

Report to the Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee

Agenda item 6.4

Planning Scheme Amendment C258 Heritage Policies Review & West Melbourne Heritage Review

20 February 2018

Presenter: Emma Appleton, Manager Urban Strategy

Purpose and background

1. The purpose of this report is to present the outcomes of the exhibition of Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C258 and recommend the Future Melbourne Committee request the Minister for Planning appoint a panel, to consider submissions to Amendment C258.
2. Amendment C258 is a critical step in delivering Council's Heritage Strategy as it will underpin all future heritage amendments in the municipality. It implements the findings of the Heritage Policies Review 2016 by modernising and updating the policies regarding the protection and redevelopment of heritage places across the municipality, as well as implementing the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016 (WMHR2016) by providing appropriate heritage protection and information about identified heritage places in the West Melbourne Structure Plan area.
3. Amendment C258 makes the following changes to the Melbourne Planning Scheme: revises the local heritage planning policies in the Melbourne Planning Scheme; replaces the 'A to D' grading system with the 'significant/ contributory/ non-contributory' grading system; incorporates new statements of significance for existing large heritage precincts (Carlton, East Melbourne and Jolimont, North Melbourne and West Melbourne, Parkville, South Yarra, Kensington); includes statements of significance for all those places in WMHR2016 assessed to be of individual significance; and applies the heritage overlay to 20 new places assessed to be of heritage significance in the WMHR2016.
4. Amendment C258 was first exhibited from 30 March to 12 May 2017 and the corrected C258 Heritage Inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. A total of 98 submissions were received from both exhibition periods.

Key issues

5. Many and varied issues were raised in submissions to Amendment C258 including:
 - 5.1 objections to the assessment of particular properties in the WMHR2016
 - 5.2 suggested changes to the heritage policies at Clauses 22.04 and 22.05, such as refining the wording, and suggestions to make the policies more or less prescriptive
 - 5.3 objections to the converted grading for particular properties and the gradings conversion methodology
 - 5.4 queries and challenges of some aspects of the large precinct statements of significance
 - 5.5 identification of potential anomalies in the proposed heritage inventory
 - 5.6 other heritage related issues that are out of the scope of Amendment C258.
6. All of these issues have been carefully considered, as set out in Attachments 2, 3 and 4. It is critical that Amendment C258 is progressed to the Independent Panel as soon as possible so that future heritage amendments can proceed. All submissions will be referred to the Independent Panel.

Recommendation from management

7. That the Future Melbourne Committee:
 - 7.1. notes management's consideration of the submissions as set out in Attachments 2, 3 and 4,
 - 7.2. requests the Minister for Planning to appoint an Independent Panel to consider all the submissions to Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C258,
 - 7.3. notes that the recommended form of the Amendment to be presented to the Independent Panel will be in accordance with Attachment 4.

Attachments:

1. Supporting Attachment (page 3 of 250)
2. C258 Response to Main Issues Raised in Submissions (page 5 of 250)
3. C258 Summary and Response to Individual Submissions (page 22 of 250)
4. C258 Amendment documents marked up with recommended changes in response to submissions (page 139 of 250)

Supporting Attachment

Legal

1. Divisions 1 and 2 of Part 3 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (the Act) deal with planning scheme amendments and set out the relevant provisions in relation to the exhibition and notification of planning scheme amendments as well as the process for public submissions and the consideration of those submissions by the planning authority or an appointed panel.
2. The recommendations set out in the report are consistent with the Act.

Finance

3. The costs for the processing of Amendment C258 are provided for in the Urban Strategy budget.

Conflict of interest

4. 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

5. In early 2015, community consultation and targeted stakeholder consultation was undertaken in conjunction with heritage consultants Lovell Chen and engagement specialist Capire Consulting Group to inform the drafting of the statements of significance and the revised local policies. This consultation included community workshops and heritage walks in each of the six large heritage precincts outside the Capital City Zone, meetings with resident groups and their associated planning and heritage groups, online engagement through Participate Melbourne and meetings with key internal and external stakeholders.
6. From mid–December 2015 to mid–February 2016, further community engagement was undertaken on the draft new statements of significance and draft new heritage policies.
7. Amendment C258 was exhibited in accordance with the Act in the following manner:
 - 7.1. Public notices were placed in the Age and Government Gazette on 30 March 2017 and 7 December 2017 (for the corrected Heritage Inventory).
 - 7.2. The Amendment and supporting information was available at the City of Melbourne counter in Council House 2, on the City of Melbourne’s Participate Melbourne website and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning’s website.
 - 7.3. A copy of the statutory notice, as well as a letter was sent to all land owners in the heritage overlay and to all owners and occupiers of land in the West Melbourne structure plan area. Approximately 80,000 letters were sent. The information was also sent to a range of stakeholders, authorities and prescribed Ministers.
 - 7.4. Three independently facilitated community information sessions were held, two prior to the formal exhibition period and one during the exhibition. Each session ran for three hours. The Amendment was presented two to three times at each session, followed by a question and answer session. Officers were on hand to provide information to attendees throughout the sessions. Over 400 people attended the three sessions.
 - 7.5. The corrected C258 Heritage Inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. While no formal community information sessions were held as part of the re-exhibition of the corrected inventory, many informal consultations were held over the phone, email and in person between community members and officers.
 - 7.6. All submissions received in response to the exhibition of the Amendment will be provided to the Panel. Submitters will also have the opportunity to address the panel.

Relation to Council policy

8. The Amendment is a 2016–17 Annual Plan initiative and addresses three actions in Council's adopted *Heritage Strategy 2013*.

Environmental sustainability

9. 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.

**MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C258:
HERITAGE POLICIES REVIEW AND WEST MELBOURNE HERITAGE REVIEW**

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE MAIN ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

Contents:

1. Heritage policies Clause 22.04 (Heritage Places in the Central City Zone) and Clause 22.05
(Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone)..... 2

2. West Melbourne Heritage Review 6

3. Gradings Conversion Methodology..... 9

5. Large Precinct Statements of Significance 11

6. General submission, other heritage and out of scope issues 13

7. Heritage Inventory..... 15

1. Heritage policies Clause 22.04 – Heritage Places in the Central City Zone and Clause 22.05 – Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone

Submitters on this issue

2: Lisa Ingram	45: Phil Gleeson (Urbis)
8: Terry Montebello	55: Anita Simon
10: Jill Fenwick	56: Hugh Tunnelcliff
11: Ian and Greta Bird	60: Rohan Story (Melbourne Heritage Action Group)
13: Fleur Rubens	63: John Stone
14: Jennifer McDonald	64: Lorraine Siska
15: Carlton Residents Group	65: Anthony Corbett
20: William Bartley (RK Lawyers)	67: Kaye Oddie
22: Marc Flipo	68: Felicity Watson (National Trust)
24: Graham Shepherd	70: Samuel Lim
28: Cheryl and Clive Miller	71: Matt Chamberlain
29: Ewan Ogilvy	72: Mary Kehoe (Hotham History Group)
31: David Vorchheimer	73: Angela Williams
34: Marlise Brenner	74: Michael Butcher
36: Chris Meidanas	80: Mervyn Fennell
37: Warren Green	81: Lucille Voullaire
41: Glenn Sedgwick	82: Helen Watson (Parkville Association)
42: Lucas Paterno	83: Ray Cowling
43: Malcolm Foo	

Summary of Issue and Management Response

More than half of the submissions suggested multiple changes to the proposed C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05). The main points and responses are summarised in the table below.

Heritage policies Clause 22.04 – Heritage Places in the Central City Zone and Clause 22.05 – Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone.		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Recommended change to Amendment C258
Many submitters suggested that the formatting, spelling and clarity of the policies should be changed.	Appropriate changes have been made to the policies.	Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown in Attachment 4.
Some submissions claimed that the new policies are too onerous and don't strike the right balance in allowing modern development.	This has been tested with City of Melbourne development planners and with heritage advisers who regularly apply the heritage policies in assessing developments. It is considered that the policies do strike the right balance of allowing appropriate redevelopment while ensuring heritage is respected.	No change to policies in response to these submissions.
Many submissions included numerous suggestions to clarify the definitions and also the information in the policy basis.	<p>The definitions in the policies were developed by the expert heritage consultants engaged to conduct the heritage policies review.</p> <p>However, it is considered that some of the suggestions would result in an improvement to the clarity of the definitions. For example, it was submitted that the word 'buildings' should be replaced with 'heritage place'. Management agrees on the basis that the definition of 'heritage place' encompasses buildings:</p> <p>"A heritage place has been assessed to have cultural significance or has identified heritage value and can include a site, area or space, building or other works, structure, group of buildings, streetscapes, precinct, archaeological site, landscape, garden or tree",</p> <p>Where it is appropriate, buildings have been referred to as 'heritage places' throughout the policy. In some provisions it remains appropriate to refer to 'buildings' for example when demolition is referenced.</p> <p>Some submitters also suggested that the</p>	Yes. The specific changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown in Attachment 4.

Heritage policies Clause 22.04 – Heritage Places in the Central City Zone and Clause 22.05 – Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone.

Summary of Issue	Management Response	Recommended change to Amendment C258
	<p>term 'heritage significance' should be changed to 'cultural significance' as this is what is specified in the Burra Charter. However, it is noted that in the header clause for the Heritage Overlay (clause 43.01) that heritage places of natural or cultural significance are distinguished. As it is the intent of the policies to apply to places of both natural and cultural significance, it is considered that there should be a definition of 'heritage significance' in the policies as it encompasses both aspects.</p> <p>A few submissions objected to the timeframe within the policy basis of the exhibited polices as follows:</p> <p>These places date from the mid-nineteenth century through to more recent times, and are variously of heritage value for their historic, aesthetic, social, spiritual and scientific significance.</p> <p>It is considered that heritage places can date from prior to the mid nineteenth century, for example, Aboriginal heritage places, so therefore putting a limiting date in the policy is inaccurate.</p> <p>Therefore the reference to timeframes under the policy basis section has been taken out.</p>	
<p>Many submitted that the language within the provisions needs to be strengthened to be more prescriptive. For example, that the word 'should', which is throughout the policy should be replaced with 'must'. Many also disputed the use of the term 'will not normally'.</p>	<p>It must first be noted that the use of discretionary language and a performance-based approach is inherent in the Victorian Planning System. The State Government's Planning Practice Note 8 'Writing a Local Planning Policy' (PPN8, June 2015) states that a local planning policy 'cannot remove the discretion under the relevant zone, overlay or particular provision', but gives a planning authority 'an opportunity to state how discretion should or will be</p>	<p>Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are marked up in Attachment 4.</p>

Heritage policies Clause 22.04 – Heritage Places in the Central City Zone and Clause 22.05 – Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone.		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Recommended change to Amendment C258
	<p>exercised under the planning scheme'. PPN8 also states that an LPP is 'a guideline about how discretion is likely to be decided and cannot prescribe mandatory requirements'; is a statement 'of intent or expectation'; and 'may contain decision guidelines for the responsible authority, and/or criteria or performance measures against which an individual application will be tested'.</p> <p>There are instances in the proposed policies where the word 'should' can be changed to the word 'must' without making the provision mandatory. Where this is the case, the language and provisions have been amended.</p>	
<p>Many submissions suggested that the policy around discouraging facadism needs to be much stronger.</p>	<p>In response, it is recommended that the policies are changed in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions for 'facadism', 'façade(s)' and 'principal façade(s)' have been added to the policy • A clear policy objective to discourage facadism has been added to the policy objectives section • The terminology discouraging facadism in the provisions about demolition has been strengthened. 	<p>Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown in Attachment 4.</p>
<p>Some submissions stated that the provisions needs to better deal with corner sites.</p>	<p>The definition for 'front or principal part of building' has been modified so that it now also applies to corner sites.</p>	<p>Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown in Attachment 4.</p>
<p>Some submitters claimed that there was no direction in regard to how non-contributory heritage places</p>	<p>It is considered that provisions about non-contributory heritage places will improve the clarity of the provisions and has been added under the demolition and</p>	<p>Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown</p>

Heritage policies Clause 22.04 – Heritage Places in the Central City Zone and Clause 22.05 – Heritage Places Outside the Central City Zone.		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Recommended change to Amendment C258
can be developed and that there needed to be clearer provisions about this.	alterations clauses.	in Attachment 4.
Some submissions suggested that the policies should include references to apply to a greater variety of building typologies.	The definition for ‘front or principal part of a building’ has been altered so that it addresses a greater range of building types.	Yes. The changes to Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 in response to submissions are shown in Attachment 4.
Many submissions are concerned with the change in policy regarding streetscapes and believe that the policy around Significant Streetscapes needs improvement.	There are specific and clear provisions and definitions for streetscapes and significant streetscapes in the policy. It is considered that this guidance is clear and does not need to be altered.	No change

2. West Melbourne Heritage Review (WMHR 2016)

Submitters on this issue

7: John Pantorno	54: Renato Ravenna
19: Simon Mitchell-Wong	58: Hugh Tunnecliff
20: William Bartley	59: Patricia Ng
21: Darren S. Goldsmith	60: Rohan Storey, Melbourne Heritage Action
34: Marlise Brenner	61: Bill Cook
38: Vinka Nassis	66: Bonnie Guo
39: Rohan Nayer	75: Chris Wren
43: Shaun Driscoll & Margaret Bradshaw	83: Ray Cowling
51: Morgan Koloni (c/o Sarah Raso – Best Hooper)	

Summary of Issue and Management Response

West Melbourne Heritage Review		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?

West Melbourne Heritage Review		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
<p>A number of submitters dispute the WMHR2016 assessment of particular properties with many requesting that their grading should be of a less significant level and some submitting that the assessed level of significance should be greater. Some also submitted that additional properties should also be proposed for the Heritage Overlay and disagree with the boundaries of some of the Heritage Overlay maps.</p>	<p>The expert heritage consultant who conducted the WMHR2016, Graeme Butler and Associates, reviewed these submissions in light of the information in the submissions and has recommended some modifications to certain assessments of places in West Melbourne and to Statements of Significance. As this is a technical matter Management has relied on Mr Butler's response to these submissions.</p>	<p>The changes that are recommended in response to submissions about the West Melbourne Heritage Review are shown in Attachment 4.</p>
<p>Some submitters suggested that particular properties should be included in the Interim Heritage Overlay.</p>	<p>The request from Council to the Minister for Planning in Amendment C273 was to approve the heritage overlay on an interim basis for 26 sites assessed to be of heritage significance (and not currently in the HO) in the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016. The Minister did not give approval for the following sites in Amendment C273 which were part of the original request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HO1182 Elm ('Ulmus' species.) street trees x2, near 80, 86 Capel Street, West Melbourne - HO1184 Elm ('Ulmus' species.), Hawke and Curzon Street Reserve, 2A Hawke Street, West Melbourne - HO1185 Elms (x6), street trees, near 81–141 Jeffcott Street, West Melbourne - HO1186 Elm, Hawke Street and King Street Reserve, near 446 King Street, West Melbourne - HO1189 Tame and Company factory, 511 King Street, West 	<p>No change.</p>

West Melbourne Heritage Review		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
	<p>Melbourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HO1190 Edward J. and Samuel Spink workshop, also J. B. Watson's stores, later Molloy and Co, hide and skin merchants, 488–494 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne - HO1193 Dixon and Co. cordial factory, later Felton Grimwade and Duerdins Pty. Ltd. Chemical laboratory, factory and store complex, 109–133 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne - HO1194 Australian Biscuit Company Ltd. stores, 300 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne - HO1195 Melbourne Remand Centre, later Assessment Prison, 317 Spencer Street, West Melbourne - HO1196 Brown's factory, later Preston Motors Pty.Ltd., 445 Spencer Street, West Melbourne - HO1180 Canary Island pines (x2 'Pinus canariensis'), Howard Street and William Street Reserve <p>However, all of these above sites are proposed to be included in the heritage overlay on a permanent basis under Amendment C258.</p>	
There were supportive submissions for the Heritage Overlays proposed for West Melbourne.	Supportive submissions noted.	No change.
Some submitters also identified anomalies between the WMHR2016 grading recommendations and those	These anomalies have been addressed. Please refer to page 16 of this document for a summary of how these anomalies have been addressed.	Exhibited C258 Heritage Inventory was corrected and re-exhibited.

West Melbourne Heritage Review		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
that were included in the exhibited C258 Heritage Places Inventory.		
Some submitters suggested that because West Melbourne is currently subject to increased development and a proposed structure plan, that it is contradictory to also propose more heritage controls over the area.	One objective of the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016 was to assess and identify all of the significant heritage places in West Melbourne to inform the development of the Structure Plan. Heritage Overlays do not prohibit development but require that the heritage places be considered in the design and assessment of development proposals.	No change.
Some submitted that the State Government Practice Note 01 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (Revised September 2012) was not been met as part of the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016.	The Practice Note 01 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (Revised September 2012) has been applied in the WMHR2016. The methodology is outlined in pages 4–6 of the WMHR2016 preamble.	No change.

