage architect, and
- Mr Daryl Jackson, architect.

Mr Edgar Gottschalk, Urbis, appeared for Enwerd Pty Ltd and SHL Nominees (1965) Pty Ltd, owners of 430-442 Collins Street.

Mr Marcus Rose, appeared for Victoria Body Corporate Services acting for the owners of 415 – 419 Bourke Street.

Mr Paris Kyne, owner of Suite 3, 479 Elizabeth Street, appeared in person.

Mr James Iles, TGM Group Pty Ltd, appeared for T Corporation Pty Ltd, owners of 351-357 Elizabeth Street.

Mr Daniel Bowden, Song Bowden, appeared for RMIT, owner of the property at 459-469 Swanston Street and 63-67 Franklin Street, another at 411-423 Swanston Street and a third at 427-433 Swanston Street. He called Ms Anita Brady, Lovell Chen, historian, to give expert evidence.

Mr Chris Karagounis, owner of 261 William Street, requested to be heard by the Panel but later advised he did not wish to attend.

Submissions	<p>In response to public exhibition, 28 written responses were received by the Planning Authority. All were referred to the Panel. 22 opposed the Amendment outright, 6 supported it.</p> <p>After the Panel was appointed, a late submission was also received and referred by the Council to the Panel.</p>
Recommendations	<p>Based on the reasons set out in this report, we recommend:</p> <p>Amendment C186 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme should be adopted as exhibited subject to the recommendations set out in Chapter 11.2 of this report.</p>

2 Background

2.1 Background to the proposed Amendment

The City of Melbourne has undertaken four central city heritage studies since 1985:

- 1985: Graeme Butler and Associates: Central Activities District Conservation Study, 1985 (the 1985 Study).
- 1993: Phillip Goad, Miles Lewis, Alan Mayne, Bryce Raworth and Jeff Turnbull: Central City Heritage Study Review, November 1993 (the 1993 Review).
- 2002: Bryce Raworth: Review of Heritage Overlay Listings in the CBD, 2002 (the 2002 Review).
- 2011: Graeme Butler and Associates: Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review, 2011 (the 2011 Review).

The present Amendment C186 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme (Planning Scheme) seeks to implement the findings of the 2011 Review which is in turn in part based on the outcomes of the earlier investigations. This is the first time that the recommendations of the four heritage studies have proceeded to an exhibited amendment. In addition to proposing that the 98 buildings recommended by the Review as of at least local significance¹ be included in individual Heritage Overlays, the Amendment also proposes the inclusion of the Celtic Club at 316-322 Queen Street in an individual Heritage Overlay. A late evaluation of this building was done by Mr Butler.

The 2011 Review was commissioned in 2010 and completed in 2011. The Review is presented in one volume.

In considering whether the buildings were of local significance, the 2011 Review assessed the buildings in the context of the central city only rather than the wider municipality. This was in recognition of the special historical role of the central city as the centre of Victorian settlement and the dominating economic engine. No party at the Panel Hearing took exception to this approach – indeed some argued that the central city setting was a consideration in the Panel’s assessment of their building. The Panel supports consideration of the buildings’ significance within this defined local context.

The 2011 Review was preceded by an environmental history of the central city prepared as a consequence of the 1993 Review². The environmental history discusses the development history of the central city under the following period headings:

- Frontier Town to 1852
- Gold 1852-9

¹ Six properties were recommended as suitable for recommendation to the Victorian Heritage Register. These would also be included in the Planning Scheme.

² *Melbourne, The City’s History and Development* by Miles Lewis with Philip Goad and Alan Mayne, April 1994.

- Boom and Bust 1860-1900
- The City Beautiful 1900-1929
- The New Image 1930-1956
- The Urban Spurt 1956-1975

The Council resolved on 7 June 2011 to seek authorisation to exhibit the Amendment which would add 99 buildings said to be of at least local heritage significance to the schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The Minister authorised exhibition on 26 July 2011.

Exhibition of the Amendment took place between 1 September 2011 and 14 October 2011. Public notices were placed in a number of newspapers and in the Government Gazette.

Some corrections were made to the mapping during exhibition and relevant owners were directly notified of these.

Interim controls sought

While the Capital City Zone provisions which currently apply to all of the sites do require planning permission for buildings and works as well as demolition, they do not call into consideration heritage issues. We understand that, therefore, prior to exhibition of the Amendment, the Council sought the application by the Minister of interim heritage controls for the subject properties.

At the time of the Panel hearing, no response to this request had been received. This absence of interim controls has allowed works detrimental to the assessed heritage significance to occur unregulated by the Planning Scheme at least at the 'Rosati' property at 95-101 Flinders Lane. Also, the absence of interim controls has been a matter of which the Panel has had to be mindful in considering the outcomes of this Panel investigation and in formulating our recommendations.

2.2 Details of the Amendment

The Amendment proposes the inclusion of 99 new individual Heritage Overlays. In the case of 12 places, the interior of the building or part of it is also proposed to be specified as subject to heritage control. Paint controls are proposed to be applied to the exterior of all buildings. A complete list of affected properties is included as Appendix A to this report. The issue of interior controls is discussed in Section 4.1(ii) of this report.

Specifically, the Amendment proposes to:

- Add 99 buildings to the schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01 of the Planning Scheme.
- Amend Planning Scheme Map no 8HO1 to show the new sites.
- In Clause 22.04 Heritage Places in the Capital City Zone, add the following additional matter to be taken into account when considering applications for buildings, works or demolition to heritage places as identified in the Heritage Overlay:

The recommendations for individual buildings and controls as detailed in the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010.

- In Clause 22.04, add the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010 as Policy References.
- Make other minor consequential administrative changes.

2.3 Processing by the planning authority

In response to public exhibition of the Amendment, some 29 public submissions were received by the Council (28 within the exhibition period). All objected to the inclusion of buildings in the Heritage Overlay (in some cases more than one building)³ except for the submissions by the National Trust and Melbourne Heritage Action group which generally supported the Amendment, and three fully supportive submissions by individuals. One objecting submission was later withdrawn.⁴

(i) Issues raised in written submissions

The issues raised in the objecting written submissions included:

- Absence of adequate heritage significance to warrant introduction of heritage controls.
- Proposed controls would limit future redevelopment.
- Planning permits have already been granted for buildings and works on the site (including demolition in some instances).

(ii) Council response to submissions

The Council considered the submissions at its Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee meeting of 6 December 2011 and resolved to request the appointment of a panel to consider the submissions.

2.4 Panel processing and report

The Panel hearing was conducted over nine non-consecutive days in March and April 2012.

In all but 11 cases, the submitters requested to elaborate on their written submissions at the Panel hearing. In most cases expert evidence was called in support.

³ Two submissions were from the RMIT – they both dealt with the same three sites.

⁴ The owner of the Kingsgate Hotel at 131 King Street.

The Panel also heard from the representative of the owner of the building at 351-357 Elizabeth Street whose late submission was received by the Council and forwarded to the Panel only after⁵ the other submissions had been referred to a Panel.

(i) Declaration by Panel member

At the directions hearing, Mr Tonkin advised that he had acted as a consultant to the City of Melbourne in April 2010 when he had provided advice on options for the City to provide heritage assistance. The advice did not relate to any particular property. He also advised that, while in his former position as Executive Director, Heritage Victoria, he had dealt with a number of central city heritage issues and was well familiar with much of the building stock in the area, he had not, to his knowledge, dealt directly with any of the buildings which are the subject of this Amendment.

The matter was stood down briefly to allow those present to consider the matter. On our return, it was established that no party took issue with Mr Tonkin continuing as a member of the Panel.

(ii) Request to remove National Mutual building from further consideration as part of the Amendment

At the directions hearing, Ms Brennan, barrister, on behalf of ISPT Pty Ltd as owners of the National Mutual site at 435-455 Collins Street, sought to have the Panel direct the Council to consider whether or not it wished to continue with the proposed inclusion of the National Mutual building in the Heritage Overlay as part of the Amendment. This request was based on an Emergency Building Order having been served by the Council in relation to the building in January 2012 following the dislodgement of one of the facing panels which had fallen into the street. Ms Brennan submitted that it was thought that some 10 per cent of the facing panels were in danger of falling.

The Panel was advised that the matter could be considered by a Council officer acting under delegation from the Council or might be further considered by the Council at a forthcoming Council meeting (which was Ms Brennan's client's preference).

The Panel ruled that as the Panel simply is required to know what buildings it is requested to consider, it was sufficient that we direct that further advice be provided by the Council concerning the National Mutual building by no later than 21 March 2012 after the matter would be further considered by the Council under delegation or otherwise. Late circulation of witness reports by the submitter was also permitted because of the uncertainty as to whether the building would be withdrawn.

Before the hearing⁶, the Panel received written advice from the Council that it had further considered the matter and it was requested that the National Mutual building continue to be considered by the Panel as a part of the Amendment.

⁵ 28 March 2012.

⁶ On 8 March 2012

(iii) Untested evidence

As noted in the summary above, Mr Storey, who was to be called to give expert evidence at the Panel hearing by the National Trust, did not finally attend due to illness.

We acknowledge that his evidence therefore has remained untested and cannot be ascribed the same weight as the evidence of the other experts who were subject to cross examination (some days in the case of Mr Butler).

Nevertheless we found his written evidence to be well presented and helpful. As Mr Tobin submitted, his evidence adds to the long list of respected heritage advisers to the Council (and to some submitters) that have recognised that the properties in the Amendment have heritage value.

(iv) Panel inspections

The Panel has inspected all the buildings about which objecting submissions were received including the late submission concerning the building at 351-357 Elizabeth Street. We have inspected all of the interiors proposed to be included in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay whether or not objecting submissions were received concerning those interiors and most of the comparative interiors referred to in Mr Butler's evidence for the Council and Mr Storey's evidence for the National Trust.

The Panel did not otherwise made inspections of the buildings not in contention except as incidentally observed during the four days of inspections.

The inspections conducted by the Panel were in part accompanied: representatives of the National Trust and Council attended those inspections of buildings where the owner or an owner's representative was present.

(v) The Panel report

The previous sections of this report have set out a summary of the Amendment, the background to it and the post exhibition processing.

In Chapter 3, we set out the policy context for the Amendment.

In Chapter 4, of this report we discuss and make recommendations about some general issues that apply across some or all of the properties. They include matters raised by the Panel itself at the hearing.

In Chapters 5-10, we deal with the individual buildings in contention⁷. Each chapter deals with buildings in one of the development periods referred to in the environmental history.

Chapter 11 provides some general conclusions and the Panel recommendations.

⁷ Generally we have not reported on supporting submissions by owners.

3 Policy context

This section of the report considers the policy context for the Amendment and focuses on the strategic and policy issues. It assesses how the Amendment meets the objectives of the Planning Scheme. The following sections of this report include a brief appraisal of the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF), the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) and Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) as relate to the issues under consideration, and aspects of the zone and overlay controls.

3.1 Planning policy framework

(i) State Planning Policy Framework

Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage includes:

- Clause 15.01-5 *Cultural identity and neighbourhood character* which has the Objective 'To recognise and protect cultural identity, neighbourhood character and sense of place'. Strategies include:
 - *Ensure development responds to its context and reinforces special characteristics of local environment and place by emphasising:*
 - *The underlying natural landscape character.*
 - ***The heritage values and built form that reflect community identity.***
 - *The values, needs and aspirations of the community (our emphasis).*
- Clause 15.03-1 *Heritage conservation* which has the Objective 'To ensure the conservation of places of heritage significance'. Strategies include to:
 - *Identify, assess and document places of natural and cultural heritage significance as a basis for their inclusion in the planning scheme.*
 - *Provide for the conservation and enhancement of those places which are of aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, scientific, or social significance, or otherwise of special cultural value.*
 - *Encourage appropriate development that respects places with identified heritage values and creates a worthy legacy for future generations.*
 - *Retain those elements that contribute to the importance of the heritage place.*
 - *Encourage the conservation and restoration of contributory elements.*
 - *Ensure an appropriate setting and context for heritage places is maintained or enhanced.*
 - *Support adaptive reuse of heritage buildings whose use has become redundant.*

The Policy guidelines state that planning must consider as relevant the findings and recommendations of the Victorian Heritage Council.

(ii) Local Planning Policy Framework

Clause 21.05 relates to City Structure and Built Form. It includes the following commentary on the importance of heritage at Clause 21.05-1:

Heritage features, buildings and streetscapes are a significant part of Melbourne's attraction, distinguishing it from other cities in Australia and internationally. Much of Melbourne's character is defined by its historic street pattern, boulevards and parks, the collection of buildings within heritage precincts, as well as individually significant buildings, identified and protected for their high cultural heritage value. Sensitivity to heritage buildings and places, local landmarks, landscape, views and character is an important component of development in context.

It also includes the following related objectives and strategies⁸:

- *To conserve and enhance places and precincts of identified cultural heritage significance.*
 - *Conserve, protect and enhance the significant fabric of identified heritage places and precincts.*
 - *Support the restoration of heritage buildings and places.*
 - *Maintain the visual prominence of historic buildings and local landmarks.*
 - *Protect the valued historic buildings, subdivision pattern, boulevards and significant public open space within the heritage precincts.*
 - *Protect the significant landscape and cultural heritage features of the City's parks, gardens, waterways and other open spaces.*
 - *Protect buildings, streetscapes and precincts of cultural heritage significance from the visual intrusion of built form both within precincts and from adjoining areas.*
- Clause 21.05-3 also contains a policy section relating to Structure and Character. It contains the following:

Scale of existing and future development

The City of Melbourne offers a range of opportunities for new development. Some areas can absorb higher density development without threat to their existing valued character or heritage and some are suited to less intense infill development. There are opportunities in some areas to develop a new built form character.
 - Clause 21.08 contains policies relating to Local Areas. In relation to the Central City, relevantly it includes:

⁸ Said to be read in conjunction with Figure 10 - Built Form Character and the detailed Implementation Strategies set out in Clauses 21.08 (Local Areas).

The Central City is Victoria's largest and most varied focus of activity, a vibrant mixed use area which operates 24 hours a day and is the State's gateway to the global economy. It is one of the nation's principal concentrations of high-order business activity including a broad range of financial, legal, administrative and government, as well as recreational, tourist, cultural and entertainment uses...

The Central City also contains both nationally and internationally significant icons. In addition to the Yarra River corridor with its Victorian bridges; icons such as Federation Square, Flinders Street Station, the Rialto, Eureka Tower, and the tram networks assist in making Melbourne an international tourist destination. Heritage buildings and intact streetscapes, the Hoddle Grid, comprising wide boulevards and narrow bluestone lanes; significant avenues of street trees and landscaping; and important public spaces and parks; also make for a nationally significant, vital and attractive metropolitan city centre....

The Central City continues to be the primary place of employment, business, finance, entertainment, cultural activity and retail in Victoria, and a place that facilitates the growth of innovative business activity....

Important components of the Central City's built form and public realm have been protected and enhanced, including the Yarra River corridor, significant parks and gardens and the Central City's significant heritage assets. The creation of a high quality, useable and exciting public realm continues to make the city an attractive and exciting place for workers, residents and visitors.

- Clause 21.08 also contains the following policies concerning the Central City:

Office and commercial use in the Central City

- *Support the Central City's role as the principal centre in the State for government, commerce, professional, business and financial services.*
- *Encourage the development and establishment of new and innovative professional, commercial and retail business which take advantage of the City's central location, technology, and its accessibility by a range of transport nodes.*
- *Support the continued development and growth of the broad range of existing business in the Central City.*

Education and hospitals in the Central City

- *Support the consolidation of education clusters on the northern and western edges of the Central City and in Flinders Street, consistent with the Land Use Amenity Principles.*

Built form implementation strategies

- *Implementation of the objectives and strategies in Clause 21.05 includes:*

Heritage in the Central City

Protect the unique qualities of the Hoddle Grid including heritage buildings and precincts, the regular grid layout, laneways, tree-lined boulevards and identified significant public open spaces.

- Clause 21.10 Future Work lists the following items as potential work items:
Review statements of significance for heritage places throughout the municipality and where necessary incorporate recommendations into the planning scheme.
Prepare a Heritage Strategy to provide a framework that co-ordinates future actions and programs regarding heritage within the municipality.
- Clause 22.04 Heritage Places within Capital City Zone has the following relevant Objectives:
 - *To conserve and enhance all heritage places, and ensure that any alterations or extensions to them are undertaken in accordance with accepted conservation standards.*
 - *To consider the impact of development on buildings listed in the Central Activities District Conservation Study and the South Melbourne Conservation Study.*
 - *To conserve and enhance the character and appearance of precincts identified as heritage places by ensuring that any new development complements their character, scale, form and appearance.*
- Clause 22.04 relevantly states that the following matters are to be taken into account when considering applications for buildings, works or demolition to heritage places as identified in the Heritage Overlay:
 - *Proposals for alterations, works or demolition of an individual heritage building or works involving or affecting heritage trees should be accompanied by a conservation analysis and management plan in accordance with the principles of the Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance 1992 (The Burra Charter).*
 - *The demolition or alteration of any part of a heritage place should not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that that action will contribute to the long-term conservation of the significant fabric of the heritage place.*
 - *The recommendations for individual buildings, sites and areas contained in the Central City Heritage Study Review 1993.*
 - *All development affecting a heritage precinct should enhance the character of the precinct as described by the following statements of significance.*
 - *Regard shall be given to buildings listed A, B, C and D in the individual conservation studies, and their significance as described by their individual Building Identification Sheet.*

The Amendment proposes add to this list of matters for consideration - the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010.

- Clause 22.04 then lists 11 precincts along with their key attributes: Bank Place; Bourke Hill; Bourke West Precinct; Collins East Precinct; Flinders Gate Precinct; Flinders Lane Precinct; Little Bourke Precinct; Post Office Precinct; The Block Precinct; The Market Precinct; and Little Lon Precinct.

The Panel was advised that none of the 99 buildings which are the subject of the Amendment would fall within any of these precincts.

3.2 Other Planning Scheme provisions

(i) Zoning

As noted earlier, all sites proposed for inclusion in new individual Heritage Overlays are included in the Capital City Zone.

In addition to the implementation of policy, the zone has the following purposes:

- *To enhance the role of Melbourne's central city as the capital of Victoria and as an area of national and international importance.*
- *To recognise or provide for the use and development of land for specific purposes as identified in a schedule to this zone.*
- *To create through good urban design an attractive, pleasurable, safe and stimulating environment.*

Relevantly, the combined effect of the head clause and the schedule(s) to the zone means that planning permission is required for the construction of buildings and works and demolition subject to specified exemptions.

(ii) Overlays

Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay has the following Purposes:

- *To implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.*
- *To conserve and enhance heritage places of natural or cultural significance.*
- *To conserve and enhance those elements which contribute to the significance of heritage places.*
- *To ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places.*
- *To conserve specifically identified heritage places by allowing a use that would otherwise be prohibited if this will demonstrably assist with the conservation of the significance of the heritage place.*

The Amendment intends to insert the 99 new entries into the table to the Schedule to Clause 43.01 and activate the interiors controls in relation to 12 buildings and additional paint controls for all 99 buildings.

(iii) Reference documents

Clause 22.04 currently includes four reference documents including: Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne 1985 and the Central Activities District Conservation Study 1985.

It is proposed to add to the list: the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and the Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010.

4 General issues

In this chapter we discuss some general issues which arose in relation to a number of submissions or which go to the fundamental adequacy of the strategic basis for the Amendment.

4.1 Adequacy of the 2011 Review

(i) The issue

A key issue to be addressed in assessing the Amendment overall is the success or otherwise of the 2011 Review in providing a sound strategic justification for the Amendment. The consequences for successful statutory implementation are also discussed in this section.

All the matters addressed in this section of the report arise either from submissions made to the Panel or from Panel questions.

Specific issues are:

- Origins of the list of buildings
- Limitations on comparative analysis
- Problems with the use of the A, B, C and D grading approach
- The use of the out of date National Estate criteria and their utility at the local level
- The drafting of statements of significance
- The lack of precinct identification as an outcome of the Review
- Interior listing proposals
- Paint controls.

(ii) Panel discussion and views

It is not the role of the Panel to re-write the heritage study or redesign the methodology underpinning it. However, the Panel is obliged to assess how well the study provides strategic support for the Amendment, to test its findings and conclusions against the submissions made, and finally to assess whether it provides a sound basis for statutory decision making into the future.

The Panel is of the view that, whilst the 2011 Review is a substantial piece of work incorporating vast amounts of information, it fails on a number of counts to provide the very strong strategic justification for the Amendment that was obviously possible given the extent of the report.

Origins of the list of buildings

It took some time into the hearing for the Panel to gain a clear understanding of the origins of the list of places being proposed for this Amendment. Whilst it ultimately became clear that the 99⁹ places were originally identified in the 1985 Study, the Panel believes that it would have been useful for the City's initial submissions and its expert evidence to have been clearer in introducing the sequence of studies as the basis for this Amendment. If it had no other benefit, such an introduction would have assisted in communicating a better understanding of the gradings attributed to places in this Amendment which was a matter debated by submitters.

Comparative Analysis

The organisation of the report on a geographic basis, whilst convenient to find particular property citations, fails to direct the reader to an understanding of the comparative basis of the recommendations. To assist our own understanding, we prepared tables of places under the headings established by the environmental history. This enabled us to gain a far better understanding of the relative merits of the different buildings within each thematic group.

We would also make the observation that the 2011 Review generally fails to draw upon the themes in the environmental history as a means of potentially justifying the significance ascribed to the buildings.

The Review was subject to criticism by several submissions for its failure to undertake rigorous comparative analysis in support of its recommendations. The argument was put that simply assembling a long list of other places, as it was alleged was done by Mr Butler, is not a reasonable comparative justification. It was also put that there was a necessity in any comparative analysis that places considered better and worse should be highlighted to justify the inclusion of a place in the overlay.¹⁰

The Panel believes that this is a sensible approach to comparative analysis and if it had been undertaken would have assisted in providing an improved justification for the Amendment. The Panel would observe, however, that, despite the criticisms made in submissions, by and large the expert evidence supporting those submissions generally listed only alternative examples which were considered better than the building in question and thus did not offer a fair assessment.

The group of nine buildings tabulated under the Urban Spurt theme, which represents a major phase in the development of modern Melbourne, were particularly the focus of this discussion. The Panel has found it difficult to understand why these nine were chosen rather than some other apparently equally deserving buildings not subject to heritage controls. It was unclear to us how they compared with one another or other buildings in the greater Melbourne area and whether there may be others which also warrant consideration for the application of the Heritage Overlay. There is no doubt that Melbourne has many buildings

⁹ 98 places come from the 1985 Study plus the late addition of the Celtic Club.

¹⁰ Submissions by Ms Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd as owner of National Mutual building at 435-455 Collins Street, quoting Panel report on Bayside Planning Scheme Amendment C37.

constructed during the period 1956 – 75 and the Panel was concerned that the selection proposed here may not adequately represent the spectrum of buildings from this important phase of Melbourne’s architectural development.

The Panel notes the view alluded to in some of the evidence, that this period was more significant for its role in destroying Melbourne’s nineteenth century character rather than being important in its own right. The Panel believes, however, that while it can be viewed as a period of destruction, it should also be viewed as a period of creativity. We note that the environmental history contains a statement of significance for the central city as a whole which takes the perspective that the central city is principally a Victorian city. It also indicates that the post 1950’s development eroded much of the earlier architectural character of the city but it does recognise that the post 1950’s period did produce much of individual architectural quality.

The Panel was faced with the option of recommending that all nine places from this group be included in a more extensive review of the building developments from this period. However, we have decided that there is sufficient consideration of these places in other reference material, including the environmental history, to enable the individual merits of each place to be determined.

Gradings

The 2011 Review adopts an A to D grading for all buildings assessed. These gradings are drawn from a potential A to E range which is described in the Review as follows:

Definitions

(Taken from both the 1985 policy document, Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne: 21- 24, and the 2008 Heritage Places Inventory, with references to the National Estate Register removed).

‘A’ Graded Buildings

1985- Buildings of national or state importance, irreplaceable parts of Australia’s built heritage.

2008¹¹- These buildings are of national or state importance, and are irreplaceable parts of Australia’s built form heritage.

‘B’ Graded Buildings

1985- Buildings of regional or metropolitan significance, and stand as important milestones in the development of the metropolis.

2008- These buildings are of regional or metropolitan significance, and stand as important milestones in the architectural development of the metropolis.

¹¹ It would seem that reference to 2008 gradings is a reference to the current gradings.

'C' Graded Buildings

1985- Buildings make an important aesthetic or scientific contribution that is important in the local area. This includes well-preserved examples of particular styles of construction, as well as some individually significant buildings that have been altered or defaced.

2008- These buildings demonstrate the historical or social development of the local area and/or make an important aesthetic or scientific contribution. These buildings comprise a variety of styles and buildings types. Architecturally they are substantially intact, but where altered, it is reversible. In some instances, buildings of high individual historic, scientific or social significance may have a greater degree of alteration.

'D' Graded Buildings

1985- Buildings are either reasonably intact representatives of particular periods or styles or they have been substantially altered but stand in a row or street which retains much of its original character.

2008- These buildings are representative of the historical, scientific, architectural or social development of the local area. They are often reasonably intact representatives of particular periods, styles or building types. In many instances alterations will be reversible. They may also be altered examples which stand within a group of similar period, style or type or a street which retains much of its original character. Where they stand in a row or street, the collective group will provide a setting which reinforces the value of the individual buildings.

