PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C56: EAST MELBOURNE HERITAGE PROJECT

Committee Planning, Development and Services Committee

Presenter Cr Ng

Purpose

1. To recommend that Council adopt the Amendment in a modified form and request the Minister for Planning to approve the Amendment. The Amendment proposed to include 26 buildings in East Melbourne, identified as having individual heritage significance, in the Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2002 in the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

Consideration at Committee

2. As a result of consideration at Committee paragraph 3.1 below was amended by the deletion of the words “but excluding 183 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, from the Heritage Places Inventory 2002”.

Recommendation

3. That Council:

   3.1. adopt Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C56 generally as exhibited; and

   3.2. resolve to submit the Amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval.
Purpose
To recommend that Council adopt the Amendment in a modified form and request the Minister for Planning to approve the Amendment. The Amendment proposes to include 26 buildings in East Melbourne, identified as having individual heritage significance, in the Incorporated Document *Heritage Places Inventory 2002* in the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

Time Frame
Following the recommendation of the Panel, the Council is required to either adopt the Amendment as exhibited, adopt the Amendment with modifications or abandon the Amendment. The Council is required to forward its decision to the Minister for Planning who has the responsibility for making the final decision regarding the Amendment.

Finance
The costs of the Amendment and Panel processes have been funded through the Development Planning Operational budget.

Legal
Part 3 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* sets out the procedure to be followed in relation to an amendment to a planning scheme. The report accurately details the options available to Council after it has received recommendations from the Independent Panel.

Sustainability

**Connected and Accessible City**
There is no significant sustainability impact.

**Inclusive and Engaging City**
There is no significant sustainability impact.
Innovative and Vital Business City

There is no significant sustainability impact.

Environmentally Responsible City

There is no significant sustainability impact.

Recommendation

That the Planning, Development and Services Committee recommend that Council:

- adopt Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C56 generally as exhibited but excluding 183 Hotham Street East Melbourne from the *Heritage Places Inventory 2002*; and

- resolve to submit the Amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval.

**Attachments:**
1. Panel Report Amendment C56
2. Properties to be included in Heritage Places Inventory
3. Building Identification Sheet Mercy Hospital
4. Building Identification Sheet Freemasons Hospital
5. 183 Hotham Street, East Melbourne
1. To recommend that Council adopt the Amendment in a modified form and request the Minister for Planning to approve the Amendment. The Amendment proposes to include 26 buildings in East Melbourne, identified as having individual heritage significance, in the Incorporated Document *Heritage Places Inventory 2002* in the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

2. In December 1999, a number of residents from East Melbourne wrote to the City of Melbourne with a list of buildings not included in the East Melbourne Conservation Study. Most of the buildings were constructed or altered during the inter-war period and this period of architecture was not strongly represented in the original East Melbourne Conservation Study undertaken in 1983.

3. All of the subject buildings have protection through the East Melbourne and Jolimont precinct (HO2) Heritage overlay provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, however this amendment will have the effect of identifying each building as being individually significant within the Precinct.

4. In March 2000 Bryce Raworth, Conservation Architect, completed an assessment of the buildings. The project resulted in the production of twenty six Building Identification Sheets providing a heritage assessment of each building and a proposed grading from A through to D as defined in the *Heritage Places Outside the Capital City Zone Policy* of the Melbourne Planning Scheme.

5. Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C56 seeks to include these additional buildings in East Melbourne into the incorporated document *Heritage Places Inventory 2002*.

6. On 11 July 2002, following the receipt of submissions, the Planning, Development and Services Committee resolved to refer the Amendment to an Independent Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning. The Panel hearing was held on 30 October 2002.

7. The Panel has released its report and recommends the Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C56 be adopted as exhibited but subject to modifications. A copy of the Panel report is found at Attachment 1. The Panel recommends that the Amendment be adopted generally as exhibited, but modified as follows:

   7.1 modify the wording of the Building Identification Sheet for the Freemasons Hospital as tabled at the hearing;
7.2 modify the wording of the Building Identification Sheet for the Mercy Hospital as tabled at the hearing;

7.3 exclude the following seven D graded properties from the Amendment:
   7.3.1 97 Albert Street;
   7.3.2 54 George Street;
   7.3.3 84 Gipps Street;
   7.3.4 10 Grey Street;
   7.3.5 23 Hotham Street;
   7.3.6 183 Hotham Street; and
   7.3.7 37 Wellington Parade; and

7.4 that the grading for the property at 84 Grey Street be changed from a D to a C grading.

8 Attachment 2 to this report provides a summary of the 26 properties included in the East Melbourne Heritage project including the recommendations of the Panel and the recommendations of this report.

9 Following exhibition of the amendment six submissions were received. Four submissions related to the recommendations and detail of the Building Identification Sheets prepared by Bryce Raworth and two submissions supported the amendment. The submissions related to three properties and were presented to the panel hearing as follows:

Mercy Hospital, Grey Street:

9.1 In accordance with a previous resolution of the Planning Development and Services Committee on 11 July 2002 the wording of the Building Identification Sheet for the Mercy Hospital was modified to reflect those parts of the hospital complex that are significant. This was done in consultation with the owners and Bryce Raworth. The revised sheet was submitted to the Panel. The Panel recommended approval of the revised sheet. A copy of the Building Identification Sheet for the Mercy Hospital is found at Attachment 3.

Freemasons Hospital, Clarendon Street

9.2 In accordance with a previous resolution of the Planning Development and Services Committee on 11 July 2002 the wording of the Building Identification Sheet for the Freemasons Hospital was modified to reflect its Victorian Heritage registration. This was done in consultation with the owners and Bryce Raworth. The revised sheet was submitted to the Panel. The Panel recommended approval of the revised sheet. A copy of the Building Identification Sheet for the Freemasons Hospital is found at Attachment 4.

183 Hotham Street East Melbourne

9.3 Amendment C56 for this property recommends a D grading. The owners of this property made a submission to the Panel stating that:
   9.3.1 the building has no historical significance having been extensively altered;
   9.3.2 the building does not fall within the definition of a D graded building; and
9.3.3 the original dwelling at the rear does not represent a good example of the period and the post war modification at the front is very ordinary;

9.4. The issues raised by the submitter for 183 Hotham Street (through legal representation and a heritage witness) focussed on the lack of architectural significance of the building rather than its contributory social significance as defined in the D grading classification. The submitter emphasised that the importance of the inter war and early post war period has not been established in any statement of significance and therefore the contribution the building made to the significance of the area was limited. The submitter also argued that the building did not make a significant contribution to the streetscape and was not part of a collective group.