3. Gradings Conversion Methodology

Submitters on this issue

1: Matt Connell	22: Marc Flipo, Melbourne Business School	34: Marlise Brenner
2: Lisa Ingram	23: Suellen Hunter, Department of Health and Human Services	35: Mary Bruckard
3: Nicole Elischer	24: Graham Shepherd, East Melbourne Historical Society	36: Chris Meidanas
5: Peter and Durelle Hargreaves	28: Cheryl and Clive Miller	37: Warren Green
7: John Pantorno	29: Ewan Ogilvy, Carlton Residents Association	38: Vinka Nassis, Oliver Hume Property Funds
9: Sylvia Black – East Melbourne Historical Society	30: David Vorchheimer, HWL Ebsworth Lawyers	42: Lucas Paterno, Urban Planning Office Pty Ltd
11: Ian and Greta Bird	31: David Vorchheimer, HWL Ebsworth Lawyers	43: Shaun Driscoll & Margaret Bradshaw
15: Judy Nicholson – Melbourne Grammar School	32: Anna Greening, Smart Planning and Design	46: Dom Patti
17: Ewan Ogilvy – Carlton Residents Group		47: Lee Thomas, Lort Smith Animal Hospital
21: Darren S. Goldsmith		

48: Jan Armstrong-Conn,
Pasley Streets Precincts
Group South Yarra

49: Farida Fleming

50: Tony and Angelika
Dimitriadis

52: Mark Duckworth

55: Anita Simon

56: Jonathan Allen, on
behalf of eight property
owners

57: Andrew Normand

59: Patricia Ng

60: Rohan Storey,
Melbourne Heritage Action
Group

62: Charles and Jennifer
Shaw

63: John Stone, East
Melbourne Group

64: Lorraine Siska

65: Anthony Corbett,
University of Melbourne

68: Felicity Watson, National
Trust

70: Samuel Lim

71: Matt Chamberlain

72: Mary Kehoe, Hotham
History Group

73: Angela Williams

74: Michael Butcher,
Melbourne South Yarra
Residents Group

77: Simon Martyn – Fulcrum
Urban Planning Pty Ltd

85: Robert Ford (Perry
Town Planning) on behalf of
the CFMEU

87: Marjorie Kennedy,
Brunswick Group Pty Ltd

88: Cathy Pearl (SJB
Planning) on behalf of
Middlefield Group

Summary of Issue and Management Response

Gradings Conversion Methodology		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
Many submissions were supportive of the gradings conversion to the contemporary gradings system.	It is essential that the contemporary gradings system is adopted to enable future heritage reviews of Melbourne's neighbourhoods to be progressed. This approach is supported by the VPP Practice Note Applying the Heritage Overlay (revised September 2012), which recommends against the use of 'letter gradings'. Planning Panels Victoria and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) have advised that no further heritage reviews will be supported until the new system is adopted.	No change.
Concerns that many heritage places have been left out of the C258 inventory.	Only those places that are within a Heritage Overlay have been included in the Inventory. Non-contributory properties within a Heritage Overlay are not listed.	No change.
Concerns about the conversion methodology.	The heritage consultants who were engaged to conduct the gradings conversion carefully developed a	No change.

	thorough, sound methodology for the gradings conversion. The methodology involved background research, desktop reviews, field and sampling work to determine the most sound method of converting the gradings of all the properties in a heritage overlay in the City of Melbourne, across to the contemporary gradings system. For details of this methodology, please see the 'Methodology Report, City of Melbourne Gradings Review' which is available online - Attachment 3 of the report to the Future Melbourne Committee of 5 July 2016.	
That the current heritage places and streetscape system is more nuanced and the proposed system is less so.	The significant/contributory/non-contributory gradings system is the contemporary, standard heritage gradings system that has been utilised across the whole country for many years. The City of Melbourne is one of the last municipalities to convert to this standard system.	No change.
Concern that the conversion will result in the 'weakening' of protection for many properties across the municipality.	The gradings conversion has not weakened the protection of heritage places. All places are still included in the Heritage Overlay so still have statutory protection.	No change.

5. Large Precinct Statements of Significance

Submitters on this issue

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 2: Lisa Ingram | 72. Mary Kehoe |
| 16. Sylvia Black – East Melbourne Historical Society | 73. Angela Williams |
| 17. Ewan Oglivy – Carlton Residents Group | 74. Michael Butcher |
| 34. Marlise Brenner | 79. Heather R. Matthew |
| 37. Warren Green | 81. Lucille Voullaire |
| 63. John Stone | 82. Helen Watson |
| 64 Lorraine Siska | 83. Ray Cowling |
| 68. Felicity Watson | |

Summary of Issue and Management Response

Precincts Statements of Significance		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
Submitters provided additional information about certain precincts which should be included in the Statements of Significance. Some submitters also queried the accuracy of some of the information in the Statements of Significance, including the dates of buildings and events.	The heritage consultants who drafted the C258 Precinct Statements of Significance, reviewed the Statements in light of the information provided in submissions. Where deemed appropriate and factually correct, the consultants recommended that the Statements of Significance be updated in response to this information.	Some of the Precincts Statements of Significance have been updated in response to information provided in submissions. These changes are shown in the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statements of Significance (refer to Attachment 4).
Some sub-areas in the large precincts should be separate precincts and have their own statements of significance.	It is out of the scope of Amendment C258 to create new heritage precincts. New heritage precincts will be identified and protected as part of current and future heritage reviews and studies which are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program (for example the current Hoddle Grid Heritage Review and Southbank and Fisherman's Bend Heritage Review).	No change.
A few submitters suggested that the Statements of Significance should include references to Indigenous occupation in the pre-contact period (for example the Scar trees in Yarra Park).	The additional information provided in submissions has been considered and in some cases the Statements of Significance have been updated in response to this information.	Some of the Precincts Statements of Significance have been updated in response to information provided in submissions. These changes are shown in the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statements of Significance (refer to Attachment 4).
There should be more acknowledgement in the precinct Statements of Significance about the social history of areas for example acknowledging that residents value diversity of cultures and ethnicity.	The Precinct Statements of Significance are guided by the requirements of Heritage Victoria. The Statement is about the precinct as a place, how it evolved and what is physically important and why. The Statements are not a social history. Where relevant to a particular historic theme, certain individuals may be identified in the Statements, but this is different to a social	No Change.

Precincts Statements of Significance		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
	history of an area.	
Significant views and vistas should be protected and added to key attributes in the Large Precincts Statements of Significance.	The precinct Statements do refer to landmarks and the visibility of prominent towers (e.g. North Melbourne Town Hall and church buildings and spires), but do not spatially identify the location of the specific views and vistas – this is a separate exercise outside the scope of this amendment.	No Change.

General submission, other heritage and out of scope issues

Submitters on this issue

1. Matt Connell	29. Ewan Oglivy	63. John Stone
10. Jill Fenwick	33. Andrew Neale	64. Lorraine Siska
11. Ian and Greta Birf	34. Warren Green	68. Felicity Watson
12. Jennifer McDonald	44. Malcolm Foo	72. Mary Kehoe
17. Ewan Oglivy	49. Farida Fleming	73. Angela Williams
24. Graham Shepherd	53. Margaret Jungwirth	74. Michael Butcher
25. Graham Shepherd	55. Anita Simon	82. Helen Watson
26. Graham Shepherd	60. Rohan Storey	83. Ray Cowling

Summary of Issue and Management Response

General submission, other heritage and out of scope issues		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
Concerns about heritage places that have been neglected or left to deteriorate, with many suggesting that owners of heritage properties should be required to restore/reconstruct heritage buildings and that penalties and enforcement should apply to owners who neglect heritage properties.	<p>The prevention of the deterioration of heritage fabric and buildings is beyond the scope of Amendment C258. The policies and provisions within the planning scheme only apply when there is an application to develop a property in the heritage overlay.</p> <p>The proposed heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) do however include policies and objectives about encouraging</p>	No Change.

	<p>the restoration and reconstruction of heritage places as part of development applications under the heritage overlay.</p> <p>It should be noted that heritage places on the Victorian Heritage Register, have different requirements and guidelines for restoration to places of local significance. Please refer to Heritage Victoria's website for these.</p>	
<p>Concerns about the construction of large underground basement areas under heritage sites and the impacts of these on heritage buildings and the ecology of the area, due to soil groundwater contamination.</p>	<p>This is out of scope of Amendment C258.</p> <p>However, this issue has been noted and management will investigate this further as part of future projects related to sustainability and ecological planning policy.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
<p>That heritage precinct boundaries should be altered, particularly the large heritage precincts with some submitting that these should be broken down into smaller sub-precincts.</p>	<p>A full heritage assessment is required in order to propose the alteration of the boundaries of the heritage overlay, heritage precincts or any heritage place. Such a heritage assessment occurred in West Melbourne as part of the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016. However this was out of scope for the rest of the Amendment C258 study area. Future heritage reviews (such as the Hoddle Grid Heritage review currently underway) are likely to identify new heritage precincts and to recommend altering the boundaries of existing precincts.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
<p>That heritage policies can conflict with other parts of the Planning Scheme - for example a design and development overlay and a heritage overlay on the same site. Submitters suggest that in these situations, Council must establish which provision is prioritised.</p>	<p>It is not uncommon for one property to have multiple overlays applying to it such as the heritage overlay, design and development overlay, environmental audit overlay, a special building overlay. All of these requirements apply for different reasons and each must be considered on a case by case basis. The objectives of each of the different overlays are considered on balance when planners assess planning permit applications to develop.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
<p>That there needs to be more heritage review of some areas and of ungraded properties, with some suggesting that the whole municipality needs to be assessed for heritage significance.</p>	<p>Apart from in West Melbourne, a full, heritage assessment of the heritage significance of properties was not part of Amendment C258. However, a priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

<p>Disputing the current letter (A–E) grading of individual properties in the existing Heritage Inventory, submitting that a grading should be higher or lower level.</p>	<p>Apart from the West Melbourne area, it is out of the scope of Amendment C258 to do a full heritage assessment of the existing heritage significance of properties. Rather, the existing gradings of properties were converted from the old gradings system to the new system using the endorsed gradings conversion methodology (see pages 10–11 of the document for discussion about the gradings conversion methodology).</p>	<p>No Change.</p>
---	--	-------------------

7. Heritage Inventory

Submitters on this issue

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2. Lisa Ingram | 86. Paul Bell |
| 5. Peter and Durelle Hargreaves | 87. Marjorie Kennedy |
| 6. Rohan Wilson | 88. Cathy Pearl (SJB Planning) |
| 9. Sylvia Black – East Melbourne Historical Society | 89. Carlton Residents Association (CRA) (additional submission) |
| 15. Judy Nicholson – Melbourne Grammar School | 90. Ray Cowling (additional submission) |
| 17. Ewan Ogilvy – Carlton Residents Group | 91. Liam Riordan (Tract) on behalf of Alan Kras. |
| 18. Jane Munro – St Peter’s Church Eastern hill | 92. Ewan Ogilvy (additional submission) |
| 29. Ewan Ogilvy – Carlton Residents Association | 93. Sylvia Black (East Melbourne Historical Society) and Barbara Paterson (Heritage and Planning East Melbourne Group) (additional submission) |
| 33. Andrew R Neale | 94. Gareth Holdstock (CBRE) on behalf of Volker Gladis |
| 67. Kaye Oddie | 95. Sally Macindoe on behalf of University of Melbourne (additional submission) |
| 68. Felicity Watson - National Trust | 96. Parkville Association (additional submission) |
| 73. Angela Williams | 97. Hotham History Project (additional submission) |
| 72. Mary Kehoe | 98. Rohan Storey, Melbourne Heritage Action (additional submission) |
| 78. Enid Hookey | |
| 79. Heather R. Matthew | |
| 82. Helen Watson - Parkville Association Inc | |

Summary of issue

General submission, other heritage and out of scope issues		
Summary of Issue	Management Response	Change to Amendment C258?
<p>Potential omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory. Some submitters included long lists of properties where they believed there was an error in the proposed grading in the exhibited C258 inventory.</p>	<p>In response to issues raised by submitters regarding the Inventory, an extensive piece of data analysis and validation work was undertaken by officers. This determined that the vast majority of potential anomalies were perceived anomalies rather than actual anomalies. Many of these perceived anomalies were due to specific address naming changes so for many the grading listed was correct but the property is now known as a different address than shown in the current Heritage Inventory. These perceived anomalies were also often due to errors in the current Heritage Inventory which lists many properties that are not in the Heritage Overlay. Amendment C258 has addressed these errors by including only those properties that are in a heritage overlay in the C258 Heritage Places Inventory.</p> <p>The investigation identified a small percentage of actual anomalies omissions (approximately per cent) and errors (approximately per cent) in the exhibited Inventory. The factors contributing to these errors were analysed and they were found to be due to changes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • property addresses • subdivision • consolidation of land parcels over the past 30 years • inaccuracies in outdated heritage databases • human error during data entry • inadvertent omissions of particular properties that were within the recent heritage review areas (mostly in City North) <p>The Inventory was updated to correct and clearly show these errors and omissions and Future Melbourne Committee (FMC) endorsed this corrected inventory at its meeting of 21 November 2017. FMC also authorised the re-exhibition of the corrected inventory at this FMC meeting. The re-exhibition took place from 7 December 2017 until 29 January 2018.</p>	<p>In response to these submissions, changes were made to the C258 Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2017 and these are shown in Attachment 4.</p>

<p>12 additional submissions were received in the re-exhibition period regarding the Heritage Inventory. Most were supportive that the anomalies had been addressed whereas some included additional lists of potential anomalies.</p>	<p>Each of the potential anomalies raised in the additional submissions have also been investigated. It was found those most contained the correct information and were perceived anomalies due to address changes over time.</p> <p>Where any typographical, errors were identified, these have been rectified and this is shown in Attachment 4.</p>	<p>In response to these submissions, changes were made to the C258 Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2017 and these are shown in Attachment 4.</p>
<p>Concern about anomalies in the C258 Heritage Inventory and requesting an independent review of this document before the Amendment can proceed.</p>	<p>Officers have conducted a thorough analysis of the Heritage Inventory in response to submissions received last year. With a data set of such magnitude and complexity, some margin of error is inevitable. It should be noted that the full details, condition and status of heritage places is assessed when full heritage reviews occur. The gradings conversion is a critical step to allow these full heritage area reviews to proceed. The State Government has advised that no more heritage reviews will be accepted until we move to the contemporary system.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the role of the Independent Planning Panel that is appointed by the Planning Minister is to review all submissions to an amendment and the actual amendment itself. This will include all components of the Amendment including the Heritage Inventory.</p> <p>It should also be noted that new heritage assessments of properties are able to be made as part of the planning permit application process, the proposed C258 heritage policies include a provision for this. This often occurs when the existing assessment of a heritage place is from a long time ago and requires updating.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submitter	1. Matt Connell
Subject Land	Kensington
Key Issues	General Submission Gradings Conversion Methodology
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applauds City of Melbourne's actions to help preserve the historical fabric of the world's most liveable city. • Owns a heritage Victorian terrace and well prepared to restore, protect and beautify it. • Concerned about seemingly large number of developments that appear to be swallowing up D graded properties, or demolishing them or new replacement buildings out of character with area. Opposes inappropriate development. • Applauds the re-grading of former D grade properties as 'contributory' as can rest easy that they will have a greater level of protection placed over them.
Management Response	The submitter is generally supportive of Amendment C258. Some of the points raised in this submission have been raised by other submitters (refer to Attachment 2 for Response to Main Issues Raised in Submissions).
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	2. Lisa Ingram
Subject Land	Kensington
Key Issues	Site Specific & General Submission Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance Heritage Inventory
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that heritage places have been left out of the inventory. • Recommends inclusion of places that are recognised in the i-Heritage database, specifically the 6-8 Bruce Street and 31-35 Elizabeth Street, Kensington as they are considered contributory to the significant heritage places there (including the Mill and woolstores, bridges, lanes and local housing) • Recommends the creation of a Mill heritage precinct to capture these properties. Notes that Kensington Roller Flour Mill was reportedly the

largest mill in the country. Kimpton's Mills also significant. The houses above link to the Mill and should be included. The submission includes a proposed Statement of Significance. Also includes other suggestions for the Statement of Significance for Kensington and submits that the industrial expansion aspect of the history of Kensington should be recognised in the Statement of Significance.

- Recommends adding a 'Z' rating system to integrate the State and Local systems, and complete the visibility of consistent visibility of State recognised buildings within lists and on plans, without duplicating their governance. This would ensure all heritage places are visibly mapped and listed and limit duplication.
- Considers that Clause 22.04 and 22.05 should be more strongly worded (must encourage new development to be designed and sited to respect identified significance of heritage place).
- Regarding Clause 22.5.08: Character and appearance of adjoining significant and contributory buildings should be reworded (here and other relevant paragraphs) to 'significant and contributory buildings in proximity'. Alternatively could also include the words 'opposite/behind' along with 'adjacent'.
- Properties mentioned from i-Heritage include
 - 28-32 Bruce Street
 - 6 Bruce Street
 - 6-8 Bruce Street
 - 8 Bruce Street
 - 31 Elizabeth Street
 - 33 Elizabeth Street
 - 35 Elizabeth Street
- Supports the grading of 5 Bruce Street as significant

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2).

Site Specific response

28-32 Bruce Street is not covered by a Heritage Overlay, so is not included in the Heritage Inventory.

6 and 8 Bruce Street and 31 Elizabeth Street and 33-35 Elizabeth Street were removed from the Heritage Overlay as part of Amendment C207 Arden Macaulay Heritage Review. The inclusion of these properties in the exhibited C258 inventory was a drafting error and it is recommended that these properties are removed.