'E' Graded Buildings

1985- Buildings have generally been substantially altered, and stand in relative isolation from other buildings of similar periods. Because of this they are not considered to make an essential contribution to the character of the area, although retention and restoration may still be beneficial.

2008- These buildings have generally been substantially altered and stand in relative isolation from other buildings of similar periods. Because of this they are not considered to make an essential contribution to the character of the area, although retention and restoration may still be beneficial.

The gradings therefore in part derive from the 1985 study. Despite the claim in the introductory paragraph to the gradings, the changes made from the 1985 definitions are not confined, however, to those resulting from the recent discontinuance of the Register of the National Estate.

The Panel does not believe that the grading system used in the 2011 Review and imposed by the City is at all useful in 2012. It appears to the Panel that continuing an A - E grading system similar to that adopted in the 1980s does not reflect the current approach to heritage conservation in Australia. Since 1998, Australia has utilised an approach which provides statutory protection at world, national, state and local levels. Most commonly buildings are identified as of significance in contemporary conservation studies are simply said to be of local significance or State significance (or other higher grades).

The Panel concurs with the observations made about the consequences of using an A-E grading system at page 12 of the 1993 Review on this matter:

After extensive discussion with representatives of the MCC and with the review's Steering Committee the study team was asked to consider the possibility of changing to an A, B, C structure to reduce the pejorative associations often implied by gradings D and E and to simplify the list overall. MCC planning staff had cited consistent problems with the old system in that owners and developers generally assumed that D and E graded buildings were clear candidates for demolition, regardless of other issues such as streetscape and visual, cultural and historic relationship with associated notable or historic buildings.

The 1993 Review then went on to adopt a three level grading for the buildings assessed as of significance: A-graded buildings were said to be of State or national importance and to be recommended for inclusion on State and national lists (as well as the then 'notable buildings' list in the Planning Scheme); B-graded buildings were said to be '*important milestones in the cultural development of the city and ... seen to be of metropolitan significance*'; C-graded buildings were said to be '*of cultural significance for their representation of different phases of development in the central city*' and '*make a contribution to the cultural value of the streetscape or precinct within which they are located*'.¹²

This 1993 grading approach therefore can be seen to ascribe State (or national) significance; local (or metropolitan) significance; and contributory significance in a precinct context. This is consistent with contemporary heritage studies. So far as **local** significance of places is concerned (as is the principal subject of this Amendment), in the 1993 Review places are either identified as significant in their own right or as making a contribution to a precinct.

The Panel notes that the grading system adopted in the 1993 Review does not confuse the level of significance with the values ascribed to the place nor the criteria used to assess the level of significance (see also discussion below). Values are the reason the place is important such as the list set out in section 4(1)(d) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* – '*...scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value*'. Criteria are a method of organising information and evidence to show how a place demonstrates the heritage values. We have the further concern that the five level grading used in the 2011 Review mixes values with gradings.

Moreover, we are concerned that there are a number of different systems of gradings proposed for the Planning Scheme (even as it relates to the central city alone).

Clause 22.04 (which relates to heritage places within the Capital City Zone) as it would be revised by this Amendment lists seven matters to be taken into account when considering permit applications relating to heritage places. Relevantly they include:

- *The recommendations for individual buildings, sites and areas contained in the Central City Heritage Review 1993.*

¹² The 1993 Review also recommended against the continuation of streetscape gradings due to the difficulty of applying that approach, which had been successful in suburban locations, to the diverse streetscapes of the central city.

- *The recommendations for individual buildings and controls as detailed in the Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011 and Heritage Assessment 316-322 Queen Street 2010.*
- *Regard shall be given to buildings listed A, B and C in the individual conservation studies, and their significance as described by their individual Building Identification Sheet.*

We note also that a reference document for that clause is the 1985 booklet: *Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne* (dated November 2005) which was prepared by a team of planners and architects including Mr Butler under the guidance of a steering committee and approved by the Council in July 1985. It is proposed to retain that booklet as a reference document. The gradings in that document are consistent with the 1985 gradings described above.

The listed matters for consideration and the reference document collectively, therefore, refer the reader to no less than three sets of gradings for buildings in the CBD: 1985, 1993 and 2011 (2008). This is clearly unsatisfactorily confusing for the reader.¹³

The Panel has other reservations about retaining the 2005 booklet as a reference document for Clause 22.04 which relates to the Central City Zone. The booklet itself, in its introduction by the Chief Executive Officer, indicates that it applies to places **outside** the Central Activities District and in particular to all existing and proposed buildings in Urban Conservation Areas and buildings outside the Central Activities District graded A, B or C ‘*under the Council’s grading system*’. It explicitly provides that:

Within the Central Activities District, the provisions of the Central City Interim Development Order and its Heritage Guidelines take precedence over the information included in this booklet.

The transparency of the planning system is in no way assisted by the retention as a reference document, a booklet which in its own introduction indicates that it does not apply to the relevant part of the municipality. We would also comment that there is almost no content relevant to assessing the types of commercial places found in the central city (even if the guide was to apply there) with the possible exception of Part 4 containing policy statements about standards for permit applications. The document is also largely out of date in a statutory sense.

To retain this booklet as a reference document for the central city simply makes no sense and compounds the gradings uncertainties.

In summary, local protection is what is proposed in this Amendment. The Panel does not believe that applying B or C gradings to places included in the overlay assists in future management decisions about those places. After all, the proposal is that they are of local importance and aside from that, management decisions should be made on the basis of their statements of significance, not some relative value within the overlay.

¹³ We note also that the Melbourne Heritage Action group also supports a new system of grading ‘*which reflects the contemporary value that Melbournians place on the heritage of Melbourne*’.

Ms Sharp who appeared for the owner of the property at 441-447 Elizabeth Street (the former Royal Saxon Hotel) made a number of submissions about how the existing poor structure of the local heritage provisions of the Planning Scheme would be compounded by this Amendment. **We agree with her view that drafting of a new policy to address individual buildings in the central city appears appropriate – though we do not believe this Amendment should be deferred pending that task.**

The gradings that have been allocated to the buildings in the 2011 Review will of course remain public knowledge and debates about the level of significance of those buildings and whether the particular gradings allocated in the Review are appropriate, will continue beyond this Panel process.

The Panel believes, however, that this should be avoided for any future amendments.

The Panel recommends that:

The Planning Authority undertake a general review of the grading system as part of developing a standardised approach to building listings in the central city area.

The Planning Authority consider retaining whether the 1985 booklet: *Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne* (dated November 2005) should be a reference document for Clause 22.04.

The Planning Authority undertake a review of the structure of the heritage sections of the Local Planning Policy Framework (and related incorporated and reference documents) of the Planning Scheme.

Criteria and thresholds

The Panel believes that it is unhelpful today for a study such as this to have utilised the National Estate Register criteria to describe the basis of significance.

The Panel accepts that the VPP Practice Note 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' still refers to the Register of the National Estate criteria (described as the Australian Heritage Commission criteria). However, as mentioned above, the Register of the National Estate has been discontinued. Also, in 2008, Australia's environment ministers agreed to a set of national criteria to be adopted by all jurisdictions at the earliest opportunity (these are commonly referred to as the HERCON criteria). These criteria (with appropriate thresholds) are utilised by the Australian Heritage Council (for the national list) and the Victorian Heritage Council for the VHR.

The on-line guide produced in March 2009 - *Protecting local heritage places: a national guide for local government and the community* (revised edition prepared with permission by Heritage Victoria as part of the Supporting Local Government Project for the Commonwealth Government and the Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand) at page 47 lists the HERCON criteria:

The following list is the Common Criteria adopted by the Environment Protection and Heritage Council of the Australian & State/Territory Governments in April 2008 (comprising the model criteria developed at the National Heritage Convention (HERCON) in Canberra, 1998):

A. Importance to the course, or pattern of our cultural or natural history.

B. Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history.

C. Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of our cultural or natural history.

D. Important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments.

E. Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.

F. Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.

G. Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions.

H. Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history.

The HERCON criteria are commonly used in contemporary municipal heritage studies. The Panel recommends this approach to the Council for future work as application of the list of criteria presents many fewer problems of interpretation at local level than the former National Estate criteria. The Panel also suggests that the Council should request that the Department of Planning and Community Development should immediately adjust the VPP Practice Note to bring it into line with current practice.

Statements of Significance

The Panel is concerned that Graeme Butler and Associates has not followed current practice in preparing Statements of Significance for places proposed for inclusion in the overlay in this Amendment. In particular the approach does not follow the guidance provided by Heritage Victoria. Whilst it uses the three common headings: *What is significant?*, *How is it significant?* and *Why is it significant?* It fails to pursue the following guidance on writing *What is Significant?*:

This should be dedicated to a description of the place or object including facts about size, layout, construction date, designers and builders, materials, integrity, condition and so on. While this section should be brief, usually no more than one paragraph, there should be no doubt about the elements of the place or object which are under discussion.

The statements of significance proposed in the Review include long statements under this heading containing pieces of history and elements of description. The Panel believes that this approach will not assist the future management of these places, nor assist owners, managers and planning officers in dealing with future development options.

The Panel was advised that the citations for the buildings as originally drafted by Mr Butler did contain a section dealing with the building elements of importance but these were removed on the suggestion of the expert peer review panel which assessed the draft citations. We understand this was because there might be inconsistency with the identification of significant elements in other parts of the citation.

In the Panel's view, the statements of significance should be reviewed with a view to clarifying the key elements of the building that warrant conservation. This might be done by reinstating Mr Butler's section dealing with these elements.

Related to this matter is the issue of where the statements of significant are to be 'housed' in a statutory sense. Are they best simply to remain part of the 2011 Review which is proposed to be a Reference Document of the Planning Scheme or should they be incorporated into the Planning Scheme?

The report of the Advisory Committee on the Review of Heritage Provisions in Planning Schemes of August 2007 discusses this matter at part 3.8 and recommends that the statements should become incorporated in planning schemes – as it would maximise their importance in decision making. The Panel supports this approach. We recognise that while statements of significance for a relatively small number of precincts can practicably be housed directly in the policy section of a planning scheme (such as has been done for the central city precincts), it is not possible to allocate the required many pages of the planning scheme to individual building statements of significance. They nevertheless could be readily included as a group in a single incorporated document of the scheme.

During the Panel hearing there were a number of suggestions made about improvements to the wording and clarity of statements of significance as well as inclusion of revised material coming to light after exhibition of the Amendment. They included changes to the statements for the Celtic Club and the Royal Saxon Hotel. The Panel recommends that the review of the statements of significance should also take these suggested changes into account.

The Panel recommends that:

The statements of significance be included in an incorporated document of the Planning Scheme.

The statements of significance for all buildings be rewritten to:

- a) be consistent with the Heritage Victoria guidance notes;**
- b) clarify the building elements of importance so as to assist statutory decision making; and**
- c) incorporate any new information coming to light after the Amendment was exhibited.**

Precincts and complementary buildings

Within the central city area, the Melbourne Planning Scheme currently has 11 heritage precincts (the statements of significance are included in Clause 22.04 of the scheme). All of these precincts are larger areas, with a mixed group of Victorian or Edwardian buildings, but represent parts of the city that are generally seen to have some historic and architectural significance regardless of the importance of individual buildings within them.

The Panel notes that whilst the study brief called for the consultant to consider the potential for further heritage precincts, he did not identify any and it is not clear whether he addressed that requirement. As a result the Amendment proposes only individual place

Heritage Overlays. The Council presentation reinforced that this Amendment provided for individual place Heritage Overlays and not for precinct overlays.

Nevertheless the issue of whether some buildings might have more appropriately been included in precincts (some being quite small in terms of building numbers and others more extensive) was raised at the Panel hearing. In particular the Panel refers to the submissions and evidence relating to the Sniders and Abrahams Warehouse where it was suggested that there was perhaps a small 'precinct' of Sniders and Abrahams buildings, or perhaps a larger industrial/warehouse precinct; and Dillingham Estates House, which on one view is part of a group of Yuncken Freeman buildings on William Street just south of Bourke Street.

This led the Panel to consider: what is a precinct? Are there a minimum number of places required before a precinct can be said to exist? Can a precinct simply be several associated buildings? Does a sense of place also have to be created?

It has not been necessary to form a view on this matter, but we would comment that serial listing - providing a number of separate but related and linked places with the one HO number - may provide an alternative approach in those cases where defining even a small precinct seems inappropriate. Neither the VPP Practice Note nor the Heritage Victoria website provides much in the way of guidance on this issue.

Of the 99 buildings in this Amendment, the Panel believes that, apart from those mentioned above, few, if any, would warrant consideration as part of a precinct or as part of a serial listing.

In evaluating Amendment 186 and the appropriateness of applying the Heritage Overlay to the individual places, we do make some observations in relation to this matter for a small number of places. Our focus, however, has necessarily been on the merits of including the places within individual place Heritage Overlays.

The Panel suggests, however, that the City should in future more fully consider other options for identifying and managing heritage places, including the designation of further precincts or adopting a serial listing approach. We would point out that recommendations for further precincts were made in the 1993 Review and it commented particularly on the collective value of remaining warehouses and factories which are more vulnerable to demolition when individually assessed (page 15 of 1993 Review).

Interiors

This Amendment proposes for the first time that the interiors of central city buildings said to be of local heritage significance be included in the Heritage Overlay. No other interiors of local significance are yet included in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay,¹⁴ despite there being recommendations concerning potentially significant interiors in the 1993 Review.

We were advised that the brief for the 2011 Review did not include an assessment of building interiors. Nevertheless, some building interiors were identified by Mr Butler during the study as being of heritage significance. The Council supported the inclusion of all

¹⁴ The interiors of those buildings which are included on the VHR are included by virtue of the provisions of the *Heritage Act 1995*.

interiors subject to some minor modifications in the case of the Law Institute building and Centenary Hall.

A number of submitters did not oppose the inclusion of the exterior of their buildings in the Heritage Overlay but were opposed to interior controls. They raised a variety of objections – most related to restrictions upon required internal changes. This, like external building changes, is not a matter we believe is relevant to the issue of whether significance is made out (see Section 4.2). Others were critical of the evaluation which had been carried out and that significance had not been established.

Collectively, the objecting submissions raise the issue of whether the 12 nominated locally significant interiors have been adequately assessed as part of the 2011 Review.

Appendix 5 to the 2011 Review contains information about the approach taken to the interiors of the buildings which were assessed.

It includes:

Recommendations in the Central City Heritage Review 2011 - Heritage Assessments report

*Although Central City Heritage Review 2011 assessments have been confined to external fabric, contributory interior elements were identified for places **where they interfaced with the public domain**. The following places have been identified as possessing valuable or contributory interior elements and the protection of these elements **should be examined further** under clause 43.01 of the Planning Scheme.*

Scope of work

*The following table lists the existing interior identified elements plus a short significance statement. There are 14 sites identified, with three of these requiring further inspections. It is possible that more significant elements are in the buildings so the recommendations must be qualified as confined to ground level interior elements and known large public spaces at upper levels. **Ongoing management of these interiors requires an incorporated plan for each place to allow for permit exemptions for non significant parts of the building interiors** (Panel emphasis).*

This appendix goes on to list the 14 buildings¹⁵ where significant interiors were identified or believed to occur.

While 12 buildings forming part of the Amendment are proposed for interior controls, no incorporated plans have been proposed for the interiors to identify the parts of the interiors not subject to controls. Instead, the approach taken in the Amendment was to specify in the

¹⁵ The Amendment later proposed that interior controls be applied to the 11 buildings where the interiors had been noted as making a contribution to the significance of the exterior of the building as seen from the public realm and one further building where inspection of a further part was recommended. The two buildings which had no internal inspection conducted did not have interior controls proposed in the Amendment.

'Heritage Place' (address) column of the proposed revised schedule to the Heritage Overlay those parts of the interior subject to controls. For example, in relation to the building at 104-110 Exhibition Street the following description of the interior intended to be subject to control is included:

Extent of internal control: Exhibition Street ground floor and hall lobbies with two-coloured Buchan marble dadoes; lacquered timber entry door joinery with etched glass and building name to doors and top lights; door glazing and brass fittings; coloured and patterned terrazzo in the foyer flooring with the Orange Order star motif, and a cascading stepped, entry stair to the first level hall with streamlined metal balustrading.

It is therefore clear from the 2011 Review itself, and indeed from Mr Butler's evidence at the hearing, that the identification of interiors for heritage controls was something which arose incidentally in the course of Mr Butler's inspection of the specified buildings for his review.

He acknowledged in response to questioning that the identified interiors, for the most part, were (as stated in the 2011 Review appendix) ones which contributed to the appreciation of the exterior view of the building. This was not always so; some of the interiors were partially or wholly not visible from the street. He also acknowledged under questioning that some of the interiors he identified as worthy of controls were regarded as more significant than others and later provided a sheet summarising his evaluation of each interior.

The interiors that Mr Butler suggested for heritage controls were reviewed by Mr Storey for the National Trust. He commented favourably on some but was less than enthusiastic about others. In his assessment of whether the interiors were worthy of special controls, Mr Storey compared many of the interiors to other interiors not recommended by Mr Butler (largely because they were in buildings not surveyed) which were from a similar development period or building genre.

The Melbourne Heritage Action group also made a quite comprehensive review of the interiors of 81 of the buildings proposed for controls and comparative ones suggested by the National Trust. They presented this at the Panel hearing. Again they were supportive of some interiors and not others. They made their own suggestions about other worthy interiors. They included Pelligrini's cafe/restaurant in Bourke Street.

The Panel inspected all of the interiors proposed for listing (whether or not there was a submission by the owner) and most of the comparative interiors referred to by Mr Storey.

Like the Melbourne Heritage Action group and Mr Storey, we believe that the interiors do vary considerably in the extent to which they have been altered and whether they are special or merely unremarkable examples of interiors of the period or associated with the building type. In some instances, all of the interior fabric remains in a portion of a building (usually the public foyer) or at least sufficient interior fabric to identify the whole of that part of the interior space as of significance. In other instances, there are quite striking original elements remaining, such as wall or floor tiling, letterboxes, cascading stairs and the like but often they are virtually the only significant remaining elements or the interior presentation is incomplete. Examples of this are the hallway tiling in the Sir Charles Hotham Hotel which is supplemented only by unremarkable pressed metal ceilings and a painted stair rail and the pressed metal ceiling with lantern light in the shop at 160-162 Bourke Street which is not supported by other remaining original interior features. In other cases, it is unclear whether

or not the interior element is original or just a sympathetic update such as the lift interior in the ACA building in Queen Street.

During the course of our inspections, we incidentally observed even more interiors which arguably are worthy of consideration for heritage controls. They include the ground floor and first floor public areas of the former RACV building in Queen Street, the vaulted lobby of 101 Collins Street, the marble-clad ground floor lobby of Dillingham Estates House and the entry area to the Athenaeum Club.

We have formed the view that it is not appropriate in the absence of a systematic and comprehensive study of all potential interiors in the city buildings to proceed to list the small group incidentally identified by Mr Butler. The somewhat random selection of interiors of varying ages, ranging from simple to quite elaborate, with different levels of intactness, affords no clear threshold of significance against which interiors can be judged.

We also suggest that it may be useful for the more comprehensive work on interiors to consider whether the interiors which might be listed should be categorised in terms of their significance in their own right or whether they make a contribution to the external appearance of the building. There are those interiors well within the building (including on upper floors) which cannot be observed except from within the interior space itself (an example of this is meeting hall in Centenary Hall in Exhibition Street); there are other interiors, usually public foyers but some shop interiors, that can be glimpsed incidentally from the street (such as the ACA building in Queen Street); and there are the large open glassed public ground floors of many of the buildings constructed since the 1950s (examples being the Law Institute building and Dillingham Estates House) which can readily be seen from the street. In the latter case, the interiors are arguably an important element of the exterior design irrespective of whether they are important for their own sake.

In relation to the latter category of 'interior', we agree with the submissions presented by Mr Testro for the Law Institute that they fall into something of a lacuna in the controls of the planning scheme which are neatly divided into external and internal controls. That internal/external categorisation of the parts of the building applies comfortably to those buildings typically developed before the Second World War, where interiors are well shielded from the public realm by solid walls punched only by limited window and doorway openings. The categorisation of internal space versus exterior does not sit well, however, with the design characteristics of many modern buildings (generally offices in the central city context), where there is a clear view to the ground floor interior. Indeed, a transparent ground floor base with more solid building above is a design element of many offices since the 1950s. In terms of their streetscape role or contribution to the appearance of the exterior of the building, it is likely not to be the detailed design of elements of the interior so much as the openness of the ground floor space that is important.

This being said, however, statements of significance afford the opportunity to state **how** an interior is important to the building. It would seem possible to clarify the internal/external role for interiors as part of such a statement.

The discussion of interiors also raised the matter of how only part(s) of the interior of a building might be best designated in planning schemes. The schedule to the Heritage Overlay allows a box to be ticked indicating that interior controls apply but does not directly indicate how only partial interiors are to be shown. As noted earlier the incorporated plan

approach was recommended in the 2011 Review but the approach taken in the proposed Amendment was to describe the area affected in the 'Heritage Place' (that is address) column. An alternative approach might have been to define the affected area in the 'Internal controls apply' column itself by providing: '*... but only to the extent of...*' (as was suggested by Mr Testro and later agreed by Mr O'Farrell in closing submissions). This is the approach taken in the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. It was also suggested by Mr O'Farrell that Clause 52.03 applying to specific sites and exclusions may be another approach.

There was considerable discussion around the issue of the legal problems occurring because of the limitations imposed upon partial internal designation – not least being the issue of the mapped area of the Heritage Overlays (which might show as applying to the entire building) having been held by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to take precedence over any inconsistent description of the land in the overlay schedule (in the case of an interior perhaps part only)¹⁶. It was also noted that if interior controls were to be applied to a number of floors in a multi-level building or even one upper floor, for example to a lift interior or lift lobby, the different ownerships in a strata titled building could cause difficulties. These matters which have been highlighted by the proposed application of interior controls to high rise city buildings require rectification and should be brought to the attention of the Department of Planning and Community Development.

In our view, there is a need for more thorough investigation of all interiors before any interiors are listed in the central city. A clear understanding of the threshold(s) to be met should be developed. The listing of the interior of a property can quite seriously restrict the flexibility of an owner to adapt the building to his or her needs and should not be lightly applied as a result of some incidental identification.

The Panel recommends that:

None of the proposed internal alteration controls be applied.

Statutory documents and paint controls

It is convenient to deal with this aspect of the 2011 Review and Amendment in this general section of the report.

External paint controls are proposed to be applied to all of the 99 buildings. This is the control additional to the standard requirement for permission to paint an unpainted external surface and where the painting of the external surface would constitute an advertisement (see Clause 43.01-1).

There was no specific opposition to this particular control in any submission.

The Panel sees no reason why this element of the Amendment should not proceed as exhibited.

A related matter was raised in the Law Institute of Victoria's written submission concerning its building at 468-470 Bourke Street, however, which has general application.

¹⁶ *Alphington Grammar School v Yarra City Council* (2008) VCAT 995. See also Exhibit T45 for a fuller discussion of this issue.

The submission pointed to inconsistent and confusing wording between the Explanatory Report and the Amendment's List of Changes document concerning whether external paint controls applied to those 12 buildings where interior controls are proposed. On the one hand the Explanatory Report includes under the heading 'What the Amendment does':

External paint controls apply for 99 places but none of the other requirements in the schedule will apply. Twelve (12) places include select building interiors.

The List of Changes document provides under the heading 'Overlays':

The Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is amended to include 99 new places. External paint controls apply to 99 places, 12 places are select building interiors with interior controls but none of the other requirements in the schedule will apply.

These documents might be read as indicating that of the 99 places, 12 are interiors and in the latter case no external paint controls apply.

The Notice of Preparation of Amendment puts it more clearly:

Amendment C186 introduces the 99 places and 12 select building interiors into the Heritage Overlay... External paint controls apply for 99 buildings and select internal controls for 12 places, but none of the other requirements will apply.

While the submission did not suggest that anyone would have been misled to the extent that further notice of the Amendment would be necessary, the Panel agrees that it would be appropriate to ensure that if, contrary to our recommendations, the Council proceeds with internal listings, the wording of the final Explanatory Report and List of Changes should be consistent and make it clear that 99 places are proposed to be included in the Heritage Overlay (or the final number as adopted); for 12 of these interior controls are to be applied; and for all 99 external painting controls would apply.

4.2 Other challenges to proposed listings

There were a number of other common matters raised in the written submissions and in presentations at the hearing relating to individual buildings which it is convenient to make general comments about.

(i) The role of a building's past occupancy in determining significance

This Amendment includes a number of buildings which were originally factories and warehouses - those uses having now largely disappeared from the central city. The buildings in most cases show no outward sign of their past occupancy. This is true also of the former Venereal Diseases Clinic in Little Lonsdale Street.

During the hearing, several of the experts presenting evidence in relation to individual buildings suggested that the previous occupancy of a building was of no consequence to its significance unless there was a clear reflection of that previous occupancy in the exterior building fabric. This was a generally a reference to there being no obvious sign that a particular company had occupied the building originally or for a significant period, rather than merely the former land use not being apparent. It was suggested, for example, that a factor reducing the significance of the Sniders and Abrahams tobacco warehouse was its

anonymity. It was even suggested that it would be better understood and hence more significant if it had a large cigar attached to it. Whilst this was clearly a ‘tongue in cheek’ response, it conveniently sums up the position being put in a number of submissions.