9.5 Council’s submission to Panel supported Bryce Raworth’s recommendation that the building at 183 Hotham Street be D graded being a representative example of the historical and social development of the East Melbourne area. This was supported at Panel by the East Melbourne Group. A copy of the Building Identification Sheet for 183 Hotham Street is found at Attachment 5.

9.6 The Panel in its report has recommended the property at 183 Hotham Street be excluded from the Heritage Places Inventory 2002. Following a site inspection the Panel found the building makes little contribution to the street. Along with the integrity of the building being rated poor and no evident significant features, the Panel considers the building is sufficiently protected by the Heritage Overlay of the Planning Scheme where a planning permit is required for demolition, buildings and works and subdivision.

9.7 The property at 183 Hotham Street has been recommended a D grading in the Amendment for its representation of historical and social development of the East Melbourne area. It was a single Victorian residence converted to flats in the inter war and post war years contributing to the rise of flat accommodation in East Melbourne. The Building Identification Sheet for the property indicates that the integrity of the building is poor and its condition fair. In this respect it is considered to be at the lower end of a D grading. It is a building that stands alone and does not form part of a collective group within the street, contrary to one of the criteria for a D graded building. It is also unremarkable as an example of inter-war flat development in that there are other more intact examples.

9.8 Given the extensive assessment of the information presented to Panel on this property and the Panel’s recommendation, and the recognition that the building’s integrity is poor it is considered that the property at 183 Hotham Street be excluded from the Heritage Places Inventory 2002.

**Other Properties**

10 The Panel made recommendations on seven other properties not the subject of individual submissions but recommended for a D grading in Amendment C56. The Panel recommended six properties be excluded from the Heritage Places Inventory 2002, ie, have no grading, citing their inclusion in a level 2 streetscape and the East Melbourne Heritage Precinct as providing sufficient heritage protection. The Panel recommended that one property be graded from a D to a C grading.

11 These seven properties identified by the Panel were not the subject of individual submissions during the exhibition of the Amendment or at the Panel hearing. All owners and occupiers of these properties were notified of the Amendment and the potential for their buildings to be included in the Heritage Places Inventory 2002. Submissions were received in respect of only 3 properties (as outlined above in paragraph 9). Bryce Raworth has reviewed the Panel’s report and does not agree with the recommendations for these seven properties. Therefore it is considered that the gradings proposed for these seven properties as exhibited in Amendment C56 be applied and included in the Heritage Places Inventory 2002.
No submissions were received in regard to the remaining 18 buildings exhibited with a proposed grading. It is therefore recommended the Amendment be adopted as exhibited and for these buildings to be included in the *Heritage Places Inventory 2002*.

### Consultation

The Amendment was publicly exhibited on 14 March 2002 for one month as required by the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. As part of the exhibition process, public notices were placed in the Melbourne Times, The Age and the Government Gazette and individual notices were sent to all property owners and occupiers. A copy of the relevant Building Identification Sheet was included with each notice. Notices were sent to relevant State Government Ministers. Six submissions were received.

A Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning heard and considered submissions to the Amendment on 30 October 2002.

The Panel report was sent to all submitters. The East Melbourne Group has advised that they do not support the Panel’s recommendations in respect of the seven properties the Panel recommended for exclusion in the *Heritage Places Inventory 2002*.

### Amendment Process

The Council is not bound to adopt the recommendations made by the Panel and can take one of the following courses of action:

1. adopt the amendment as exhibited and request the Minister for Planning to approve the amendment; or
2. adopt the amendment with modifications and request the Minister for Planning to approve the revised amendment; or
3. abandon the amendment.

The Council is then required to forward its decision to the Minister for Planning who has the responsibility for making the final decision regarding the amendment.

### Conclusion

The Amendment has been through a proper statutory process, culminating in the Panel hearing and its report. The Panel has considered all the issues raised by the submitters and supports the overall objective of the Amendment. The Panel recognises the heritage importance of East Melbourne from a local, state and national perspective and recognises that most buildings recommended in the Amendment to be included in the Heritage Places Inventory represent a significant contribution to the historic precinct.

It is recommended that the amendment be adopted as follows:

1. 32-32 George Street – C grading;
2. 37 George Street – C grading;
3. 51-53 George Street – D grading;
4. 55-57 George Street – D grading;
19.5 100 George Street – C grading;
19.6 156 George Street – A grading;
19.7 104 Gipps Street - A grading;
19.8 129-135 Grey Street – D grading;
19.9 100 Hotham Street – C grading;
19.10 22 Powlett Street – C grading;
19.11 53 Powlett Street – C grading;
19.12 56-58 Simpson Street – D grading;
19.13 60 Simpson Street – D grading;
19.14 62 Simpson Street – D grading;
19.15 143 Simpson Street – D grading; and
19.16 98 Vale Street – D grading.

20 In respect to this group of buildings no submissions were received and no modifications were suggested by the Panel. It is recommended that the Council adopt the amendment to add these buildings to the Heritage Places Inventory 2000 with the above listed gradings, as exhibited.

20.1 97 Albert Street – D grading;
20.2 54 George Street – D grading;
20.3 84 Gipps Street – D grading;
20.4 10 Grey Street – D grading;
20.5 23 Hotham Street – D grading; and
20.6 37 Wellington Parade – D grading.

21 In respect to this group of buildings no submissions were received but the Panel suggested that the buildings should not be graded. It is recommended that the Council not accept the Panel’s recommendation and adopt the amendment to add these buildings to the Heritage Places Inventory 2000 with the above listed gradings, as exhibited.