Large Precincts Statements of Significance response

The industrial expansion history of Kensington is not directly relevant to the Kensington precinct which is predominantly residential in character, with some commercial development. It is more relevant to other parts of Kensington. However, references in the statement to local industry and its expansion and influence on the precinct have been reviewed, and in some instances further

emphasised.

Regarding the Mill area of Kensington, and related properties, these are outside the current precinct boundary and accordingly should not be referred to in the Statement of Significance.

General Submission response

State recognised buildings are significant at the State level and are included in the Inventory. In the schedule to the Heritage Overlay, (Clause 43.01) there is a column where places included on the Victorian Heritage Register are identified. The way that heritage places are mapped in the Planning Scheme is governed by the Victorian State Government and is outside of the scope of Amendment C258.

Adding places to the Heritage Overlay is out of scope of this project.

Recommendation In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the:

- C258 Heritage Places Inventory Incorporated Document
- C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance
- C258 Heritage Policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05)

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **3. Nicole Elischer**

Subject Land North Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission

Summary

- Pleased that City of Melbourne investing in maintaining inner city character
- Proposes a review of the grading of the subject site (currently proposed to be graded as contributory, without a streetscape grading), to non-contributory.
- Mentions that any future development of the site (to address the lack of fire safety in the building, overshadowing to the north, energy efficiency and non-compliance with building standards) would require considerable internal and external configuration, which would degrade the heritage character.
- Submits that compliance with fire and building standards would require an additional internal wall which would rise above the roof line (which is already significantly altered from the original) and require moving the front entry.
- Mentions a 2-3 storey building at front of the block is more in keeping with adjoining structures and better able to retain open space to the rear of the property
- Considers that there are adequate controls in place without the need for heritage

Management Response This property already has heritage protection. The proposed grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.

Under the current grading system the subject site has a C grading. C graded properties in all precincts except Parkville required a desktop review as part of

the gradings conversion methodology. Under this desktop review, this property was confirmed to be contributory.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **4. Alice Moloney on behalf of Mr John Elie Sader**

Subject Land Carlton

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Supports the amendment

Summary

- Carlton Conservation Study (1984) has two entries with the same property key number, but with two separate photos – both D graded
- Amendment C258 now excludes the subject site so it is ungraded. It clarifies that one property is contributory, while the subject site is not listed.
- On this basis, the amendment is supported

Management Response **Site Specific Response**

Noted that the submitter is supportive of Amendment C258. Both properties are included in the Carlton Precinct Heritage Overlay HO1.

The subject site is not listed in the current Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2016, so it is considered to be ungraded.

Under Amendment C258, all ungraded heritage properties are proposed to be converted to 'non-contributory' and all 'non-contributory' properties do not appear in the C258 Heritage Places inventory 2017. Therefore, the omission of the subject site from the C258 Heritage Places Inventory 2017 was intentional.

Both of the other properties are listed in the current Heritage Places Inventory 2016 as being D graded so under Amendment C258 have been converted to contributory.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **5. Peter and Durelle Hargreaves**

Subject Land North Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission - Gradings Conversion
Heritage Inventory

Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-3 Youngs Lane and 2 Youngs Lane (also called 26 Youngs Lane) should be included in C258. It is not currently included. • Currently graded C3, and listed in i-heritage as well as the Melbourne Planning Scheme Register report (2000 – Allom Lovell), BIF 1999, North and West Melbourne Conservation Study 1983. • Submits that 1-3 and 2 (26) Youngs Lane should be included within the inventory as they make a historical contribution to the area
Management Response	<p>Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2).</p> <p>The property addresses 1-3 and 2 Youngs Lane appear in the current Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2016, as C graded. These addresses however do not appear on Council’s GIS system and it is inconclusive which properties need to be reviewed.</p> <p>It is considered that the consultants who conducted the gradings conversion should conduct a desktop review of 1-3 and 2 Youngs Lane, North Melbourne, in accordance with the gradings conversion methodology, to determine the proposed converted grading for these properties. The process for proceeding with this review should be determined by the Panel.</p>
Recommendation	Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	6. Rohan Wilson
Subject Land	South Yarra
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Heritage Inventory</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter queries the gradings of 13 and 15 Alexandra Avenue South Yarra • Notes that the property was previously C graded, along with neighbours at 9-11 and 15 Alexandra Avenue and is now unlisted in the inventory. Number 15 is also unlisted and 9-11 is listed as significant • Questions if there is an error and perhaps the property should be listed – as both were designed by same architect, built at the same time, and consistent in form. • Mentions that 9-11 are converted to a single dwelling, whilst 13 and 15 are separate. Both have had some exterior additions. 13 has some dormer windows added and 15 has a sun room added. • Notes that original features of 13 and 15 include lead light windows, exposed brick and fret work • Notes that there are errors, gaps and inconsistencies in the amendment and inconsistent naming of property address

Management Response	The omission of the subject sites in the Inventory has been corrected and these properties are now listed as contributory in the corrected Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from December 2017 to 29 January 2018.
Recommendation	No changes are therefore recommended to Amendment C258 in response to this submission. Refer submission to Panel.
Submitter	7. John Pantorno
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	West Melbourne Heritage Review
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support the proposed grading of the property. • States that the subject site is proposed to change from a C grading, to 'significant'. • The submitter is a strong advocate for maintaining heritage buildings across Melbourne, and states that their property should not be classified as significant, as the subject street is made up of mixed use buildings with no real heritage significance. • The property (constructed in the 1900s) is nestled between two large buildings and can't be viewed on the street. Only the façade remains. • Requests a change to a less significant category.
Management Response	This property has been assessed in the West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016WMHR2016 as being C graded (under the current grading system) and as individually significant and contributory to the HO3 precinct (under the proposed grading system). No further evidence has been provided by the submitter regarding why the property is not significant. The WMHR2016 Consultant ('WMHR Consultant') has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission and recommends that there be no change to the grading or Statement of Significance for this property.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	8. Terry Montebello
Subject Land	Kensington
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission

General Submission

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Gradings Conversion Methodology

Summary

- Supports changes to the gradings classifications system.
- Supports introduction of an incorporated document which includes an inventory of heritage places, identifying their grading based on significant, contributory and non-contributory system.
- Supports change to streetscape grading system (essentially only focussing on significant streetscapes).
- Considers that Clause 22.05 does not properly reflect the new grading system and suggested changes are tracked in a word version of the policy.
- Notes that many terms used throughout clause 22.05 don't reflect the glossary, for instance 'significant buildings' is used rather than 'significant places'.
- Suggests moving the reference to the definition so that it addresses the whole policy rather than just performance standards.
- Suggests changing wording in the policy from, 'significance' to 'cultural heritage significance' as this is the clear purpose of the Heritage Overlay.
- At Clause 22.05-5, the submitter suggests inserting a reference to the local policy regarding demolition of non-contributory building. While there are many buildings which are non-contributory, there is no policy provision dealing with them in relation to demolition. The definition clarifies that non-contributory buildings have no heritage significance, however the policy should be clear that demolition should not normally be permitted.
- With reference to the GR22, the submitter notes the existing height control in relation to the proposed policy seeking upper level setbacks and references to concealment or partial concealment. One needs to be mindful of the impact of these constraints on the ability to construct a dwelling suitable for modern standards.
- The submitter believes there is no basis for requiring upper-level setbacks on new buildings to meet the same tests of either concealed or partially concealed. Given that two story heritage buildings are common in Kensington, and asks what is objectionable about a second storey component on a new dwelling being visible provided it doesn't dominate the street or obscure sight lines?
- The submitter has provided a suggested amended Clause 22.05-7 to make it clearer why an upper level setback might be required and to clarify that the setback referred to is relative to the ground floor façade or building line.
- Notes that policy should not require same upper level setback standard for a newly constructed non-contributory building as is required of either an addition or alteration of significant (concealed) or contributory (partially concealed) heritage place.
- Considers that the issue of setbacks should be limited to ensuring there is no domination of sight lines to significant or contributory buildings or for streetscape purposes.
- Seeks the deletion of the following provision, 'not adopt a façade height which is significantly lower than prevailing heights in the streetscape'

Management

It is noted that this submission is supportive of many aspects of Amendment

Response	C258 including the conversion to the new gradings system. All of the suggestions in this submission for the C258 heritage policies have been considered and Management agrees with some of these suggested changes. Refer to Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of this.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, several changes to the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) are recommended. See Attachment 4 - Amendment documents marked up with recommended changes in response to submissions. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	9. Sylvia Black East Melbourne Historical Society
Subject Land	Multiple – all of East Melbourne and Jolimont
Key Issues	General Submission Gradings Conversion Methodology Heritage Inventory
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter states that the Heritage Places Inventory is flawed. There are many omissions, some based on earlier versions and some new. • This submission focuses on contributory and significant listings – though notes that omissions are also present for non-contributory listings. • Omissions include Victorian houses, interwar flats, and one off buildings such as the old Olympic Swimming Pool in Batman Avenue. • Fitzroy and Treasury Gardens and Yarra Park are missing from the inventory. • Errors include the Mercy Hospital – this hospital in Grey Street is significant, but so are the individual buildings in other parts of the campus. These include the old 1970s maternity hospital which has now been converted to apartments and a multistorey block of medical rooms converted from the 1950s and a Mercy Place Aged Care (10 years old). • Omissions include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 19-29 Albert Street, interwar flats. ○ 33 Albert Street, Victorian. ○ 45 Albert Street, Victorian cottage. ○ 97 Albert Street, Tunbridge Manor, interwar flats. ○ 99 Albert Street, interwar flats. ○ 103 Albert Street, interwar flats. ○ 246 Albert Street, interwar flats.

- 426 Albert Street, previously C.
- Old Olympic Swimming Pool in Batman Avenue
- 15-21 Burchett Lane.
- 25-27 Burchett Lane.
- 6,8,10,12 Garden Avenue, previously A.
- Cathedral Place – St Andrews Hospital and Fence, previously C.
- 28 Charles Street, coach house now a separate property.
- 126-158 Mercy Maternity Hospital (1970s) converted to apartments (2000s).
- Fitzroy Gardens
- 40 George Street missing from the old inventory, 42 was D. 40 and 42 are now both missing.
- 190A George Street, modern, previously C graded.
- 125A and 125B George Street, previously A graded.
- 140 Gipps Street, Mercy apartments, significant in new.
- 166 Gipps Street, St Francis Building, significant in new.
- 111 Gipps Street, C, consider upgrading
- Gisborne Street
- 1-11 Grey Street, Cnr Hoddle, interwar flats
- 10 Grey Street, single storey Vic cottage, missing from inventory.
- 18-30 Grey Street, interwar flats, missing from inventory.
- 50-54 Grey Street, interwar flats. Not graded.
- 12-14 Grey Street, renumber: 14 is a Victorian cottage; 12 is a 1950s two storey.
- 36-42 Grey Street needs to be renumbered: 42 is a two storey Victorian terrace house; 36 and 38 are 1970s two storey units
- 84 Grey Street: these match but separate from 147-163 Powlett Street, missing from inventory

Hoddle Street places missing from the Inventory

- 1081 Hoddle Street, Ascot Lodge, interwar studio flats.
- 1085 Hoddle Street, interwar studio flats.
- 1123-1133 Hoddle Street, cnr Hotham, interwar flats.
- 1135-1137 Hoddle Street, New Boundary Hotel.
- 1149 and 1151 Hoddle listed as 20 and 22 Hayes Lane in new inventory
- 1235 Hoddle Street, corner Albert, interwar flats.

Hotham Street

-
- 80 Hotham Street should be upgraded from C.
 - 146 and 148 (Johnston Collection) were A, now ungraded.
 - 147-151 Hotham Street (Powlett Mansions), missing.
 - 189 Hotham Street, Victorian house with reproduction parts, missing.
 - 131 Hotham Street, Cairns Apartments, missing
 - 166 Hotham Street (Hotham Place) not graded
 - 29-33 Hotham Street is two separate buildings, should be separately numbered.
 - 39 Hotham Street, old Lutheran church, missing.

Jolimont Road

- 106 recently demolished and it's hard to judge what is being constructed.
- 128-138 should be renumbered. 128 part only of a modern office building.

Jolimont Street

- 86 Jolimont Street, C in old, missing.

Jolimont Terrace

- 36-38 Jolimont Terrace, red brick interwar flats, missing.

Lansdowne Street

- St Patrick's College tower, missing

Macarthur Place

- Gordon Reserve. Elements listed separately in old, reserve listed as a whole in new

Morrison Place

- 12 Morrison Place, A grade in original, missing.

Nicholson Street

- Royal College of Surgeons, missing.

Palmer Street

- 15 Palmer Street, The Hermitage Art Deco flats, missing

Parliament Place

- Lutheran Church Hall, A in original, missing in new
- Lutheran Church House, A in original, missing in new
- 22-36 is listed which is the church, which is listed as 65-75 Cathedral Place in new.

Powlett Reserve

- Sub-station. Missing
- Tennis pavilion. Missing

Powlett Street

- 147-163 Powlett, Cnr Powlett and Grey Street, Belgravia Square,

interwar flats. This was listed as 84 Grey Street. Both should be listed. Separate buildings.

- 41-49 (part Canally) missing from new version, maybe under George Street
Cnr Hotham Street, East Melbourne cellars has lost listing for interiors in new version.
- Magnolia Court numbering not clear in new: 95-101 missing, and 105-109 contributory. 107-109 is corner property and should be listed separately.
129-135 Powlett Street, B in old, Now ungraded.

Simpson Street

- 66 Simpson Street, interwar flats, missing

Spring Street

- Parliament House and grounds. A in old, missing in new

St Andrew's Place

- 34-40 what is this? No such address.

Treasury Gardens

- Several elements listed in original, Gardens not listed at all in new.

Vale Street

- 8 and 10 Vale Street. Missing
- 98 Vale Street (interwar flats) was D. Now missing

Victoria Parade

- 548-550 Victoria Parade, 548 refers to new apartments built behind 550.
- 550 Victoria Parade, SF Vic house. Amend address.
- 552-554 Victoria Parade, interwar flats. Missing.
- 488 Victoria Parade, DF Vic house. Originally D now missing.
- 446-452 Victoria Parade, Tribeca?, originally A now missing
- 376-378 Victoria Parade. Originally A now missing
- 186 Victoria Parade, Greek Church, originally A now missing.
- 146-148 Victoria Parade should read 148-150.
- 68-90 and 86-196 Victoria Parade, both addresses seem to apply to Salvo's carpark, should read 68-106. Originally 80.
- Samuel Mauger Monument, centre plantation near cnr Gisborne. Missing.

Verona Lane

- 22 Verona Lane is Mercy Place Aged Care facility, modern. Listed as significant. Surely not.

Wellington Parade

- 12 Wellington Parade, interwar studio flats, missing
- 56-70 Wellington Parade, Eastbourne House, upgrade
- 114 Wellington parade, missing
- 134-142 Wellington parade, interwar shops with 1950s matching addition. Missing
- 180 Wellington Parade, MCG Hotel, C in original, missing in new Jolimont Station. Missing

Wellington Parade South

- 157 has sadly recently been façaded, all that remains is the chimney and one room at the front, extensive footings work going on at the rear.
- 161 - Jolimont Grange, Art Deco flats. Missing
101 (Redcourt) included as part of Jolimont Square, 95-133 Wellington Parade. Should have own listing.
- 113 (Mornington) included as part of Jolimont Square, 95-133 Wellington Parade. Should have own listing.

Yarra Park

- All elements previously listed are missing

Management Response

Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters – in particular, see the response to Submission #93. Please also see Attachment 2 for the response to main issues raised in submissions.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, some changes are recommended to the C258 Heritage Inventory – see Attachment 4 for details.

Submitter

10. Jill Fenwick

Subject Land

All of East Melbourne

Key Issues

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Concerned about the construction of large underground basement areas, particularly given impacts on ecology. Objects to 'iceberg' buildings and this also has a heritage impact due to the aesthetic of the precinct and can lead to damage to heritage properties through soils being affected by groundwater contamination
- Seeks protection of 'significant' buildings from deliberate long term deterioration (Valetta example) – update point to 'enhance and protect from deterioration'
- Regarding the protection of views and vistas to heritage places, seeks the inclusion of advertising – preventing it on or across from Yarra Park. This includes commercial advertising on tram stops, blocking sight lines to Wellington Parade
- Considers that the language is not strong enough – for applications

	<p>involving significant of contributory heritage places, it is submitted that it should be mandatory to have a heritage impact statement. Also seeks mandatory groundwater diversion where excavation works are intended. Given that 19th century houses generally rest on bluestone footing in moist clays, significant harm can occur from water levels. Concerned with control over water diversion, whether rainwater or ground water: if a building has a proportion of green space, then potential problems for neighbouring heritage houses can be avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that 'should' be needs to be replaced by 'must' be for first sentence in additions • Considers that subdivision of airspace above heritage buildings should be forbidden • Notes that no reference is made to underground parking in vehicle accommodation and access and how this impacts on adjoining properties. • Seeks prevention of excavation below groundwater levels • Considers signage should be dealt with more thoroughly – particularly electronic signage that diminishes or blocks streetscapes and vistas, particularly concerned about Yarra Park.
Management Response	<p>Some of the issues raised in this submission about the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) were also raised by other submitters. For details, see Attachment 2.</p>
Recommendation	<p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>11. Ian and Greta Bird</p>
Subject Land	<p>HO1 - Carlton</p>
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion Methodology</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises a concern that any weakening of heritage protection will be exploited by developers • Considers that the replacement of the existing nuanced system and streetscape system should not be lightly undertaken. • Considers that terms such as 'modernise' and 'streamline' will be exploited by VCAT witnesses. • Considers that heritage overlays designed to conserve and enhance heritage places ignore the benign neglect of heritage places noting that neglect is ignored, resulting in sites falling into disrepair.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks legal requirement to maintain buildings at reasonable standard
Management Response	The issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters, particularly in relation to the language used in the C258 heritage policies Clause 22.04 and 22.05. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.
Recommendation	<p>Some changes to the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) are recommended in response to this submission. For details, see Attachment 4 - Amendment documents marked up with recommended changes in response to submissions.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	12. William Brazenor
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that 28 Erskine Street is listed in the inventory, but number 30 is missing, although similar in style, form and construction. • Suggests 30 Erskine Street be included on the heritage database • Asks about minimum open space and height of new development questioning if it been adopted by Council
Management Response	The property at 30 Erskine Street is included in HO3 but does not have a grading in the current inventory. The non-contributory grading is consistent with the consultant's conversion methodology.
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	13. Fleur Rubens
Subject Land	Carlton
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentions 53-55 Little Palmerston Street noting they constructed an extension that is sympathetic. • Notes that the extension was graded D, but submits that it should not have

been graded at all. Considers that the original building was graded C, which is appropriate.