It seems to us that this argument is a variant on the argument presented in *A Heritage Handbook* edited by Graeme Davison and Chris McConville for the Monash Public History Group (Allen and Unwin, North Sydney, 1991). In that book, Professor Davidson is critical of the identification of places as of local heritage significance through their association with local identities – an association that usually was not evident in the built fabric. It might be considered that ‘local identity’ could be extended to a company or firm - which originally occupied the building.

The following quotation from page 91 of the book perhaps best expresses the criticism of significance given to a building by association:

As Sir John Summerson, the British architectural historian, once remarked, ‘the objective fact that a certain man did live in a certain house is of purely subjective value’. The connection becomes more than sentimental only if the historic personage and the building somehow help to interpret each other.

The Panel believes, however, that the approach that the historic personage and the building must help to interpret each other is perhaps an approach that is not so useful at the local level¹⁷ and certainly not relevant when a warehouse or factory building was built for a particular type of business. A lack of labelling of previous occupancies, or identifying features from those occupancies such as names on pediments, in the main does not prevent these buildings being seen as former factories and warehouses. It is the generic land use which in the main which is often the critical factor in significance rather than the particular business.

So far as the former Venereal Diseases (VD) Clinic is concerned, the anonymity of the building is perhaps hardly surprising and should not be regarded as reducing its significance.

Generally each place has been dealt with in terms of its historic and architectural significance, regardless of the existence of labelling or identifying features.

(ii) The role of economic policy considerations

The issue

The issue that was addressed in a number of submissions was whether, in assessing if a building should be included in the Heritage Overlay, consideration should be given to other policies of the planning scheme, in particular those which support economic development in the central city. It was suggested, at least in the case of marginally important buildings, that their inclusion in the overlay - with its attendant presumption of conservation - should be traded off against other planning objectives.

¹⁷ See the discussion of this matter in the Panel report on Boroondara Planning Scheme Amendment C99 page 38.

These matters were addressed in some detail in Ms Brennan's submission for ISPT Pty Ltd as owner of the National Mutual site at 433-455 Collins Street, as well as in Mr Walker's submissions for the Currie and Richards property at 473-481 Elizabeth Street. They were responded to by Mr O'Farrell in his submissions for the Council and in Mr Tobin's submissions for the National Trust.

Ms Brennan's submissions included:

- The Council as planning authority is under a statutory obligation to implement all of the objectives of planning in Victoria not merely those relating to heritage conservation.
- In preparing (and assessing) planning scheme amendments the Council and Panel are obliged to have regard to State and local planning policies, including those for the CBD and must consider economic and social effects if the circumstances appear to so require.
- The decision in *Australian Conservation Foundation v Minister for Planning* (2004) VCAT 2029 establishes that all relevant planning issues, including indirect social and economic effects, must be considered.
- The Panel in considering whether to apply the overlay should allow the city to perform its capital city functions.

Mr Walker's submission in relation to this matter also relied on the *Australian Conservation Foundation* case. In particular, he relied upon its findings concerning indirect effects being a legitimate subject for a submission to a proposed Amendment. He submitted that the effect of the *Australian Conservation Foundation* decision in combination with section 12(2) of the Act is that a planning authority must consider all planning policies which have a sufficient nexus to the amendment – in this case not just heritage policies. He said that as one effect of imposing heritage controls is to constrain development, the policies relating to the primary functions of the city should also be considered.

Mr Walker's submission acknowledged that previous panels had not generally taken this approach in relation to consideration of heritage amendments.

The Council response

In his closing reply for the Council, Mr O'Farrell addressed this matter. He submitted that reference to the *Australian Conservation Foundation* case was misplaced and distinguishable in that there were terms of reference purporting to limit the considerations of the panel (which does not apply here).

He noted that previous panels had consistently taken the view that trade-offs against other objectives and requirements of the planning schemes are to be dealt with at the planning permit stage rather as part of the consideration of the appropriateness of a heritage amendment.

Mr O'Farrell quoted the following passage from the report of the panel in relation to Amendment C99 to the Boroondara Planning Scheme as a convenient summary of the panels' approach:

Panels have generally been consistent in their view that consideration of matters beyond the issue of whether or not an individual site or a precinct has the requisite level of local significance, lie outside the proper scope of the assessment of a proposal to apply a Heritage Overlay.[1] These views have normally been expressed in response to submissions about personal disadvantage to the submitter as a result of the heritage listing such as such as economic consequences for a landowner, costs of repair of a building in poor condition, a desire to demolish and rebuild, and the like.

It is our view, however, that even when the competing issues raised are broader and of a public nature such as urban consolidation, they remain outside the proper scope for consideration in relation to the matter of whether a Heritage Overlay should be applied.

The decision as to whether a planning scheme overlay which signals and regulates particular characteristics of land should apply to any site is not a decision which is normally taken having regard to 'trade-offs' against other competing objectives and controls of a scheme. Places are not excluded from the Environmental Significance Overlay, for example, because the planning authority wishes to see the land developed. The consideration of application of that overlay is based on whether or not the land has significance. Similarly areas are included or not included within flooding overlays purely on the basis of whether flood liability applies. In the same way, when a Heritage Overlay is proposed to be applied to a property or area, the consideration should be whether or not it has local heritage significance.

We would also say that planning scheme overlays with few exceptions do not impose prohibitions on development but require that certain values pertaining to the land are taken into account in any proposal to develop the land. Some development proposals may be judged to be inappropriate having regard to all the factors relevant to the permit decision and refused as a result, but others will be judged as satisfactory. This is true of the Heritage Overlay.

In the present case, the Panel is in effect being requested to make a decision in the context of the Amendment about potential demolitions in the area(s) proposed to be made subject to the Heritage Overlay. In our view, these matters are normally and properly dealt with under planning permits. It is only when a permit application outlining the proposed use and development is before a planning body that the proper trade-offs or balancing of policies can be made.

In this respect we refer to the report of the Panel considering Whitehorse Amendment C140 which includes:

The Panel notes that the management of heritage places is a two stage planning process. Firstly the objective identification of heritage significance (the current stage); and secondly the ongoing management of the place having regard to such matters such as the economics of building, retention and repair, reasonable current day use requirements etc as part of the consideration of an application for development.

This approach to the management of heritage places has been adopted in practice by planning panels and by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The comments by the panel considering the Ballarat Planning Scheme Amendment C58 are often referred to.

At page 53 of their report the Panel said:

Panels have consistently held that whenever there may be competing objectives relating to heritage and other matters, the time to resolve them is not when the Heritage Overlay is applied but when a decision must be made under the Heritage Overlay or some other planning scheme provision. The only issue of relevance in deciding whether to apply the Heritage Overlay is whether the place has heritage significance.

Mr O'Farrell also submitted that at the permit stage the balancing against other policies would necessarily occur as a result of Clause 10.04 of the scheme which directs integration of policies in favour of net community benefit and sustainable development.

Other submissions

Mr Tobin for the National Trust also referred to a number of other panel reports which have taken the same approach to the matters to be considered at the time of a proposed heritage amendment. His submission also pointed out that to do otherwise would be to 'second guess' the future use (or development).

Mr Tobin also pointed out that under the Capital City Zone provisions permission is required for buildings and works and these provisions would invite consideration of broader competing policy objectives.

Panel discussion and views

The *Australian Conservation Foundation* case is one which is concerned with the issue of whether the ambit of considerations by a panel can be constrained by terms of reference. It finds that they cannot and that the decision maker is obliged by section 12 of the Act to entertain submissions on environmental matters and consider the environmental effects of a proposed amendment including its indirect effects.

It appears that it is by analogy that it is argued that we must consider the economic consequences of the present heritage Amendment.

The *Australian Conservation Foundation* decision was considered by the panel considering Amendment C84 to the Brimbank Planning Scheme. As here, it was a heritage amendment proposing individual place Heritage Overlays. Relying on two cases (one being *Australian Conservation Foundation*), it was argued for a submitter that the panel should have assessed the heritage study's recommendations against the State and local planning policy frameworks of the scheme (including economic, environmental and social objectives) prior to preparation of the amendment.

The Panel commented that the two cases relied upon revolved around the question of whether the discretion to consider social and economic effects implied in the wording of section 12(2)(c) should or should not have been exercised. Noting that neither case related

to heritage controls, they found that the cases did not have specific relevance to Amendment C84.

We similarly believe that the findings of the *Australian Conservation Foundation* case are not directly relevant here.

Section 12 of the Act to which it refers sets out the responsibilities and duties of a planning authority. They relate inter alia to the matters which are to be considered when a scheme is being prepared.

Relevant parts of section 12 are:

- 12 (2) *In preparing a planning scheme or amendment, a planning authority-*
- (a) must have regard to the Minister's directions; and*
 - (aa) must have regard to the Victoria Planning Provisions; and*
 - (ab) in the case of an amendment, must have regard to any municipal strategic statement, strategic plan, policy statement, code or guideline which forms part of the scheme; and*
 - (b) must take into account any significant effects which it considers the scheme or amendment might have on the environment or which it considers the environment might have on any use or development envisaged in the scheme or amendment; and*
 - (c) may take into account its social effects and economic effects (our emphasis).*

It appears that there is a mandatory obligation to consider significant environmental matters in the preparation of an amendment (the matter in contention in the *Australian Conservation Foundation* case) but there is discretion as to whether social and economic effects are to be considered.

We are conscious that the apparent difference between the two provisions may not be as great as it first appears.

The second case to which the Brimbank panel was referred was *Glenroy RSL v Moreland City Council* VSC 29; [1997] VICSC 29 (3 July 1997) reported in 19 AATR. The Supreme Court was considering the whether a similarly worded discretion to consider social and economic effects under section 60 of the Act, which relates to the matters to be considered by a responsible authority (and the Tribunal) when considering an application for permit, was indeed discretionary in all circumstances.

That section provides:

- (1A) Before deciding on an application, the responsible authority, if the circumstances appear to so require, may consider-*
- (a) any significant social and economic effects of the use or development for which the application is made...*

The Court held:

If "the circumstances appear to so require" I am of the view that the responsible authority (and thus, on a rehearing, the Tribunal) is then bound to have regard to

*whichever of the four specified subject matters bears upon the issue. I do not accept that the expression "may consider" is to be read in s.60(1)(b)¹⁸ as conferring a discretion on the decision-maker but rather, in the words of Jervis CJ in argument in *MacDougall v. Paterson* [1851] EngR 973; (1851) 11 C.B. 775 at 773; [1851] EngR 970; 138 E.R. 672 at 679 "the word 'may' is merely used to confer the authority: and the authority must be exercised, if the circumstances are such as to call for its exercise" (See *Finance Facilities Pty Ltd v. Federal Commissioner of Taxation* (1971) 127 C.L.R.106 at 134-135 per Windeyer J; see also *Mitchell v The Queen* (1996) 184 C.L.R.333 at 345-346). To adopt and adapt the language of Windeyer J in *Finance Facilities*, the responsible authority (and the Tribunal) are each given power to consider the matters mentioned in sub-s.(1)(b) in forming their decisions but upon proof of the particular case out of which the power arises, that is "if the circumstances appear to so require", the responsible authority, or the Tribunal (as the case may be) is then bound to consider them.*

While there is no similar reference to 'if the circumstances so require' in section 12, the *Glenroy* case nevertheless provides some guidance on whether there are obligations to consider other matters beyond heritage when urged to do so by submitters.

In relation to this heritage Amendment we do not think that the circumstances require us to consider matters beyond whether the places which are the subject of the proposed Heritage Overlays have heritage significance – in particular we do not think we are required to consider and trade-off other economic policies of the Planning Scheme. We adopt the reasoning of the panel which considered Boroondara Planning Scheme Amendment C99 as quoted above in making this finding. The Heritage Overlay like most other overlays in the VPPs is a tool with a particular purpose to recognise and manage heritage places. It should be applied to those places where heritage significance is found to apply.

In this respect we note that the VPP Practice Note on Applying the Heritage Overlay, in the section headed 'What places should be included in the heritage overlay?', indicates that, in addition to heritage places not relevant here, the overlay is to be applied to 'places identified in a local heritage study, provided the significance of the place can be shown to justify the application of the overlay'. There is no mention in the Practice Note that other trade-offs are to be made.

We believe that the proper time for economic imperatives and the like to be considered is at the permit application stage when the detail of what is to be done to a place is known and heritage considerations can be fairly weighed against other outcomes. This is an approach consistent separating heritage assessment and management as described in the Burra Charter.

There can be no concern that this later balancing of competing objectives will not occur. As Mr Tobin noted, the Capital City Zone provisions impose the need for permission for buildings and works and demolition, and the multiple permissions under the zone and the

¹⁸ Now section 60(1A)(c)

overlay will ensure that considerations applying at the time of a permit application will not be confined only to heritage matters as they might be if only heritage permission were triggered. The balancing of heritage considerations against other scheme policies and requirements will always occur where works are proposed on the sites of these buildings – allowing the worth of their retention or demolition to be considered when there is a known proposal for buildings and works.

With respect to this issue of whether other competing considerations should apply at the time the Amendment is being considered, we were not referred to any other panel report where a different approach to ours has been taken.

(iii) Permits

The issue

There were a number of matters raised concerning the relationship of the Amendment to extant planning permits and applications, most notably:

- The role that an existing permit for redevelopment of a site plays in considering whether the Heritage Overlay should now be applied and whether there is a need to accommodate it in some way.
- The effect of the incoming heritage controls upon current applications for permits and the need for additional permissions.

These matters were the subject of submissions made on behalf of the owners of the Celtic Club and the National Mutual building in particular. We understand that planning permits exist or permit applications have been also made in relation to the Women's VD Clinic, the Royal Saxon Hotel, the Currie and Richards site, and the Law Institute site.

Some of the key matters raised were:

- Ms Brennan advised that there is a permit to develop the National Mutual site¹⁹, current to 2 December 2015, which allows the demolition of the open plaza forecourt, part of the basement car park and façades of the existing building; together with refurbishment of the existing office tower and the construction of an 11 storey office building to Collins Street with ground floor retail; a two storey icon building for use as a restaurant; and a pedestrian laneway. The earlier written submission for ISPT Pty Ltd suggests that heritage matters had been considered when the permit application was made.

While this permit seems to allow 'contemporising' changes to be made to the cladding of the existing building, it is not clear whether this permission would allow any changes required to deal with the complete replacement of new external panels as a result of the recent problems.

- Mr Bisset advised that his client has an application before the Minister for Planning seeking to demolish part of the building on the site (retaining the facade to which the

¹⁹ Planning Permit No 2006/0419

Heritage Overlay would apply) and to construct a 48 storey mixed use development with three basement levels housing the Celtic Club and 256 dwellings. Permission is also sought for use of the land as a hotel (with gaming), a function centre, restricted recreation facility and a liquor licence.

He advised that his client sought to have an incorporated document added to the Amendment (see Clause 43.01-2) which would provide for a two²⁰ dimensional building envelope allowing the proposed development to proceed behind the retained façade without the need for further planning permission under the incoming overlay (which was not opposed). This was on the basis that the planning permit application had been carefully designed having regard to all relevant matters which included heritage and it was inappropriate for it to have to be reassessed.

The Council response

Mr O'Farrell's closing submissions included that submitters' reference to these permits was again to try to persuade the Panel from recommending the application of the overlay having regard to other matters. He noted that it was in the context of the 'accrued rights' debate.

So far as accrued rights are concerned he noted that permission for demolition is required under the Capital City Zone (which applies to all of the sites) and in circumstances where permission for demolition under the zone has been granted the question arises whether further permission for demolition under any incoming overlay would be required. He also noted the provision to the Panel of legal advice which had been provided to ISPT Pty Ltd in relation to the National Mutual building which is to the effect that no further permission would be required for demolition given their existing permit. He said that there may be a future debate about this, but it was unnecessary for the Panel to resolve this matter.

He also indicated that the Council opposed the inclusion of an incorporated plan for the Celtic Club property as the building envelope had not yet been agreed and the Council were proposing a series of changes.

Mr O'Farrell also suggested that the issue of whether a permit would be required for repairs to the National Mutual building if an overlay was applied was an issue for another day. He noted however, the interpretative issue around whether the exemption for routine repairs and maintenance would apply (Clause 62.02-2) or whether a permit would be required because the appearance of the building would be altered (Clause 43.01-1).

Other submissions

Submissions on this matter were also made by Mr Tobin for the National Trust. Mr Tobin indicated that the Trust did not take issue with the notion that where the relevant permissions are regulated by the Planning Scheme and a planning permit is obtained that this constitutes an accrued right. He indicated an acceptance that the introduction of the Heritage Overlay would not have retrospective application and the permit would stand.

His submission went on to say:

²⁰ The draft incorporated plan provided showed no maximum tower height.

However, the mere existence of a planning permit does not mean that the permit will be acted on. All permits have expiry dates and will expire should the development not proceed within the time permitted under the permit (and no extension of time is sought or granted).

The existence or otherwise of permits is an irrelevance insofar as the application of the Heritage Overlay is concerned. The primary question, in fact the only question, remains whether or not a particular site should be the subject of the Heritage Overlay, and it has no bearing on this question, it being part of the second type of enquiry, on the question of whether or not the Overlay should apply.

Panel discussion and views

We agree that it does seem that the Panel has been advised of these permits and applications to support of the submitters' position that consideration needs to be given to other matters besides heritage – most notably the development potential of these sites. As Mr O'Farrell submitted, this is similar to the argument about the need to consider and balance other development policies of the Planning Scheme against those relating to heritage conservation.

It is again our view that it is appropriate, in the context of considering the Amendment and whether Heritage Overlays should be applied, to consider only the heritage significance of the buildings. We do not believe that it is appropriate to consider the permits and applications - principally for the reason that the permits may never be acted upon (and the applications not granted), and thus the consequences for the integrity of the building remain uncertain.

So far as the incorporated plan for the Celtic Club site is concerned, we do not believe we can endorse any unknown final outcome for the land.

The other issue around permits and applications which requires consideration is the matter of whether the incoming controls will require new permit applications to be made. It was suggested or implied that it would be an unreasonable outcome if further permission was necessary.

It would seem that further permits for development (including demolition) would not be required either where permits have been granted and acted upon, or, if not acted upon, where the permits contain all of the necessary permissions to develop the land (a complete accrued right).

We agree with Mr O'Farrell that this matter should be left for another day, however, and another arena. We simply do not have sufficient information about permissions that have been granted, controls in place at the time etc, to make an informed judgment about their relationship to the incoming controls. We will comment that we expect that there will be some debate around these matters²¹.

²¹ Considering the possibly conflicting decisions in *Brimbank City Council v LS Planning Pty Ltd* [2006] VCAT 2218 and *The University of Melbourne v Minister for Planning* [2011] VCAT 469.

So far as this matter relates to underlying concerns about the fairness of imposing new controls on those landowners who have already obtained permits or have embarked on an application process, we advise that we are satisfied that there is sufficient flexibility in the management of the planning system that these problems can be overcome.

5 Places from the period to 1852: 'Frontier Town'

5.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int*	Written Sub**	Presented to Panel
George Evans shop and residence row 309-325 Swanston Street	HO1081	B			

*Internal alteration controls

**Submission

5.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

There were no places in this category addressed at the Panel hearing.

5.3 Written submission only

No written submissions addressed this property.

5.4 No submissions

Only one place originating from this period is proposed for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay, being the property at 309-325 Swanston Street – George Evans Shop. It was not the subject of submissions. The property was not inspected by the Panel and we see no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to this place.

6 Places from 1852-1859: 'Gold'

6.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Hoffman's flour stores, later Henry Box & Son Company offices and warehouse 104 A'Beckett Street	HO993	B			
Pynsent's store and warehouse 303-305 Elizabeth Street	HO1018	B			
Pattinson's general store, later Prince of Wales and Federal Club hotels, later Bulley & Co. Building 380 Elizabeth Street	HO1020	C			
Royal Saxon Hotel, former 441-447 Elizabeth Street	HO1022	B		Y	Y
Savings Bank of Victoria Flinders Street branch, former 520-522 Flinders Street	HO1040	C			
Bayne's shops and residences, later Little Reata restaurant 68-70 Little Collins Street	HO1055	A			
Cleve's Bonded Store, later Heymason's Free Stores 523-525 Little Lonsdale Street	HO1062	B			
James White's hay and corn store, part of Metropolitan Hotel 261 William Street	HO1088	C		Y	

6.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

(i) Former Royal Saxon Hotel, 441 – 447 Elizabeth Street

The place

This building consists of a part three and part two storey former hotel building constructed in several stages. The buildings facing Elizabeth Street include a three storey face brick building (southern part) using a Regency architectural style and a two storey basalt building to the north (a similar wing to the south was demolished at some stage in the past). A red brick building at the rear was constructed as later addition to the hotel and a portion of the original hotel yard is bordered by remnants of a bluestone rubble wall to the west. The yard was originally accessed via a carriageway which passed beneath the southern end of the three storey building.

The issue

The written submission lodged by Hansen Partnership Pty Ltd for the owner of this property in response to the exhibited Amendment raised the following issues:

- The 'B' grading proposed for this building overstates its heritage importance and it was removed from the interim list of the Register of the National Estate.
- The association of the building with the founding of the nearby Queen Victoria Market is of marginal cultural, historical or social value.
- It is of a simple, common mid-1800's architectural style - used by a number of hotels from the same period- and hence not exemplary or a key example of its style.
- Significant alterations have been made to the façade.
- The use is no longer as a hotel.

In summary, the submission was that the values of the building were slight and outweighed by the need to allow reasonable development of the site.

Ms Sharp, barrister, appeared for the owner, Goodyear Pty Ltd. She submitted:

- Amendment C186 is misconceived.
- The Amendment has not been prepared with the necessary rigour.
- The ability of the building to meet one of the National Estate criteria completely is disputed, claiming that: early hotels in Melbourne are commonplace and were often used as meeting places; whilst it has a continued use for accommodation (it is now a series of apartments) this is of limited importance; that the aesthetic significance is at best limited to the three storey façade and the incorporated carriageway; and the building may be of interest to the community, but is not highly regarded.
- The building should be graded at no more than a 'C'.
- Should the Amendment be approved the extent of the HO over this property should be limited to the three storey façade.

The expert witness called by her, Mr Taylor, made the following points:

- That the building has some architectural, aesthetic or cultural significance at the local level.
- However, the balance of the site (including the rear annexe and the yard) has little or no significance.
- The front section with its Regency style façade and covered carriageway has some capacity to demonstrate the area's early development and land use. Whilst the form of the building was once common it is now rare – including the covered carriageway.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the site and its buildings are:

- Historically and socially significant as one of Melbourne's earliest surviving and continuously occupied hotels - constructed in 1858 on the then main approach to Melbourne via Elizabeth Street.
- Important for the rare and distinctive carriageway from Elizabeth Street (now accommodating a shop).
- Historically important as the venue for the meeting that established the Queen Victoria Market.
- Aesthetically significant for its elegantly simple and symmetrical façade composition.

An annotated statement of significant for this building prepared by Mr Butler, after his last inspection, was provided to the Panel.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the application of the overlay, but felt that the claim for significance around the hosting of a meeting related to the establishment of the Queen Victoria Market was not strongly justified. The Trust specifically noted the rarity of carriageways associated with hotels.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel agrees with the submitter and the National Trust that it is not appropriate to ascribe historical significance to the building based on its hosting a meeting concerning the establishment of the Queen Victoria Market. The market itself is by far the more significant site on this criterion.

The Panel undertook a detailed inspection of the site on 12 April 2012 and we have concluded that the story of the development of this site is not yet fully understood (and was not presented as part of the evidence). It is possible that the three storey section was a redevelopment of an earlier two storey complex, of which the two storey basalt building at 447 Elizabeth Street was part.

Regardless of this, it is clear that the building at 441-447 Elizabeth Street as we see it today was in place by 1860. We agree with the experts that it should be ascribed historical and social significance on the basis that it is one of Melbourne's earliest hotels on what was originally the main entry road to the city.

The Panel accepts that the annexe at the rear is a later addition, but it was developed for hotel use. There was also some discussion about the origins of the basalt wall at the rear which may have been part of another property (part only of which survives). It appears likely, however, that this was used to support a structure which faced onto the hotel yard and should also be included.

We are of the view that the whole of the site should be included in the overlay.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Royal Saxon Hotel at 441-447 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) **A revised the statement of significance to reflect the evidence of Mr Butler; and**
- b) **A re-inspection by representatives of the Planning Authority and the statement of significance for the place adjusted to accommodate information that is revealed as a consequence.**

6.3 Written submission only

(i) James White Hay and Corn Store – 261 William Street

The place

This is a two storey parapeted shop and dwelling constructed in 1854-5. It is finished in dressed and tuck pointed stone with a slate roof. It presents architecturally as part of the abutting Metropolitan Hotel (opened on that site in 1854). The shop was first developed for James White, a hay and corn dealer.

The issue

An objecting written submission was forwarded to the Council on behalf of the owner, Chris Karagounis, by Alex Kaar Pty Ltd. The submission included that aesthetically the building does not display any heritage features and does not have such heritage significance that it warrants controls. The site has potential for redevelopment.

The Council position

In the 2011 Review, the building is found to be of historical significance as one of the oldest group of shops and dwellings within the Capital City Zone. Mr Butler's evidence was that while the ground floor has been rendered, the upper level painted and the upper level windows sheeted over, these are reversible and other original elements such as the dressed stone window sills and carved stone cornice and parapet are intact.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building and submitted that it was an unusual example of a shop constructed and faced with basalt, the more common facing material for these buildings being cement render.

Panel discussion and views

The submission by the owner does not provide any information upon which his assertions are based. We accept the expert evidence provided by the Council, supported by the National Trust, about the significance of this very early shop and dwelling which has had only minimal alteration.