**84 Grey Street – D grading**

22 In respect to this building no submissions were received but the Panel suggested that the building should have a C grading. It is recommended that Council’s original assessment be maintained, that the Panel’s recommendation not be accepted and that Council adopt the amendment to add this building to the *Heritage Places Inventory 2000* with the above listed grading, as exhibited.
Freemasons Hospital, Clarendon Street – A grading/Mercy Hospital Grey Street – A grading

In respect to these buildings submissions were received about which buildings on the site were significant. The Committee has previously agreed to modify the Building Identification Sheet to mirror the extent of significance with the Victoria Heritage Register. The Panel has agreed the Council’s position. It is recommended that the Council adopt the amendment to add this building to the Heritage Places Inventory 2000 with the above listed grading, as exhibited, and modify the Building Identification Sheet as previously resolved.

183 Hotham Street – No grading

In respect to this building a submission was received from the property owner which argued that the building was extensively altered and had no historical significance. The Panel has agreed with the submission and has recommended that the building not be graded. It is recommended that the Council accept the Panel’s recommendation and adopt the amendment without adding this building to the Heritage Places Inventory 2000.

Recommendation

That the Planning, Development and Services Committee recommend that Council:

25.1 adopt Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C56 generally as exhibited but excluding 183 Hotham Street, East Melbourne from the incorporated document Heritage Places Inventory 2002; and

25.2 resolve to submit the Amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval.
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1. THE PANEL

Associate Professor Renate Howe and Ms Ann Keddie were appointed to a Panel under delegation from the Minister for Planning on 8 August 2002 to hear submissions in respect of Amendment C56 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The Hearing was held on 30 October 2002 at Planning Panels Victoria, 80 Collins Street Melbourne.

In reaching its conclusions and recommendations, the Panel has read and considered all submissions and a range of other material referred to it in relation to the amendment. This includes written submissions and oral presentations.

The Panel has undertaken unaccompanied site visits to the various properties subject to the proposed Amendment and their general locality as part of its considerations.
2. THE AMENDMENT

In December 1999 members of the East Melbourne Association wrote to the City of Melbourne seeking to include in the East Melbourne Conservation Study a number of buildings not graded as individually significant. Most of the buildings were constructed or altered during the inter-war period, a period of architecture not strongly represented in the original East Melbourne Conservation Study undertaken in 1985 which focused on nineteenth century buildings.

Bryce Raworth of Bryce Raworth Pty Ltd was commissioned by Council in March 2000 to undertake a heritage assessment of the proposed buildings for incorporation into the Heritage Register. The result was the "East Melbourne Conservation Study - Additional Buildings", consisting of twenty-six Building Identification Forms, with an assessment and grading for each building, from A to D as defined in the Heritage Places Outside the Capital City Zone Policy at clause 22.05 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme (MPS).

Amendment C56 seeks to include these additional twenty-six buildings in the incorporated document Heritage Places Inventory 2002. This document provides a list of all graded buildings and streetscapes within the City of Melbourne (excluding the Capital City Zone). The Panel was provided with a copy of this Inventory which is an incorporated document under clause 81 of the MPS. It lists graded buildings (and the associated streetscape grading) located outside of the Capital City Zone. The property listings of the East Melbourne and Jolimont area comprise one of eight geographical areas into which the Inventory is divided.
3. AMENDMENT C19

At the time of approval of the Melbourne New Format Planning Scheme in 1999, a number of matters were identified which required review, including a review of specific matters within the Heritage Overlay. One of the key purposes of the review was to introduce a new heritage grading system from A-D which necessitated re-appraisal of certain buildings formerly graded as D, E and F for inclusion in the new D grading which covered buildings of local heritage interest. Allom Lovell and Associates was commissioned by Council to undertake the review and to make grading recommendations. Amendment C19 sought to give statutory effects to the outcome of this review.

"The East Melbourne Conservation Study - Additional Buildings", was initially included in and exhibited as part of the Amendment C19. However, the Panel recommended that it be deleted from Amendment C19 and progressed later as a separate amendment due to concerns about the grading criteria applied to the assessment of the 26 buildings. The Report noted that the Panel supported "the Amendment as it stands but it also recognises that the Council needs to do further work to complete the amendment process".

In February 2002, Bryce Raworth was requested by Council to review the 26 Building Identification Sheets for "The East Melbourne Conservation Study; Additional Buildings" project, using the grading definitions for A-D now included in the MPS. As a result of this review, Bryce Raworth did not consider that any changes were needed to the recommendations regarding the grading of buildings made in the Allom Lovell review. "The East Melbourne Conservation Study -Additional Buildings" was therefore placed on exhibition as Amendment C56.
4. PLANNING CONTEXT

This section of the report sets out the planning context for Amendment C56 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme. It discusses elements of the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF), Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) and Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) that the panel considers are relevant. It also examines relevant statutory provisions currently applying to the amendment area.

State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)

The Council submission addressed the relevant aspects of the SPPF in relation to the Amendment. The general statement of principle in relation to Environment at clause 11.03-2 is relevant especially in requiring planning to contribute to the protection of cultural heritage and in particular to 'protect areas and sites with significant historic, architectural, aesthetic, scientific and cultural values.'

The relevant policies in the SPPF are found at clauses 14-19, and the specific policy relating to heritage (clause 15.11) aims:

*To assist the conservation of places that have a natural, environmental, aesthetic, historic, cultural, scientific or social significance or other special value important for scientific and research purposes, as means of understanding our past as well as maintaining and enhancing Victoria’s image and making a contribution to the economic and cultural growth of the State.*

In implementing this specific policy, responsible authorities need to take into account the findings and recommendations of the Victorian Heritage Council and the provisions of the Heritage Act 1995.

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)

City of Melbourne’s Municipal Strategic Statement (City Plan) addresses Heritage in Part One under the theme Attractive City. It recognises the importance of the location of so many of the city’s heritage buildings in the City of Melbourne area, and the responsibility of the Council in their protection. City Plan (5.2) states that:

*Heritage features, historic streetscapes and precincts consistently rate highly as a significant part of Melbourne’s attraction, distinguishing it from other cities in Australia and internationally. They are a significant part of Melbourne’s attraction as a place in which to live, visit, do business and invest. They are also important for cultural and sociological reasons, providing a distinctive historical character and sense of community history.*

City Plan identifies a broad range of heritage features and emphasises the aims of the Council to conserve and enhance the city’s architectural and other heritage and historical assets. It identifies East Melbourne and Jolimont as forming one of the most intact 19th century areas in the City and as of
national importance and that conservation of the area’s heritage is the primary development consideration.