- Wants the grading to be updated so that the original cottage is contributory, and addition is non-contributory
- The submitter would find this useful as was denied permission to place solar panels on the extended (1980s) part of the dwelling. Although the current policy may now allow solar panels, but uncertain
- May seek to develop in the future and doesn't want any complications due to incorrect grading

Management Response

Site Specific response

The place at 53-55 Little Palmerston Street is currently included in HO1 with a D grading. Under the proposed grading system the place is contributory which is consistent with the heritage consultant's conversion.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Under the proposed C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) there are now provisions around solar panels such that they '*may be permitted on any visible part of significant or contributory buildings where it can be demonstrated there is no feasible alternative and the services and ancillaries will not detract from the character and appearance of the building or heritage place. Items affixed to roofs, such as solar panels, should align with the profile of the roof.*

Services and ancillaries should be installed in a manner whereby they can be removed without damaging significant fabric.

For new buildings, services and ancillaries should be concealed, integrated or incorporated into the design of the building.'(Clause 22.05-14 Services and Ancillaries)

This addresses the issue raised by the submitter.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.

Refer submission to Panel.

Submitter

14. Jennifer McDonald

Subject Land

General policy

Key Issues

General Submission

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- In considering Clause 22.05-3 – under application requirements, suggests that 'may be required' should to be replaced with 'will be required' in some cases. The submitter states they have experienced this added to conditions of the permit, once granted, but question this logic as they ask what is the point after a permit is granted. Instances are cited (conservation management plan, arborists report, engineering report)
- Concerned that much of the scheme is unenforceable.

- Considers that there is too great a use of 'should' and 'should not', and 'normally be permitted', and that this makes it impossible to lodge a convincing objection at VCAT as it too discretionary
- Cites an example of an underground car park to be constructed in front of an A grade building. Policy says additions should always be concealed. Asks if this 'should' ought to be must?
- Instead of 'will not normally be permitted', suggests that demolition of A and B heritage buildings be only permitted subject to a court hearing.

Management Response

The issues and suggestions in this submission have been raised by other submitters. Refer to Attachment to for response to main issues raised in submissions.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, some changes to the heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) are recommended. See Attachment for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

**15. Judy Nicholson
Melbourne Grammar School**

Subject Land

South Yarra

Key Issues

Site Specific Submission - Gradings Conversion
Heritage Inventory

Summary

- Supports translation for most properties but note there are exceptions and the School seeks review of proposed gradings for:
 - 92 Domain Street
 - 100 Domain Street
 - 129 Hope Street
- Notes that none of these properties are currently graded in Heritage Places Inventory (2016), but are now contributory.
- Disagrees that these buildings fit the definition
- Describes 129 Hope Street as a contemporary building
- Describes 100 Domain Street as a 2-storey brick dwelling
- Described 92 Domain Street as a rendered brick cottage
- Considers that the designation of 129 Hope Street raises the questions as to the level of rigour used in the inclusion of these ungraded properties
- Notes that the school is proud of its history and as a custodian of heritage buildings and its use of sensitive design solutions is ongoing
- Submits that the school resists the proposed inclusion of these buildings as it is not satisfied as to the level of rigour that underpins their proposed inclusion

Management Response	<p>Some of the issues raised in this submission were raised in others. Please refer to Attachment 2 – Response to main issues raised in submissions.</p> <p>The inclusion of 192 and 100 Domain Street and 129 Hope Street in the Inventory has been corrected and these properties have been removed from the C258 Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. Refer to Attachment 4 - C258 Amendment documents marked up with recommended changes in response to submissions.</p>
Recommendation	Refer submission to Panel.
Submitter	<p>16. Sylvia Black</p> <p>East Melbourne Historical Society</p>
Subject Land	East Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests including references to indigenous occupation in the pre-contact period, including Yarra Park scar trees, Mounted Police Depot and the foundry on George Street. Also queries the Victoria Brewery date and identifies grammatical errors. • Submits existence of the Mounted Police Depot should be included as part of East Melbourne's earliest beginnings. The first barracks were erected in 1838. The 1866 Gruchy isometric drawing showed the barracks complex to have been substantial, with barracks rooms, mess hall, stables, tack room, feed room, farrier, an indoor riding school, ten cell gaol and hospital to name a few. A wide driveway led south from Wellington Parade to the hospital and this became Berry Street, now the only tangible link between the past and the present. • Identifies grammatical errors in the Statement of Significance (further details can be found in the original submission). Adjust the statement of significance to reflect this. • Regarding page 65, considers that paragraph 5; line 2 'Victoria Brewery on Victoria Parade, established in the 1880s' is a questionable statement. Adds that Thomas Aitken started a small brewery near the corner of Victoria Parade and Powlett Street in 1854. Over the years it passed through many transitions and growth spurts. Notes that Heritage Victoria says it is 'Victoria's longest surviving and architecturally most significant brewery complex'. The 1880s date should be revised.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Grammatical and other minor errors and clarifications have been addressed in the Statements of Significance.</p>

	The information supplied by the submitter was provided to the heritage consultant and changes have been recommended to the documents as follows. Reference to the Aboriginal history of Yarra Park has been included, and greater emphasis has been given to the Mounted Police Barracks and the early Colonial administration history of the precinct. The earlier brewery has also been referred to.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4). Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter	17. Ewan Oglivy Carlton Residents Group
Subject Land	Carlton
Key Issues	General Submission Gradings Conversion Methodology Heritage Inventory Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports additional guidance in local policies regarding vehicle access, fences and gates and services and ancillaries. • Considers guidance in relation to other key and contentious issues must be strengthened. • Welcomes development of the Statement of Significance for Carlton, but submits that this Statement would be vastly more useful as an assessment tool if the separate and non-contiguous sub-areas of Princes Park, University Square and the large area east of Swanston Street were addressed separately. • Mentions involvement of William Guilfoyle in the design of University Square. • Submits that Council must ensure City North sites are included – the consultant recommended that ‘statements for other precincts should be included in the new Incorporated Document’ and this wasn’t followed. • Submits that they accept that a new gradings system is required, but that the adopted definitions have necessitated the review of the significance level of thousands of Heritage Places across the Municipality. Considers that most of the Heritage Places reviewed by the consultants have not retained their previous status as Locally Significant Heritage Places in their own right and does not believe that this is a credible or acceptable outcome. It is submitted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contributory category is problematic as it doesn’t regard local places as significant.

- Contributory is not addressed in ICOMOS Burra Charter.
 - No consistency in the term as it is applied in Victoria.
 - Meaningless descriptor when applied to an isolated heritage overlay that includes just one C or D graded building.
 - Less than 25% of the C and D graded buildings that are included in Carlton are in the significant category, and has resulted in tangible change in status of over 1,000 heritage places.
 - Accepts that a revised Heritage Places Inventory is required but submits that the Carlton section includes so many gaps and mistakes that it requires a drastic overhaul before it will be useful as an assessment tool.
 - Inconsistencies between the way places are described and mapped must be addressed.
 - List separately odd and even numbers.
 - Exhibited Amendment documents must be peer reviewed before any document is subject to a panel hearing given the number of gaps/errors – particularly the City North area of Carlton – the only properties that appear to be covered are those within the three small precinct overlays. There is no record of any of the heritage places in the University Square, or properties west of Swanston Street.
 - Several Heritage Places have been demolished.
 - Considers that where the local policy conflicts with other parts of the Planning Scheme, Council must establish which provision is prioritised (i.e. DDO and Heritage).
 - Seeks a review of the boundaries of Heritage Precincts and Overlays so that revised local policies become permit triggers when new development adjacent or behind heritage places occurs.
 - Considers that those provisions of the proposed Local Policy which address the concealment of higher rear parts of new buildings (and additions to Heritage Places) require elaboration. For example, this guidance must address the extent of any partial concealment that will be acceptable. Council must also clarify the vantage point that is to be adopted when the matter of concealment of higher rear parts is being considered (far side? front?).
 - Seeks a revision of the definitions of 'respectful and interpretive' to be more precise. For instance in Clause 22.06-18 - the submitter questions what 'referenced' means? .
 - Considers that the incorporated documents must be listed separately from reference documents as they have different weights.
 - Concerned that the language of key objectives regarding demolition is ambiguous (should 'not normally' be 'rarely').
 - Concerned that C graded buildings will be reduced to a façade or two.
 - Concerned that Level 3 streetscapes no longer prevent demolition, endangering D3 buildings.
 - Questions the decision to abandon streetscape gradings. In the large suburban wide Heritage Precincts, the streetscape gradings have provided an important heritage context at the local level.
-

-
- Seeks a review of Heritage Overlays that include a group of buildings, for instance the site of the former Children's Hospital includes significant places, but is not considered a precinct, and has no Statement of Significance.
-

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Gradings Conversion Methodology response

Some of the issues raised in this submission about the gradings conversion methodology have been raised in other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for a discussion of these issues.

The contributory category is part of the contemporary gradings system that the City of Melbourne is required to convert to. Places that are graded contributory have heritage significance that contributes to a heritage precinct and this is how contributory places are consistently described across Victoria. These heritage precincts can be locally significant, or significant to the state of Victoria.

Part of the gradings conversion methodology was for places in an individual heritage overlay to be converted directly to significant.

Heritage Inventory response

The C and D graded buildings were converted in accordance with the conversion methodology which meant that all C graded buildings in Carlton were subject to an expert desk-top review to determine whether they should be converted to contributory or significant. All D graded buildings in Carlton were directly converted to contributory.

As part of the investigation into anomalies in the Inventory it was found that there was an error in the drafting of the gradings in the City North Heritage Review (Amendment C198) area which includes part of Carlton. Some of the places that were assessed in the City North Heritage Review were inadvertently omitted from the exhibited C258 inventory. These omissions have been corrected and were included in the corrected C258 Heritage Inventory that was exhibited from 7 December to 29 January.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Some of the issues and suggestions about the policies raised in this submission were raised in other submissions and are discussed in Attachment 2 – Response to main issues raised in submissions.

Large Precincts Statements of Significance response

The consideration of sub-precincts with their own statements of significance was not within the scope of Amendment C258. However, the statement has been reviewed to ensure that the more distinctive components of the precinct are readily understood. More information on University Square, and the other residential squares, has also been added to the statement.

Regarding the design of University Square, it has been clarified by Lovell Chen (and added to the statement) that John Guilfoyle, William Guilfoyle's brother, was involved.

The former Children's Hospital site is referred to in the precinct Statement of

Significance, but the individual HO for this property does not have its own statement. Preparing statements of significance for individual properties is out of scope for Amendment C258.

Recommendation Large Precincts Statements of Significance

In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statements of Significance (refer Attachment 4).

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 heritage policies Clause 22.04 and 22.05 (refer Attachment 4).

Heritage Inventory

In response to this submission, changes were made to the C258 Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2017 (refer Attachment 4) which was re-exhibited.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **18. Jane Munro**
St Peter’s Church Eastern hill

Subject Land East Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Heritage Inventory

Summary

- Submitter is generally supportive of Amendment C258.
- Proposed heritage listing for St Peter’s Anglican Church should be consistent with the listing of the property under the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) as they currently don’t match.
- The current listing doesn’t include the St Peter’s Parish Hall, which has the postal address of 15 Gisborne Street, and the proposed C258 listing doesn’t include the Parish Hall either. (All buildings in St Peters Church Precinct except Hall in Gisborne Street).
- VHR listing: St Peters Eastern Hill Precinct – 453-479 Albert Street and 13-19 Gisborne Street, East Melbourne.
- Supports the heritage listing in the Planning Scheme of A1 for 13-19 Gisborne Street and 453-479 Albert Street.

Management Response Noted that the submitter is generally supportive of Amendment C258.

Site Specific response

Under the current grading system the properties at 13-19 Gisborne and 453-479 Albert Street have an A grading. A graded properties in all precincts were converted to Significant under the proposed grading system.

The Significant grading is consistent with the gradings conversion methodology.

Heritage Inventory response

State recognised buildings are significant at the State level and are included in the Inventory. In the schedule to the Heritage Overlay, (Clause 43.01) there is a column where places included on the Victorian Heritage Register are identified.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **19. Simon Mitchell-Wong**

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues General Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Supports recognition of the 1882 Spink Tinsmith and Italianate storefront (at 488 La Trobe Street).
- Supports the proposed heritage policies, as Melbourne’s culture defines the city’s identity.
- Considers the Amendment helps to preserve the Melbourne that is loved.
- Strongly requests interim heritage protection to Spinks Tinsmith.
- Includes comments regarding the Statement of Significance for 488 La Trobe Street.

Management Response

It is noted that the submitter is supportive of Amendment C258.

This submission has been assessed by the WMHR consultant who generally concurs with the views set out in this submission. This is the only Victorian-era factory warehouse with a shopfront or storefront in West Melbourne. Although there are shopfront fragments on shops and residences in Victoria Street for example, they are rare and therefore culturally valuable.

The exhibited Heritage Places Inventory 2017 lists 488 La Trobe Street as significant and it is proposed to be included in the Heritage Overlay under Amendment C258.

It was included in the request from Council to the Minister for Planning for Amendment C273 to approve the Heritage Overlay on an interim basis for 26 sites in West Melbourne assessed to be of heritage significance (and not currently in the HO) in the WMHR2016. The Minister did not approve C273 for 11 heritage places in West Melbourne including 488 La Trobe Street.

Recommendation In response to this submission the Statement of Significance for 488-494 La Trobe Street (within the C258 Incorporated Document West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016) will be amended to add the following (underlined) information:

“What is Significant

...The growth of industry in the north and west of Melbourne is reflected by the location of this workshop, reflecting the growing railway and shipping connections forged by the Coode canal construction from the 1870s to its completion in 1886, linking the port and shipping with the vast inland railway network to provide produce for food processing in works such as Spinks. Factories and warehouses were grouped once again around the transport links on the west side of Melbourne’s commercial area, after the initial limited port facilities offered by the Yarra River at the founding of the City in the 1830s...

Why is it Significant

...Historically, as an early and relatively well-preserved industrial building in the Melbourne Central Activities District, linked with jam making, fruit preserving and the Spink brothers; also a reflection, by its location, of the access to the growing transport networks in this part of the City linking manufacturers to markets and suppliers; and

Aesthetically, as a custom workshop design by renowned architect, Thomas Watts in the prevailing commercial style and inclusion of valuable early shopfront joinery...”

Please refer to Attachment 4 for the tracked changes version of the Amendment C258 Incorporated Document West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016, showing these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter	20. William Bartley RK Lawyers on behalf of Miami Hotel
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	West Melbourne Heritage Review Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that very little of the subject property is intact and that the building doesn’t fit with the contributory definition. • The submitter notes that the site is currently ungraded, but is proposed as contributory. • Notes that it is occupied by single storey commercial buildings of modest scale which front King Street; a steel fence and post WW2 brick façade conceals much of the site. Although originally constructed in the late 19th century, the buildings on the site have been extensively altered from their original form and the level of integrity and intactness on the site varies due to additions and damage. Portions of the brick walls situated on the rear boundary and on the south-east side boundary of the site are in fair condition with a moderate level of integrity. However, portions of brick walls situated on the rear boundary and on the south-east side boundary of the

site are in fair condition with a moderate level of integrity. Yet, this part is concealed from King Street, one of the elevations has been altered via addition of a roller door and the roof is not original.