The objections concerning restriction upon redevelopment of the site are not considered to be relevant to the Amendment but are to be taken into account in relation to any permit which might be sought for the land. See Section 4.2 for a discussion of this issue.

Having considered this issue the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the James White Hay and Corn Store at 261 William Street.

6.4 No submissions

The six places listed in the table in Section 6.1 were not the subject of submissions. They were not inspected by the Panel and we see no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to these places.

7 Places from 1860-1899: 'Boom and Bust'

7.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Australia Felix Hotel, later Alhambra, Stutt's, Morells', and Richardson's Hotel, and National Australia Bank 168-174 Bourke Street	HO998	C			
Gothic Chambers (City Proprietary Company building) 418-420 Bourke Street	HO1005	C			
Sniders & Abrahams tobacco and cigar factory 9-13 Drewery Lane	HO1014	C		Y	Y
Elizabeth Chambers 21-23 Elizabeth Street	HO1015	B			
Knight's shops and dwellings, later Hood and Co and Edinburgh Chambers 215-217 Elizabeth Street	HO1016	B			
Wilson's shop & residence 299 Elizabeth Street	HO1017	C			
Bank of Australasia, former 384 Elizabeth Street	HO1021	B			
Griffiths Bros Pty Ltd building 26-30 Flinders Street	HO1034	B			
Schuhkraft & Co warehouse, later YMCA, and AHA House 130-132 Flinders Street	HO1036	C			
Cobden Buildings, later Mercantile & Mutual Chambers and Fletcher Jones building 360-372 Flinders Street OR 1-5 Queen Street	HO1037	C			
Coffee Tavern (No 2) 516-518 Flinders Street	HO1039	C			
Penman & Dalziel's warehouse group part 4-6 Goldie Place	HO1044	B			
Throstle's stores 106-112 Hardware Street	HO1045	C			
Union Bond Melbourne Storage Company Ltd 115-129 King Street	HO1047	B			
Marks' warehouse 362-364 Little Bourke Street	HO1051	B			

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Warburton's shops & warehouses 365-367 Little Bourke Street	HO1052	C			
Briscoe & Co warehouse, later EL Yencken & Co P/L 392-396 Little Collins Street	HO1056	B			
McCracken City Brewery malt store, later Ebsworth House 538-542 Little Collins Street	HO1057	B		Y	
Porta and Sons, Steam Bellows Works 25 Little Lonsdale Street	HO1058	C			
Watson's warehouse, later Kelvin Club 14-30 Melbourne Place	HO1065	C			
Clarke's Shops & Dwellings 203-205 Queen Street	HO1070	B			
Celtic Club 316-322 Queen Street	HO985	B		Y	Y
Union Hotel, later Tattersalls Hotel 288-294 Russell Street	HO1073	C			
McCaughan's Coffee Palace, later Great Southern Private Hotel 10-22 Spencer Street	HO1075	C			
Melbourne Democratic Club and shops and residences 401-403 Swanston Street	HO1082	C			
County Court Hotel, later Oxford Scholar Hotel 427-433 Swanston Street	HO1085	B		Y	Y
Spier and Crawford, warehouse 259 William Street	HO1087	B			

7.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

(i) Sniders and Abrahams Tobacco Factory – 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-90 Drewery Place

The place

This complex of two linked buildings was constructed as a cigar and tobacco factory and warehouse. They are claimed to have been built in 1890 to a design by prominent Melbourne architect, Nahum Barnet. The building facing Drewery Lane (on the south-west corner of the intersection with Drewery Place) is a more decorated design, described as Queen Anne Revival style, than the attached building to the west at 2-20 Drewery Place which demonstrates a more restrained and modest version of the Renaissance Revival style.

The issue

The written submission made to the Council in relation to this property was in the form of an expert report by Mr Barrett dated October 2011. It says that it was prepared for Gorman Kelly Pty Ltd, managing agents of the property, on behalf of the owner, Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd. The views Mr Barrett expressed in that report were consistent with his evidence as discussed below.

Mr Barrett also noted that there was confusion around the full extent of the site proposed to be included in the Heritage Overlay. The reference in the schedule to Clause 43.01 refers to 9-13 Drewery Lane only, but the mapped Heritage Overlay 14 is more extensive. Mr Barrett comments that it appears to include the adjoining buildings at 2-20 and 22 Drewery Place and he notes that it had been suggested to him that there is internal connectivity between the three buildings. The material in the 2011 Review itself refers only to 9-13 Drewery Lane²², and Mr Barrett's written submission discusses the significance of the property at 9-13 Drewery Lane only.

At the hearing, however, this issue of the proposed extent of the Heritage Overlay was clarified and the values of the two abutting buildings (9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place) were addressed.

The owner was represented at the hearing by Ms Sharp, barrister. Having noted the confusion over whether 2-20 Drewery Place was proposed for heritage controls, she made the following submissions:

- The origins of the building at 2-20 Drewery Place are unknown.
- The buildings have some contributory value as part of an historical precinct.
- Neither building provides any visual evidence of the association with Sniders and Abrahams, the tobacco industry generally, or with architect, Nahum Barnet.

²² Mr Butler later indicated that it was intended that the Heritage Overlay extend to the immediately adjoining property to the west.

- It is an exaggeration to state that Barnet specialised in the tobacco and cigar warehouse and factory architecture.

When called to give expert evidence by Ms Sharp, Mr Barrett made the following points:

- Changes have been made to the exterior of the Sniders and Abrahams building at 9 – 13 Drewery Lane and as a result it is not a particularly intact example of a late Victorian/Edwardian warehouse.
- The association of the building with Sniders and Abrahams ceased in the 1920s and today that association is not evident in the fabric.
- That this is not a good example of the English Queen Anne Revival style as popularised by English architect, Norman Shaw.
- The site is not important as an individual building or buildings, but may warrant identification as part of a precinct.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the combined building is:

- Aesthetically significant for its early and successful use of the English Queen Anne Revival style of architecture.
- Historically significant for its role in the development of a cigar and tobacco manufacturing and warehousing precinct in this part of the city and for its association with architect, Nahum Barnet.
- The building had been consistently afforded a 'C' grading throughout the heritage studies and reviews.
- In its reply submission, the Council sought to clarify any confusion over the extent of the proposed overlay and reinforce that what is proposed is an individual building overlay covering the two building addresses, not a precinct overlay.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and the expert evidence from Mr Storey made the following comments:

- Whilst this is an example of the Queen Anne Revival style (9-13 Drewery Lane only) it is not as dramatic or overt as other examples in the city such as the Winfield Building at 495 Collins Street.
- There was a concentration of buildings associated with the tobacco industry in this part of the city.
- Nahum Barnet was a prolific commercial architect.

A written submission by Mr Duff, the occupant of a nearby building in Little Lonsdale Street, addressed the scientific value based on construction methodology of the nearby building at 7 Drewery Lane and his own building (also known as 1 Drewery Lane). He comments that No 1 is *'not as architecturally attractive as numbers 7 and 9-13'*.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected the buildings from the exterior.

We believe that despite Mr Butler's evidence that both 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place were built at the same time, they present as two different buildings of different architectural styles. However, it is clear that both buildings were used by Sniders and Abrahams for some time and that they were internally linked.

The Panel considered whether this linked pair of buildings would be more appropriately identified as part of an industrial/warehouse precinct, or as one of a group of serially listed building associated with Sniders and Abrahams (see discussion at Section 4.2(iii)). We think there is clearly a case for defining an industrial/warehouse precinct in this part of the central city, as suggested by Ms Sharp, or at least serially listing Sniders and Abrahams' buildings.

Despite this, the Panel is obliged to consider the Amendment as presented to it and in the absence of any precinct for this area the Panel believes that these linked buildings are sufficiently important in their own right to warrant the application of a Heritage Overlay.

We find that the linked building is both historically and aesthetically significant at the local level for its association with the tobacco industry and as a remnant of the industrial/warehouse precinct in this part of the city. We find that the changes which have been made to the buildings do not detract from an appreciation of their original industrial/warehouse role. We also do not think it is a fair criticism that the fabric does not reveal an association with Snider and Abrahams: warehouse buildings of this kind frequently were not 'labelled' as to the firm occupying them nor did the materials produced or stored inside generally dictate the form of the building - they are a generic type of building.

Regardless of whether the corner building is as good an example of the Queen Anne Revival style as other buildings in the city, such as the former Winfield building, the Panel believes that its architectural design is important and particularly so for an industrial building sited in a back lane. The Panel accepts that Barnet designed other buildings for tobacco manufacturers and merchants, but is aware that he was a prolific and highly regarded architect in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and his reputation is not dependent on his role as the designer of tobacco warehouses.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings at 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) A review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that both buildings are covered by the overlay.**

The Planning Authority consider further amending the Planning Scheme to incorporate a Heritage Overlay over an industrial precinct which incorporates the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings or including them as part of a serial listing of buildings associated with the firm Sniders and Abrahams.

(ii) Celtic Club (former West Bourke Hotel) – 316-322 Queen Street

The place

The former West Bourke Hotel is a two storey hotel building located on the corner of Queen and Latrobe Streets designed in an Italian Renaissance Revival style. It was constructed in 1876 as a two storey structure to a design by prominent Melbourne architect George Johnson and in 1924 extensive renovations and additions (including a third storey) were made to the design of the building by architect, Arthur Barnes. It has been occupied as the Celtic Club since 1957.

The issue

The written submission lodged by MacroPlan on behalf of the building owner, Celtic Club Inc., included the following points:

- The building has been assessed in earlier studies (1976, the 1985 Study and the 2002 Review) but its significance has not previously been recognised as sufficient to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.
- A specific heritage assessment was done for the building only after a planning permit had been lodged for its redevelopment in September 2010. The redevelopment then proposed would have retained the façade.
- The 'B' grading of the building is challenged. Only a 'C' grading is supported by Lovell Chen Architects who were engaged as experts by the owner.
- There is a second planning permit currently under consideration by the Minister for the redevelopment of the site – this again retains the façade. Lovell Chen has advised on its retention.
- Current Planning Scheme policies provide a sound basis for assessment and heritage controls are not warranted.
- The property at 316-322 Queen Street comprises two lots: Lot 1 on TP874263B and Lot 2 on TP644R. The Heritage Overlay should not apply to both lots as was exhibited but only to Lot 1 upon which the former West Bourke Hotel is sited.
- The letter to the Minister for Planning appended to the written submission (dated 9 September 2011) includes that *the Celtic Club has longstanding cultural and historical significance in the City of Melbourne.*

At the hearing, the owner was represented by Mr Bisset of Minter Ellison.

He submitted that the owner was not opposed to the application of the Heritage Overlay to the site as proposed by the Amendment, but requested that the Panel should have regard to:

- The adequacy of the heritage assessment undertaken by Mr Butler and previous assessments.
- The appropriate heritage grading for the building (it is proposed as a 'B' grading).

- The appropriateness of having two separate policy reference documents for the Amendment.
- The need to clarify the extent of the overlay for this site (HO985).
- The appropriateness of including an incorporated plan in the schedule which reflects the current permit application for the site.

Mr Bisset called expert evidence from Mr Lovell of Lovell Chen. He made the following points:

- This is a building of local significance and warrants inclusion in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay.
- Despite the evidence that the building was designed by prominent architect, George Johnson, the claim that this is a 'milestone' place has not been established sufficiently for the building to be graded 'B'.
- The extent of importance can only be attributed to the original building and not the adjacent Milburn House.
- He requested that the statement of significance for the Celtic Club be amalgamated with those in the 2011 Review²³.

Mr Lovell later provided a revised statement of significance for the building based on the additional knowledge which had come to light after exhibition of the Amendment.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Historically important as a 'characteristic form of mid Victorian-era commercial Melbourne derived from the growing effect of Italian Renaissance Revival architecture as applied at first to two-storey buildings at the beginning of two decades of massive growth in Melbourne City. The relative integrity of the façade ground level is high adding historical value to the place.'
- Historically important for its links with Port Phillip pioneer, George Evans.
- Aesthetically important for its ornate classical façade.

In his submissions in reply, Mr O'Farrell clarified that the Council only wished to apply the Heritage Overlay to the Celtic Club building and not the adjoining site. He also indicated that the Council was opposed to the proposal put by the owner that an incorporated document be included in the Planning Scheme which reflected the current planning permit application.

Mr O'Farrell supported the owner's submission that the Statement of Significance for the property should be included as part of the main 2011 Review reference document, hence enabling the deletion of the second reference document. He indicated also that the Council agreed that it was appropriate that there be changes to the statement of significance for the

²³ Mr Butler advised that the Celtic Club statement of significance had preceded the 2011 Review and supported the amalgamation.

building reflecting new information. Mr O'Farrell further pointed out that Mr Lovell had conceded that the grading was a 'line ball' matter and that in the Council's opinion the building should remain graded as 'B'.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the overlay and made the following points:

- The façade is impressive.
- The architecture is more typical of designs that were produced some ten years later. In other words, it is something of an architectural trail blazer.
- The association with George Evans has more to do with his estate than himself personally.
- The façade is largely intact from its major periods of construction.
- It is a rare surviving example of a corner hotel in the CBD.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected this building externally.

It is clear from the evidence presented at the hearing that the original two storey building was constructed in 1876 to a design by prominent Melbourne architect, George Johnson, and extended in 1924 to designs by architect, Arthur Barnes.

The Panel believes that the original Celtic Club building is of architectural and historic importance and warrants inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. It also believes that this is an important early work by George Johnson and has a long association with the Irish community as the Celtic Club and as such should be graded 'B'.

The Panel does not believe that the association with George Evans adds to the historic significance of the place in any significant way.

We agree with Mr Lovell that a revised statement of significance for this building is required and suggest that the Council when reviewing the statements of significance for all buildings should have regard to his suggested alternative (see the discussion at Section 4.1(ii)).

The Panel notes that the Council agrees with the submissions that the overlay should be restricted to the original Celtic Club building and the planning scheme map should be amended accordingly.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Celtic Club at 316-322 Queen Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) A review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that the original building only is covered by the overlay; and**
- b) The statement of significance be amalgamated with the 2011 Review and a single reference document only be included in Clause 22.04.**

7.3 Written submissions only

(i) McCracken City Brewery – 538-542 Little Collins Street

The place

536 -542 Little Collins Street is developed with a four storey warehouse building constructed in two stages, the first dating from between 1878 and 1879. It presents a façade to Little Collins Street which relies on a Renaissance Revival design. The top floor was added sometime in the twentieth century.

The issue

The owner of the building, Housing Choices Australia, submitted:

- The building has been significantly modified.
- An upgrade from a 'C' to 'B' grading is unjustified.
- The proposed Heritage Overlay would unnecessarily encumber the site for future development of affordable housing.
- Modifications to the building reduce its contribution to the fabric of the immediate streetscape.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Of aesthetic significance as a good free-standing example of a Victorian era Renaissance Revival palazzo style building.
- Of historic significance as one of only two brewery buildings remaining in the central city and the only surviving remnant of the large McCracken Brewing complex.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment.

Panel discussion and views

On the basis of the submissions and evidence presented at the hearing, the Panel believes that the building is of both architectural (aesthetic) and historic significance in the city. The McCracken Brewery was a large and significant operation of historic importance and this remaining remnant, albeit a warehouse and not a brewing building, retains its distinctive Renaissance Revival form.

The other issues raised in the submission are addressed in the general issues in Section 4.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the former McCracken City Brewery warehouse at 538-542 Little Collins Street.

7.4 Agreement at hearing

(i) County Court Hotel (now Oxford Scholar Hotel) - 427-433 Swanston Street

In its written submission, RMIT as owner of this building (known as RMIT Building 81) did not object to the inclusion of this building in the Heritage Overlay based upon advice from Lovell Chen Architects, provided the extent of the overlay was reduced. This was on the basis that the western portion of the exhibited Heritage Overlay area is subject to a substantial new development and contains no original building fabric. It was submitted that the development retains the original hotel and only this part of the site should be included in the overlay.

The Council accepted that position.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the County Court Hotel building (now Oxford Scholar Hotel) at 427-433 Swanston Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) **The overlay boundary apply only to the extent of the original hotel building.**

7.5 No submissions

The remaining 23 places for which no submissions were received are listed in the table in Section 7.1. The Panel did not inspect any of these buildings (nor those above where submissions in support were received or written objections were later withdrawn) and we see no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to these places with the exception of any interiors.

8 Places from 1900-1929: 'The City Beautiful'

8.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Exhibition Boot Company 160-162 Bourke Street	HO996	C	Y	Y	
Bourke House 179-183 Bourke Street OR 145 Russell Street	HO999	C		Y	
Evans House, later Rochelle House 415-419 Bourke Street	HO1004	C	Y	Y	Y
Burke, later Burns, House 340-342 Collins Street	HO1090	B			
Huddart Parker Ltd Building 464-466 Collins Street	HO1012	C			
State Savings Bank of Victoria, Western Branch 615-623 Collins Street	HO1013	B			
Union Bank Chambers, later A.N.Z. Bank 351-357 Elizabeth Street	HO1019	C	Y	Y	Y
Currie & Richards showrooms & warehouses 473-481 Elizabeth Street	HO1025	C		Y	Y
Alley Building 30-40 Exhibition Street	HO1026	C	Y		
Kelvin Hall & Club, former 53-55 Exhibition Street	HO1027	B			
Fancy goods shop & residence 309 Exhibition Street	HO1029	C			
Sargood Gardiner Ltd warehouse 61-73 Flinders Lane	HO1030	B			
Denniston & Co P/L clothing factory, later Rosati (1986- 2012) 95-101 Flinders Lane	HO1031	C	Y	Y	Y
Higson Building 125-127 Flinders Lane	HO1032	A			
Victorian Cricket Association Building (VCA) 76-80 Flinders Street OR 1-9 Exhibition Street	HO1035	C			

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Waterside Hotel 508-510 Flinders Street	HO1038	C			
Prince of Wales Hotel, later Markillies Hotel 562-564 Flinders Street	HO1041	B			
Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co 63-67 Franklin Street	HO1042	C		Y	Y
Keep Bros & Wood workshop and showroom, later Stramit Building 96-102 Franklin Street	HO1043	B			
Barrow Brothers warehouse 12-20 King Street	HO1046	C			
Peoples Palace 131-135 King Street	HO1048	B			
Argus Building, former 284-294 La Trobe Street	HO1049	C			
Collie, R & Co warehouse 194-196 Little Lonsdale Street	HO1059	C			
Cavanagh's or Tucker & Co's warehouse 198-200 Little Lonsdale Street	HO1060	A			
Women's Venereal Disease Clinic 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street	HO1061	C		Y	Y
Michaelis Hallenstein & Co building 439-445 Lonsdale Street	HO1064	B	Y		
Yorkshire House 20-26 Queen Street	HO1066	C			
Grant's warehouse 217-219 Queen Street	HO1071	B	Y	Y	
Royal Bank of Australia Ltd, later English Scottish & Australian Bank Ltd 42-44 Russell Street	HO1072	C			
Sir Charles Hotham Hotel 2-8 Spencer Street OR 566-580 Flinders Street	HO1074	B		Y	
Batman's Hill Hotel 66-70 Spencer Street	HO1076	C			
Hotel Alexander, later Savoy Plaza Hotel 122-132 Spencer Street	HO1077	B			
Elms Family Hotel 267-271 Spring Street	HO1078	C		Y	Y

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Cann's Pty Ltd building 135-137 Swanston Street	HO1079	C			
Swanston House, Ezywalkin Boot Shoe and Slipper Store 163-165 Swanston Street	HO1080	C			
Druids House 407-409 Swanston Street	HO1083	B	Y		
W D & H O Wills (Aust) Ltd tobacco Warehouse 411-423 Swanston Street	HO1084	C		Y	Y
State Electricity Commission of Victoria building, later Lyle House 22-32 William Street	HO1086	C			

8.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

(i) Evans House – 415-419 Bourke Street

The place

This six level reinforced concrete factory and office building was originally constructed for Thomas Evans Pty Ltd, tent and flag makers, in 1929-1930. The building has a cement and terra-cotta faience clad façade to Bourke Street.

The issue

An objecting written submission was lodged by CARE, town planning, on behalf of Victoria Body Corporate Services Pty Ltd acting on behalf of the owners. No reasons were given in the letter for opposing the inclusion in the overlay.

At the Panel hearing, Mr Rose, a part owner of the property, made submissions on behalf of the Body Corporate for this building. He agreed with the Planning Authority's view that the exterior of the building had significance, but he was opposed to the proposal to include parts of the interior in the Overlay, arguing that much of it had been altered and that if the lift and its entry doors were listed this might preclude future upgrading to meet access standards.

The Council position

The Council considers that the building is:

- Historically significant as a well preserved city retailer and manufacturer.
- Aesthetically significant as a well preserved façade and with a well preserved and significant interior.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert evidence from Mr Storey made the following points:

- While not strictly a 'Moderne' style building it is one of the first to display the influence of this style.
- There are many buildings built by city retailers and surviving from the inter-war years, but this one does retain elements of its original ground floor shopfront.
- The ground floor stair lobby and stairway are intact.

Melbourne Heritage Action fully supported the inclusion of the interiors of this building in the Amendment.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected the building externally and internally (in the company of Mr Rose) and believes that the building does have significance to the city. It is also confident that, while a considerable amount of the lobby and staircase interior is original, there have been significant alterations in recent times. Without a proper comparative survey of interiors throughout the CBD it is impossible to ascribe value to this particular interior (see discussion at Section 4.1(ii)).

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to Evans House at 415-419 Bourke Street.

(ii) Union Bank Chambers – 351-357 Elizabeth Street

The place

The building is a five storey office building with banking chamber on the ground floor. It was built for the Union Bank in 1926-27.

The issue

A late written submission was received from TGM Group Pty Ltd acting on behalf of the owner of this property, T Corporation Pty Ltd.

Mr Iles made submissions at the hearing on behalf of the owner. He indicated that the proposed overlay was opposed because:

- The building does not warrant a 'C' grading.
- The building has been altered since it was completed in 1927.
- The proposed internal controls are not adequately specified.

Mr Iles relied on extensive documentation which clarified changes to the original design and alterations made to the building over time.

The Council position

The Council considers the building:

- Of aesthetic significance as a handsome and substantially intact example of a Commercial Palazzo styled building with an important ground floor interior.
- Of historic significance for its long association with banking in the northern part of the city.
- Visually related to the former Argus Building on the opposite corner.

Other supporting submissions

Mr Storey as a late addendum to his witness report, provided supporting comments concerning the proposed inclusion of this building in the Heritage Overlay. They included:

Architectural:

...It is certainly handsome and substantially intact. Notable features include good proportioning and balance of solid and void, recessed vertical windows forming piers, and the large cornice (which continues around each major corner), supported by large abstracted brackets. The Commercial Palazzo or Stripped Classical style was by far the dominant style in the mid to late 1920s for multi-storey commercial buildings, not just banks. There are therefore many comparative examples, and this building compares well with others that already have individual HOs, and others included within C186.

The building is also substantially intact, including the gridded multi-pane windows; the only changes appear to be the removal or covering over of the first floor cornice and its iron balconettes and lamps, and the loss of the banking chamber door. The office entry appears intact.

Historical:

...The building has provided banking facilities in the northern end of the city since 1927, which is a long association. Perhaps more importantly it represents the growing requirements of businesses in this end of the CBD (notably the newish motor trade), a need large enough that the Union Bank believed a branch only a few blocks from its head office (351 Collins, 1878) was justified. Like other banks that built branches within the CBD, a few floors for rental purposes were built, also representing the desirability of an address in the CBD for office purposes beyond the more prestigious addresses of say Collins and Queen Streets.

Further aspects of significance:

Building type only or mainly found in the CBD:

Like other banks that built branches within the CBD, a few floors for rental purposes were built, representing the desirability of an address in the CBD for office purposes beyond the more prestigious addresses of say Collins and Queen Streets. As an early 20th century multi-storey commercial office building, this is a building type characteristic of the CBD. There are practically no examples in suburban Melbourne, and only a few examples in major country centres.

Comparative buildings:

[Photos of nine comparative buildings are attached by Mr Storey]

Melbourne Heritage Action nominally supported the inclusion of the interior of this building in the Amendment.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel thanks Mr Iles for his forensic analysis of the changes made to the building since its design and construction. However, the Panel believes that despite these changes, the building retains its significance as an important piece of architecture in the central city. The changes do not significantly alter the appearance of the building. Some are not 'changes' made to the building since it was first constructed (but were variations from the architect's plans put in place when the building was constructed). In other cases, changes are easily reversible.

We have recommended for the reasons set out in Section 4.1(ii) that no interior controls should proceed at this stage.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to the Union Bank Chambers at 351-357 Elizabeth Street.

(iii) Currie and Richards – 473-481 Elizabeth Street

The place

This is a complex of buildings with two storey shops facing Elizabeth Street, a covered carriageway, and a large open warehouse at the rear (now used for car parking), a two storey former warehouse building (now apartments) and a relatively modern redevelopment of apartments all facing the remnants of the service yard originally used by the firm Currie and Richards (as were many of the buildings).

The issue

An objecting written submission was made by Hansen Pty Ltd on behalf of the Owners' Corporation for this property (Ace Body Corporate Management) which included:

- Including the entirety of the site in the Heritage Overlay is inappropriate and given the varied historical pattern of use and development it should not be considered a single heritage site.
- Much of the fabric illustrating the hardware use has been removed and the use is not historically significant, in any case, given the number of hardware stores in the city at the time.
- The buildings, including those fronting Elizabeth Street, have undergone extensive modification. The warehouse at the rear has been converted to a garage and much of the rear yard has been filled in with residential apartments.
- While some parts of the site have heritage value, this is not an important heritage site and development of the non-contributory parts should not be prejudiced.