The planning scheme responds to this through the Heritage Overlay which identifies individual buildings and precincts. The Heritage Overlay (East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct - HO2) applies to all sites included in this Amendment. A planning permit is required for demolition, subdivision and buildings and works. The following are among the purposes of the Heritage Overlay:

- 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

The local policy Heritage Places Outside the Capital City Zone gives guidance on the conservation of buildings and streetscapes and provides performance standards for assessing the heritage aspects of planning applications. Clause 22.05 applies to all areas within a Heritage Overlay area excluding the Capital City Zone. Relevant policy objectives are:

- To conserve all parts of buildings of historic, social or architectural interest which contribute to the significance, character and appearance of the building, streetscape or area.
- To ensure that new development and the construction of external alteration of buildings, make a positive contribution to the built form and amenity of the area and are respectful to the architectural, social or historic character and appearance of the streetscape and area.

The policy also requires in considering applications under the Heritage Overlay that regard is given to buildings listed in the individual conservation studies and their significance as described by their individual data sheets which include information of the age, style, notable features, integrity and condition of the building.

Related Strategic Planning Issues

- Melbourne 2030- Planning for Sustainable Growth

This is the Victorian State Government’s 30 year plan to manage growth and change across metropolitan Melbourne. It recognises the importance of and protection of heritage places at Policy 5.4 which states that heritage 'is not just about conservation, but about understanding the history, development patterns, cultural layers and themes of places.'

- Amendment C60 - Draft Municipal Strategic Statement

Under state legislation, a municipality must review its MSS every three years. The City of Melbourne MSS has been reviewed and is on exhibition as part of the Amendment C60 process.
The exhibited MSS, a draft copy of which was submitted to the Panel, identifies heritage precincts as critical components of the city structures that should be protected and enhanced in future development. In particular the exhibited MSS cites East Melbourne and Jolimont as relatively intact heritage areas considered to be of national as well as of state and metropolitan importance.

Clause 21.06-3 Cultural Heritage Places attributes much of the city of Melbourne's character to its 'high cultural heritage value' and aims to 'conserve and enhance places of identified cultural and heritage significance.'

In considering the planning framework, the Panel noted that both state and local planning objectives aim to conserve and protect significant fabric and heritage places and precincts and that East Melbourne is a significant heritage area of national importance.

The Panel also noted that all 26 subject buildings have heritage protection through the East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct (HO2) Heritage Overlay provisions of the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The effect of this Amendment will be to identify each building as being individually significant within the precinct through inclusion in the incorporated Inventory of heritage buildings.
5. EXHIBITION AND SUBMISSIONS

Amendment C56 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme was placed on exhibition for a period of one month on 14 March 2002 as required by the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

A total of six submissions were received in response to the exhibition of the Amendment.

Four submissions were related to the recommendations and detail of the Building Identification Forms prepared by Bryce Raworth.

- Philip Martin for Gadens Lawyers on behalf of the Freemasons Hospital and Grand Lodge Holding Ltd, Clarendon Street
- Ian Jackson, Galilee and Associates Solicitors on behalf of Mrs JC Jackson, owner of 183 Hotham Street
- Ms Sarah Crisp 8/53 Grey Street re 183 Hotham Street
- Corrs Chambers Westgarth on behalf of the Sisters of Mercy Property Association re Mercy Hospital, Grey Street

Two submissions were in support of the Amendment in its exhibited form:

- The East Melbourne Group Inc
- National Trust Australia (Victoria)
6. DIRECTIONS HEARING

A Directions Hearing in relation to this matter was held on 8 October 2002. A number of directions were made about the circulation of documents relating to the hearing and a timetable was set.

At the Directions Hearing Angela Croome, Senior Planning Officer, City of Melbourne representing the Council and Mr. Michael Wright QC, representing the Freemasons and Mercy Hospitals, informed the Panel that the Council was likely to support modifications to the Amendment which would probably mean that oral submissions on behalf of the hospitals would be unnecessary at the Panel hearing. These modifications would constitute changes in the wording of the Building Identification Forms for the Freemasons Hospital and the Mercy Hospital as a result of further work being undertaken by Heritage Victoria in the process of the nominations of each hospital for inclusion on the Victorian Heritage Register.
7. PANEL HEARING

A Panel Hearing for the amendment was held on 30 October 2002 at the offices of Planning Panels Victoria at 30 Collins Street Melbourne during which the following parties were represented and/or heard:

*Melbourne City Council (Planning Authority):*

Ms Angela Croome, Senior Planning Officer  
Mr Bryce Raworth - Bryce Raworth Pty Ltd - Conservation Consultant and Architectural Historian, expert witness.

*East Melbourne Group Inc:*

David P. Littlejohn of counsel  
*Mr Ian Jackson (183 Hotham Street)*

Mr Stephen Jones of counsel  
Mr John Briggs, John Briggs Architects Pty Ltd, Architect and Conservation Consultant, expert witness.

The Council submission prepared and presented by Ms Croome gave a comprehensive overview of the Amendment, the planning framework and its heritage purposes. Ms Croome also outlined the Council response to the submissions. Council supports the Amendment in a modified form to include changes to the wording of the Building Identification Forms for the Freemasons Hospital in Clarendon Street and the Mercy Hospital in Grey Street resulting from further work undertaken by Heritage Victoria.

Ms Croome reported that the Freemasons Hospital had now been registered by Heritage Victoria (HI972). An amended Building Identification Form recording the registration and changes made in consultation with the hospital were submitted to the Panel. These included noting of the Heritage Victoria registration and a map of the hospital buildings and site showing the boundaries of the heritage area. These modifications were not opposed by the hospital. Consequently no further submissions were made to the panel on Freemasons Hospital which was not represented at the Panel hearing.

Ms Croome also reported that the Mercy Hospital had been nominated for registration with Heritage Victoria and was still being assessed. The Panel was informed that in response to the submission of the Mercy Hospital and in accordance with Council resolution, the Building Identification Form prepared by Bryce Raworth for the Mercy Hospital had been amended. The changes relate to identifying on the Building Identification Form the original building comprising the 1932/34-39 wing in Grey Street as the area of heritage significance. The changes had been made in consultation with the
hospital and were in accord with the proposed extent of registration under the Heritage Act.