- Although the consultant's citation is noted, it is submitted that there is no rationale, assessment or justification provided as part of the amendment to justify the contributory grading.
- Considers that the site doesn't meet the definition as it doesn't contribute to the precinct, the historic use is not evident when viewed from the public realm and the site is largely altered. It also doesn't contribute to the streetscape. The submitter notes that restoration is unlikely as the alterations are irreversible.
- Considers that some of the objectives and performance standards of proposed clause 22.05 are unreasonably conservative and unnecessarily restrictive:
 - the third bullet point to clause 22.05-2 limits circumstances in which further information, beyond the information adopted by Council, may be considered as a basis for consideration of development and works. This is at odds with the proposed permit requirements which require, for all applications involving significant or contributory heritage places, the submission of further information such as heritage impact statements, sight lines and arboricultural reports. This point should be changed to enable consideration of further information as a basis for consideration of development and works, as appropriate.
 - It may be appropriate for demolition of part of a significant building or the front part of a contributory building to be allowed, if it can be demonstrated that the demolition of that part of the building would not negatively impact upon the significance of the heritage place. This paragraph should be amended.
 - The poor condition of a building is a relevant consideration when assessing whether demolition of that building should be permitted – this should be reflected in the second paragraph of Clause 22.05-5.
 - Many performance standards and definitions will mean that new buildings and additions are to be entirely concealed. Full concealment is unreasonable – partial concealment is more appropriate and should be allowed for contributory and significant buildings.
 - Application of 22.05-9 is uncertain- seeks to apply to renovation, but renovation is not defined in ordinary meaning and may overlap with other performance standards.

Management Response

A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Many of the issues raised in this submission about the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to

main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.

West Melbourne Heritage Review response

This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being D graded (under the current grading system) and contributory to the HO3 precinct (under the proposed grading system). The ‘WMHR Consultant’ has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission and it is recommended that there is no change to the Statement of Significance for this property.

It is also considered that the issues surrounding the development of the site or parts of the site can be dealt with in a planning application.

Recommendation	<p><u>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</u></p> <p>Some changes to the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) are recommended in response to this submission in particular the word ‘renovation’ has been deleted from the policy. For details, see Attachment 4 - Amendment documents marked up with recommended changes in response to submissions.</p> <p><u>West Melbourne Heritage Review</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
-----------------------	---

Submitter	<p>21. Darren S. Goldsmith</p> <p>Goldsmith Lawyers</p>
------------------	---

Subject Land	<p>West Melbourne</p>
---------------------	-----------------------

Key Issues	<p>West Melbourne Heritage Review</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
-------------------	--

Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter believes that that subject site should not be ‘contributory’ due to alterations to the building from its original appearance. The submission lists changes including to the parapet, entrance, ground floor windows, all window styles, chimneys removed, building material (rendered), flagpoles removed and added etc.
----------------	--

Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 to be D graded (under the current grading system) and contributory to the HO3 precinct (under the proposed grading system). The WMHR Consultant has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission and has concluded that</p>
----------------------------	--

there should be no change to the West Melbourne Heritage Review assessment of this place as contributory to the North and West Melbourne Precinct Heritage Overlay (HO3).

It is also considered that any proposed development options can be dealt with at the planning application stage where heritage issues can also be taken into account.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **22. Marc Flipo**
Melbourne Business School, Carlton

Subject Land Carlton

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
General Submission
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Submits that the combined area of the Melbourne Business School site represents large redevelopment opportunity in a designated urban renewal area.
- Submits that there were sensible and logical policy qualifications introduced to Clause 22.05 which deemed certain aspects inapplicable to the City North Precinct but that these provisions have not been translated to the exhibited draft Clause 22.05 under C258.
- Considers that these omissions and other elements including 'demolition' policy are prejudicial to the orderly planning of the area and the achievement of the objectives of DDO61.

Management Response **Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response**

Many of the issues raised in this submission about the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.

Site Specific response

The Melbourne Business School at 183-195 Bouverie Street already has heritage protection under HO1121 which was introduced as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review with the current grading listed as C and D.

The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the City North Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant and a D grading was converted to contributory.

Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, 183-189 Bouverie Street is contributory and the 193-195 Bouverie Street is significant,

Recommendation

Site Specific

In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.

Heritage Policies

In response to this submission, some changes have been recommended to the heritage policies. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter

23. Department of Health and Human Services

Subject Land

Kensington, Carlton and North Melbourne

Key Issues

Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion

Summary

- Submits that the brown brick 1970s flat building at 19 Barnett Street, Kensington should not be graded, and is likely an anomaly due to the adjoining dwellings at 17 and 21 Barnett Street being listed.
- Submits that the 'significant' gradings of 91 Barnett Street and 45 Pitt Street are inappropriate and both should be 'contributory'
- Submits that the Uniting Church, currently C graded, at 9-17 Brougham Street is proposed to be non-contributory and should be 'significant'

Management Response

Under the current grading system the property at 19 Barnett Street, Kensington has a C grading. C graded properties in Kensington required review. Some of these properties warranted a significant grading although the great majority remained contributory. Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the consultant's conversion methodology, 19 Barnett Street is contributory.

Under the current grading system the property at 91 Barnett Street, Kensington has a D grading, however this property is in a Heritage Overlay that is outside of a large precinct. In line with the consultants methodology these places were converted to significant.

Under the current grading system the property at 45 Pitt Street, Carlton has a C grading. C graded properties in Carlton required review. Some of these properties warranted a significant grading although the great majority remained contributory. Under the proposed grading system this property is significant.

	The significant grading is consistent with the consultant's conversion methodology.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel
Submitter	24. Graham Shepherd East Melbourne Historical Society
Subject Land	East Melbourne
Key Issues	General Submission Gradings Conversion Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that this submission is generally supportive of Amendment C258. • Submits that precedent should not be considered in heritage decision making. Suggests that a balance sheet / record should be used to account for progress in enhancing heritage values of the city. Breaches of heritage values would be 'debits' and positive actions 'credits'. An example of a 'debit' is when something such as a garden is removed. An example of a 'credit' could be removing car spaces or adding parkland. The balance sheet should be public and managed independently. • Provides commentary on how precedents such as 'height' and excessive development get utilised by applicants that result in poor heritage outcomes. • Submits that rules such as the 25% of the land to be permeable have been reduced to 'guidelines' resulting in costly impacts to residents of East Melbourne because of breaches by neighbours of such rules. • Suggests statements for the policy basis / strategic assessment of Clauses 22.04 and 22.05.
Management Response	Some of the issues raised in this submission about the C258 heritage policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05) were also raised by other submitters. For details, see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	25. Graham Shepherd

East Melbourne Historical Society

Subject Land Non-specific

Key Issues General Submission

Summary

- Submits that wind is notable by its absence in the many dimensions of the Amendment and that wind is becoming more and more relevant due to high-rise developments.
- Fluid dynamics is an extremely well understood discipline which as yet has not been applied to housing / architecture.
- Submits in some cases wind could be harnessed for energy in turbines but also equally environmentally valuable to increase setbacks and tree plantings.
- Suggests that the MCG concourse could be converted to open garden of trees.

Management Response

Some other submissions raised concern about the construction of large underground basement areas under heritage sites and the impact this has on the ecology of the area, due to soil groundwater contamination. Impacts on soil groundwater are assessed as part of the building permit process and this is out of scope of the considerations of the heritage overlay and heritage policies and Amendment C258. However, this issue has been noted and management will investigate this further as part of future projects related to sustainability and ecological planning policy.

In relation to wind impacts due to high-rise developments, these are addressed in other policies and parts of the planning scheme related to design and development (particularly in Design and Development Overlays) but are out of scope of this Amendment which focuses on heritage policies.

Recommendation In response to this submissions, no changes are recommended to Amendment C258I

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **26. Graham Shepherd**

East Melbourne Historical Society

Subject Land Non-specific

Key Issues General Submission

Summary

- Submits that the independent authority should assess all aspects of the planning application to ensure that Melbourne's heritage values are enhanced at all stages in line with ISO 9000 to improve process.

- Individual property owners at a financial disadvantage against developers whether it be through limited knowledge or inequity of resources. Uses TP-2010-362/A as example of this.
- Gives examples
 - 'Valetta House' (202-206 Clarendon Street) which is in a state of disrepair.
 - 99 Hotham Street, East Melbourne is example of deep excavation which will threaten foundations and gardens of neighbours. Lack of knowledge within City of Melbourne, the builder, the owner or any consultants about the consequences of such works.
 - 54 Powlett Street, East Melbourne is another example of over-development resulting eroding heritage values of East Melbourne.

Management Response A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes to Amendment C258 are recommended.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **27. Valerie and Catherine Thomas**

Subject Land Non-specific

Key Issues General Submission

Summary

- Submits that the City cannot afford to lose what heritage remains and that heritage buildings should not be demolished.
- Considers that the City must show due diligence when making amendments and that this is paramount to understand and value our history.

Management Response The submission is noted. Please see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by all submissions.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **28.Cheryl and Clive Miller**

Subject Land Non-specific

Key Issues General Submission

Gradings Conversion

- Summary**
- Submits the amendment results in a reduction in protection in particular to ‘contributory’ buildings due to the wording of the policy. This will substantially change built form environment and is inconsistent with heritage.
 - Does not feel qualified to comment on wording of policy, West Melbourne Review or the gradings conversion and therefore defers to Carlton Resident’s Association.
-

Management Response The issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **29. Ewan Ogilvy**
Carlton Residents Association

Subject Land Carlton

Key Issues General Submission
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Inventory
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

- Summary**
- Notes that according to Planning Practice Note 1 there are two thresholds, either local or state significance, to be applied to the assessment of significance, with letter gradings not appropriate. Subsequently, it is assumed that D graded places are of local significance whereas C are considered above this but not necessarily state significant.
 - Notes that the proposed definition of ‘significant’ includes both local and state level significance.
 - Considers that there is no basis for including some C graded heritage places in the proposed ‘significant’ grading.
 - Considers that there is no simple translation rule for C graded heritage places, with only a desk top review and limited field work undertaken. This should be subject to an extensive and detailed peer review prior to any panel hearing.
 - Questions what the status of the places proposed to be contributory if they are no longer considered to be local heritage places ‘in their own right’ and submits they should be listed in a Neighbourhood Character Overlay.
 - Notes that of the 1200 C graded properties in Carlton, only 329 are proposed to be significant. Submits that given the new definition of ‘contributory’ the inescapable conclusion is 100’s of heritage places are
-

	downgraded.
Management Response	<p>Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>The issues raised are the same as those raised other submissions, particularly in Submission #17. Please refer to Attachment 2, response to main issues raised in submissions and also to the Management Response to Submission #17 for details.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2017 (refer Attachment 4).</p> <p>Please refer to Recommendations in Submission #17.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel</p>
Submitter	<p>30. David Vorchheimer</p> <p>HWL Ebsworth Lawyers</p>
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to all properties in individual HO's becoming 'significant' as they will have more stringent and strict policy considerations for any future applications for buildings, works or demolition. • Notes that all properties that are subject to an individual HO, regardless of what they are currently graded, will now be graded 'significant'. This 'one size fits all' approach is considered inappropriate and inconsistent with the principles of proper planning'. • Submits that there is no strategic basis / justification provided for this grading 'uplift' • Considers that the changes will adversely affect the future development of all sites within individual HOs
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for the management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>The subject site already has heritage protection under HO1118, which was introduced as part of Amendment C207 Arden Macaulay Heritage Review, with the current grading listed as C.</p> <p>The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the Arden Macaulay Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant and a D grading was converted to contributory.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the Arden</p>

Macaulay Heritage Review conversion methodology, the subject site is significant,

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **31. David Vorchheimer**
HWL Ebsworth Lawyers

Subject Land Carlton

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Notes that all individual HO's will become 'significant' and therefore have more stringent and strict policy considerations should any future application for buildings, works or demolition be made.
- Notes that all properties that are subject to an individual HO, regardless of what they are currently graded, will now be graded 'significant'. This 'one size fits all' approach is considered inappropriate and inconsistent with the principles of proper planning'.
- Considers that there is no strategic basis / justification provided for this grading 'uplift'
- Submits that the changes will adversely affect the future development of all sites within individual HOs
- Raises a particular concern for their client who elected not to participate in C198 (which resulted in an individual HO for this site) as it was to be given a C grading.
- Concerned about changes to 22.05 that now include City North, in particular in relation to concealment.

Management Response

Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

The subject site already has heritage protection under HO1126 which was introduced as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review with the current grading listed as C.

The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the City North Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant.

Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, the subject site is significant.

Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	32. Anna Greening Smart Planning and Design
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission General Submission Gradings Conversion
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that C258 introduces new requirements and performance standards for the subject site and that the new precinct Statement of Significance affects subject land. Notes that the subject site's D grading to be replaced with 'significant'. • Notes that the current grading of D is the lowest. Subject site is one of 213 buildings within North and Wet Melbourne, which have gradings proposed to change from 'C' to 'D' to 'significant'. • Submits that the site has gone from lowest grading to most stringent grading and therefore much higher protection. • Concerned about the methodology of the conversion and submits there is a lack of justification or information provided to support substantial change in grading. • Submits that due to lack of supporting information the re-grading is not justified with no known explanation available. • Considers that C258 is flawed and should not be approved in current format.
Management Response	<p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>This property already has heritage protection. The grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading. D graded properties in North Melbourne required review. While the majority remained contributory, some of these properties warranted a significant grading.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system this property is significant.</p>
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter	33. Andrew R Neale
Subject Land	Multiple addresses
Key Issues	General Submission Heritage Inventory
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that the inventory is incomplete. • Lists streets that are not in the proposed inventory including Cobden Street, O'Connell Street, Princess Street all in North Melbourne and Barry Street, Carlton (numbers 56-58, 147, 149, 151) • Lists numerous properties querying why they do not appear in proposed inventory including 56-58, 60-62 and 64 Courtney Street, North Melbourne, 37 Flemington Road, North Melbourne (Exchange Hotel), 22-24 Palmerston Street, Carlton (Sir John Hotel), 16 University Street, Carlton, 120, 122, 124 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne, 15 Bendigo Street, North Melbourne, 44 and 48-50 Villiers Street, North Melbourne, 66 and 68 Harcourt Street, North Melbourne. • Queries the high gradings of 24-26 Bendigo Street, North Melbourne, 24 Villiers Street, North Melbourne, 38 Villiers Street, North Melbourne, 42 Villiers Street, North Melbourne. • Queries whether the Corkman should or should not be graded given its removal.
Management Response	The omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory was also raised by other submitters. See Attachment 2 for management's detailed response to this issue.
Recommendation	In response to this and other submissions which raised omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory, a corrected inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 until 29 January 2018. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	34. Marlise Brenner
Subject Land	Non-specific
Key Issues	General Submission Gradings Conversion Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance West Melbourne Heritage Review
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports simplifying the gradings and application of controls. • Raises concerns around only valuing street frontage and not appreciating or

	<p>considering laneways. Similarly a non-contributory building may have a significant laneway vista.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests a specific category for acknowledging laneways. • Encourages the policy direction on fences and gates but is concerned around potential contradiction regarding replacement and demolition of fences. • Notes that minor works are not defined in the policy and this would be helpful. • Notes that there is no acknowledgment of residents valuing diversity of cultures and ethnicity in the Statements of Significance. • Considers that the gradings are generally positive but the definitions are too vague. Questions how the terms are tested and the extent of further consultation with the community. • Considers that the liberal use of the term significance may cause confusion. • Supportive of updating the inventory and the additional HOs in West Melbourne.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Notes that the submission is supportive of the West Melbourne Heritage Review.</p> <p>The precinct Statement of Significance focuses on what is significant about the precinct. The statement identifies that residents in the precinct were historically politically active, forming associations, and similar information; but the current views of the residents, on contemporary social matters, are not normally canvassed in a statement such as this. The statement is also about the precinct as a place, how it evolved and what is physically important. It is not a social history of the precinct, which is a different exercise.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Relating to the precinct Statements of significance, in response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>

<p>Submitter</p>	<p>35. Mary Bruckard</p>
<p>Subject Land</p>	<p>North Melbourne</p>
<p>Key Issues</p>	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that little guidance is provided in regard to non-contributory gradings. • Notes that the proposed inventory does not list non-contributory buildings. • Building is currently D3 and proposed to be 'contributory'. It is submitted that status of the building should reflect the VCAT decision and therefore be

	non-contributory.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>This property already has heritage protection. The converted grading was determined in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading. D graded properties in North Melbourne required review. While the majority remained contributory, some of these properties warranted a significant grading.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system this property is contributory.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	36.Chris Meidanas
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that little guidance is provided in regard to non-contributory gradings. • Notes that the proposed inventory does not list non-contributory buildings. • Building is currently D3 and proposed to be 'contributory'. It is submitted that status of the building should reflect the VCAT decision and therefore be non-contributory.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>This property already has heritage protection. The grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading. D graded properties in North Melbourne required review. While the majority remained contributory, some of these properties warranted a significant grading.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system this property is contributory.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>

Submitter	37. Warren Green
Subject Land	Carlton
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the local policy does not identify separate sources. • Notes that the inventory contains omissions, errors and inconsistencies. • Submits the amendment represents a down grading of Carlton's heritage assets. • Seeks a more prescriptive approach to address the respectful and interpretive design outcomes sought and the issues relating to concealment of higher rear parts of new works. • Considers policy does not address the appropriateness of development adjacent to but not within a heritage precinct or overall. • Notes that the application of the precinct HOs, over such a large area, is generic without recognising smaller scale differences. Submits that South east Carlton, an area long recognised for its high value heritage and known historically as one of Melbourne's earliest 'conservation zones', should be a separate precinct with its own Statement of Significance. Similarly, University Square and Princes Park are other precincts which are worthy of individual Statements of Significance and the additional protection they could provide. • Notes that where properties have individual HOs they should always have Statements of Significance. The old Children's Hospital did not have an individual Statement of Significance making it more vulnerable (refer to VCAT hearing P1375/2014). • Carlton's existing C and D assets are presently viewed as locally significant but in the new system 'contributory' buildings will not be. The State Government Practice Note offers a more appropriate assessment tool.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>There may be justification for sub-precincts, or new discrete precincts within the larger HO1, with separate Statements of Significance. However, identifying where this might occur was outside the scope of the current project, but Council may consider a review of this type in the future. Further reference has been made in the statement to the small squares, including University Square.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4).</p> <p>In response to this and other submissions which raised omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory, a corrected inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 until 29 January 2018.</p>

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **38. Vinka Nassis**
Oliver Hume Property Funds

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Queries why Amendment C258 divides the properties into three separate addresses.
- Notes that the site is in a precinct of relatively low heritage significance.
- Notes that the Roden Street and Hawke Street elevations were built in 1925, well after the original 1889 construction and accordingly these gradings are not justified.
- Submits that the West Melbourne Structure Plan recognises it as a 'strategic site', so the proposal to upgrade heritage protection creates 'planning tension' inconsistent with this.
- Notes that Council has supported TP-2016-501 which decreases the site's heritage value.