Mr Walker, made submissions on behalf of the owner of the property at the Panel hearing. Those submissions included:

- On a comparative basis this 'C' graded building is at the lower end of the significance spectrum for this Amendment.
- The relationship with the firm Currie and Richards is of interest, but not of significance and there is very little, if anything remaining to indicate that this firm occupied the site.
- There is no adequate analysis as to why the firm Currie and Richards is of local significance.
- The courtyard arrangement at the rear has been totally compromised and no longer represents the arrangement that existed in the 1850s, some of which was the yard for the adjoining hotel, not the Currie and Richards complex.
- The carriageway arrangement from Elizabeth Street is not unusual as claimed. The former Royal Saxon Hotel is another nearby example.

Mr Walker tendered a copy of the revised endorsed plans for planning permit TP-2011-785 applying to the site which permits the partial demolition of buildings and construction of a two storey addition. The plans were approved by the Council in March 2012.

He also made submissions about the inadequacy of the Amendment generally and the failure of Mr Butler to adequately assess the building against the relevant criteria. He also submitted that the Panel is obliged to consider planning objectives other than those related to heritage protection in determining whether to recommend the approval of the Amendment.

Mr Walker called Mr Barrett as an expert witness. He made the following points:

- The former Currie and Richards showrooms and warehouse have some heritage value for their capacity to interpret aspects of the historic development of this part of the city.
- The covered carriageway and courtyard is neither intact nor does it provide any visual evidence of the site's association with Currie and Richards. Carriageways from the street are not as uncommon in the central city as is supposed – Mr Barrett showed photographs of a number of purported comparative examples.
- An individual Heritage Overlay applied to this site would unreasonably constrain the future use or development of the site.
- This is not a particularly prominent work of the firm Oakden and Ballantyne and must be seen as a dated approach to façade design on Elizabeth Street.

The Council position

This complex of buildings is considered significant for:

- Its history as an extensive showroom and warehouse complex.
- The retention of parts of the courtyard with its carriageway access.

- A representation of the extensive hardware business of Currie and Richards.

Other supporting submissions

Mr Kyne and owner of one of the units in this complex made a written submission in support of the inclusion of this property in the Heritage Overlay. He also presented his views at the Panel hearing. He submitted:

- The buildings developed for use by Currie and Richards are substantially intact.
- The carriageway and courtyard arrangement, once common in the city is now rare.
- The 'C' grading should allow a balance between heritage protection and reasonable development.

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert report pointed out:

The combination of Edwardian-era showrooms facing Elizabeth Street, stores at the rear, a Victorian-era workshop, the courtyard and the carriageway which served them is not repeated as a courtyard-oriented complex in the City of Melbourne, although once more common in the early Victorian-era and is now uncommon in the state.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel agrees with the Planning Authority that this complex is appropriately graded as a 'C' building.

It is agreed by all parties that the buildings facing Elizabeth Street were modified using a conservative architectural language for use by Currie and Richards, hardware and iron merchants. While a more striking or contemporary architectural style may have added to the heritage significance of the site, we do not believe that the conservative architectural style adopted detracts from that significance. In fact, it reinforces the architectural language of other elements of this part of Elizabeth Street.

So far as the issue of the building reflecting the Currie and Richards use is concerned, the covered carriageway was inserted to enable Currie and Richards to access the yard and warehouse buildings at the rear and remains today.

The Panel disagrees with Mr Barrett's view that the carriageway and rear yard are common in the city. The examples shown by him were not truly comparative - in some instances they represented nothing more than side setback areas.

Mr Walker made strong submissions concerning the redevelopment potential of the land and sought to have the Panel 'trade-off' the heritage controls against economic opportunity. We do not agree that this is appropriate consideration at this stage. See discussion at Section 4.4(ii).

During the Hearing, it became apparent that the mapping of the property may not be accurate and may have inadvertently incorporated part of the adjacent property. This must be reconsidered.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Currie and Richards building at 473-481 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) **A review of the overlay boundary in relation to the property boundary, and if necessary align the overlay boundary with the property boundary;**

(iv) Rosati (Denniston and Co) – 95-101 Flinders Lane

The place

The building at 95-101 Flinders Lane, in the clothing supply area of the central city, was originally designed by architect Sydney Wilson in 1907 for Denniston and Company Pty Ltd, wholesale clothiers. It was then a single storey brick factory with basement. It was largely rebuilt in 1938 after a major fire, to a design by architects, AS and RA Eggleston. It was rebuilt to two levels with a saw tooth roof behind the retained single storey façade.

In 1986 the building was occupied as a restaurant/cafe known as Rosati. It underwent major internal changes with the construction of a large central timber bar and the laying of a mosaic floor within the large former factory space. Changes were also made to the front windows at this time.

Since exhibition of Amendment C186, the use of the building has remained as a cafe/restaurant (of a different name) but the building interior has been undergone a substantial refit with a new²⁴ central bar and the floor mosaics removed or covered²⁵. The factory shell, saw tooth roof and the street façade remain.

The issue

The written submission by Tixxis Pty Ltd consulting on behalf of the current owners included the following:

- Previous reviews have concluded that heritage listing is not warranted and there have been no intervening circumstances which would change this grading.
- The citation does not place any historic or social significance on the restaurant use.
- The building is not a rare or unusual example.
- The building has been substantially altered.
- The alterations to create a cafe are of no heritage significance.

²⁴ The Melbourne Heritage Action group suggested that it was possible that the 'new' bar was perhaps just a covering over the former bar. We concluded on our inspection that this is unlikely.

²⁵ While at the hearing an unknown person whom we understand to be associated with Waynesbury Pty Ltd advised that the mosaic floor had been removed, it was suggested by the Melbourne Heritage Action group that this was not the case. Our inspection, while not conclusive, suggested that the new rubber flooring had perhaps been put directly over the mosaics.

- The citation only supports further investigation of the interior at best and none of the interior fittings relate to the period of significance.

The written submission also raises concern that, in previous negotiations and mediations, the Council had not raised the matter of the significance of the interior (apparently beyond the front 10 metres), which is to said to remain unaltered in manner consistent with a mediated permit outcome.

The owners, Waynesbury Pty Ltd, were represented at the hearing by Mr Scally of Best Hooper. He called Mr Lovell to give expert evidence.

Mr Scally's submissions included:

- The building is unremarkable and has been substantially altered. At the least the interior should not be made subject to controls.
- The former associations with Denniston Company Pty Ltd and Rosati's restaurant are insufficient to give the building significance.
- The 2011 Review graded the building higher ('C') than it had been in 1985 without additional justification. The building is not, however, 'substantially intact'.

Mr Lovell's evidence was devoted almost exclusively to the extensive alterations which had been made to the structure.

The Council position

The 2011 Review identifies the building as historically important for its long association with clothing manufacture in the heart of the Flinders Lane clothing precinct, and its association with the then new cafe culture introduced to the central city by the Rosati restaurant. It is also identifies the building as aesthetically important as a successful fusion of an Edwardian-era factory with a 1938 saw tooth addition, and an avant-garde restaurant design blending old and new fabric to evoke an Italian theme.

Mr Butler's evidence included that the original façade of the building had been deliberately retained in the 1938 renovations after the fire.

Other submissions

Mr Tobin for the National Trust indicated that, on the basis that the interior tiling is no longer in place, the Trust does not pursue the interior listing of the building. He indicated that so far as the exterior is concerned, the Panel should assess the evidence.

Melbourne Heritage Action's submission included particular comment on the recent alterations to the interior of this building. They submitted:

The disgraceful act of vandalism which has seen the destruction of much of this building's interior should not deter the Panel from going ahead with interior controls. It is our understanding that the mosaic floors are in fact intact beneath the rubber matting. There are many photographs of these mosaics and the Panel should consider that these mosaics are intact and worthy of protection.

I urge the Panel not to be deterred by what was obviously a spiteful attempt to undermine the correct procedures of these hearings.

Panel discussion and views

So far as the claim is made by the submitter that a number of previous reviews have concluded that heritage protection is not warranted, this is incorrect. The 2005 Study afforded the building a D(3)²⁶ grading which is afforded to buildings which were *'either reasonably intact representatives of particular periods or styles, or they have been substantially altered but stand in a row or street which retains much of its original character'*²⁷. The 1993 Review graded the building as 'C' as does the 2011 Review, and the 2002 review did not assess it. As noted earlier none of the earlier studies proceeded to the amendment stage.

The written submissions in our view misunderstand the fact that the significance of the place is claimed to be associated with not only in its former industrial use but also with the conversion to a restaurant.

With respect to the presentations at the hearing, however, we have been persuaded that this building is both internally and externally substantially modified. Mr Lovell's evidence about the extent of changes to the front façade (including window alterations, express plinths lost, parapet changes, and capping mouldings incomplete) was confirmed on our inspection as was the dearth of Rosati remnants in the interior.

Little remains of either the Denniston era fabric or the Rosati fit out. From the Denniston era, the only elements remaining are the saw tooth roof and the much altered remnants of the façade. From the Rosati period, almost nothing seems to remain except possibly the mosaic floor about which we received conflicting submissions. While our inspection leads us to suspect that the mosaic tiles may well remain beneath rubber flooring, this remnant in our view would not recommend that interior controls should be applied.

As was said in the Advisory Committee Report on the Review of Heritage Provisions in Planning Schemes, an initial threshold that any heritage place must pass before it is deemed to be an appropriate candidate for heritage controls is that there must be elements of the place which require management (see for example Section 2.11.6 of that report). While the report indicates that the elements may be very ephemeral and still warrant management, in the case of building interiors, we suggest that consideration also needs to be given to the advice given in the Practice Note that interior controls should be sparingly applied.

For the reasons given in Section 4.1(ii), we do not support the proposed internal controls for all 12 buildings proceeding without a further more comprehensive review of building interiors.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay not be applied to Rosati (Denniston and Co) at 95-101 Flinders Lane.

²⁶ '3' refers to the streetscape grading

²⁷ As defined in the reference document in Clause 22.04: *Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne*

(v) Cyclone Woven Wire Factory – 63-67 Franklin Street and 459-469 Swanston Street

The place

This is a pair of linked red brick and stucco three storey buildings facing Franklin Street and on the corner of Swanston and Franklin Streets built for the Cyclone Wire Fence Company in two stages. The first was the original two storey building at 63-67 Franklin Street (in 1906) and the second was the 1916 additional storey to that building and the new building on the corner (459-469 Swanston Street).

Some confusion arose about the identity of the land because of the inconsistency between the mapping of the proposed Heritage Overlay and the address proposed for the schedule to Clause 43.01 in the exhibited Amendment (the latter omitted the Swanston Street building and referred to 57-77 Franklin Street). Further confusion apparently arose when the submitter later understood that only the Swanston Street building of this attached pair was proposed to be included in the Heritage Overlay²⁸. The proposal to include **both** buildings was later clarified and the values of the full site were addressed by the Council and the submitter (including in evidence) at the Panel hearing.

The subject buildings at 63-67 Franklin Street and 459-469 Swanston Street are known as RMIT Buildings 49 and 39 respectively.

The issue

The owner of the combined site, RMIT University, made two written submissions to the Council about buildings in its ownership proposed for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. RMIT advised that for the building at 459-469 Swanston Street (Building 39) it had obtained expert advice from Lovell Chen Architects. This advice was that the building did not have sufficient heritage significance to warrant inclusion in an individual Heritage Overlay. The building was said to be of some historical interest but not of sufficient architectural interest or merit, or sufficient historical significance, to justify its inclusion in the overlay.

RMIT was represented at the hearing by Mr Bowden of Song Bowden Planning. On behalf of the owner, he submitted:

- The Planning Authority had been confused as to what parts of the site are significant.
- The Amendment as it affects this complex should be abandoned, pending the Council establishing a clear understanding as to what is important.
- Building 39 (459-469 Swanston Street) is a key site in RMIT's development plans and coverage by a Heritage Overlay would unreasonably constrain those plans.

Mr Bowden called Ms Brady from Lovell Chen to provide expert evidence. She made the following points:

²⁸ See second submission from RMIT dated 6 December 2011.

- The building at 63-67 Franklin Street has sufficient significance to be included in the Heritage Overlay.
- The building at 459-469 Swanston Street has been modified and the brickwork painted.
- The building at 459-469 Swanston Street derives some historical significance for its association with the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company, but this building is of lesser importance than the attached building in Franklin Street because it is a later addition to the complex. It is not important enough to be included in the Heritage Overlay.

The Council position

The Planning Authority has indicated that this combined building should be graded 'C' and that its significance lies in it being:

- A well preserved factory complex within the central city.
- Historically important for its association with the well known Cyclone Woven Wire fence company.

Other supporting submissions

Melbourne Heritage Action made submissions to the effect that the interior of this building pair may warrant investigation.

The National Trust supported the inclusion of these attached buildings in the Amendment pointing out that the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company introduced the extremely popular cyclone fencing to Victoria in 1898 and was the main supplier in the first decades of the twentieth century when this factory was established and expanded. The Trust's evidence also noted that architecturally the building on the corner is an early example of classical motifs as opposed to a tall, arched red brick style.

Panel discussion and views

In the Panel's view, both buildings (63-67 Franklin Street and 459-469 Swanston Street) form a cohesive complex designed for and occupied by the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company. The Franklin Street building, constructed in 1906, was given a new upper floor and saw tooth roof in 1916 when the building at 459-469 Swanston Street was also constructed and joined to it to make a complex for the company. The Panel believes that the two buildings as seen today form a cohesive reminder of the significance of the company and are aesthetically important, drawing on the same architectural language to create a prominent pair of buildings in the city.

The Panel acknowledges that the failure of the Council to initially correctly identify the property proposed for the Heritage Overlay caused confusion and some inconvenience for the submitter. However, the Panel believes that after having been provided with additional time to address the corrected extent of the overlay and presenting a comprehensive case that any inconvenience was overcome.

Having considered the issues, the Panel recommend that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the former Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company buildings at 63-67 Franklin Street and 459-469 Swanston Street.

(vi) WD and HO Wills Tobacco Warehouse – 411- 423 Swanston Street

This is a five storey reinforced concrete warehouse constructed for tobacco merchants WD & HO Wills in 1924-25. It was designed by architect Francis J Davies and built by Walter Cooper. It used what was known as the Claude Turner system of reinforcing column and slab connection.

The issue

The owner of the site, RMIT University, addressed this building in its written submissions to the Council. RMIT's objection to inclusion of the building in an individual Heritage Overlay was based on expert advice from Lovell Chen Architects. It was said that the building had some historical interest but had neither sufficient architectural significance or merit, nor sufficient historical significance, to be included in the overlay.

RMIT University was represented at the hearing by Mr Bowden. On behalf of the owner he submitted that:

- The building was of insufficient importance to warrant the application of a Heritage Overlay.
- The evidence of Mr Storey (submitted by the National Trust) concurred with that of Ms Brady (who was called to give evidence on behalf of the submitter).
- The notion of the building being part of a 'precinct' had been raised by Mr Butler. However, the Panel is not considering whether a precinct designation should be approved and should not spend time considering that matter.
- There is a disconnect between Mr Butler's evidence about the Turner 'flat slab' construction and the conclusion which is focussed on historic significance.

Mr Bowden called Ms Brady from Lovell Chen to provide expert evidence. She made the following points:

- The association of this building with WD & HO Wills is of some historical value, but '*...many buildings within the Capital City Zone have long standing associations with specific companies; this is not a scenario which particularly distinguishes this building.....*'
- There are other buildings in the city which reflect the history of tobacco manufacturing in Melbourne. Buildings such as Dover's warehouse and the former Gill Memorial Home are earlier, more architecturally distinguished, and already covered by heritage controls.
- The statement of significance suggests that the building is of architectural interest, not significance. It does not meet the threshold for local significance against these criteria.

The Council position

The Council has indicated that this building should be graded 'C' and that it is:

- Historically significant for its long association with WD & HO Wills.
- Historically significant for its association with the architect Francis J Davies and his authorship of a building that collapsed shortly before the erection of this building.
- Of aesthetic interest as a well preserved, but conservative design for its time.

Other supporting submissions

The expert evidence by Mr Storey presented by the National Trust made the following observations:

- Architecturally it cannot be said to be more than a decorated warehouse and the least architecturally interesting of the places related to the tobacco industry.
- The association with the 'notorious' architect is more of an interesting aside than an aspect of significance. The association with the tobacco industry is the main area of interest, and there is only one associated with this company. However there are six other buildings built by and for the tobacco industry in the CBD.

Mr Storey supported the listing of this building noting that tobacco warehouses are particularly concentrated in the central city.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel cannot understand why the association with Davies and his earlier failed design for another building which was referred to by Mr Butler in any way attributes significance to this building.

However, we find that it is historically significant as a purpose built warehouse in an area of the city used at the time for industrial and warehouse purposes. It is also well preserved, a fact that does not seem to be contested. Its survival remains as an acknowledgement that the central city had a wider range of uses than at present – this was one.

Ms Brady agreed that WD and HO Wills was a major tobacco company and, when questioned about her concern about the building's failure to reveal its function, acknowledged that warehouses for different products are not substantially different in external form.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the former WD & HO Wills warehouse at 411-423 Swanston Street.

(vii) VD Clinic – 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street

The place

This is a two storey red brick and cement rendered building constructed in 1919 to a design by the Public Works Department. At that time the Chief Architect was S C Brittingham. The building is described as an early Georgian Revival building. It was purpose built as a facility for the treatment of venereal diseases in women and operated as such for ten years.

The issue

An objecting written submission was lodged by Hansen Partnership Pty Ltd, on behalf of the owner of the site, Victoria University of Technology. The submission raised the following matters:

- The subject property is not of historic significance: the use as a VD clinic was short-lived and only one of a number of uses made of the building and the external appearance of the building does not inform the public of this past use.
- Use as a women's VD clinic does not afford the building historical significance.
- While the site is part of a government buildings precinct this alone does not afford it significance.
- The subject property is not of aesthetic significance as this is merely an early not especially good example of work by the then Public Works Department Chief Architect, E Evan Smith.
- This is not a good example of Georgian Revival style, having elements not typical of the style, nor is it a building of architectural merit.

The owner was represented at the hearing by Ms Rigo of the Hansen Partnership. On behalf of the owner, she reiterated and expanded upon the written arguments:

- The building only operated as a women's VD clinic for ten of its 92 years. As a consequence its association with this use is not historically significant.
- This was but one of a number of facilities established for the treatment of venereal diseases after WW1, and is therefore not significant in its own right.
- The property does not have a strong community attachment and does not meet the inclusion guidelines for this criterion.
- The attachment of aesthetic significance around the authorship of E Evan Smith is lost because the building was designed whilst S C Brittingham was Chief Architect.
- That as a precursor to the Georgian Revival buildings emanating from the Public Works Department during the 1920s, this is not of great significance.

Ms Rigo called Mr Taylor to provide expert evidence. He made the following points:

- The building is not a 'landmark', nor is the program that it supported. The program was but an episode in the history of women's health care in Victoria, a theme that is better represented by other sites and places around the city.

- The building's aesthetic characteristics are not held in high esteem by the community.
- The use of the building, to the extent that it might be of historic interest, cannot be read from the fabric.
- There is no known significant community interest in the building.

Ms Rigo also called Mr Jackson, architect, to provide expert evidence. He spoke of a new building proposed to be built on the site.

The Council position

The Planning Authority has indicated that this building should be graded 'C' and that it is:

- Historically significant for its construction to service a specific health need, a need which now is something of a curiosity.
- Aesthetically significant as a modest Georgian Revival design emanating from the Public Works Department at a time that it was moving to adopt this design genre.

In his response submissions for the Council, Mr O'Farrell pointed out that under cross-examination Mr Jackson did not dispute the local significance of the site.

He also submitted that the understanding of the former use of the building can be achieved through a consideration of the building fabric and its documented history. In other words, it does not need a prominent label in order for it to be understood.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert, Mr Storey made the following points:

- Whilst not a pure example of the twentieth century Georgian Revival, it appears to be one of the earliest examples using this style in Victoria.
- The place has high historical significance as the only place ever built specifically for women's venereal diseases in Victoria.
- Mr Butler's claim that this was located in the 'back slum' brothel district of 'Little Lon' is incorrect. This area was a government office precinct and by the 1920s Melbourne's brothels had largely dispersed to the inner suburbs.

Some considerable time after the hearing had finished, a letter to the Minister for Planning from the Lakes Entrance Regional Historical Society Incorporated dated 5 May 2012 concerning this building was forwarded to the Panel. As its contents related to the matters at hand, we required its circulation to relevant parties inviting replies by 22 May 2012. Replies were received.

The letter, while it was principally an objection to the planning permit to which Ms Rigo and Mr Jackson referred at the hearing, makes the following points about the significance of the building:

- The building is of high historic significance – a significance higher than suggested by the material produced for the Amendment. In the post war years, venereal diseases increased dramatically in Melbourne and amounted to a public health crisis.

- The clinic is therefore a link to the nation's wartime efforts.
- The next door TB Clinic built in 1927 is not part of the Amendment but has similar historical and architectural merit. Together the buildings form a significant pair.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel is persuaded to the view that the building is historically important as part of the story associated with the provision of health services (in this case, women's health services) in the central city. The Panel notes that this facility was constructed nearby to the original Queen Victoria Hospital for Women. It also notes that there are no hospitals left in the central city and very little in the way of health care facilities generally.

We note that this building is sited next door to an early clinic for the treatment of tuberculosis (about which there was some confusion in terms of assessment by Mr Raworth in the 2002 Review). We comment that assessment of the heritage values of this building may also warrant investigation.

The VD building is, however, of limited aesthetic significance. During the hearing, we were informed that E Evan Smith was not the Chief Architect of the Public Works Department at the time of the buildings design and therefore any significance related to his authorship is lost. It is also clear that it is not a pure Georgian Revival building as designed in the PAD under Smith. Rather, it is a transitional design, drawing on architectural features from the immediate past as well as incorporating some 'Georgian' features.

Having considered the issue, the Panel recommend that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former VD Clinic at 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) The statement of significance be amended to focus on the historic, rather than aesthetic, importance of the building.**

(viii) Elms Family Hotel – 267-271 Spring Street

ISPT Pty Ltd is owner of the property at 267-271 Spring Street (the Elms Family Hotel). It contains a two storey brick and cement rendered hotel constructed in 1924-1925 which is said in the 2011 Review to be of social, historical and aesthetic significance.

The owner made a written submission to the Council opposing its inclusion in the Heritage Overlay based on a number of factors including low architectural significance, the issue of a previous permit and the specific practical circumstances surrounding the development of the land. The submission appended an expert report by Mr Trethowan, architect, which expressed the view that the only structure of any heritage note on the subject site was the hotel itself.

At the directions hearing, the owner was represented by Ms Brennan. She indicated that her client wished to have the mapped extent of the Heritage Overlay clarified. As exhibited, the overlay appeared to apply not only to the historic hotel itself but also to the two flanking structures in Spring and Little Lonsdale Street.

The Panel was advised by Ms Hellman for the Council that there had been an error in the mapped area and the Council would agree to reduce it to cover the hotel only. This was directed to be formally confirmed in writing by no later than 2 March 2012.

This written confirmation was subsequently provided by the Council to the solicitors acting for the owner on 2 March 2012, with a copy being forwarded to the Panel on 5 March 2012 together with a copy of the revised map which satisfied both the Council and the submitter.

The covering letter from the solicitors for the owner, Norton Rose Lawyers, to the Panel, indicated that 'on the basis that the attached revised Heritage Overlay map forms the basis of HO1078 (that is, only the Elms Hotel itself is included within the Heritage Overlay and not the flanking structures on both Spring Street and Little Lonsdale Street), our client does not propose to make any submissions at the Panel hearing regarding HO1078.'

Strictly speaking the letter from the solicitors leaves it unclear as to whether the owner continues with its objections based on the other concerns as included in the original submission.

This matter was not further pursued by the Panel at the hearing, however. The Panel understood that the owner's position was that the objecting written submission no longer applied or was withdrawn²⁹ given the 'agreement' over the revised mapping.

The Panel, having considered the material concerning the mapping, does not disagree with this re-delineation of the boundary.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Elms Family Hotel, 267-271 Spring Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) The overlay boundary be redrawn as agreed by the Council (and shown on the map attached to its letter to Norton Rose of 2 March 2012) to include only the Elms Family Hotel building.**

²⁹ Once a panel has been appointed to consider submissions, the ability of a submitter to 'withdraw' a written submission is unclear under the legislation, as is the status of changes to amendments that a planning authority 'makes' or says will be made at the time of approval. See the discussion in Cardinia C91 (PSA) [2008] PPV 123 (18 November 2008).

8.3 Written submissions only

(i) Bourke House – 179-183 Bourke Street

The place

This is a six storey reinforced concrete building, constructed for Posner Bros. Jewellers in 1922-23. It was designed by Leslie M Perrott and built by Thompson & Chalmers.

The issue

The owners of the building, D L N Pty Ltd, submitted a written objection to the inclusion of the building on the basis that it does not have heritage significance. This claim was not supported by any other submission or evidence.

The Council position

The Council submitted that this building should be graded 'C' and that it is:

- Aesthetically significant for its early progression to a Modernistic façade design, by the abstraction of a prevailing Greek revival style.
- Historically significant as a well preserved multi-storey example of the work of reinforced concrete specialist Leslie M Perrott.