With regard to the building at 183 Hotham Street, the Building Identification Form prepared by Bryce Raworth recommends a D grading and no modification was deemed necessary.

The evidence given by Bryce Raworth supported and explained the modifications to the Building Identification Forms for the two hospitals. Mr Raworth also explained that requests for modifications to minor elements of some data sheets had been received and modifications had been made to the satisfaction of all owners except the owners of 183 Hotham Street. It was Mr Raworth’s view that the D grading for this building should stand. The grading was appropriate given that the building is recognisable as a Victorian structure that has been converted to flats with an extension to its front in 1947. The building thus provides an insight into the two key periods of East Melbourne’s development and is appropriately recognised as a representative building.

The submission on behalf of the East Melbourne Group by David Littlejohn supported the Amendment as the buildings ‘are significant both individually and as a group and contribute to the rich mix of styles of architecture which make East Melbourne representative of the architectural, social and cultural and historical significance of the City of Melbourne and the State of Victoria.’ It was submitted that the architecture of the inter-war and immediate post war period demonstrates the shift in population and change in accommodation and location of East Melbourne for health services.

The East Melbourne Group supported the modified Building Identification Form in relation to the Freemasons Hospital. In relation to the Mercy Hospital, the submission argued that the whole site should be included not just the 1930s buildings. In relation to 183 Hotham Street, the submission supported the evidence of Mr. Raworth that it was appropriate that this building retain its D grade and be listed on the Heritage Places Inventory.

The submission by Mr Jones opposed the listing of 183 Hotham Street. Mr Jones argued that the original features of the Victorian building were difficult to identify externally and have been removed internally through the alteration of the building into flats. The integrity of the building was poor and it was not significant in its contribution to the streetscape. Mr Jones emphasised that there was no statement of significance for the early post-war period or policy document that would justify its inclusion. Mr Jones called expert evidence from Mr John Briggs who argued that ‘the Moderne overtones of the subject building have some relation to the larger body of inter-war flats constructed in the area, however this building cannot sensibly considered to be representative of this inter-war group’. It did not make a significant contribution to the streetscape and ‘should not be considered as a contributory building as it is not part of a collective group’. The importance
of the post-war period had not been established in terms of heritage priority and the contribution of the building to the significance of the Heritage Overlay area is at best limited.

The Panel has considered all written submissions as well as submissions presented to it in the hearing process. In addressing the issues raised in these submissions, the Panel has been assisted by the information provided to it as well as its own observations from inspections of specific sites and areas. The Panel’s consideration of the issues raised are addressed in the following sections of the report.

The key issues identified by the Panel were:

- the heritage significance for the East Melbourne area of interwar and early post-war buildings
- the methodology of heritage evaluation
- the relationship of streetscape gradings, Heritage Overlay and individual listings in determining heritage importance
8. PARTICULAR PROPERTY/AREA CONSIDERATIONS

This section of the report discusses the Panel response regarding the three properties subject to submissions.

(i) Freemasons Hospital, Clarendon Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
A grading

Issues raised by submitters
These have been discussed above and related to limiting heritage significance to the 1930s building.

Council response
The issues have been resolved as part of the registration of the Freemasons Hospital by Heritage Victoria. The Building Identification Sheet for the Freemason’s Hospital in Amendment C56 has been modified to record details of the Heritage Victoria listing and the Heritage Victoria site plan has been attached to clarify the extent of the graded fabric and to accord with the registration under the Heritage Act. The modified Building Identification Form including the plan accompanying the Heritage Victoria registration was submitted to the Panel.

Panel response and recommendation
The Freemasons Hospital is a significant building of the period in East Melbourne. The area covered by the map attached to the modified Building Identification Form will protect the building from unsympathetic development. The Panel supports consistency in the description of places on the Victorian Heritage Register and the City of Melbourne’s Heritage Places Inventory.

The Panel therefore recommends approval of the submitted modifications to the Building Identification Form.

(ii) Mercy Hospital, Grey Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
A grading

Issues raised by submitters
The existing planning scheme and Heritage Act controls are sufficient to protect the cultural heritage significance of the hospital. If the hospital is to be included in the Heritage Places Inventory reference should be limited to the original hospital building constructed in 1935 and extended in 1939.
Council response
After consideration of the draft description of Cultural Significance prepared for Heritage Victoria and consultation with the hospital, the Council proposed modifications to the Building Identification Form that made clear the A grading was limited to the 1930s building.

This modification was opposed by the submission on behalf of the East Melbourne Group which argued for the site to be included in its entirety. Exclusion of other buildings on the site would only serve to erode the protection that listing would afford ‘in that whilst part of the building may be listed and protected, other parts of the site could conceivably still be developed with the effect of diminishing the heritage significance of the immediately abutting historical buildings.’

Panel response and recommendations
It was the Panel’s view that the proposed modification to clarify the extent of the graded fabric to the 1930s buildings was appropriate in this instance and will most likely accord with the registration description under the Heritage Act. The Panel noted there was no room for further development on the site.

The Panel recommends approval of the submitted modifications to the Building Identification Form.

(iii) 183 Hotham Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D graded

Issues raised by submitters
The building has no historical significance having been extensively altered and does not resemble the 1862 dwelling referred to in the Building Identification Form. The building does not fall in the definition of a category D building and should not have been included in the Heritage Places Inventory.

The original Victorian dwelling at the rear does not represent a good example of the period. Its original features are unrecognisable and of no value. The post war modification at the front of the building is very ordinary.

The arguments put forward by Mr Jones and the evidence of Mr Briggs in support of these submissions at the Panel hearing have been outlined above. Mr. Briggs argued that the grading of a building such as this, lacking in integrity and notable features might be seen as an example of a heritage listing being used as ‘a defacto means of controlling new development, rather than truly established levels of significance and providing appropriate protection of buildings having a demonstrated level of value.’

Council response
This was the only building subject to a submission requesting removal from the Inventory. In regard to 183 Hotham Street, Ms Croome informed the Panel that the Council after consideration of the submissions did not see a need to modify the D grading recommended by Bryce Raworth. In the Council’s view the D grading indicates the significance of this building in its conversion of an early grand house to apartments in the inter-war period with an extension to the front of the building in the 1940s. The alterations to the building in the 1930s and 40s were integral to its heritage significance.