Management Response Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Please note that Council issued a refusal of Planning Permit Application TP-2016-501 on 28 August 2017.

West Melbourne Heritage Review response

This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being C graded (under the current grading system) and individually significant and contributory to the HO3 precinct (under the proposed grading system).

The West Melbourne Heritage Review Consultant has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission as follows:

The property is divided into three separate addresses in the C258 Heritage Places Inventory 2017 and in the WMHR2016 two components were assessed as contributing to a newly identified heritage precinct – the Briscoe and Co ironmongers Warehouse Complex. The two parts that make up this precinct are:

- 164-170 Roden Street (Roden Street Wing), which was assessed to be contributory to the Briscoe precinct and also to the North and West Melbourne Heritage Overlay precinct HO3; and
- 172-170 Roden Street part (Hawke Street Wing) assessed to be individually significant, contributory to the Briscoe precinct and also contributory to the North and West Melbourne Heritage Overlay precinct

HO3.

Together these two parts they make up the significant Briscoe complex, listed as 164-184 Roden Street in the C258 Heritage Inventory. However, each part has assessed to have differing cultural heritage values; therefore there are two Statements of Significance, one for the overall significant Briscoe precinct and one for the significant, Hawke Street Wing component. In the C258 Heritage Inventory, the two components and also the whole precinct are listed.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **39. Rohan Nayer**
PDG Corporation

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Notes that there is no reference or assessment against Practice Note 01 which guides when heritage overlays should be applied to sites.
- Submits that the criterion under the Practice Note for architectural and for historical significance has not been met and the building does not meet the benchmark in terms of importance or aesthetic quality and architectural style for instance. Therefore it is submitted that Practice Note 01 has not been met and the HO should not apply.
- Considers that the Statement of Significance is brief and includes no compelling reason/s why the site is worthy of heritage protection.
- Notes that the Statement of Significance / survey notes relate to the Gadsden companies activities away from this site and other tenuous links to the company, which inadvertently demonstrates that this site is of no historical or aesthetic importance.

Management Response This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being C graded (under the current grading system) and significant (under the proposed grading system) with a new Heritage Overlay control. The WMHR Consultant has considered the information provided in this submission and has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission and recommends that there is no change to the West Melbourne Heritage Review of this place.

In relation to the application of Practice Note 01 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (Revised September 2012), no evidence has been presented to suggest that the provisions have not been met. The West Melbourne Heritage Review methodology has been outlined on pages 4-6 of the review preamble

Methodology for each place assessment and Criteria and thresholds, and in Appendix 6: Assessment criteria used in this report. Similarly the criteria outlined in the Practice Note have been applied under the associated cultural values of historic, aesthetic, technical and social as stated in 'Why is it significant?'

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **40. David Passarella of Mills Oakley**
On behalf of Allied Pinnacle (formerly Allied Mills)

Subject Land Kensington

Key Issues Site Specific Submission

Summary

- Notes that the 2017 inventory includes the Allied Pinnacle site both as significant in building grading and significant streetscape. However, it is noted that this site is not covered by a Heritage Overlay and therefore should not be included in the proposed inventory.
- Submits that the Allied Pinnacle site be removed from the 2017 Inventory.

Management Response The property is not included in a Heritage Overlay. It is considered that because only properties in a Heritage Overlay are to be, listed in the Heritage Inventory, Management agrees with the submitter that the property should be removed from the inventory.

Recommendation Remove the subject site from the proposed Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **41. Glenn Sedgwick**

Subject Land Parkville

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
General Submission
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Notes that on the subject land, the house occupies one address, while another address is effectively the "backyard" and currently has a fence which is substantially higher than what the proposed policy requires.
- Considers that Clause 22.05-13 Fences and Gates is problematic in that by

	<p>requiring fences be no more than a maximum height of 1.2m if solid and 1.5m if more than 50% transparent, prevents any new or repaired fence from being solid and high enough to render the property secure and private.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that the policy should ask that any replacement fence be sympathetic to its surroundings and the policy should be amended to allow for a solid high (say 2m) fence
Management Response	<p>Safety and security are not directly relevant to heritage controls, however in cases where there are a lot of high fences perceptions of safety are decreased.</p> <p>The fence requirements proposed in Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 allow for discretion.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>42. Lucas Paterno</p> <p>Urban Planning Office Pty Ltd</p>
Subject Land	<p>General, City North area</p>
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that Princess Street North Melbourne has been omitted from the proposed Heritage Inventory and that the extent of properties omitted generally is unknown. Given the magnitude of this error, it is questioned whether there is sufficient information available in the Amendment documentation on exhibition. • In relation to HO3, DDO61 and CCZ5 (where DDO61 and CCZ5 encourage increased density and higher built forms), it is submitted that the proposed Clause 22.05 is contradictory to Clause 10 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme, which discusses balancing conflicts in favour of net community benefit. • Notes that the amendment does not seek to achieve the planning outcomes at Section 4 of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Management agrees with the submitter that properties 4-6 and 1-11 Princess Street, North Melbourne have been omitted from the inventory in error..</p>

Recommendation The omission of these properties from the Inventory has been corrected and these properties are now listed as significant and contributory in the Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **43. Shaun Driscoll & Margaret Bradshaw**

Heritage advice from GJM Heritage

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission

West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Submits that prior to purchasing the property in 2015, Council's Development Planning Department, in consultation with the heritage adviser, agreed that subject to normal planning and building requirements, there should be no impediment from a heritage perspective to seeking a full demolition of the existing building.
- Submits that the prior written advice by MCC stands and they would not have purchased the property if they had been advised at the time that there was going to be an adverse change to the existing heritage classifications.
- Notes that GJM Heritage have assessed the place and concluded that, "The existing 'D' grading is appropriate. The building does not meet the local heritage threshold set out in Planning Practice Note 1 to be classified as an individually significant building"
- It is submitted that the place should be classified as 'non-contributory', removed from HO843 and the citation varied to reflect the 'non-contributory' classification.

Management Response Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

It is noted that a demolition application (29A-2016-88) under the Building Act 1993 to demolish the subject building was lodged with Council in June 2016 and was refused on the grounds that no planning permit existed.

It is also noted that, following a pre-application meeting in October 2016 (PA-2016-369), the City of Melbourne's advice was that, while full demolition was not preferred, it could potentially be considered but would be reliant on a sympathetic and appropriate replacement building.

It is noted that no planning permit application has since been lodged.

West Melbourne Heritage Review response

The two properties, currently in HO843, have both been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being D graded (under the current grading system) and

significant (under the proposed grading system). The WMHR Consultant has reviewed the assessment of these properties in light of this submission and recommends minor changes to the Statement of Significance (detailed below in the 'Recommended Changes' section). The WMHR Consultant's additional review is as follows:

Of the 194 Victorian-era house rows in West Melbourne only 18 predate this row. It is among the oldest 10% of surviving house rows in West Melbourne.

The row of two houses is significant but the components are contributory to this significance. Therefore, these buildings are not each individually significant but part of a small, significant row house heritage precinct.

This place was already in Heritage Overlay HO843 when the review was undertaken and as such had already been through a public evaluation process that had determined it to be part of a place of local significance within the Melbourne Planning Scheme. Although altered, the two houses in the Heritage Overlay have not changed materially since this occurred. The West Melbourne review provides the place with a Statement of Significance, revealing for the first time its historical associations.

The WMHR consultant agrees that the houses do not appear significant individually but as a small house row precinct, they are significant to the City of Melbourne.

The proposed grading of each reflects the contributory role each has to the locally significant small house row precinct which is the Heritage Overlay HO843 that the two houses are currently in. These two houses are associated with some key figures in the history of West Melbourne (engine driver Hulse, and engineer and miner Robert Haddon) and represents the major employer in the area, the Victorian Railways.

Given that Hulse had these two houses built, and resided in one and no other West Melbourne house can be associated with him - as a figure well known in the area, the association is strong enough and warrants local historical significance.

Any proposed development options can be dealt with at the planning application stage where heritage issues can also be taken into account.

Recommendation West Melbourne Heritage Review

Expand the Statement of Significance, correcting a typographic error and clarifying the role of the two houses in the row, in determining the significance of the overall precinct.

"How is it significant?"

Thomas Hulse's house, at 159 Roden Street, is of contributory significance to the row 159-163 Roden St which is significant historically to West Melbourne."

Heritage Inventory

Accordingly, it is recommended that the C258 Heritage Inventory is be updated to show that 159 Roden Street is contributory, 163 Roden Street is also contributory but that 159-163 Roden Street is a significant house row precinct.

In response to this submission, two C258 Incorporated Documents have been updated: the West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016,

and the Heritage Places Inventory 2017. Please refer to Attachment 4 for the details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter	44. Malcolm Foo
Subject Land	Carlton
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission General Submission Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Amendment C258 and notes that the Council has considered previous input to the Heritage Policies Review comprehensively. • Commends the Council for clearly defining the terms, “Respectful and Interpretive” and the re-include the term “size”. • Notes Council’s view on allowing some discretion in the policies, however believes that other methods are needed to support those parts of the larger precincts which have more heritage sensitivity. This could be achieved by prescribing greater weight to the HO wherever there is conflict or ambiguity, in relation to another planning overlay. • Considers that smaller HOs that have buildings classed as significant should have separate statements of significance, as these might not be sufficiently protected by the generic precinct statements and ambiguities caused by nearby DDOs. • Notes that they have previously supported Council in defending a VCAT application within HO81 and believes that having as much heritage protection as possible, i.e. individual statements of significance, would be beneficial in avoiding long and expensive VCAT hearings.
Management Response	<p>Noted that the submitter is generally supportive of Amendment C258.</p> <p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>

Submitter

45. Phil Gleeson of Urbis

On behalf of Maria George Building Pty Ltd

Heritage advice from Bryce Raworth

Subject Land 181 Flinders Lane, Melbourne (HO506)

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Submits that they are in the final stages of a design process for the subject land and has had meetings with City of Melbourne planning officers and heritage consultant, with the intention to lodge a Planning Permit Application. The application is for a 10 storey addition above the existing building
- Concerned that the policy changes could unreasonably limit the proposed planning application from being considered on its merits.
- Specifically notes that in Clause 22.04-8, “additions should not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building”. Submits that this fails to consider individual sites and their context and is not considered necessary or appropriate.

Management Response Issues surrounding the development of the site or parts of the site can be dealt with in a planning application.
The requirement at Clause 22.04-7 “additions should not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building” allows for discretion and it is, important that there is clear guidance around what kinds of additions are appropriate in a heritage place.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **46. Dom Patti**

Subject Land South Yarra

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion

Summary

- Notes that their property is currently graded D within an individual Heritage Overlay and understands that all individual HO properties have been graded ‘significant’ regardless of the current grading.
- Submits that this is unfair and misrepresentative of the property.
- Notes that Bryce Raworth has been engaged to assess the property and believes the property has no individual heritage value and does not contribute to a heritage precinct.
- Submits that the property should be graded as ‘non-contributory’ and notes that a ‘significant’ grading will cause the following disadvantages to the property owner: devaluation in property values; financial disadvantages and

	burden; more cumbersome permit processes; development restrictions
Management Response	<p>It is considered that Amendment C258 will have no impact on property values as no properties are being removed from the heritage overlay and the gradings of properties are not being reassessed but rather converted from the old system to the new system.</p> <p>As stated in the submission, the subject property already has heritage protection under the heritage overlay. The grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading in an individual Heritage Overlay. Places with individual Heritage Overlay controls were not proposed for review, but were transferred to the significant grading. Under the proposed grading system this property is significant</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>47. Lee Thomas</p> <p>Lort Smith Animal Hospital</p>
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the changes to the grading system and the ‘significant’ classification for the subject land which is currently C graded. • Considers that this classification has been principally imposed based on a desktop analysis and is surprised given the buildings on site have been altered over time, and is seeking clarification from Council. • Seeks to work with Council to ensure any proposed change does not restrict the ongoing capabilities of the site. • Notes there are other means by which to recognise the heritage importance of a site beyond that of simply retaining a building and surely being able to sustain this unique veterinary hospital for the community is of greater value than the building itself. • Notes that given an increasing demand for their services, it is imperative to preserve future development options for the site rather than reduce the capacity and capabilities of future operations • Considers that a more appropriate classification would be a ‘contributory’ grading.
Management Response	<p>The properties are currently protected by the Heritage Overlay, HO1123 – Villiers Street Precinct, which was introduced as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review. Both properties are currently listed in the Heritage</p>

Inventory 2016 as Building Grading – C and Streetscape Grading - 2.

The proposed grading under C258 was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the City North Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant.

Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, the properties are proposed to be converted to significant under Amendment C258.

Please note that 24-28 Villiers Street is known as '24 Villiers Street' and 36-38 Villiers Street is known as '38 Villiers Street' on Councils GIS system, so this is how the properties are listed in the C258 Heritage Places Inventory 2017.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes to Amendment C258 are recommended.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **48. Jan Armstrong-Conn**

Subject Land South Yarra

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion

Summary

- Supports the Melbourne South Yarra Residents Group submission that Pasley Street is listed as a sub-precinct of South Yarra.
- Believes the Pasley Street Precinct is often neglected, notes that when the City of Melbourne applied the General residential Zone to the area, rather than the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, thus providing less protection.
- States that a major concern is the deletion of streetscape gradings.
- Considers that the streetscape of Park Place and Pasley Street are exceptional and act as a background of Victorian terrace houses from Fawkner Park and that these streets are both largely intact and restored and demonstrate LaTrobe's intent for a city surrounded by parks.
- Notes that, similarly, much of the stretch of Punt Road requires protection as it will increasingly come under pressure for development.
- Submits that the streetscape gradings should remain in place until reviewed comprehensively and that Pasley Street and Park Place be deemed significant Streetscapes. Notes that it is understood that this is happening in the future, but raises concerns over how long this may take to happen.
- Notes that there is no discussion of the complexity between HO6 and the DDO9.
- States that the heritage status of properties that were not built in the 19th Century have no status in the review and raises the issue that these places will become of greater interest for inappropriate redevelopment, particularly with the removal of Streetscape Gradings.
- Considers that additional properties in Pasley Street and Park Place should be given heritage protection (places individually listed in submission).

- Submits that 40-50 Pasley Street, which is C graded, should have been given the significant grading, rather than contributory. Built in 1882 and recently faithfully restored, it is one of the original houses in the street.
- Queries the address for 1 Pasley Street North and believes it should be given a significant classification, noting it was previously listed as 579 Punt Road and C graded.

Management Response

Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions).

Adding places to the Heritage Overlay or regrading places is out of scope of this project.

The properties at 40-50 Pasley Street, South Yarra have heritage protection under HO6. The proposed grading's were determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.

Under the current grading system the property at 40-42 Pasley Street is not graded, so this property is correctly translated to a non-contributory grading under the proposed grading system.

Under the current grading system 44-50 Pasley Street has a C grading. C graded properties in South Yarra required review. Some of these properties warranted a significant grading although the great majority remained contributory. Under the proposed grading system this property is contributory.