Mr Butler's evidence supported this.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert evidence pointed out:

- It is a striking and unusual design for the period.
- That the architect Leslie M Perrott did specialise in reinforced concrete design, that this was one of his first large scale commissions and that he went on to found a highly significant Melbourne architectural firm.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel finds no reasons to discount the evidence lead by the Council and supported by the National Trust.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to Bourke House at 179-183 Bourke Street.

(ii) Grant's Warehouse – 217-219 Queen Street

The place

This is a three storey red brick warehouse constructed in 1904 for Alexander Grant (solicitor) to the design of architects Gibbs and Finlay. The building has unusual relatively elaborate ornamental Art Nouveau detailing. It has a cemented cornice on top of a semi-circular cemented and ornamental façade, four brick piers with cement capitals and tiling. From the inside of the building, now used as a shop, a Traegerwellblech corrugated iron vaulted ceiling can be observed.

The issue

The written submission by the owner, Lynnlea Nominees Pty Ltd, objected to the proposed inclusion of the building in the Heritage Overlay and attached an expert report by Lovell Chen, December 2011. However, that report supported the findings about the local significance of the 'handsome' building's external Romanesque Revival Style and Art Nouveau detailing and opposed only the listing of the interior. This opposition to the listing of the ceiling was based on a comparative investigation which had indicated that surviving examples of this form of construction are not especially rare. It was therefore said that, while the ceiling was of interest, it was not of sufficient importance to set aside the Practice Notes³⁰ cautionary advice that only '*special interiors of high significance*' should be made subject to controls.

The Council position

The 2011 Review indicates that the building is of aesthetic and historical significance to the City of Melbourne as an unusually ornate well-preserved example of an American Romanesque revival warehouse and one of relatively few Art Nouveau ornamented buildings within Melbourne's Capital City Zone. It is said to be of historical interest because of the ceiling. External controls and internal controls to the extent of the ceiling to the main chamber are proposed.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust and Melbourne Heritage Action suggested that the ceiling is in fact a structural feature covered by exterior controls. They also were of the view that Traegerwellblech was a common form of construction to support upper floors and, whilst they are not usually exposed as ceilings, are in any case not rare.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel is aware that the Traegerwellblech construction system was promoted in building journals during the late nineteenth century and it appears that it was a popular technique for supporting upper floors in buildings constructed at this time. It would also appear that it

³⁰ DPCD Practice Note: Applying the Heritage Overlay

was unusual for this structural system to be exposed as an interior feature, although the Panel did notice one other example on its inspections at Charles Hotham Hotel carriageway.

For the reasons set out in Section 4.1(ii), we do not recommend that any of the proposed interior controls be applied at present but would point out that since this is part of the structure of the building any controls imposed over the building may cover it anyway.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, to Grant's Warehouse at 217-219 Queen Street.

(iii) Sir Charles Hotham Hotel – 2-8 Spencer Street

The place

This four level (ground and three upper floors) building was built in 1913 to a design of architect William Pitt. It is a brick building with cement render detailing and features a cylindrical domed tower on the corner of Spencer and Flinders Streets. The curve of this tower is continued down to the first floor and forms a long oriel bay.

The issue

The written submission by the owners of this building, Australian Budget Accommodation Group Pty Ltd, indicates that the company opposes the inclusion of the building in the overlay because:

- It does not have heritage significance. This was not elaborated on.
- The original fabric has been modified and part replaced on many occasions.
- The eastern part of the building was added at a later date.
- The building is old and almost dilapidated.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Architecturally significant as a large, well preserved and successful corner hotel design in the Edwardian Freestyle, by the important architect William Pitt.
- Historically significant for its location with other Edwardian era and late Victorian hotels in this part of the city and as the largest Edwardian era hotel built within the central city.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert, Mr Storey, made the following comments:

- It is a fine example of Edwardian Freestyle design.
- It is remarkably intact, including at ground level.

Melbourne Heritage Action submitted that the remaining interior fabric in this building was '*absolutely significant*' despite there being no proposed controls over the interior as part of this Amendment.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected building and does not believe that changes to the fabric are such that the original architectural design and detailing have been so compromised that the significance has been lost.

It is a large prominently sited hotel building which addresses the important south-west corner entry to the central city.

The Panel noted Melbourne Heritage Action's submission with respect to the interior of this building and believes that it is further evidence of the need for a more comprehensive survey of interiors in the central city before the Heritage Overlay calls up any interior controls.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the Sir Charles Hotham Hotel at 2-8 Spencer Street.

8.4 No submissions

The 25 places for which no submissions were received are listed in the table in Section 8.1. The Panel did not inspect any of these buildings (except for four interiors) and sees no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to these places, with the exception of the interiors.

9 Places from 1930-1956: 'The New Image'

9.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Commonwealth Motors, former 111-125 A'Beckett Street	HO994	B			
Grange Lynne Pty Ltd, later White & Gillespie Pty Ltd Building 185-187 A'Beckett Street	HO995	B			
Barnett Building 164-166 Bourke Street	HO997	C			
Norman's Corner Stores, former 180-182 Bourke Street	HO1000	C			
Carlton Hotel 193-199 Bourke Street	HO1001	C			
Commonwealth Bank of Australia 219-225 Bourke Street	HO1003	A			
Hardy Brothers Jewellery Store 338 Collins Street	HO1007	C			
Commercial Union Building, later AUC Office 409-413 Collins Street	HO1009	B			
Centenary Hall 104-110 Exhibition Street	HO1028	B	Y	Y	Y
Pawson House 141-143 Flinders Lane	HO1033	C			
Russell's building 361-363 Little Bourke Street	HO1050	C			
Drayton House 373-375 Little Bourke Street	HO1053	C			
City West Telephone Exchange 434-436 Little Bourke Street	HO1054	B	Y		
Blessed Sacrament Fathers Monastery, St Francis 326 Lonsdale Street	HO1063	C			
Provident Life Building 37-41 Queen Street	HO1067	B			
Australasian Catholic Assurance (ACA) Building 118-126 Queen Street	HO1069	A	Y		

9.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

(i) Centenary Hall – 104-110 Exhibition Street

The place

This is a six storey reinforced concrete building built in 1934-35 to a design of architects, Hugh Philp and Geoffrey Bottoms.

It consists of a basement, shops to the ground floor, a large assembly hall on the first floor (with staircase access from the ground floor lobby), rehearsal and lodge rooms and residential and office space on the upper levels.

It is designed in a 'Moderne' style with cement rendered façades and steel framed windows.

The issue

A written submission was made by Urbis consultants on behalf of the owners of the building, Vapold Pty Ltd, objecting to the inclusion of the exterior and part of the interior of the building in a Heritage Overlay. The objection included the following:

- The implications for future renovation, development and resale value. It was said that: development opportunities in the Central City *'should be paramount, and not be obstructed or restricted by a perceived heritage value or significance'*.
- The heritage value of the site does not warrant heritage controls, as most existing central city listed buildings are 'A' graded and the subject building is only 'B' graded in the 2011 Review and was earlier graded 'C' (in the three studies from 1985 onwards).
- It is inappropriate to include the interior or part of it in the heritage controls as the 2011 Review states that further investigation of the interior is required.

The owners were represented at the hearing by Ms Brennan. She made the following submissions:

- Mr Butler's approach to the application of the criteria lacks rigour and his methodology seems to be about accumulating information of historic interest, rather than properly addressing the significance of this building.
- The sustainability of the city as the State's principal centre of commerce, government and cultural life may be compromised if the strong presumptions in favour of conservation, as indicated by this proposal, prevail.
- The Orange Order has not played an important or influential role in the life of Melbourne and the building no longer has any connection to the Order and there is nothing about the exterior of the building that demonstrates the former association.
- The building is not a good or notable example of the 'Moderne' style.
- No proper rationale has been provided for the regrading of the building from 'C' to 'B'.
- The approach to listing interiors, such as is proposed here, is entirely unacceptable. Some recommendations have been made without proper inspections, there is a lack of

consistency of approach and there has been no systematic comparative analysis of interiors in the central city.

- The ground floor of this building has been altered and modernised.

Ms Brennan called Mr Barrett as an expert witness. He indicated:

- Other and better examples of this vertical 'Moderne' style exist in central Melbourne.
- It appears that any significance attached to the residential elements of the building may be ill-founded as plans show that they were never built.
- The comparison with other halls and theatres shows that this is not comparatively important.
- The hall on the first floor is modest in character.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Aesthetically significant as a good and well preserved example of the 'Moderne' style which is uncommon in the central city.
- Historically important as an unusual building type combining residential space, clubrooms, offices and a meeting hall.
- Important as a development on the site of two previous Protestant halls, perpetuating a use originally established in the 1840s.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and in doing so suggested that while it isn't the most striking example of art-deco architecture in the city, its interiors are notable examples of the style. Mr Storey's written evidence also suggested that the building is rich in relief, notably in panels at the first floor level and skyline.

Mr Storey's written evidence suggested that as it was constructed in the 1930s it would be one of the last social club buildings constructed in the central city. He also comments that the building is remarkably intact even to the angular brass-framed shopfronts, front doors and lobby area.

Melbourne Heritage Action fully supports the inclusion of interior controls for this building.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected the building externally and internally.

We believe that the building does have historical and architectural significance and is a well preserved example of the 'Moderne' style. This, in our view, alone makes it worthy of inclusion in the overlay. The significance of the building is augmented by its being the third Protestant hall on this site, built by the Victorian Protestant Hall Company to service the Loyal Orange Lodge, an organisation established by the protestant Irish, a group of some historic importance in Melbourne. The Hall Company had offices on the third floor.

As is discussed in Section 4.2, we do not believe that it is necessary for a particular element of a building, such as the star in the terrazzo flooring of the front lobby of this building, to announce a connection with its former owner or occupier. Also, for the reasons we again set out in Section 4.2, we do not believe that the consideration of heritage significance should be traded off against other policies of the scheme including those which support the development of the central city area.

We do not accept Mr Butler's assertions that the Loyal Orange Lodge is linked to the Liberal Party (the current occupants of at least part of the building). However, the Liberal Party, established in 1949, has jointly occupied offices and the hall in similar fashion for most of its period of existence and that in itself may be well be assessed of some historic importance.

The Panel accepts Ms Brennan's submissions that, at this stage and in the absence of an appropriate comparative study, the proposed interior controls should not proceed (see Section 4.2(ii)).

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to Centenary Hall at 104-110 Exhibition Street.

9.3 Written submissions only

There were no places in this group with written submissions only.

9.4 No submissions

The 15 places for which no submissions were received are listed in the table in Section 9.1. The Panel did not inspect any of these buildings (except for three interiors) and sees no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to these places with the exception of the interiors.

10 Places from 1956-1975: 'The Urban Spurt'

10.1 Table of all places from this period included in the Amendment

Place	HO	Grade	Int	Written Sub	Presented to Panel
Hoyts Mid-City Cinemas 194-200 Bourke Street	HO1002	B			
London Assurance House, former 468-470 Bourke Street	HO1006	B	Y	Y	Y
Atlas Assurance Co Ltd, later Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance building 404-406 Collins Street	HO1008	C			
Royal Insurance Group Building 430-442 Collins Street	HO1010	A		Y	Y
National Mutual Life Centre 435-455 Collins Street	HO1011	C		Y	Y
English Scottish & Australian Banking Co., former 453-457 Elizabeth Street	HO1023	C			
Commonwealth Banking Corporation of Australia branch bank, former 463-465 Elizabeth Street	HO1024	C			
Royal Automobile Club of Victoria (RACV) Building, former 111-129 Queen Street	HO1068	C		Y	
Dillingham Estates House, former 114-128 William Street	HO1089	B		Y	Y

10.2 Places addressed at Panel hearing

(i) London Assurance House (Law Institute) – 468-470 Bourke Street

The place

The London Assurance House was constructed in 1957-59 to the design of Bernard Evans and Partners, architects. It is a non-freestanding well preserved glass curtain walled building. The highly transparent ground floor entry foyer includes travertine faced walls with green marble inserts and a marble stair and floor. The front façade of the building is framed by stone facing is a striking Mondrian-like pattern of square windows. The building has been favourably commented upon in professional journals since the time of its construction. The building has been consistently graded 'B' in all central city heritage studies.

The issue

The written submission by the owner and occupier of this property, the Law Institute of Victoria Ltd, indicated that the Institute:

- Objects to the inclusion of the property in the Heritage Overlay.
- If the property is to be included, objects to the extent of the proposed Heritage Overlay and believes that the extent of the overlay should be confined to the multi-level building at the southern end of the site and exclude the car parking area at the rear.
- Opposes the application of interior controls on the basis that:
 - extensive renovations took place in 1996 and 2004, thereby altering the fabric at all levels except, as relevant here, to the extent of the walls in the entry lobby; and
 - the inspection (by Mr Butler) of the ground floor interior was done from the street only and there is no clear identification of the elements of the interior which are significant.
- If interior controls are to be applied, believes those controls should be confined to the ground floor area visible from the street; that is, the entry foyer from Bourke Street; and definitely should not include the basement level, the ground level beyond the top of the entry stairs and to any of the first to eight floors.

The submission also pointed to inconsistent and confusing wording as between the Explanatory Report and the Amendment's List of Changes document concerning whether external paint controls applied to those 12 buildings where interior controls are proposed. The submission also raised the issue of how best to designate interior controls where they are proposed to be applied to only part of the interior. Further, it was noted that while Appendix 5 to the 2011 Review suggested an Incorporated Plan would be developed for each place allowing permit exemptions for non-significant parts of the interiors, this had not been done and the content of any such plan is not known to the owners.

Mr Testro, representing the Institute, elaborated on these concerns at the Panel hearing. His submissions added that as the focus of the claimed heritage characteristics of the building is on the front façade to Bourke Street, the extent of external controls should relate only to that front façade. He also submitted that the onus for establishing that the property should be included in the Heritage Overlay lay with the Council rather than the owner having any obligation to prove anything. He encouraged the Panel to critically review the rigour of the professional analysis which had been undertaken. He added that the difficulties of effectively applying interior controls to only parts of the interior of buildings are a further reason no internal controls should be applied.

Mr Testro called Ms Lardner to give expert heritage evidence. Ms Lardner's evidence included:

- Comparative analysis of five other buildings of similar type and period of construction.
- The view that the building does have significance at the local level.
- Heritage controls to the exterior of the building would be appropriate, but redefined so as to leave outside the overlay the rear car parking area and access way.

- Comparatively the façade of the building displays a higher degree of articulation and visual interest than some similar buildings from the late 1950s.
- The extent of alteration to the interior of the building including the lobby indicate that interior controls are not warranted.
- The external controls which would apply to the glass windows would enable the transparency of the lobby to be retained.

The Council position

The Council's view is that this is an important building which has both historic and aesthetic values. The aesthetic values relate to its being a well-preserved and elegantly transparent all-glass curtain walled office building begun only three years after the first international Modernist buildings were built in Melbourne. It is said to be historically important as an example of 'Insurance Architecture'.

It was indicated to us on behalf of the Council that it would agree to a reduced area for the mapped Heritage Overlay, that is, to apply it only to the 1950s building and leave out the rear car parking area and access way. Mr O'Farrell suggested that if it was thought that it would not be possible to accurately include the area on the overlay maps, an incorporated plan approach might be adopted.

Mr O'Farrell's concluding submissions included that the Council only proposed interior controls for the ground floor foyer and the stairs to the mezzanine level.

Other submissions

Melbourne Heritage Action made a supporting submission addressing the Amendment in general. Relevantly, it included:

We would also like to commend the City of Melbourne for their proposed protection of several post WW II buildings for the first time.

At the Panel hearing, Mr Mann and Mr Davies made a more extensive presentation in support of the Amendment. In relation to this building, however, they described the interior as follows:

One of very few modern interiors with anything left however this is really only travertine side walls (all other materials changed), the columns, and the use of a split stair- not enough to be accurately described as an interior.

Mr Storey's written evidence for the National Trust included the following helpful review of the present situation with respect to heritage controls and post-war buildings:

...there are no post-war buildings currently with an individual overlay in the CCZ/CBD except for those on the VHR (ICI House, BHP House, Eagle House). 100 Collins Street, the first post war all-glass curtain wall building built in 1955, is 'A' graded, and located in the heritage precinct HO504. This amendment C186 includes six office towers, being the Law Institute, RACV, National Mutual, Royal Insurance, Estates House (which have been objected to in some or all aspects), and Atlas Insurance (which has not been objected to). There are only three other post-war places in the amendment, being Hoyts Midcity Cinema, and two banks,

the ES&A and the Commonwealth Bank in Elizabeth Street (the latter rather altered), none of which have been objected to.

By far the majority of post-war office blocks have been altered at ground level with refurbishment or insertion of shops....There are none in C186 that are in tact down to the every detail: the most intact are those that have a façade that extends to the ground, usually in piers.....

So far as the Law Institute building is concerned, he comments on the transparency of the ground floor and its retention of most external design details. He notes the unusual use of randomly placed hopper windows at upper levels. Mr Storey does not ascribe to Mr Butler's view that an insurance architecture genre can be usefully defined and ascribed to this building. He nevertheless makes useful comparisons with other office buildings of this period noting that this is one of the few glass wall office blocks not already on the VHR to remain substantially intact. He notes that even those on the VHR have generally been modified especially at ground floor level.

Mr Storey is not supportive of interior controls for this building, given the level of alteration (with only the side walls and split stair structure reasonably intact). He does support re-delineation of the Heritage Overlay boundaries to coincide with the 1950s building.

Panel discussion and views

So far as the exterior of this building is concerned, there really was little debate as to the significance of the southern façade. Even Ms Lardner acknowledged its particular aesthetic significance. This is a building that has been highly regarded by the architectural profession for decades.

While Mr Testro's submission opposed the listing of the totality of the exterior of the 1950s building, this was based on no other justification than there was agreement about the significance of the façade. We would agree that there is unlikely to be any claimed significance for the fabric of the side walls or rear wall of this building but this matter was not debated sufficiently for us to adopt a facadist approach to this building. The content of the statement of significance appropriately indicates the importance of the façade design and the transparency of the entry lobby.

The Panel believes that this building, which has consistently been graded 'B' in the post 1985 heritage assessments (recognising a high level of significance), should be included in the Heritage Overlay on the basis that it is an early well preserved and striking curtain wall building. We believe that such onus as applies to the Council in establishing the importance of the building has been successfully met – the expert evidence by Ms Lardner with respect to the exterior was in the main in agreement with that given by Mr Butler.

We agree with the submitter, Council and the National Trust that the overlay area should be confined to the building itself (in accordance with the Council agreed revised footprint). An incorporated plan approach to the designated area may be required if there are limitations to accurate depiction on the maps.

Concerning the proposed interior controls; we make the comment that this interior is significantly altered both in terms of layout as well as finishes. There is no doubt, however, that the view from the street to the ground floor interior is an important element of the

building design. It is the transparency of the space which is the important element in this respect, rather than any of the interior detail.

We do not agree with Ms Lardner's view that it is adequate in preserving that transparency for the ground floor windows and glass doors to be subject to control as part of the exterior. Changes might be made behind them (as part of the interior) which could alter the transparency of the lobby.

Nevertheless, for the reasons set out in Section 4.2(ii), we do not recommend that any interior controls proceed without a further more comprehensive CBD interior survey.

So far as the general problems of interior listings and the poor wording of the Amendment documentation are concerned, these are dealt with in Section 4.2(ii) of our report.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, to the London Assurance House (now Law Institute building) at 468-470 Bourke Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) **Alteration of the overlay boundary so as to include only the exterior fabric of the 1950s building (and exclude the rear parking area and access way) within the overlay.**

(ii) National Mutual – 435-455 Collins Street

The place

This large reinforced concrete building was built in 1962-65 to a design by prominent architects Godfrey, Spowers, Hughes, Mewton and Lobb in association with Leith and Bartlett. Constructed on the old Western Market site, it was built behind a large public plaza which faces Collins Street.

One of its main design features is the white marble balcony balustrading which encircles the building as a strong horizontal feature.

The issue

The written submission lodged by the owners, ISPT Pty Ltd, raised the following objections:

- The building is of insufficient historical or architectural significance to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. The submission appended an expert report by Professor Miles Lewis which supported this view.
- A planning permit is in place for demolition and redevelopment of the site (planning permit No, 2006/0419 appended to the submission) allowing commencement until 2 December 2015). The permit, which has been extended once allows the demolition of the façade of the existing building, demolition of the open plaza forecourt and redevelopment of that part of the site for an 11 storey office building, a two storey restaurant building and a pedestrian laneway supporting retail uses. The permit was granted by the Minister after heritage matters were considered.
- The condition of the building will not allow its retention in its current form. The building is in poor physical condition and at the end of its design life.

The owners of the building, ISPT Pty Ltd as Trustee for Industry Superannuation Property Trust No 1, were represented at the hearing by Ms Brennan. She made the following submissions:

- The 'C' grading of the building is not itself sufficient to warrant application of the overlay and there has been a failure to adequately address accepted approaches to threshold analysis.
- In addition to heritage considerations the planning authority must also consider matters such as the effect of the overlay on other strategic planning objectives, the economic effects of the overlay and the effect of the overlay on planning objectives such as the fulfilment of the capital city functions of the Melbourne CBD.
- Mr Butler, in coming to his recommendations, has made a number of erroneous assumptions, including assertions that it is a curtain wall building and that the balconies are accessible.
- The reliance on 'snippets' of Melbourne's post war history to establish historic significance is not adequate.
- It is premature to attribute heritage significance to relatively recent buildings such as this.
- Whilst the National Mutual building can be considered to make an important aesthetic contribution to Melbourne, it is not outstanding and therefore does not qualify under the terms of the National Estate criteria.
- The structural adequacy of the existing façade is seriously compromised and its preservation in its current form is unachievable. Since the original submission in October 2011 concerning this issue, a marble facing panel has fallen from the building, leading to fencing off of the perimeter of the building and testing and removal of most of the panels³¹.

She called Professor Lewis and Mr Sheldon as expert witnesses on behalf of her client.

Professor Lewis made the following points, also expressed in his earlier expert report appended to the ISPT Pty Ltd submission:

- *'It is not possible to demonstrate that the building is of no significance. But it certainly rates behind a number of other Melbourne buildings of the decade which won awards or have otherwise been identified as examples of excellence or innovation.'* He said in oral evidence that the building was mediocre itself, but conceded that it was dramatic in urban design.
- The notion that there is a category of buildings from this period which could be described as 'Insurance Architecture' is rejected. The type of buildings which Mr Butler refers to, are general commercial buildings, some of which were built for insurance companies.

³¹ An Emergency Building Order was issued on 30 January 2012.

- The building is not a glass curtain wall building. Indeed the international comparative buildings referred to by Professor Lewis included buildings which similarly have a second skin of horizontal balconies such as the Richard Neutra's work in Brazil.
- The fashion for plaza forecourts did not last long and does not afford the building significance.
- The building would probably fit into the 50 most important buildings of the period of 1955-65, but that doesn't warrant a form of protection as proposed by the Heritage Overlay.

In relation to the latter point, Professor Lewis tabled a schedule of buildings from the 1955-1965 period, nominating those that he considered superior to National Mutual.

Mr Sheldon restricted his evidence to describing the structural design of the marble balustrade panels, the current condition of those panels and the reasons for their failure.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building:

- Is historically significant as a landmark private development within the City's history, distinguished by its scale and combination of office and retail uses.
- Is aesthetically a well preserved and large example of curtain wall architecture, distinguished by its free standing site, the high degree of external finishes and the encircling balconies.

In his concluding submissions for the Council, Mr O'Farrell made the following points:

- The Panel should reject the submissions made on behalf of ISPT Pty Ltd in relation to building maintenance, economic imposts and existing permits.
- Mr Butler had successfully addressed the criteria for the inclusion of this building in the Heritage Overlay and referred back to ISPT's submissions with respect to the recommendations of Mr Wight's paper concerning how thresholds of significance might be determined.
- The Panel does not need to address the question as to whether a permit would be required for repairs and maintenance should the overlay for this building be approved.

Other submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment.

Mr Storey's written evidence, as noted earlier in Section 10.2(i), described the current situation with heritage controls and post-war central city buildings. Having noted the lack of intactness of most of these, including those on the VHR, he went on to say:

Interestingly the only building that can be described as the least altered (at least until the recent loss/removal of some of the marble) is the National Mutual building. The façade is intact down to the placement of the shop fronts, and all access balconies, black marble piers, and balustrading....

His written evidence goes on to provide his opinion that the potential loss of some or all of the marble cladding does not detract from the significance of the overall design and that the marble might be replaced with material of similar appearance.

He commented also that rather than being a curtain wall building as claimed by Mr Butler:

This is actually an early example of the move away from glass curtain walls, adopting instead an unusual balcony arrangement, perhaps a reaction to climate.'

Mr Storey's report included that there was only one other balcony/'second skin' façade design in the central city being the building at 8 Market Street.

He also suggests that the building is 'a large scale realisation of 'luxury' finishes with marble cladding and a gold coloured metal grid'.

Concerning the buildings siting in a plaza, it was Mr Storey's comment that '*it is the biggest and best tower and plaza combination in the CBD...*'. He notes that Philip Goad in his book *Melbourne Architecture* (2009 page 190) that the building is:

... one of Melbourne's best examples of the post-war urban design concept of a high-rise slab with an open landscaped plaza at ground level... it does not have a conventional glass curtain wall... instead it has deep horizontal spandrels and thin vertical brass rod-like elements... glass has disappeared in favour of floating horizontal mass and vertical decorative delicacy.