Bryce Raworth’s evidence supported the identification of Hotham Street as a D grade building.

*D 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 of 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.*

Mr Raworth argued that the flats at 183 Hotham Street are representative of the historical and social development of the East Melbourne area. They are an altered example of a Victorian residence converted to flats in the inter-war and post-war years and contribute to the group of buildings within East Melbourne that demonstrate the rise of flat accommodation in the area in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s - an important development in the demographics and built form of the area. The grading was not meant to encourage the restoration of the building to its Victorian form, even if this were possible. No 80 Vale Street was cited as an equivalent conversion from Victorian house to flats during the 1940s.

This analysis was supported by Mr. Littlejohn for the East Melbourne Group who described the building as an adaptive re-use of early grand houses that occurred in East Melbourne and ‘that the conversion of 183 Hotham’s Street’s 1880 structure to flats in 1947 was a common practice and reflective of changing social needs and patterns in the mid-twentieth century’ and contributed to the rich mix of styles which makes East Melbourne’s heritage so significant. His submission asserted that 183 Hotham Street is a ‘particularly good example’ of the practice of early grand houses being converted to flats. Its significance attached directly to *the hybridisation of architectural styles which are directly reflective of its change in usage*.

**Panel response and recommendations**

The Panel did not consider that this Victorian building with its post-war facade merited inclusion in the Heritage Places Inventory. Mr Raworth described it *‘as a minor contributory element of representative interest’* although he judged this ‘contributory element’ to East Melbourne’s architecture of this period sufficient for inclusion on the Inventory and worthy of a D grading.
However, the integrity of the building is rated poor and no notable or significant features are noted on the Building Identification Form. Close inspection revealed that the original larger Victorian house has been severely compromised and in the view of the Panel its appearance makes little contribution to the street. It was the Panel’s view that the heritage significance of the building was sufficiently protected by the Heritage Overlay which requires a planning permit for demolition, subdivision and buildings and works. The Planning Scheme spells out stringent criteria for the Council to consider before deciding on the demolition of buildings. If any substantial alterations or re-development proposals are put forward to Council the heritage significance of the building will be considered at the permit application stage.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory.
9. OTHER PROPERTIES

This section of the Report will discuss other properties proposed for inclusion on the Inventory that were not the subject of individual submissions. At the hearing the Panel made it clear that properties included in Amendment C56 that had not received individual submissions would also be considered by the Panel. On the basis of submissions made at the Hearing and site inspections the Panel recommends changes to the following properties;

(i) 97 Albert Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
The Panel has considerable misgivings about the individual listing of Tunbridge. As one of a number of Anderson designed blocks of flats in the proposed listings, it is by far the least successful, with its pastiche ‘decorative devices from a range of contemporary sources’. The mishmash of Art Deco elements, steel windows, Georgian revival timber casements and trim of cordoba tiles to the roof is an unhappy one, applied to a massive and poorly resolved building. In the Panel’s view, this building does not warrant a D grading given the protection already afforded by the Heritage Overlay and Level 2 streetscape grading.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory

(ii) 54 George Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
‘La Maison’ is an extensively modified Victorian building. Although the form of original building remains recognisable form the street, it is hardly an ‘intact representation of the period.’ It is unlikely that the numerous alterations made to this building could be reversed. Rated of poor integrity, its 1960s facade does not add to a group of buildings or the streetscape, although it does stand in a street that retains much of its original character. The streetscape itself has a Level 2 grading and this with the Heritage Overlay in the Panel’s view provides sufficient protection for this building of poor integrity and fair condition.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory.
(iii) 84 Gipps Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
The Haven is a small single story Victorian villa extensively remodelled in the 1930s and 1990s. It has a recent two story addition visible from the street. The oversized architect designed interwar portico, although interesting, is just one of a number of alterations which this building has undergone. It is rated of poor integrity and does not contribute to a group of buildings in the streetscape. In the Panel’s view the Level 2 streetscape grading and Heritage Overlay provides adequate protection for this building.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory

(iv) 10 Grey Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
A Victorian single story cottage extensively remodelled. The Panel takes issue with the statement that the house ‘continues to make a positive contribution to the early character of the street.’ Such ‘early character’ is hard to envision when the building sits between an undistinguished 1960s building and a late Victorian pair of polychrome terraces. Opposite is a large block of 1950s flats. The streetscape grading of 2 taken in conjunction with the Heritage Overlay provides in the Panel’s view, sufficient protection for this house.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory.

(v) 23 Hotham Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
A nondescript pair of two story buildings linked by an ornamental arch with the title ‘Beverley Mansions’. The buildings do not contribute to a group of buildings or the streetscape, do not have a high standard of condition or integrity and make no statement regarding the inter-war or early post-war period. The Panel questions the significance of the fence noted in the citation. The fence, which may be original, has clearly been altered. In the Panel’s view the individual listing of this property, already protected by the Heritage Overlay and Level 2 streetscape, was not justified.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory.
(vi) 37 Wellington Parade

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
Victorian era two-story house that has been substantially altered to have a vaguely Georgian character and is rated of poor integrity. Although at the end of a row of two storey houses the Panel noted on inspection that of the five terraces in the row, no two are alike. Eight windows with new joinery and surrounds have been added to the north, the verandah removed and the front section rendered and new porch added. Again, the Panel judged the Level 2 streetscape and Heritage Overlay sufficient heritage protection for this building.

The Panel recommends exclusion from the Inventory.

(vii) 84 Grey Street

Recommendation of Amendment C56
D grading

Panel response and recommendation
The designation of this developer designed pair of 3 storey flats as D seems to the Panel to warrant reconsideration. Belgravia Square was constructed in 1940 and in addition to the well handled European Modern elements noted in the description, the composition displays to the street other notable aspects of inter-war flat development, such as the integration of recessed garages. Architecturally, it is substantially intact with little alteration visible from the exterior. The block demonstrates the historical development of the area as a well located fashionable area for flat development. Integrity and condition is rated good. It was the Panel’s view that the rating for this building should be C as it is an intact example of between -the -war architecture. It meets the criteria for C buildings which must:

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 building types. Architecturally they are substantially intact, but where altered it is reversible.