Under the current grading system 1 Pasley Street North has a D grading. D graded properties in South Yarra were translated to contributory which is correctly listed in the proposed inventory.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

49. Farida Fleming

Subject Land

Carlton

Key Issues

Site Specific Submission
General Submission
Gradings Conversion
Large Precincts Statements of Significance

Summary

- Opposes the new heritage gradings which will result in the downgrading of a significant number of properties in Carlton.
- Believes that the set of buildings that are part of the former Children's Hospital, which are all individually significant, should be considered a Precinct Overlay and have a new Statement of Significance developed, as it is stated that these buildings are a unique part of Melbourne's heritage, and

	<p>being considered a precinct would discourage inappropriate development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that they recently went to VCAT, with the support of the City of Melbourne, and successfully opposed an 8 storey building next door. • Proposes that 'contributory' not be used in the new grading system and instead use the State Government's Planning Practice and grading system with categories of State Significance or Local Significance. • The application of the 'contributory' grading has seen the downgrading of 1000 heritage places in Carlton as only 329 of the 1,393 C and D graded buildings in Carlton have achieved the new significant category, leading to a deterioration of heritage values across the whole area. • Seeks Statements of Significance for smaller HO precincts.
Management Response	<p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions).</p> <p>Amendment C258 converts heritage gradings from the old system to the new system and re-assessing heritage places or creating new Heritage Precincts is out of scope for this project,</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	50. Tony and Angelika Dimitriadis
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands that the facade should be protected but objects that Council has gradually increased restrictions and significantly limited what they can do. • Submits that the property should not be upgraded to "significant". • Notes that they agree to keep the front original rooms and leave the pitch roof unchanged, the rear is not original and the submitter believes they should be able to do as they please with it. • Notes they have applied for a permit to build a second floor to the rear of the house.
Management Response	<p>The subject property has heritage protection under the HO which was reviewed as part of Amendment C207 Arden Macaulay Heritage Review with the current grading listed as C.</p> <p>The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the Arden Macaulay Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the Arden</p>

	Macaulay Heritage Review conversion methodology, the subject property is significant.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no changes are recommended. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	51. Sarah Raso of Best Hooper On behalf of Spacious Property Development Group
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission West Melbourne Heritage Review
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that it is proposed that the property at 488-494A La Trobe Street, West Melbourne be subject to an individual Heritage Overlay (HO1190) and nominated as 'significant'. • Submits that the property does not warrant individual heritage protection and should not be included in Amendment C258. • Considers that the HO inflates the heritage significance of the existing building.
Management Response	<p>This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being C graded (under the current grading system) and significant (under the proposed grading system) with a new individual Heritage Overlay proposed – HO (HO1190). No further evidence has been provided by the submitter regarding why the property is not significant.</p> <p>In response to this submission, the WMHR Consultant does not recommend any changes to the grading or Statement of Significance for this property.</p>
Recommendation	In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents. Refer Submission to Panel
Submitter	52. Mark Duckworth
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission General Submission Gradings Conversion

<p>Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that the role of contributory buildings is underestimated. • Notes that in North Melbourne only 5%of buildings are regarded as significant which raises the real prospect of the character of the area undergoing piecemeal development that could destroy the cultural and architectural significance. • Proposes that contributory buildings be revised and upgraded. • Considers that some of Melbourne most important buildings are omitted because of the way the precinct is designed. • Queries why the Meat Market is not included and why 48-50 Villiers Street is omitted.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions).</p> <p>Amendment C258 converts heritage gradings from the old system to the new system and re-assessing heritage places is out of scope for this project,</p> <p>Management agrees with the submitter that the Meat Market at 36-54 Courtney Street and 48-50 Villiers Street, North Melbourne have been omitted from the inventory in error.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>The omissions of the Meat Market at 36-54 Courtney Street and 48-50 Villiers Street in the Inventory have been corrected and these properties are now listed as significant in the Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
<p>Submitter</p>	<p>53. Margaret Jungwirth</p>
<p>Subject Land</p>	<p>Parkville</p>
<p>Key Issues</p>	<p>General Submission</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that Parkville West has some of the oldest homes and that despite zoning for little change, the area has been inundated with development. • Considers that the HO has done nothing to protect the area from development out of keeping with the existing homes which affects the value of the area. • Disappointed with the level of development and noise and disruption. • Considers that Melbourne is far from the heritage place it was and considers it is now a continuous building site.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Amendment C258 is an important step in delivering Council’s Heritage Strategy and will underpin all future heritage amendments in the municipality. It modernises and updates the policies regarding the protection and redevelopment of heritage places across the municipality</p>

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **54. Renato Ravenna**

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Notes their property is in an existing HO with a 'significant' grading.
- Suggests that 456-462 La Trobe Street properties be considered for inclusion in the West Melbourne Heritage Review.
- Notes that the rear of both buildings faces Phoenix Lane and suggests a 'non-contributory' grade could possibly save the streetscape.

Management Response

These previously ungraded places at 8 Phoenix Lane & 456-462 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne have been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being D graded (under the current grading system). These places are not currently subject to a Heritage Overlay, nor is one proposed as part of this amendment.

The WMHR Consultant has reviewed the assessments of these properties in light of this submission and recommends that there is no change to Amendment C258.

The early date of the warehouse or store at 456 La Trobe Street is partly evident by the stone still visible on the refaced elevation to La Trobe Street but is more so from the rear lane. Both elevations have been heavily altered and thus cannot be assessed as significant because the building lacks a true expression of its 1850s.

The factory at 460-462 La Trobe St has been heavily altered at ground level but maintains a fair integrity on the upper level. However the original design was typical only of its era and the place has no known significant historical associations.

Recommendation Given the alterations to both buildings and the existence of other warehouses or stores of higher integrity and greater age in West Melbourne and the Melbourne CBD, the West Melbourne Heritage Review assessment of these places should remain as proposed.

In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter	55. Anita Simon
Subject Land	East Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that Valetta house is a significant heritage building and must be protected and that in comparison to Valetta house, Clarendon House, next door, of similar importance has been appreciated in its care and maintenance. • Notes that historically, Clarendon Street was a prestigious address however many houses have been lost and non-complying alterations have detrimentally affected the streetscape in East Melbourne. • States that the proposed new local heritage policies must be supported by significant penalties, where conservation is neglected. • Notes particular details of the history of Valetta House and why it is significant, and includes photos to demonstrate the good condition of this building until its most recent acquisition after which is deteriorated with windows, doors, mouldings having been damaged or removed, the plaster is cracking and it appears neglected. • Considers that the gradings are much clearer and more logical in the proposed system, however considers this is useless if there are no penalties or serious enforcement against demolition by neglect.
Management Response	<p>Noted that the submitter is supportive of the new grading system.</p> <p>The neglect or deterioration of heritage fabric and buildings is beyond the scope of Amendment C258. The policies and provisions within the planning scheme only apply when there is an application to develop a property in the heritage overlay (see Attachments 2 for a full response to this and other main issues raised in submissions).</p> <p>Valetta House at 202-206 Clarendon Street, East Melbourne has heritage protection under HO132. Under the proposed grading system this property is significant.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	56. Jonathan Allen
	On behalf of eight property owners

Subject Land	East Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission Gradings Conversion
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that the current heritage overlay grading (D grade in a Level 2 Streetscape) should remain and the building be excluded from the proposed changes as they consider that the heritage value of the building is limited to the front façade and is sufficiently protected by the current HO. • Notes that the building has been significantly altered over many decades and no longer represents a good example of the original period, nor has the original fabric been retained. • Notes that the streetscape has properties of similar age that have been built behind and/or over from a distance shorter than these proposed heritage changes, for example the Tribeca Apartments. • Considers that the amendment represents an increased heritage requirement, which could have an economic impact in respect of future site development.
Management Response	<p>It is considered that Amendment C258 will have no impact on property values as no properties are being removed from the heritage overlay and the gradings of properties are not being reassessed but rather converted from the old system to the new system.</p> <p>The property has heritage protection under HO2. The grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading. D graded properties in East Melbourne were translated to the contributory grading. Under the proposed grading system this property is contributory.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	57. Andrew Normand
Subject Land	Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission Gradings Conversion
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that the buildings to which people attach significance to north of Elizabeth Street are those which were constructed during the Haymarket era, which has always been characterised by change, that is its heritage. • Notes that every 50 years or so, the buildings in Elizabeth Street, between Pelham and Queensberry streets have been regenerated. Between 1900

and 1950 almost all of the buildings were demolished except for the Commercial Bank and the Royal Artillery Hotel.

- Notes that the subject property, which was the Manchester Arms Hotel was demolished in 1939 to make way for the Hollyford Hotel which has been altered.
- Considers that the subject property should still tell an historical story, but it does not do so.
- Notes that the Commercial Bank and the Royal Artillery Hotel are the only significant building from that era and the other buildings make not contribution to the precinct.
- Submits that their heritage status and the subject property in particular should not be upgraded from 'C' to 'significant'.

Management Response

The property already has heritage protection under HO1121 which was introduced as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review with the current grading listed as C.

The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the City North Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant.

Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, the subject property is significant.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

58. Hugh Tunnecliff
Department of Justice

Subject Land

West Melbourne

Key Issues

Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review related

Summary

- Notes that Amendment C258 proposes to apply a new Heritage Overlay to the subject site at 317 Spencer Street, West Melbourne (Melbourne Assessment Prison – MAP).
- Opposes the inclusion of the property in a permanent Heritage Overlay.
- Raises concerns relating to the operational impacts from the imposition of the Heritage Overlay, particularly in the case of upgrade works and urgent health, safety and security works that may be required from time to time.
- Notes that there is a need for ongoing flexibility in relation to works at the facility in the context of the Secretary to the Department of Justice and Regulation's responsibilities under the Corrections Act 1986.
- Notes that existing protections for the facility include PUZ3, which

designates the land for Health and Community purposes and DDO33, which actively provides protection for buildings of heritage significance in the precinct (example provided in the submission).

- Notes that Heritage Victoria's 2008 study on post war built heritage between 1945 and 2000 did not identify the facility as being of heritage significance.
- States that while noting architectural elements of the building in the proposed Statement of Significance, the Butler report described the historical theme as 'policing the city' and does not discuss the split between 'policing' and 'corrections' or address the facility as an active prison.
- The proposed statement notes the, 'associated rich history that includes notorious prisoners' which is an ordinary feature of all prison facilities in the State.
- Suggests that a further assessment is necessary, noting the differences in the definition of a 'B' graded building and a 'significant' building and the Statement of Significance to include consideration of the facility as an active prison facility.
- Considers that proposed Clause 22.05 imposes more stringent requirements for permit applications.

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being B graded (under the current grading system) and significant (under the proposed grading system) with a new individual Heritage Overlay. The WMHR Consultant has considered the information provided in this submission and has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this and recommends that there is no change to Amendment C258.

The following additional comments are made:

- No planning permit is required for maintenance that replaces like with like.
- The Public Use Zone, Clause 36.01, does not directly address heritage places.
- Schedule 33 to the Design and Development Overlay does not prevent demolition of the existing building or parts thereof.
- The proposed Heritage Overlay is independent of HO3 North and West Melbourne precinct. Any new works are to relate to the existing building or contributory elements of the place.
- Survey of Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria, prepared for Heritage Victoria in 2008 assessed potential post Second War places that should be considered for the Victorian Heritage Register. This proposed Heritage Overlay is proposed at the local level not the State level.
- The relevant theme for this building is administering justice in association with policing the city.
- In response to the statements that the, "associated rich history that includes notorious prisoners" is an ordinary feature of all prison facilities in the State, this does not alter the fact that this prison has known associations as listed that have gained great public notoriety and cannot be regarded as 'ordinary' prisoners.
- Assessment of the MAP included physical and known historical evidence.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the Statement of Significance for this place.

It is recommended that, 'Administering justice' be added as a relevant historical theme to Appendix 2 of the West Melbourne Heritage Review. This does not affect the Statement of Significance or any other related Amendment C258 documents.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **59. Patricia Ng**

Subject Land North Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion

Summary

- Opposes the proposed rating of the property and concludes the heritage grading should be changed to 'non-contributory'.
- Suggests that C258 is amended to incorporate statements which explicitly spell out how decisions will be made in the face of practical considerations competing regulations and laws and which priorities will be upheld over complying with the heritage overlay requirements.
- In reference to the site, states that alterations to the property over the years have been such that that the heritage value has been diminished and the site no longer exhibits characteristics that reflect the era of the property and contribute to the heritage of North Melbourne.
- Considers that the property may have been mis-graded in the past, and that consequently, the current rating on which the property is based may not have been determined correctly.
- Considers that the property has insignificant heritage value because of its location, streetscape, lack of "cohesion" with other surrounding properties in portraying a historical setting consistent with the original era that the property was built and the development of North Melbourne generally
- Accepts that property has some historical significance but contents that the property has little aesthetic characteristics and representative value based on significant alterations to the property which have not preserved the aesthetic characteristics of the property.
- States that 45 O'Shannassy Street currently is not under any heritage protection and that in many ways 4 Harris Street is very similar to 45 O'Shannassy Street so therefore property should also not be protected.

Management Response It is beyond the scope of Amendment C258 to reassess property gradings as a full heritage assessment is required. Rather, the gradings of properties were converted from the old gradings system to the new system.

The subject property has heritage protection under the heritage overlay. The proposed grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.

Under the current grading system the property has a D grading. D graded

properties in North Melbourne required review. Some of these properties warranted a significant grading although the great majority remained contributory. Under the proposed grading system this property is contributory.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **60. Rohan Storey**
Melbourne Heritage Action Group

Subject Land All of municipality.

Key Issues General Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Supports the preparation of revised heritage policies, especially for the CBD, as it is considered that where the current policies are vague, they have led to very poor outcomes. Clear guidelines regarding the extent of demolition are particularly supported.
- Considers that there are many flaws, and that the guidelines are not specific enough given the well-known issues that arise with the types of development and alterations to heritage buildings now occurring in the CBD and indeed across the municipality.
- Submits that there should be a clear guideline that facadism is not acceptable. Suggests that the guidelines in 22.04 and 22.05 that read ‘the degree to which it contributes to the perception of the three dimensional depth and form of the building’ should be modified to clearly state that the building, as a building, should be retained, instead of just some external facades retaining a three dimensional appearance (for instance the exterior plus perhaps a reconstructed roof).
- Strongly supports policy that states that full demolition would not normally be permitted for significant or contributory places, and that even partial demolition for significant places would not normally be permitted, noting that this is a departure from current practice, even by Heritage Victoria, and recommends that this provision remain, but be further expanded, noting that the definition of ‘front or principle part’ applying to industrial and commercial buildings is neither sufficient, nor applicable to corner buildings.
- Notes that the guidelines are entirely about buildings, with no policy for bluestone kerbs and gutters or laneways, or trees or gardens. States that there are also no policies for ‘lanescapes’, street furniture, objects, public art, or interiors; while none are yet formally listed by the City of Melbourne, they

will or should be in the near future.

- Suggests that there should be a clearer distinction between policies for precincts and those for individual buildings.
- Notes that there is confusion between places with individual overlays within precincts and places which will be graded 'significant' which exists only in the CBD.
- Suggests that Clause 22.04 and 22.05 are so similar that there should simply be one policy.
- Considers that sites next to individual HO places not controlled.
- Submits that various lines and section of the Policy are either too vague or do not fully explain intent (see appendix 1 which is an altered version of Clause 22.04).
- Does not support the Minister's interim protection for all but those where development proposals are active and urges the City of Melbourne to pursue immediate interim protection of a number of threatened sites, particularly 488 La Trobe Street, which may be unnecessarily lost to a proposed apartment tower currently at referral. Considers that the system is failing important buildings if they are proposed for protection but not afforded that protection simply because a development application is underway.

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

West Melbourne Heritage Review Response

In regards to the request to include certain properties (specifically, 488 La Trobe Street) in the interim heritage overlay (Amendment C273), Council did request that the Minister for Planning approve the heritage overlay on an interim basis for 26 sites assessed to be of heritage significance (and not currently in the HO) in the WMHR2016 – this request included 488 La Trobe Street. The Minister did not approve C273 for the following sites which were part of the original request:

- HO1182 Elm ('Ulmus' sp.) street trees x2, near 80, 86 Capel Street, West Melbourne
- HO1184 Elm ('Ulmus' sp.), Hawke and Curzon Street Reserve, 2A Hawke Street, West Melbourne
- HO1185 Elms (x6), street trees, near 81-141 Jeffcott Street, West Melbourne
- HO1186 Elm, Hawke Street and King Street Reserve, near 446 King Street, West Melbourne
- HO1189 Tame and Company factory, 511 King Street, West Melbourne
- HO1190 Edward J. and Samuel Spink workshop, also J. B. Watson's stores, later Molloy and Co, hide and skin merchants, 488-494 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne
- HO1193 Dixon and Co. cordial factory, later Felton Grimwade and Duerdins Pty. Ltd. Chemical laboratory, factory and store complex, 109-133 Rosslyn

Street, West Melbourne

- HO1194 Australian Biscuit Company Ltd. stores, 300 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne
- HO1195 Melbourne Remand Centre, later Assessment Prison, 317 Spencer Street, West Melbourne
- HO1196 Brown's factory, later Preston Motors Pty.Ltd., 445 Spencer Street, West Melbourne
- HO1180 Canary Island pines (x2 'Pinus canariensis'), Howard Street and William Street Reserve

Please note that all of these above sites are proposed to be included in the heritage overlay on a permanent basis under Amendment C258.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Refer to Attachment 2 for the management response to main issues raised by submissions for details of the changes to the policies that are recommended in response to this submission.

It is agreed that the policies are not entirely about buildings and where relevant, the wording has been altered to explicitly describe the heritage places rather than buildings. Street furniture, trees, etc are all included in definition of a heritage place so where there is a provision about a 'heritage place' it applies to all of these elements.

It is agreed that there should be more specific guidance for trees so this has been added.