Late in the hearing Mr Tobin for the National Trust provided a copy of a brochure produced at the time of the building's construction³².

As the building owner was no longer represented at the hearing at this time, the Panel arranged for a copy of the brochure to be forwarded to the owner's solicitors inviting a response. Norton Rose responded by letter dated 20 April 2012 as follows:

The document produced by the National Trust does not amount to an independent assessment of the architectural merit of the National Mutual building. The production of a booklet recording the history of the site is a marketing tool which might be employed in relation to any new commercial building constructed in the CBD, including on this site.

The booklet was prepared contemporaneously to the opening of the building, and at that time the historical significance of the building itself could not be assessed. The document does not identify or support any new grounds for aesthetic or historical significance. At best the document can be described as a self promotional tool.

Accepting that the brochure is self-promotional in nature, the Panel has nevertheless found it useful in shedding some further light on the history of this building. It includes:

³² The booklet (Exhibit NT97) is untitled but indicates that it was '*issued by the National Mutual Life Association of Australasia Limited to commemorate the official opening of National Mutual Centre, 447 Collins Street, Melbourne, March 1965.*'

- The National Mutual Life Association commenced business in 1869 as an off-shoot of the National Fire Insurance Company of Australasia. This fire insurance company had earlier had its offices on the Western Market site and hence the National Mutual Life Association had its beginnings on this site.
- At the time of its completion, the National Mutual building was the largest office building in Melbourne and, including the car park in the 13 acres of roofed space, was, at the time, the largest commercial building in Australia.
- The balconies were designed to reduce the heat load on the building and as a consequence the air conditioning plant was smaller than it would have had to be if the design had adopted a glass face without the balconies. Also, the underside of the balconies were able to be used to support the main air conditioning ducts rather than their being punched through supporting beams; and window cleaning was able to be undertaken without using suspended cages.

Panel discussion and views

Integrity and condition of the building

The matter of the condition of the building's marble cladding is clearly a major issue of concern for the owner. We were advised, and we accept, that the existing cladding is likely to be virtually all, if not completely, removed; and it will not be possible to reinstate it, as its removal causes breakage of the marble panels.

Mr O'Farrell in his closing submissions urged the Panel not to consider the matters of building maintenance, economic imposts, the existing permit and the like, on the basis that they are irrelevant to the task of the Panel. We cannot agree. If a clear outcome for the building cladding had been described to us and we were persuaded that the outcome would significantly reduce the integrity of the building and hence its heritage values (rather than its condition as such), it would properly be a matter for us to consider.

Nevertheless the evidence presented by Mr Sheldon was to the effect that the final solution for re-cladding of the building and any other required structural works has not been identified. In the absence of a clear understanding about these matters, the Panel believes that it is not beyond the realms of possibility that a cost effective, sensitive solution which would maintain the appearance of the building (and hence its significance) could be found. As a consequence, the integrity of the structure has not weighed heavily in our assessment of its significance.

Validity of comparator group

We agree with Ms Brennan that the fact that the 2011 Review afforded this building a 'C' grading does not in itself determine that its inclusion in the Heritage Overlay is appropriate. This is in part because we do not believe that the grading approach used in the 2011 Review is useful (see Section 4.1(ii)). It is also because, as she submitted, there should be a proper comparative approach taken to defining thresholds and assessing whether the building meets the defined threshold. We think this is particularly the case when architectural significance is being considered.

In Section 4.1(ii) we discuss the importance of the proper definition of a comparator group in providing a base against which relative significance can be assessed. We believe that

comparisons are a necessary tool in determining thresholds of significance, but the comparisons must be valid ones and the comparisons must be explicitly made. Comparison is especially an issue in relation to this and other buildings from this most recent period.

However, we have found no great assistance in assessing the architectural significance of this building, by the comparisons with which we were presented by the Council and the submitter.

On the one hand, Mr Butler simply included the National Mutual building in a list of 16 buildings constructed at the same time for insurance company clients - without undertaking any comparative analysis.

The absence of any meaningful comparisons by Mr Butler is a problem in itself, but we also advise that we do not agree with him that a comparator group based on insurance company buildings alone is a useful group in the circumstances that no significance is being ascribed to the use of the building but rather its physical form.

On the other hand, Professor Lewis compared the National Mutual building to several other local examples from the same period including The Royal Assurance Building, Gilbert Court, Alliance Assurance, ICI House, BP House and the HC Sleigh Building, Total Car Park and AMP Square. All of these had won contemporary awards, had been recognised for their excellence or had been seen to be innovative or influential. He also thought that the comparator group should have included international examples and provided some limited evidence of overseas buildings of a similar type to the National Mutual building.

In relation to Professor Lewis's approach, we would first say that it must be born in mind that it is **local** significance to the Melbourne Capital City Zone that is being considered here, not State or indeed a national/international grading. Therefore, whilst the building's relationship to **international** comparators is interesting and indeed might have enhanced its (local) significance, the fact that it may not be as good as the international comparators does not detract from its local significance as a prominent central city building of its time.

Second, so far as Professor Lewis' **local** comparators are concerned, we find that they are not helpful as while they are all similarly tall buildings, they are not directly comparable in other respects:

- They adopt mixed approaches to cladding, for example the Royal Assurance Building has an innovative prefabricated concrete cladding system; a number of others are clear glass curtain wall clad structures quite unlike the cladding used on National Mutual; and the AMP building uses vertical ribs clad in stone.
- All of the comparators have different approaches to the manner in which they meet the ground and provide an entrance to the building. In this case the original arrangement at ground level is intact.
- The comparators are also mixed in the manner in which they sit on their sites and include buildings which variously are in plazas or on podiums or are built to the street.
- Professor Lewis unfairly compares the National Mutual only with local buildings which have been recognised elsewhere as of architectural excellence, including by listing on the VHR. Clearly this is not the worst building in Melbourne, and Professor Lewis acknowledges that. The only comparator to which Professor Lewis said the subject

building is superior is the former RACV building in Queen Street, which he described as 'awful'. So far as the RACV is concerned it is our view that it is not a useful comparator with the National Mutual as the approach to cladding is entirely different to that used on the National Mutual building and it is not sited within a plaza.

In identifying a number of characteristics which distinguish the National Mutual building from others in the comparative group used by Professor Lewis, we are conscious that it might be said that we are taking an overly restrictive approach to defining the group; that is, one which would see the National Mutual being identified as the only (and hence best) example of a particular building type. It is not our intention to define the group in this way, however, but rather to show that there is a need to be more rigorous and more analytical in dealing with comparisons. This is also discussed in Section 4.1(ii).

So far as comparisons are concerned, we were assisted somewhat by Mr Storey's evidence that there is really only one other balcony/'second skin' building in the CBD (at 8 Market Street). This highlights the rarity of the design approach.

The lack of useful local comparators and the uniqueness of the building in the city context, is a factor, we believe, relevant to the criteria for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.

We also believe that the unusual prominence and scale of the building lends to its architectural significance.

The environmental history discusses the prominence of this building in the section dealing with architecture and streetscape in the 'Urban Spurt' period (page 136):

...in 1962-5 there arose on the site the National Mutual Centre at 435 -455 Collins Street. The construction cost £4 million and was 22 storeys high. The building itself was a much more stylish one than the Southern Cross, designed by the architects Godfrey Spowers Hughes Mewton & Lobb, and lavishly finished. But the dramatic aspect was the creation of a large forecourt to Collins Street, unparalleled in any other commercial development in the city. The development was open on three sides, with a freestanding tower slab set back on the southern most part of the plaza. The implications for the city were potentially dramatic. The modernist vision of a city of high rise towers set amidst landscaped greenery at ground level seemed imminent, provided that major corporations were able to purchase large city sites or consolidate a number of sites.

We agree that this building was a dramatic addition to Melbourne's architecture at the time of its construction and, as outlined in the brochure produced at the time of its opening, it was the largest office building in Melbourne and the largest commercial building in Australia. It remains a particularly prominent building today, some 45 years later.

The balconies

Some time was spent in discussing this element of the building and, in particular, whether the balconies serve any useful purpose. It is clear that, despite Mt Butler's suggestion to the contrary, the balconies were not designed to be accessible balconies for the outdoor amenity of occupants of the building, but they were important as a form of solar protection,

providing support for air conditioning ducts and enabling window cleaning without the use of suspended cages³³. The Panel therefore accepts that they were an important functional feature of the building and that the associated balustrades provide a distinctive architectural feature.

Historical significance of the plaza

At the hearing there was discussion around the issue of whether the building's setting within a plaza was an historically important factor in the history of architecture or urban design in the central city. It was noted that this siting arrangement preceded or was perhaps a precursor to the introduction of plazas and setbacks as components of the Planning Scheme requirements for the central city area.

Ms Brennan was critical of Mr Butler's analysis of this issue saying that '*a comprehensive documentation of the intent, content and consequences of the key controls and policies and then a judgement about whether they are important in a historical sense in the shape and form of the City*' is required but had not been supplied. She suggested that such a history has not been written.

In his evidence, Professor Lewis again addressed this matter of the development of a plot ratio approach to building siting and its inclusion in the Planning Scheme. He was again damning of the approach and the utility and amenity of the public spaces created. Mr Butler defended the amenity of the spaces.

We note that the environmental history for the central city includes comments on this matter at page 136 as follows:

In 1957 Victoria's State Building Regulations Committee decided in favour of modifying height limit laws for city buildings. The 132 foot (40 m) height limit introduced in 1916 had been exceeded by ICI House in the previous year, and it was now replaced by a system allowing greater heights in individual cases, dependent upon floorspace and light angles... The increase in height of buildings in the central city soon suggested other implications for the form of the city. The fad for open space at ground level was to sweep away the propriety of the 1930's street architecture and usher in a new era of plazas and landscaped public space. At their best, these spaces became public spaces, blessed with sun and lurching workers and perhaps a fountain, but more commonly they became windswept and barren, alienating spaces which sowed the seeds of future planning controls of the 1980s and 1990s when the plaza was virtually outlawed and new buildings were made to face hard upon the front boundary.

It is the Panel's view that this plot ratio approach to building development encouraging plazas, as is referred to in the environmental history of the central city (and in the evidence by Mr Butler), was an important phase in central Melbourne's development albeit one that lasted for a relatively short period. We accept that there is no comprehensive tome setting out the history of planning controls in the city, but we find the recognition of this issue in the environmental history telling. This building more than any in the central city area illustrates

³³ From the booklet produced at the time of construction.

the outcomes of this development approach. The other examples referred to by Ms Brennan are at a lesser scale and/or are internalised within the site. The Panel believes the plaza setting is an element of significance whether or not the amenity outcome in the plaza was a good one.

Historical association with National Mutual Life Association

Whilst this building is no longer the headquarters of the National Mutual Life Association, it is of some interest that the company appears to have enthusiastically embraced the opportunity to construct this large headquarters building on the site from whence it originated. It is true that the company had its own stand alone original headquarters at the corner of Queen and Collins Streets (it remains as a place on the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR)), but the Western Market site was the home of the National Fire Assurance Company, the creators of the National Mutual Life Association and early managers of the company (from this site). It is also of some note that this was an important insurance company originating in Melbourne.

Other economic considerations

For the reasons that are set out in Section 4.2 of this report, we do not believe that in considering the proposed inclusion of a building in a Heritage Overlay of a planning scheme, it is appropriate to make a trade-off between the heritage objectives of the scheme and the other objectives. We also deal with the issue of existing permits (which apply in the case of this building as well as others) in that section of the report.

Too early to judge significance

This building is now 47 years old. The Panel believes that sufficient time has passed to allow a reasonable judgement to be made of its heritage importance. We would also comment that it is also important that the time between construction and such judgements being made should not be so long that important examples of buildings from a particular period are lost.

Errors by Butler

While we agree with Ms Brennan that Mr Butler's description of this building as a curtain wall structure is not apposite – certainly most would not apply that description to the building's cladding – we do not find it to be a factor fatal to his evidence.

Similarly, while there was an issue around the function and functionality of the balconies (as discussed above), whether or not they have proved to be functional for building occupants (especially given more stringent health and safety regulations around potential current day access to them) does not detract from the integrity of the architectural design of the building.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the National Mutual building at 435-455 Collins Street.

(iii) Dillingham Estates House - 114-128 William Street

The place

This 24 storey reinforced concrete office building was built between 1973 and 1976 for the Dillingham Corporation. It was designed by Yuncken Freeman Architects under the design leadership of Barry Patten.

The building is freestanding, rising out of a paved plaza which opens directly into the William Street foyer. The curtain wall cladding of aluminium and glass presents as an austere reflection of the international modernist architecture of the time.

The issue

Urbis Pty Ltd, consultants, lodged an objecting written submission on behalf of the building owner, Tackelly No 6 Pty Ltd which made the following points:

- The site is of relatively low heritage significance and does not warrant heritage controls.
- Other comparable buildings (by Yuncken Freeman from the same period) are already included in the heritage overlay and the VHR, notably the Eagle Star building at 473 Bourke Street and former BHP House at 130-149 William Street, negating the need for this one to be included in the Heritage Overlay.
- The site includes a relatively modern office building and development opportunities should be paramount.

Ms Brennan, represented the owners at the Panel hearing and made the following more extensive submissions:

- This building does not meet the high level of aesthetic significance that should be applied before a Heritage Overlay is deemed appropriate. The application of the National Estate criteria should require a building to make an outstanding contribution to the aesthetics of the city, not simply make an important aesthetic contribution – the definition applied for ‘C’ graded buildings as this is.

These buildings demonstrate the historical or social development of the local area and/or make an important aesthetic or scientific contribution. These buildings comprise a variety of styles and buildings types. Architecturally they are substantially intact, but where altered, it is reversible. In some instances, buildings of high individual historic, scientific or social significance may have a greater degree of alteration.

- The argument for the application of the overlay places considerable importance on this building’s relationship with other Yuncken Freeman buildings in the vicinity. However, this Amendment does not propose that a precinct be identified, just this, as a stand alone building.
- The building is not satisfactorily compared with other buildings of its design and type.

Ms Brennan called Mr Peter Barrett to provide expert evidence. He stated:

- This building lacks the level of innovation and sophistication found in the former Shell Headquarters building (now demolished), the AMP Building (to the north-west) and the former BHP building (to the north).
- This was a dated attempt to sustain a modernist aesthetic promoted by Yuncken Freeman and is not as important as their earlier works in this style.
- It has little historical value as it never had a long association or identified with a particularly significant owner or tenant.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Significant aesthetically as one of the three superb Yuncken Freeman International Modernist styled multi-storeyed office buildings within the Capital City Zone.
- It's distinguished by its façade treatment using aluminium and glass which is displayed to its full effect in this free standing structure.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment and its expert evidence suggested that whilst it relied on façade detailing from the earlier Eagle House, it was built as a 'silvery foil' to the adjacent BHP House.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel inspected the building externally and from within the foyer area.

It is clear that it compares most strongly with Eagle House, which is included on the VHR and designed by the same firm. They are both buildings clad in aluminium and glass with very similar detailing and presentation. Unlike Eagle House, however, this building is freestanding with a large floor plate. It therefore does not gain the elegance attributed to Eagle House which is a direct consequence of its site. Whilst the buildings have similar facade appearances, they are otherwise quite different given Dillingham Estates House is a freestanding design and has a different relationship with the surrounding paved plaza.

It must also be pointed out that to compare it unfavourably with Eagle House is unfair as that building is one included on the Victorian Heritage Register. This building is being promoted as a site of local importance to the city not one of State importance. We have the same concerns about the slanted comparator group used by Mr Barrett as we have in relation to that used by Professor Lewis in relation to the National Mutual building.

In his evidence in support of the Amendment, Mr Butler implied that this building gains significance because of its association with the architects, Yuncken Freeman. However, he did not make a great deal of their role in designing central city buildings. We would comment here that the application of an overlay over a precinct of Yuncken Freeman buildings (or a serial listing of such buildings) might well have been considered.

However, the critical point about this building in our view is - as was put by the National Trust - that it is a 'silvery foil' to the adjacent BHP building (also designed by Yuncken Freeman). The use of an architectural style which some have described as outdated at this

time appears to have been purposefully chosen to provide compositional harmony with the adjoining buildings. It is clearly a building of some prominence which makes a positive contribution to the architectural presentation of this part of the city.

The Panel disagrees with the arguments put forward on behalf of the owner that it does not meet a sufficiently high level of significance for inclusion in the overlay. To dismiss it because it does not match the level of aesthetic importance of other buildings which are of State significance is not relevant. The Panel believes that this building meets the necessary threshold for a place of local aesthetic significance.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the former Dillingham Estates House at 114-128 William Street.

(iv) Royal Insurance Building – 430-442 Collins Street

The place

This 18 storey reinforced concrete building was designed by architects, Yuncken Freeman and built between 1962 and 1965 (at the same time as the National Mutual Building opposite). Unlike other Yuncken Freeman buildings in the city, this one is clad with pre-cast concrete elements which incorporate the structural expression of the building.

The building won the RAIA's General Building category award in 1967.

The issue

Urbis Pty Ltd, consultants, made an objecting written submission on behalf of the owners, Enwerd Pty Ltd and SHL Nominees (1965) Pty Ltd. The written submission made the following points:

- The building does not have sufficient aesthetic, architectural or social significance to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.
- The site includes a relatively modern building of low heritage significance in the heart of the commercial district, thus development opportunities should be paramount.
- There are numerous similar buildings in the central city, so inclusion of this building in the Heritage Overlay is unnecessary.

The owners were represented at the hearing by Mr Gottschalk of Urbis. He submitted that the building:

- Is of insufficient significance to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay and that it is significantly altered at ground level – thereby compromising the Yuncken Freeman design intent.
- The opportunity for redevelopment should be retained – as referred to in Melbourne Planning Scheme policies. Since the building is of relatively low significance, development policies should hold sway.
- There are numerous similar buildings in CBD being proposed in this Amendment, therefore there are sufficient buildings of this type in the Heritage Overlay and there is

no need for this one. 15 other Capital City Zone office towers from 1960s are proposed for protection in this Amendment.

- Also two better buildings by same architect – Eagle Star building at 473 Bourke Street and the former BHP House at 130 -149 William Street are included on the VHR and under heritage overlays.
- The building could retain its ‘B’ grading but not be included in the overlay.

The Council position

The Council submitted that the building is:

- Aesthetically significant as the most elegant, early pre-cast concrete clad International Modern office design in the city.
- Important for having been recognised by the RAIA with an award in its 1967 awards program.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust supported the inclusion of this building in the Amendment. In doing so it made the point that it is less altered at ground level than most other post war towers.

Panel discussion and views

The Panel was presented with a considerable amount of material about the comparative value of buildings from this period and in most instances this building was lauded as a superior example of the architecture of the period and of the work of Yuncken Freeman.

The Panel also rejects the idea that ground floor alterations have changed the building to such an extent that its significance has been substantially compromised.

The Panel does not believe that there should be a trade off against development policies at this identification stage - see the general discussion of this issue in Section 4.4.

Having considered the issues, the Panel recommend that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the Royal Assurance Building at 430-442 Collins Street.

10.3 Written submissions only

(i) Former RACV Club – 111-129 Queen Street

The place

This building was constructed in 1959-61 for use by members of the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria to the design of Bates Smart and McCutcheon, architects. It incorporates two street entries to Queen Street – one for the club and one for the office. The building comprises a three storey transparent cantilevering podium in aluminium framed glass and polished black granite, with a fifteen storey manganese brick clad tower above surmounted by a butterfly form roof.

The issue

The written submission by Eighth Grange Pty Ltd, the owner of this property, opposed the inclusion of the former RACV building in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay (exterior only proposed) on the basis that the building is a non-descript, common and unremarkable 1960s building. It is said to be plain looking if not unattractive (a view shared by Professor Miles Lewis – the expert called by ISPT Pty Ltd in relation to the National Mutual building).

It was also asserted that much of the building's exterior (with the exception of the brickwork) has been substantially altered.

It was noted that the 2002 Review downgraded the building from 'C' to 'D'.

The Council position

The Council submissions were to the effect that the building is both historically important (due to its association with the RACV which was founded in 1903) and aesthetically - as well-preserved example of post war modern architecture and an early example of fast track design and construction.

Mr Butler gave evidence supporting the 'C' grading of the building.

Other supporting submissions

The National Trust's written evidence by Mr Storey included:

- 'While the main building is somewhat slab like, there is a lightness to the strongly horizontal glass podium level, juxtaposed by the vertical solid block of the tower portion. This has been somewhat undermined by the alterations to the podium level but is still present. The main block appears massive in elevation, but is slim in profile'.
- The association with the RACV is self evidently of high importance.
- Its fast track design and construction is also of historical importance.
- The unusual grouping of facilities and the podium terrace are of importance.
- The use of punched masonry was a move away from glass curtain walls of the 1950s.
- Comment on the innovative and rare use of the horizontal podium base.
- The butterfly roof form is only one of two in the central city. This form was infrequently used on commercial buildings.

Panel discussion and views

The exterior

So far as the exterior is concerned, the submitter did not elaborate on the extent of alteration and the building's current appearance seems to closely resemble what was built as shown in contemporary photographs. Both the National Trust and the Council experts agree on the significance of the building.

Concerning the allegations by the submitter that the building is plain if not unattractive, we accept that this is a building characteristic of the office genre of the time.

The Panel also believes that the historical association with the RACV is significant. This was not commented on by the submitter.

The interior

The Panel notes that the interior of the building is not proposed to be subject to controls, but, like many buildings of the period and later, the transparency of ground and lower levels is an element of the building's presentation to the street. The important role of transparent lower levels to buildings of this genre and whether **interior** controls ought to be applied to protect this aspect of the **external** appearance is something which the Panel's believes warrants further consideration by the Council (see Section 4.1(ii)).

Further, the Panel incidentally observed that many of the original interior fittings of the lower levels of the club entrance to the building appear to be largely intact. This is an example, therefore, of building interiors apparently worthy of consideration for protection not being subject to recommended interior controls - for no apparent reason³⁴. This supports our view as discussed in Section 4.1(ii) that there is need for a more comprehensive survey of interiors before any interior controls are included for the central city.

Having considered this issue, the Panel recommends that:

The Heritage Overlay be applied as exhibited to the former RACV building at 111-129 Queen Street.

10.4 No submissions

The four places for which no submissions were received are listed in the table in Section 10.1. The Panel did not inspect any of these buildings and sees no reason why the Amendment should not proceed in relation to these places with the exception of the interiors.

³⁴ Mr Butler offered the view that he didn't think he should go into the building.

11 General conclusions and recommendations

11.1 Conclusions

Melbourne Heritage Action as part of their written submission at the hearing noted that the Council had not updated its (local) central city heritage listings for 30 years and congratulated the City in taking this first step towards that update. They also congratulated the Council on ‘the brave and commendable step’ of moving to list post World War II places for the first time. They urged the Council to take heritage listing in the central city further:

It must be remembered that this amendment is a stop gap measure. The City of Melbourne must be supported and encouraged to continue the process by listing new precincts, interiors, many more buildings, signage, street art and furniture, as well as to review the way they manage Melbourne’s iconic laneways. Twelve interiors and 99 buildings is the tip of the iceberg...

The Panel similarly commends the City of Melbourne for moving forward with local listings, including those of relatively modern buildings, after a very long delay since the new format planning scheme was introduced. We agree with Melbourne Heritage Action that there needs to be a thorough investigation of building interiors (and we suggest that interior listings be delayed until this work is completed), of street furniture and street art, as well as consideration of the introduction of other precincts. With respect to the latter we particularly suggest that consideration needs to be given to the delineation of precincts which support the central city’s industrial and warehousing heritage.

While many submitters objecting to this Amendment went to considerable lengths in engaging representation and calling witnesses, we have with one exception recommended that the places all should proceed to inclusion in the Heritage Overlay – though with some changes. This is in part a result of the very helpful material in support with which we were supplied by the National Trust and others, and in part due to the underlying worth of the nominated buildings which have, almost without exception, been consistently identified since 1985 as of at least local heritage significance by different reviewers.

While the Panel has supported the implementation of this Amendment, it is not without some reservation. We indicate earlier in our report that we find that both the 2011 Review and the Amendment have been prepared with less drafting precision and organisational structure than is desirable. We have commented on the non-standard approach to statements of significance, the reliance on the old National Estate criteria and the outmoded approach taken to gradings. We have also commented that there is a need for a more general review of the structure of the heritage provisions in the central city.

Nevertheless we support the Amendment proceeding subject to the recommendations specific to the Amendment as specified below. We have also made recommendations in relation to further work that is required, though these need not delay the Amendment proceeding.