The Panel recommends re-grading from D to C
10 OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE AMENDMENT

The Panel supports the overall objective of the Amendment. East Melbourne is an important area for city, state and national heritage. Most buildings recommended by the City of Melbourne to be included in the East Melbourne section of the Heritage Inventory as part of Amendment C56 to the MPS, represent a significant contribution to the architectural, social, cultural, historical significance of the East Melbourne historical precinct.

The focus for East Melbourne heritage has been on nineteenth century buildings as evidenced in the earlier heritage studies by Meredith Gould and Graeme Butler. This Amendment emphasises the importance of twentieth century heritage in East Melbourne where in the inter-war and immediate post-war period flats had been built and older buildings converted for multiple residence. This Amendment will protect buildings that reflect the shift to apartment living and the development of modern architectural styles. It will also reflect the development of health services in East Melbourne with the inclusion of two architecturally significant hospitals of the inter-war period- the Freemasons and Mercy hospitals.

The review urged by the Panel for Amendment C19 was not as rigorous as that Panel had anticipated. Bryce Raworth’s evidence noted that ‘while extensive research was not undertaken with regard to individual places, sufficient information was available and/or gathered for an assessment of the merits of each place to the degree normally expected of a municipal grading system.’ However, this Panel considers that given the importance of heritage gradings especially in the City of Melbourne area, the integrity of the planning system would benefit from more extensive heritage assessments. The Panel noted Mr Raworth’s point regarding the additional weight placed by VCAT on listed buildings. However, this additional weighting may well be negated in a situation where the nomination cannot be clearly shown to meet the criteria for inclusion on the Inventory.

In its consideration of Amendment C56 the Panel found that the D classification criteria for local significance did not provide adequate guidance for assessment of especially borderline classifications. This grading will inevitably include marginal buildings and more specific guidelines would enhance decision making. All of the buildings in Amendment C56 have heritage protection through the East Melbourne and Jolimont precinct (HO2) overlay provision of the MPS and the arguments for specific buildings to be given further heritage protection through the Inventory must be clear and consistent. The relationship of streetscape gradings, Heritage Overlay and individual listings needs to be considered more carefully. In most cases where the Panel has recommended a D building be excluded from the Inventory the combination of streetscape grading and the Heritage Overlay was deemed to provide strong and sufficient heritage protection.
11. PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Panel appointed to consider Amendment C56 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme has recommended that it BE ADOPTED as exhibited, subject to the following modifications:

That Council replace "The East Melbourne Conservation Study - Additional Buildings" in the incorporated document, *Heritage Places Inventory 2002*, as exhibited, with a revised Inventory reflecting:

(a) modifications to the wording of the Building Identification Form for the Freemasons Hospital, Clarendon Street as tabled at the Panel hearing as Appendix 10 to the Council submission.

(b) modifications to the wording of the Building Identification Form for the Mercy Hospital as tabled at the Panel hearing as Appendix 12 to the Council submission.

(c) the exclusion of the following D graded buildings from the Inventory:

- 97 Albert Street
- 54 George Street
- 84 Gipps Street
- 10 Grey Street
- 23 Hotham Street
- 183 Hotham Street
- 37 Wellington Parade

(d) that the grading for the property at 84 Grey Street in the Inventory be changed from a D to a C graded building.

Renate Howe Ann Keddie

December 2002
## MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C56
### EAST MELBOURNE HERITAGE PROJECT

### SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES TO BE INCLUDED IN HERITAGE PLACES INVENTORY 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26 properties included in project and placed on Exhibition</th>
<th>Proposed Grading</th>
<th>Submissions following Exhibition</th>
<th>Submissions made to Panel</th>
<th>Panels recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendation to PDS Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97 Albert Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemasons Hospital, Clarendon Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-38 George Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 George Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-53 George Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 George Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-57 George Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 George Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 George Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Gipps Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Gipps Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Grey Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Grey Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-135 Grey Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Hospital, Grey Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hotham Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Hotham Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 Hotham Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>no grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Powlett Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Powlett Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-58 Simpson Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Simpson Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Simpson Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Simpson Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Vale Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Wellington Parade</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no grade</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Melbourne Conservation Study
Building Identification Form (2000)

Building Address: Grey St, East Melbourne
Type: Hospital

Building Title: Mercy Hospital
Original use: Hospital
If not residential: Hospital

Victorian Heritage Register: Not Listed
National Trust (Vic) Register: Not Listed
Register of the National Estate: Not Listed

Grading:
- None [ ]
- A [ ]
- B [ ]
- C [ ]
- D [ ]

Streetscape:
- Conservation Area

Negative File:
B17-B19

Style:
Modern

Period:
- Early Vic. [ ]
- Victorian [ ]
- Edwardian [ ]
- Inter-War [ ]
- Post-War [ ]

Construction Date:
1932/34.39

Source:
F Good

Notable Features / Significance:
- unpainted cement render [ ]
- verandah decoration [ ]
- verandah roof and structure [ ]
- elaboration / high standard design of rendered surfaces [ ]
- unpainted decorative brickwork [ ]
- retains evidence of earlier colours or finishes [ ]
- intact shop front [ ]
- post-supported shop [ ]
- significant fence [ ]

Description:
The Mercy Hospital is a crisply detailed, five-storey hospital designed by Arthur Stephenson on his return from a tour of Russian and American hospitals in 1932. The Mercy was his first of a number of hospitals by Stephenson to display the uncompromising forms of the new functionalism that he had observed while abroad. The building comprises an asymmetrical block with broad, sweeping balconies to the upper four floors enhanced by softly curving balustrading, typical of the mode. The Mercy is notable for its reinforced concrete structure, its expressed escape stairs and its stark exterior, largely devoid of decorative elements. These ideas were reiterates in a sympathetic extension to the eastern end of the building some years later although a clock and exterior screens visible in early photographs appear to have been removed at that time. Stephenson was knighted in 1954 for services to architecture.

Integrity:
- Good [ ]
- Fair [ ]
- Poor [ ]

Condition:
- Good [ ]
- Fair [ ]
- Poor [ ]

---

1 F Good, Melbourne Architecture, p.143.
2 DL Johnson, Australian Architecture 1900-1951, p.133.
**Alterations and Recommendations**

O = Reestablish, S = reinstate sympathetic alternative, R = Remove, RAM = Remove by Approved Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos</th>
<th>Sympathetic</th>
<th>Recs</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Recs</th>
<th>Extremely Inappropriate</th>
<th>Recs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern extension</td>
<td>Rooflop structures</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Removal of clock and screens</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments**

The Mercy Hospital forms part of a local group of hospitals which includes the nearby Freemasons Hospital. The extent of significant hospital fabric identified in this report comprises the 1932/34-1939 wing to Grey Street.

There are a number of buildings which have been constructed on the site since the original Mercy Hospital in 1932/34-39. No buildings other than the original wing have been assessed and this citation does not apply to any buildings on the hospital site other than the 1932/34-39 wing.

**Additional Photographs**
## East Melbourne Conservation Study
### Building Identification Form (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Building Title</th>
<th>Victorian Heritage Register</th>
<th>National Trust (Vic)</th>
<th>Register of the National Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon St, East Melbourne</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Freemasons Hospital</td>
<td>H1972</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>National Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streetscape</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Negative File
B01, C12

### Style
Moderne

### Period
- Early Vic.
- Victorian
- Edwardian
- Inter-War
- Post-War

### Construction Date
- c. 1936-37 & 1956-58

### Source
P Goad

### Notable Features / Significance
- unpainted cement render
- elaboration / high standard design of rendered surfaces
- intact shop front
- verandah decoration
- unpainted decorative brickwork
- post-supported shop
- verandah roof and structure
- retains evidence of earlier colours or finishes
- significant fence

### Description
The Freemasons Hospital is a crisply detailed, four-storey hospital which dominates its corner site. It is one of a suite of local hospitals designed by Arthur Stevenson after his return from a tour of Russian and American hospitals in 1932 and demonstrates the uncompromising forms of the new functionalism that he had observed while abroad. The Freemasons comprises a three-storey block with a number of smaller habitable rooftop elements. Sweeping balconies to the upper two floors are enhanced by subtly curving corner treatment characteristic of the Streamline Moderne mode. The exterior is finished in a stark, white painted render with a rigid window arrangement relieved only by blue glazed tiles. The northern section of the building including the entire Albert Street frontage is a later addition (1956-58) as are the changes to the entrance and the relief at roof level (1958). Stevenson was knighted for services to architecture in 1954.

### Integrity
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

### Condition
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

---

1 P Goad, Melbourne Architecture, p.143.
Alterations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos</th>
<th>Sympathetic</th>
<th>Rocs</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Rocs</th>
<th>Extremely Inappropriate</th>
<th>Rocs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aluminium windows</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments

The Freemasons Hospital forms part of a local group of hospitals which includes the Mercy Hospital. The significance of the place extends to all of the buildings from the 1930s and 1950s building campaigns, as identified in the registration of the place under the Heritage Act.

Additional Photographs
East Melbourne Conservation Study
Building Identification Form (2000)

Building Address: 183 Hoehan St, East Melbourne
Type: Plats

Victorian Heritage Register: Not Listed
National Trust (Vic): Not Listed
Register of the National Estate: Not Listed

Grading:
None ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

Street Value:
1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ Conservation Area: East Melbourne

Negative File:
D09-D12

Style:
Victorian

Period:
Early Vic. ☐ Victorian ☐ Edwardian ☐ Inter-War ☐ Post-War ☐

Construction Date:
c. 1880, 1947

Source:
On-site inspection

Notable Features / Significance:
- Unpainted cement render
- Elaboration / high standard design of rendered surfaces
- Intact shop front
- Verandah decoration
- Unpainted decorative brickwork
- Post-supported shop
- Verandah roof and structure
- Retains evidence of earlier colours or finishes
- Significant fence

Description:
A substantial, two-storey Victorian residence, built for pastoralist, Patrick McFarland in 1862, which has been extensively modified through the twentieth century. Building permits suggest that the building was converted to flats in 1939 and that the front section of the house was added in 1947. The early sections at the rear of the building comprise a sprawling red brick dwelling with an original or early slate roof still in place. Window openings and joinery appear to date from the original construction with simple sashes, generally in a poor state of repair. At the rear of the building, the exterior has been painted white but this too is in need of attention. As noted above, the front facade of the building was extensively remodelled in the postwar period and now comprises a large, two-storey portion in rendered and face brick and finely detailed steel windows. The portion has been painted white but panels of decorative face brick and brick corbelling constructed as part of the 1947 alterations are still discernible beneath the paint. This adaptive reuse of early grand houses occurred frequently, in East Melbourne, throughout the interwar period.

Integrity:
Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

Condition:
Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

1 MCC Building permits numbers 20742 and 24118 hold at PRO
### Alterations and Recommendations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos</th>
<th>Sympathetic</th>
<th>Recs</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Recs</th>
<th>Extremely Inappropriate</th>
<th>Recs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint to decorative brickwork</td>
<td>RAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments

### Additional Photographs

![Image of building and tree](image-url)
FINANCE ATTACHMENT

PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C56: EAST MELBOURNE HERITAGE PROJECT

Funding of $7,900 has been provided in the 2002/03 budget of Development Planning to cover the costs of the Amendment and Panel.

Joe Groher
Manager Financial Services
Divisions 1 and 2 of Part 3 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (“the Act”) set out the required process for amending a planning scheme. This includes exhibition, giving notice of the proposed amendment, receiving public submissions and the appointment of a panel to hear submissions in relation to the proposed amendment.

Section 23 of the Act provides that after considering a submission which requests a change to the amendment the planning authority must either change the amendment in the manner requested, abandon the amendment or part of the amendment or it can refer the submissions to a panel appointed in accordance with Part 8 of the Act.

That Part provides amongst other things that the Minister must appoint a panel which may consist of one or more persons. The Minister also has the power under the Act to require additional notice and the consideration of additional submissions after the amendment is submitted.

The Minister may then approve the amendment or part of the amendment with or without changes subject to any conditions it wishes to impose. The Minister may also refuse the amendment. If approved, the Minister must publish notice of the approval of the amendment in the Government Gazette and Council must also provide notice of the approval in a manner satisfactory to the Minister.

The amendment will come into operation on publication of the notice in the Government Gazette or on the later day or days specified in that notice.

Alison Lyon
Manager Governance Services