11.2 Recommendations

For the reasons set out in this report, the Panel recommends that Amendment C186 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme should be adopted generally as exhibited subject to the following recommendations:

General

1. The statements of significance be included in an incorporated document of the Planning Scheme.
2. The statements of significance for all buildings be rewritten to:
 - a) be consistent with the Heritage Victoria guidance notes;
 - b) clarify the building elements of importance so as to assist statutory decision making; and
 - c) incorporate any new information coming to light after the Amendment was exhibited.
3. The Planning Authority consider whether the 1985 booklet: *Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne* (dated November 2005) should be a reference document for Clause 22.04.
4. The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to the following properties:
 - a) James White Hay and Corn Store at 261 William Street;
 - b) Former McCracken Brewery warehouse at 538-542 Little Collins Street;
 - c) Former WD & HO Wills warehouse at 411-423 Swanston Street;
 - d) Bourke House at 179-183 Bourke Street;
 - e) Sir Charles Hotham Hotel at 2-8 Spencer Street;
 - f) National Mutual building at 435-455 Collins Street;
 - g) Former Dillingham Estates House at 114-128 William Street;
 - h) Royal Assurance Building at 430-442 Collins Street;
 - i) Former RACV building at 111-129 Queen Street;
 - j) Former Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company buildings at 63-67 Franklin Street and 459-469 Swanston Street;
 - k) Evans House at 415-419 Bourke Street;
 - l) Union Bank Chambers at 351-357 Elizabeth Street;
 - m) Grant's Warehouse at 217-219 Queen Street; and
 - n) Centenary Hall at 104-110 Exhibition Street.
5. The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to those properties where no submission was received and there was no Panel assessment.
6. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Royal Saxon Hotel at 441-447 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to the following:

- a) A revised the statement of significance to reflect the evidence of Mr Butler; and
 - b) A re-inspection by representatives of the Planning Authority and the statement of significance for the place adjusted to accommodate information that is revealed as a consequence.
7. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings at 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) A review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that both buildings are covered by the overlay.
 8. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Celtic Club at 316-322 Queen Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) A review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that the original building only is covered by the overlay; and
 - b) The statement of significance be amalgamated with the 2011 Review and a single reference document only be included in Clause 22.04.
 9. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the County Court Hotel building (now Oxford Scholar Hotel) at 427-433 Swanston Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) The overlay boundary apply only to the extent of the original hotel building.
 10. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Currie and Richards building at 473-481 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) A review of the overlay boundary in relation to the property boundary, and if necessary align the overlay boundary with the property boundary;
 11. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former VD Clinic at 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) The statement of significance be amended to focus on the historic, rather than aesthetic, importance of the building.
 12. The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Elms Family Hotel, 267-271 Spring Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) The overlay boundary be redrawn as agreed by the Council (and shown on the map attached to its letter to Norton Rose of 2 March 2012) to include only the Elms Family Hotel building.
 13. The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, to the London Assurance House (now Law Institute building) at 468-470 Bourke Street as exhibited subject to the following:
 - a) Alternation of the overlay boundary so as to include only the exterior fabric of the 1950s building (and exclude the rear parking area and access way) within the overlay.

Do not apply the Heritage Overlay

14. The Heritage Overlay not be applied to Rosati (Denniston and Co) at 95-101 Flinders Lane.
15. None of the proposed internal alteration controls be applied.

Further Work

In addition to the recommendations specific to Amendment C186, the Panel recommends that the Planning Authority:

- 16. Undertakes a general review of the grading system as part of developing a standardised approach to building listings in the central city area.**
- 17. Undertakes a review of the structure of the heritage sections of the Local Planning Policy Framework (and related incorporated and reference documents) of the Planning Scheme.**
- 18. Consider further amending the Planning Scheme to incorporate a Heritage Overlay over an industrial precinct which incorporates the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings or including them as part of a serial listing of buildings associated with the firm Sniders and Abrahams.**

Appendix A List of buildings proposed for inclusion

List of all buildings proposed for inclusion in Heritage Overlay under Amendment C186 (from exhibited Explanatory Report, Attachment 1).

HO Number	Property Number	Street
HO993	104	A'Beckett
HO994	111-125	A'Beckett
HO995	185-187	A'Beckett
HO996	160-162	Bourke
HO997	164-166	Bourke
HO998	168-174	Bourke
HO999	79-183	Bourke
HO1000	180-182	Bourke
HO1001	193-199	Bourke
HO1002	194-200	Bourke
HO1003	219-225	Bourke
HO1004	415-419	Bourke
HO1005	418-420	Bourke
HO1006	468-470	Bourke
HO1007	336-338	Collins
HO1090	340-342	Collins
HO1008	404-406	Collins
HO1009	409-413	Collins
HO1010	430-442	Collins
HO1011	433-455	Collins
HO1012	464-466	Collins
HO1013	615-623	Collins
HO1014	9-13	Drewery Lane
HO1015	21-23	Elizabeth
HO1016	215-217	Elizabeth
HO1017	299	Elizabeth
HO1018	303-305	Elizabeth
HO1019	351-357	Elizabeth
HO1020	380	Elizabeth
HO1021	384	Elizabeth
HO1022	441-447	Elizabeth

HO Number	Property Number	Street
HO1023	453-457	Elizabeth
HO1024	463-465	Elizabeth
HO1025	473-481	Elizabeth
HO1026	30-40	Exhibition
HO1027	53-55	Exhibition
HO1028	309	Exhibition
HO1029	104-110	Exhibition
HO1030	61-73	Flinders Lane
HO1031	95-101	Flinders Lane
HO1032	125-127	Flinders Lane
HO1033	141-143	Flinders Lane
HO1034	26-30	Flinders Street
HO1035	76-80	Flinders Street
HO1036	130-132	Flinders Street
HO1037	360-372	Flinders Street
HO1038	508-510	Flinders Street
HO1039	516-518	Flinders Street
HO1040	520-522	Flinders Street
HO1041	562-564	Flinders Street
HO1042	63-67	Franklin Street
HO1043	96-102	Franklin Street
HO1044	4-6	Goldie Place
HO1045	106-112	Hardware Street
HO1046	12-20	King Street
HO1047	115-129	King Street
HO1048	131-135	King Street
HO1049	284-294	La Trobe
HO1050	361-363	Little Bourke
HO1051	362-364	Little Bourke
HO1052	365-367	Little Bourke
HO1053	373-375	Little Bourke
HO1054	434-436	Little Bourke
HO1055	68-70	Little Collins
HO1056	392-396	Little Collins

HO Number	Property Number	Street
HO1057	538-542	Little Collins
HO1058	25	Little Lonsdale
HO1059	194-196	Little Lonsdale
HO1060	198-200	Little Lonsdale
HO1061	372-378	Little Lonsdale
HO1062	523-525	Little Lonsdale
HO1063	326	Lonsdale
HO1064	439-445	Lonsdale
HO1065	14-30	Melbourne Place
HO1066	20-26	Queen
HO1067	37-41	Queen
HO1068	111-129	Queen
HO1069	118-126	Queen
HO1070	203-205	Queen
HO1071	217-219	Queen
HO985	316-322	Queen
HO1072	42-44	Russell
HO1073	288-294	Russell
HO1074	2-8	Spencer
HO1075	10-22	Spencer
HO1076	66-70	Spencer
HO1077	122-132	Spencer
HO1078	267-271	Spring
HO1079	135-137	Swanston
HO1080	163-165	Swanston
HO1081	309-325	Swanston
HO1082	401-403	Swanston
HO1083	407-409	Swanston
HO1084	411-423	Swanston
HO1085	427-433	Swanston
HO1086	22-32	William
HO1089	114-128	William
HO1087	259	William
HO1088	261	William

Appendix B Document List

Document List: Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C186

Document No	Description	Presented by
PA1	Melbourne City Council submission	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA2	Expert evidence by Mr Graeme Butler of Graeme Butler and Associates	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA3	2002 Bryce Raworth Pty Ltd Study draft list of buildings proposed for Heritage Overlay coverage with explanatory text	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA4	Extracts from 2002 Raworth Study (citations for Currie and Richards, former Royal Saxon Hotel and centenary Hall)	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA5	Grading of Interiors table by Mr Butler	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA6	Supplementary evidence for Celtic Club by Mr Graeme Butler	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
NT7	Extract from Melbourne Planning Scheme, Clause 22.05	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT8	Extract from Melbourne Planning Scheme, Clause 22.04	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
SB9	Extract from Ian Wright paper, Review of Criteria and Thresholds for Inclusion of Places on the Heritage Overlay	Ms Susan Brennan
SB10	RAIA 20 th century building register (from RAIA website)	Ms Susan Brennan
SB11	Herald-Sun article regarding National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB12	Photo of elevations of National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB13	Photo of South façade of National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB14	Photo of Flinders Lane Street side of National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
AW15(1)	Planning Permit Application: TP-2011-785, 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW15(2)	Planning Permit Application: TP-2011-785, 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
PA16	Notional date range percentages of places in Heritage Overlay as prepared by Graeme Butler	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council

Document No	Description	Presented by
LI17	DDO Schedule 1	
JS18	Extract from Heritage Register for Royal Saxon Hotel (former)	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Hansen Partnership for Goodyear Pty Ltd
PA19	Diagram for 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA20	Bundle of statutory documents regarding Interior listing options	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
SR21	Submission for 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street	Hansen Partnership on behalf of Victoria University
SR22	Evidence by Mr Michael Taylor for 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street	Hansen Partnership on behalf of Victoria University
U23	Submission in relation to 430-442 Collins Street	Urbis
R24	Evidence by Mr Darryl Jackson for 372-378 Little Lonsdale Street	Hansen Partnership on behalf of Victoria University
SB25	Submission for 114 William Street	Ms Susan Brennan for Tackelly Pty Ltd
SB26	Evidence by Mr Peter Barrett for 114-128 William Street	Ms Susan Brennan for Tackelly Pty Ltd
SB27	Submission on behalf of Vapold Pty Ltd	Ms Susan Brennan on behalf of Vapold Pty Ltd
SB28	Extracts from Melbourne Planning Scheme	Ms Susan Brennan on behalf of Vapold Pty Ltd
SB29	Evidence for Centenary Hall by Mr Peter Barrett	Ms Susan Brennan on behalf of Vapold Pty Ltd
SB30	Collection of email correspondence re the Loyal Orange Lodge	Ms Susan Brennan on behalf of Vapold Pty Ltd
AW31	Evidence by Mr Peter Barrett for 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW32	MMBW 1995(?) plan with present day overlay	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
PA33	Franklin Street Signage	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
AW34	Planning Permit for 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne

Document No	Description	Presented by
AW35	Submission on behalf of the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW36	Photo of 'Courtyard', 473-481 Elizabeth Street	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW37	Extract from Bayside C37 and C38 Panel Report	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW38	Extracts from Central City Heritage Study Review 1993	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
PA39	Heritage Places Inventory July 2008 (Incorporated Document)	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
AW40	<i>ACF, WWF Australia, Environment Victoria and The Climate Action Network Australia v Latrobe City Council</i> [2004] VCAT 2029	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
AW41	Extract from Brimbank PS Amendment C84 Panel Report	Mr Andrew Walker for the Owners Corporation for 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne
RS42	Submission re 415-419 Bourke Street	Mr Marcus Rose on behalf of Body Corporate for 415-419 Bourke Street
GT43	Evidence by Ms Helen Lardner, HLCD re 468-470 Bourke Street	Mr Gary Testro for Law Institute of Victoria Ltd
GT44	Blow up photos	Mr Gary Testro for Law Institute of Victoria Ltd
GT45	Submissions for Law Institute of Victoria Ltd re 468-470 Bourke Street	Mr Gary Testro for Law Institute of Victoria Ltd
PK46	Submission re 473-481 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne	Mr Paris Kyne
PA47	Folder of documents	Melbourne City Council
SB48	Planning Permit for National Mutual site	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB49	Extracts from Bayside Amendments C37 and C38 Panel Report	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB50	Extract from Report of Heritage Overlay Advisory Committee	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB51	Extract from Ian Wight paper	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd

Document No	Description	Presented by
SB52	Expert witness report by Mr Mark Sheldon, Aurecon Australia Pty Ltd re 433-455 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB53	Photos of National Mutual x 2	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB54	Evidence by Professor Miles Lewis re: 433-455 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB55	A note on Richard Neutra and surrounding balconies by Miles Lewis	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
PA56	Graeme Butler & Associates 2011: 2005 citation	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
P57	List of municipalities with interior controls from Mr Geoff Austin, Heritage Victoria	
JS58	Submission for Royal Saxon Hotel 441-447 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Hansen Partnership for Goodyear Pty Ltd
JS59	Mr Michael Taylor's expert evidence for Royal Saxon Hotel 441-447 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Hansen Partnership for Goodyear Pty Ltd
JS60	Extracts from Moreland PS and Yarra PS	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Hansen Partnership for Goodyear Pty Ltd
DB61	RMIT University submission	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University
DB62	Photo of looking west at RMIT University Building 37 from Swanston Street	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University
DB63	Expert witness statement by Ms Anita Brady, Lovell Chen Pty Ltd	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University
SB64	Submission for National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd as Trustee for Industry Superannuation Property Trust No 1
SB65	List of post war buildings in Amendment C186	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB66	433 Collins Street Further Report by Aurecon	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB67	Photos of National Mutual building, 433 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd

Document No	Description	Presented by
SB68	Building Services Review – 433 Collins Street – Condition Assessment by Norman Disney and Young	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB69	435-455 Collins Street - Part of permit application	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB70	<i>Mrocki v Port Phillip City Council (No 1)</i> [2007] VCAT 1719	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB71	<i>Brimbank CC v LS Planning Pty Ltd</i> [2006] VCAT 2218	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB71A	Letter from Norton Rose regarding Accrued Rights and Amendments to Planning Scheme Controls for 435-455 Collins Street	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
SB72	As above	Ms Susan Brennan for ISPT Pty Ltd
BH73	Submissions on former Rosati restaurant, 95-101 Flinders Lane for Waynesbury Pty Ltd	Mr Dominic Scally of Best Hooper Solicitors for Waynesbury Pty Ltd
BH74	Evidence by Mr Peter Lovell, Lovell Chen Pty Ltd for Tixxis Consulting on behalf of Waynesbury Pty Ltd	Mr Dominic Scally of Best Hooper Solicitors for Waynesbury Pty Ltd
BH75	Supplementary evidence for 95-101 Flinders Lane by Peter Lovell of Lovell Chen	Mr Dominic Scally of Best Hooper Solicitors for Waynesbury Pty Ltd
BH76	Photos of 95-101 Flinders Lane	Mr Dominic Scally of Best Hooper Solicitors for Waynesbury Pty Ltd
BH77	Photos – interiors, 95-101 Flinders Lane	Mr Dominic Scally of Best Hooper Solicitors for Waynesbury Pty Ltd
PA78	Supplementary evidence for Celtic Club by Graeme Butler	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA79	Heritage Assessment of Former West Bourke Hotel, 316-322 Queen Street	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PB80	The Celtic Club Inc submission	Minter Ellison Lawyers for The Celtic Club
PB81	Evidence on Celtic Club by Mr Peter Lovell, Lovell Chen	Minter Ellison Lawyers for The Celtic Club
PB82	Supplementary evidence on Celtic Club by Mr Peter Lovell, Lovell Chen	Minter Ellison Lawyers for The Celtic Club
PB83	Celtic Club redevelopment plans	Minter Ellison Lawyers for The Celtic Club

Document No	Description	Presented by
JS84	Submission on 9-13 Drewery Lane by Mr Peter Barrett	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JS85	Supplementary submission on 9-13 Drewery Lane by Mr Peter Barrett	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JI86	Submission for 351-57 Elizabeth Street	Mr James Iles for TGM Group Pty Ltd
MHA87	Melbourne Heritage Action submission	Mr Rupert Mann for Melbourne Heritage Action
MHA88	List of all buildings and assessments inspected by Melbourne Heritage Action	Mr Rupert Mann for Melbourne Heritage Action
MHA88 A & B	Central City Heritage Review 2011 Interiors PowerPoint and notes	Mr Tristan Davies for Melbourne Heritage Action
JS89	Titles search for 9-13 Drewery Lane	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JS90	Planning Property Report for 9-13 Drewery Lane	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JS91	Submissions for 9-13 Drewery Lane	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JS92	Dovers Building Victorian Heritage Database Info	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
JS93	Part of Greater Geelong Amendment C89 Panel Report	Ms Jane Sharp instructed by Sackville Wilks Lawyers for Shiff Nominees Pty Ltd
NT94	National Trust submission	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT95	Extract from Ballarat Amendment C58 Panel Report	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT96	Expert evidence by Mr Rohan Storey	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT97	Historical article on the National Mutual Centre (booklet prepared at time of opening of building)	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT98	Union Bank evidence by Mr Rohan Storey	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
NT99	Interior evidence by Mr Rohan Storey	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust

Document No	Description	Presented by
PA100	Council closing submission	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
PA101	Extract from Maribyrnong Amendment C31 Panel	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
NT102	Addendum to expert evidence of Mr Rohan Storey	Harwood Andrews Lawyers for National Trust
PA103	Proposed extent of Heritage Overlay area	Mr Peter O'Farrell for Melbourne City Council
SB104	Information on internal aspect of 104 Exhibition Street	Mr Lloyd Elliot of Urbis on behalf of Peter Barrett
DB105	Submission for RMIT Buildings 39 and 49	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University
DB106	Supplementary evidence by Ms Anita Brady, Lovell Chen Pty Ltd	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University
DB107	Supplementary evidence by Ms Anita Brady, Lovell Chen Pty Ltd	Mr Daniel Bowden of Song Bowden Planning Pty Ltd for RMIT University

Managements Response to the Recommendations of the Panel

Panel Recommendation	Response	Change to Amendment C186
1 The statements of significance be included in an incorporated document of the Planning Scheme.	Agree. The Statements of Significance (SoS) are currently included in the <i>City of Melbourne Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011</i> which is proposed to be a reference document in Clause 22.04 Heritage in the Capital City Zone Policy. As an incorporated document carries more statutory weight than a reference document, it is agreed that the SoS be extracted from the <i>Review</i> (excluding the historic commentary that is not needed in a SoS) and collated to form an incorporated document.	Combine all SoS to form a new document that will be incorporated into the Planning Scheme.
2 The statements of significance for all buildings be rewritten to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) be consistent with the Heritage Victoria guidance notes; b) clarify the building elements of importance so as to assist statutory decision making; and c) incorporate any new information coming to light after the Amendment was exhibited. 	Agree. The SoS will be amended to remove historic commentary that is not need in a SoS, clarify the building elements of importance and to incorporate information that came to light at the panel hearing. The historic commentary will remain in the <i>Review</i>	Modify the Statements of Significance to remove unnecessary statements related to the history of places and to insert a section for each SoS which clarifies the building elements of importance.
3 The Planning Authority consider whether the 1985 booklet: <i>Urban Conservation in the City of Melbourne</i> (dated November 2005) should be a reference document for Clause 22.04.	Agree. The recommendation is beyond the scope of this Amendment as it affects all properties in the Heritage Overlay in the Capital City Zone. However it should be considered in the event that Clause 22.04 is reviewed.	No change

Panel Recommendation	Response	Change to Amendment C186
<p>4 The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to the following properties:</p> <p>a) James White Hay and Corn Store at 261 William Street;</p> <p>b) Former McCracken Brewery warehouse at 538 - 542 Little Collins Street;</p> <p>c) Former WD & HO Wills warehouse at 411 - 423 Swanston Street;</p> <p>d) Bourke House at 179 - 183 Bourke Street;</p> <p>e) Sir Charles Hotham Hotel at 2 - 8 Spencer Street;</p> <p>f) National Mutual building at 435 - 455 Collins Street;</p> <p>g) Former Dillingham Estates House at 114 - 128 William Street;</p> <p>h) Royal Assurance Building at 430 - 442 Collins Street;</p> <p>i) Former RACV building at 111 - 129 Queen Street;</p> <p>j) Former Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company buildings at 63 - 67 Franklin Street and 459 - 469 Swanston Street;</p> <p>k) Evans House at 415 - 419 Bourke Street;</p> <p>l) Union Bank Chambers at 351 - 357 Elizabeth Street;</p> <p>m) Grant's Warehouse at 217 - 219 Queen Street; and</p> <p>n) Centenary Hall at 104 - 110 Exhibition Street.</p>	Agreed.	<p>Remove internal controls from the schedule to Clause 43.01 (Heritage Overlay)</p> <p>It was noted during the final drafting of the amendment documents that 219-225 Bourke Street was recently already included in the Heritage Overlay (HO990 – as part of Amendment C150 in 2011) and is in the Victorian Heritage Register (Ref No H2264). This property has therefore been deleted from the C186 HO Schedule and Map.</p>
<p>5 The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, as exhibited to those properties where no submission was received and there was no Panel assessment.</p>	Agreed.	No change.

Panel Recommendation	Response	Change to Amendment C186
<p>6 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Royal Saxon Hotel at 441 - 447 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to the following:</p> <p>a) A revised the statement of significance to reflect the evidence of Mr Butler; and</p> <p>b) A re-inspection by representatives of the Planning Authority and the statement of significance for the place adjusted to accommodate information that is revealed as a consequence.</p>	<p>Agreed. As a result of further evidence provided at the Panel hearing Mr Butler agreed that the SoS should be amended.</p> <p>Mr Butler has incorporated this new information into the SoS.</p>	<p>Amended Statement of Significance to incorporate the evidence of Mr Butler and the information revealed at the re-inspection of the property.</p>
<p>7 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings at 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place as exhibited subject to a review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that <u>both buildings</u> are covered by the overlay.</p>	<p>Agreed. As exhibited both the buildings at 9-13 Drewery Lane and 2-20 Drewery Place are covered by HO1014. There is therefore no need to amend the HO.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>8 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the Celtic Club at 316 - 322 Queen Street (HO985) as exhibited subject to the following:</p> <p>a) A review of the overlay boundary, and if necessary amend it to ensure that the <u>original building only</u> is covered by the overlay; and</p> <p>b) The statement of significance be amalgamated with the 2011 Review and a single reference document only be included in Clause 22.04.</p>	<p>Agree. All parties at Panel agreed that the HO should apply to all floors of the original building to the north of the site.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>001HO2Map08 altered so that HO985 applies only to the original building.</p> <p>The Statement of Significance for the Celtic Club at 316-322 Queen Street has been included in the new incorporated document comprising all the SoS.</p>

Panel Recommendation	Response	Change to Amendment C186
9 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the County Court Hotel building (now Oxford Scholar Hotel) at 427 - 433 Swanston Street as exhibited subject to the overlay boundary applying only to the extent of the original hotel building.	Agreed. The evidence shows that the western portion of the exhibited HO1085 area is subject to a substantial new development and contains no original building fabric. The HO1085 should only apply to the part of the site containing the original Hotel.	001HO2Map08 altered so that HO1085 applies only to the original hotel building.
10 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Currie and Richards building at 473 - 481 Elizabeth Street as exhibited subject to a review of the overlay boundary in relation to the property boundary, and if necessary realigning the overlay boundary with the property boundary;	Agreed. The property boundary was reviewed and HO1025 is correctly applied to the relevant properties	No change.
11 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former VD Clinic at 372 - 378 Little Lonsdale Street as exhibited subject to the statement of significance being amended to focus on the historic, rather than aesthetic, importance of the building.	Agreed. There should be more emphasis on the historic, rather than the aesthetic, significance of the building.	Amended Statement of Significance which focuses on the historic importance of the building.
12 The Heritage Overlay be applied to the former Elms Family Hotel, 267 - 271 Spring Street as exhibited subject to the overlay boundary being redrawn as agreed by the Council (and shown on the map attached to its letter to Norton Rose of 2 March 2012) to include only the Elms Family Hotel building.	Agreed. Prior to the Panel hearing officers realised that the land around the Elms Family Hotel had been inadvertently included in HO1078 and it was agreed that the boundary would be redrawn to include only the Elms Family Hotel building.	The 005HO2Map08 map amended so that HO1078 map applies only to the Elms Family Hotel Building.
13 The Heritage Overlay be applied, without internal alteration controls, to the London Assurance House (now Law Institute building) at 468 - 470 Bourke Street as exhibited subject to the alternation of the overlay boundary to include only the exterior fabric of the 1950s building (and exclude the rear parking area and access way) within the overlay.	Agreed. The removal of the rear parking area and rear access way from the HO1006 was agreed prior to the Panel hearing as this area does not contribute to the heritage significance of the building.	The 002HO2Map08 map amended so that HO1006 includes only the 1950s building.

Panel Recommendation	Response	Change to Amendment C186
14 The Heritage Overlay not be applied to Rosati (Denniston and Co) at 95 - 101 Flinders Lane.	Agreed. As the building has been substantially altered the HO should be removed.	The 007HO2Map08 and HO Schedule (Clause 43.01s) amended to remove 95-101 Flinders Lane (HO1031).
15 None of the proposed internal alteration controls be applied.	Agreed. The interiors nominated in Amendment C186 were based on the study of 100 buildings. The Panel said that all interiors be investigated before any are listed in the Planning Scheme. Should Council wish to consider interiors this can be included in a heritage work program once the Heritage Strategy has been adopted by Council.	Alter the HO Schedule to remove reference to the interiors.
16 Undertake a general review of the grading system as part of developing a standardised approach to building listings in the central city area. The Panel said that the Amendment C186 should not be deferred pending this task but that this should be done before any future heritage amendments.	Agreed. This recommendation for further work needs to be considered in the context of other heritage priorities and studies. Once Council has an adopted Heritage Strategy, a program of heritage projects can be considered.	No change
17 Undertake a review of the structure of the heritage sections of the Local Planning Policy Framework (and related incorporated and reference documents) of the Planning Scheme.	Agreed. This recommendation for further work needs to be considered in the context of other heritage priorities and studies. Once Council has an adopted Heritage Strategy, a program of heritage projects can be considered.	No change
18 Consider further amending the Planning Scheme to incorporate a Heritage Overlay over an industrial precinct which incorporates the Sniders and Abrahams warehouse buildings or including them as part of a serial listing of buildings associated with the firm Sniders and Abrahams.	Agreed. This recommendation for further work needs to be considered in the context of other heritage priorities and studies. Once Council has an adopted Heritage Strategy, a program of heritage projects can be considered.	No change