Recommendation In response to this submission, a number of changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter 61. Bill Cook

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

- Summary**
- Considers that the proposed grading of 'contributory' of the site at 43 Hawke Street should instead be 'significant', particularly given that the three houses on either side, are graded 'significant'. Raises shortcomings with other properties that have been significantly more modified than the site and have less heritage features.
 - Lists other relevant Hawke Street Properties surrounding the site and describes their features:
 - 49 – earlier period, intact and original

-
- 47 – comparable period, façade, parapet, windows and verandahs have lost all Victorian features and fence significantly modified
 - 45 – comparable period, looks original but we believe lace work was replaced in 1980s? Parapet has lost some features
 - 43 – our Property in question, most lacework removed and fence replaced but impressive parapet substantially intact
 - 41 - earlier period, highly modified verandahs and fence
 - 39 – earlier period, original intact but fence replaced
 - 37 – earlier period, intact and original
 - States that their own assessment of the heritage character of 43 Hawke Street is that it retains considerable heritage and architectural merit and adds at least as much as the other houses under consideration, and in some ways, even more, to the character of this “significant” streetscape.
 - Supports the definition of gradings which purport to be influenced by the values of the community –“may be highly valued by the community”. Though notes that they have experienced in past that the role of heritage experts in determining heritage gradings for Council goes unchallenged.
 - Considers that heritage gradings and assessments are not adequately influenced by the community.
 - Does not agree with the assessment of West Melbourne’s heritage both generally and for this property in particular.
 - Considers that the distinction between ‘significant’ and ‘contributory’ is highly subjective, rather than objective.
 - States that there are many anomalies in the gradings and suggests every step needs to be undertaken carefully and judiciously to ensure that the Register is as complete and correct as possible before its final adoption.
 - Concerned that ‘significant streetscapes’ are used sparingly in the register and tend to be employed in parts where regarded as ‘consistent heritage streetscapes’.
 - Concerned that 51-55 Hawke Street has been excluded from the Eastern side of Hawke Street

Management Response

Noted that the submitter is generally supportive of the new grading system. Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters, particularly in relation to the gradings conversion methodology. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions).

This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being D graded (under the current grading system) and contributory to the HO3 precinct (under the proposed grading system).

The WMHR Consultant has considered the information provided in this submission and has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this

submission and recommends that there is no change to the assessment.

The Kipling house at 43 Hawke Street is a Victorian-era two-level row house in a significant row house streetscape. When assessed in 2015, the house had been altered which has reduced its integrity to its construction date and hence the expression of the Victorian-era architecture and history. This in turn meant that it had a lesser heritage value than the houses that are more intact of the same type and era. The definition of a significant place includes, 'is typically externally intact' showing the role of integrity in the assessment.

As a 'contributory' building within the North & West Melbourne Precinct Heritage Overlay the house has been recognised as playing a vital role in the significance of the whole North and West Melbourne area. The streetscape importance level of this part of Hawke Street, assessed on a scale of 1-3, has been recommended for elevation from one of local significance (2) to one of significance to Victoria (1) and as such has provided further recognition to the row and the house. This 'significant streetscape' status has been confirmed in the proposed Heritage Places Inventory 2017.

Expert views such as seen in the West Melbourne Heritage Review are based on objective criteria as listed in the West Melbourne Heritage Review. The methodology has been outlined in pages 4-6 of the review preamble, and in Appendix 6: Assessment criteria used in this report. Similarly the criteria outlined in the Victorian Planning Provision Practice Note 01 have been applied under the associated cultural values of historic, aesthetic, technical and social. The community have been asked to comment on this expert view but this comment should be framed by the same accepted criteria.

However social value is one of the above criteria (G) where demonstrated recognition by the community over time adds to its significance. However social heritage values have not been identified in this house or the row but the historical and aesthetic values have been recognised in the review. Nevertheless there has been no dedicated social value assessment in the area and this might be a potential future project for the City of Melbourne. Such a study would require extensive consultation within the area and was outside of the scope of the West Melbourne heritage review. This was outside the scope of the West Melbourne Heritage Review and Amendment C258, but it may be a future project that Council might wish to consider undertaking.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated C258 Amendment documents.

In response to this and other submissions which raised omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory, a corrected inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 until 29 January 2018.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **62. Charles and Jennifer Shaw**

Subject Land South Yarra

Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the simplified grading system • Opposes the significant grading given to the subject property and suggests a more appropriate grading, in-line with the local South Yarra Community Group’s findings, is contributory or no grading at all. • Notes that based on Statement of Significance criteria for South Yarra, compared to other properties in Marne Street that are graded as significant or contributory, the significance of the properties is diminished by their associated grading with the property • Considers that the grading contradicts the review prepared by the Melbourne South Yarra Residents Group in 2015 that was noted as a reference document to the Melbourne Planning Scheme. • Considers that previous gradings of the property failed to identify the significance of the property when compared to the consideration and detail given to the other graded properties along Marne Street.
Management Response	<p>Noted that the submitter generally supports the new grading system.</p> <p>The subject property has heritage protection under HO6. The proposed grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a B grading. All B graded properties were translated to significant. Under the proposed grading system this property is significant.</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of Amendment C258 to reassess property gradings as a full heritage assessment is required. Rather, the gradings of properties were converted from the old gradings system to the new system based on the methodology developed by Council’s heritage consultants.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>63. John Stone</p> <p>East Melbourne Group – President</p>
Subject Land	<p>East Melbourne</p>
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>

Large Precincts Statements of Significance

Summary

- Submits that all of East Melbourne and Jolimont should be a protected historic precinct with human scale of precinct preserved.
- Considers Indigenous landmarks should be noted in the Statement of Significance for East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct.
- Supports the contemporary gradings system, but considers that streetscape levels also need to be translated into new definitions of heritage significance.
- Suggests there should be better enforcement by Council where development and demolition of heritage properties does not comply with policy.
- Supports the concealment guidelines that currently apply in Level 1 Streetscapes.
- Considers there should be guidance in policy about subterranean excavations.
- Considers that the heritage significance of laneways should be better recognised.
- Concerned that dual occupancy developments are not suited to small heritage lots.
- Supports the new policy guidance for corner sites and infill development. Development applications that do not respect heritage fabric should be refused a permit.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission such as heritage enforcement, subterranean excavations and inclusion of all of East Melbourne and Jolimont within a heritage precinct are not within the scope of Amendment C258.

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Large Precincts Statements of Significance response

The information supplied by submitter #16 – East Melbourne Historical Society was provided to the consultant and changes have been made to the Precinct Statement of significance for East Melbourne and Jolimont as follows. Reference to the Aboriginal history of Yarra Park has been included, and greater emphasis has been given to the Mounted Police Barracks and the early Colonial administration history of the precinct. The earlier brewery has also been referred to.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

The issues raised in this submission about the heritage policies have been raised by other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management's response to main issues raised in submissions.

Recommendation Large Precincts Statements of Significance

In response to this and submission #16, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4).

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

In response to this submission, a number of changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter	64. Lorraine Siska
Subject Land	Whole municipality, West Melbourne focus
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>West Melbourne Heritage Review</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Council’s commitment to the enormous undertaking involved in Amendment C258. • States that words in the policy objectives of Clause 22.05 should be strengthened. In regard to demolition, the words “will not normally” would read stronger as “will not except under exceptional circumstances” or “will rarely...” and “should not” sounds like a little tap on the hand. Why not use “must not” or “will not”. • Considers that the words “significance” and particularly “contributory” need further clarity for comprehension as there are differing connotations placed on these words by different municipal councils, VCAT, developers and barristers. Considers that the ‘contributory’ definition needs stronger attributes. • Supports the revised Statement of Significance for North and West Melbourne and the detail that has been included. • Suggests a heritage review undertaken for North Melbourne as soon as possible as the area is experiencing strong development pressure. • Raises anomalies in the Revised Heritage Inventory 2017 including 187 Stanley Street, West Melbourne which was demolished in early 2015 and 132-134 Roden Street, West Melbourne, where a demolition permit was issued 2015. Suggests that these should not be in inventory. • Attached a letter from the CEO, Mr Rimmer regarding the demolition of 187 Stanley Street, West Melbourne • Also attached a document of alleged anomalies (approx. 45 in total) between the Heritage Inventory 2017 and the West Melbourne Heritage Review.
Management	It is noted that this submission is supportive of many aspects of Amendment

Response	<p>C258.</p> <p>The issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters, particularly in relation to the language used in the C258 heritage policies Clause 22.04 and 22.05. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of the changes recommended.</p> <p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance response</u></p> <p>Supports the Statement of Significance for North and West Melbourne and the detail that has been included.</p> <p><u>West Melbourne Heritage Review response</u></p> <p>The anomalies in the C258 Heritage Inventory have been investigated and addressed (Refer Attachment 2 for a discussion about the Heritage Inventory).</p> <p>Management agrees with the submitter that as 187 Stanley Street, West Melbourne was demolished prior to the WMHR2016 being endorsed and prior to the exhibition of Amendment C258, it should be removed from the inventory and Incorporated Document: West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016.</p> <p>132-134 Roden Street, West Melbourne has not been demolished.</p>
Recommendation	<p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, no change is recommended to Amendment C258.</p> <p><u>West Melbourne Heritage Review</u></p> <p>In response to this and other submissions which raised omissions and anomalies in the exhibited inventory, a corrected inventory was re-exhibited from 7 December 2017 until 29 January 2018.</p> <p>It is recommended that 187 Stanley Street, West Melbourne be removed from the C258 Inventory and Incorporated Document. Please refer to Attachment for to see these recommended changes.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>65. Anthony Corbett, Director Campus Strategy</p> <p>University of Melbourne</p>
Subject Land	<p>University of Melbourne Land</p>
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission – Heritage Inventory</p> <p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion methodology</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p>

Summary

- University of Melbourne is a body politic and corporate pursuant to the provisions of the University of Melbourne Act 2009 (Vic) and owns and occupies numerous graded buildings in Parkville, Carlton and Southbank that are subject to the heritage controls of the Scheme.
- Concerned the heritage review lacks necessary level of rigour and fails to have regard to the special circumstances of The University of Melbourne and that the Amendment, in its current form, will significantly impact the University's ability to continue to provide fit for purpose education research facilities. Notes that the University has ambitions to continue to grow and to accommodate its anticipated growth, as well as to consolidate current operations, the University needs more purpose built, best practice student housing, teaching and research facilities on and proximate to the campus.
- Recognises the need to reform the manner in which heritage places are graded (significant, contributory and non-contributory), though in so far as Amendment applies to University land, submits that it should be reconsidered.
- Questions the adopted approach to convert all places with a site-specific heritage overlay to a 'significant' grading regardless of the A, B, C or D grading currently attributed to that place. Submits that this approach is overly simplistic and does not apply the degree of sophistication and rigour appropriate for such a significant change to the way applications to develop heritage places are considered pursuant to the amended local policies.
- Suggests a more appropriate course would first be to undertake a review of individual buildings affected by site-specific heritage overlays associated with C or D graded places – noting the majority of heritage graded buildings at the Parkville campus are subject to site-specific heritage overlays and it is submitted that many of these places could be included in non-contiguous groups under one (or more) heritage overlay (s) – ie the precinct approach set out in Planning Practice Note 1. – submits that under this model the C and D graded buildings could be translated to 'contributory' gradings which more suitable for the University. Submits that applying this approach would not preclude each building having a Statement of Significance, however it would enable there to be a 'like-for-like' translation of heritage gradings from the old to the new system.
- Submits that the existing provision in Clause 22.05 'Whether the demolition or removal is justified for the development of land or the alteration of, or addition to, a building' should not be removed from the policy as it is a particularly important policy in the context of the University's growth aspirations.
- Notes that at least 21 University buildings that are identified to be translated from C or D gradings to 'significant' – under current grading system there is an appropriately broad discretion available to assess whether buildings can be partially or fully demolished – if these buildings are upgraded to 'significant' and the policy is changes as drafted, the ability of the decision maker to exercise that discretion will be much more constrained, even where redevelopment is warranted – places an unreasonable impediment on the

planned and future development program of the University.

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Gradings Conversion methodology response

Some of these issues raised in this submission about the gradings conversion methodology have been raised in other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for a discussion of these issues.

The contributory category is part of the contemporary gradings system that The City of Melbourne is required to convert to. Places that are graded contributory have heritage significance that contributes to a heritage precinct and this consistently how contributory places are described across Victoria. These heritage precincts can be locally significant, or significant to the state of Victoria. Part of the gradings conversion methodology was for places in an individual heritage overlay to be converted directly to significant.

In regards to the suggestion that the gradings conversion needs to be more rigorous and that a more appropriate course would first be to undertake a review of individual buildings affected by site-specific heritage overlays associated with C or D graded places, this is what occurs as part of a full heritage assessment. Apart from in West Melbourne, Amendment C258 did not include such a full heritage assessment of the heritage significance of properties – rather, the old gradings of properties were converted to the contemporary gradings system in accordance with the gradings conversion methodology.

The heritage consultants who were engaged to conduct the gradings conversion carefully developed a thorough, sound methodology for the gradings conversion. The methodology involved background research, desktop reviews, field and sampling work to determine the most sound method of converting the gradings of all the properties in a heritage overlay in the City of Melbourne, across to the contemporary gradings system. For details of this methodology, please see the 'Methodology Report, City of Melbourne Gradings Review' which is available online - Attachment 3 of the report to the Future Melbourne Committee of 5 July 2016.

It is priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program.

Heritage Inventory response

The anomalies raised in this submission have been investigated and have been corrected. The corrections are shown in the corrected Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from December 2017 to 29 January 2018.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Some of the issues and suggestions about the policies raised in this submission were raised in other submissions and are discussed in Attachment 2 – Response to main issues raised in submissions.

Recommendation **Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)**

In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 heritage policies Clause 22.04 and 22.05 (refer Attachment 4).

Heritage Inventory

In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Heritage Places Inventory 2017 (refer Attachment 4).

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **66. Bonnie Guo**
Contour Town Planners

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Submits that irrespective of whether the site at 102 Jeffcott Street, West Melbourne is currently ‘ungraded’ or ‘D’ graded, the proposed elevation of the heritage grading for the building at the subject site to a ‘contributory’ grading, is not justified or supported.
- Notes that the preliminary work associated with the West Melbourne Structure Plan, identified the subject site as a ‘strategic site’ within a ‘growth opportunity area’ – an identification which clearly contemplates redevelopment, whereby the proposal to elevate the applicable heritage grading for the subject site will create planning tension.
- Notes that planning Permit No. 2012/000444 has been issued for this site and is still ‘active’ – this permit allows alteration of the built form presentation and ultimately the heritage value of buildings onsite.

Management Response

A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

The subject property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being D graded (under the current grading system) and contributory to the HO771 precinct (under the proposed grading system).

The WMHR Consultant has considered the information provided in this submission and has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission and recommends that there is no change to the assessment.

No evidence has been provided to contradict the West Melbourne Heritage Review assessment. The assessment is justified and supported by the Statement of Significance of the proposed group, the proposed Sands and McDougall precinct.

As this place is already subject to a heritage overlay, the planning application process would have already considered the relevant heritage issues as part of the approved permit. Amendment C258 will not impact on the ability of this permit to be acted on.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **67. Kaye Oddie**

Subject Land North and West Melbourne

Key Issues Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)
General Submission
Heritage Inventory

Summary

- Submits that draft Amendment does not provide strengthened guidance, greater clarity and certainty with regard to protecting and enhancing the heritage value of heritage places and precincts and has proposed changes to amendment C258 to better achieve this.
- Suggests wording to improve policy at Clause 22.05 Objectives, 22.05-5 Demolition, 22.05-6 Alterations, 22.05-7 New Buildings, 22.05-8 Additions, 22.05-11 Relocation, 22.05-12 Vehicle Accommodation and Access, 22.05-14 Services and Ancillaries, 22.05-15 Street Fabric and Infrastructure, 22.05-18 Definitions, 22.05-19 Policy Reference
- Suggests the “musts” must be applied for New Buildings (22.05-7) and Additions (22.05-8) in all streetscapes. Past interpretations of what is ‘limited’ or ‘partly concealed’ based on the term “should” has been shown to be subjective, inconsistent in application and certainly detrimental, not respectful, to the heritage precinct. Examples of poor outcomes from the “should” terminology are provided below; the proposed wording of the new provisions will not “strengthen” heritage provisions, rather it will maintain the status quo – demonstrably a failure in heritage protection.
- Requests additional provisions to both clauses 22.04 and 22.04 including similar provisions to that found in the Heritage Act regarding financial and custodial penalties (Heritage Act Part 5 – Permits) and also the City of Melbourne Local Law that effectively penalises people who allow a property to become a dilapidated state (Activities Local Law, Part 10).
- Submits that the review has failed its holistic criterion to include parks, gardens, trees.
- Submits that the Heritage Overlay that applies to Shiel Street should be extend across to the other side of the street to include intact row of historic

Elm Trees.

- Submits that it is illogical and inconsistent that adjoining Catting Street (and other streets in the Hotham Hill area) have their wider streetscape included in the heritage overlay, but not Shiel St.
- Questions why there is selective application of heritage significance to some trees, not others, e.g. 208-292 Arden St - 4 Peppercorn trees; 2A Hawke St - Elm tree in reserve (Level 3 streetscape); 80-86 Capel St - 2 Elm street trees but not Shiel St's Elm row?
- Submits that in a number of locations around North and West Melbourne, the heritage overlay boundaries should be extended including: The centre-of-road treed median on Melrose Street, properties on the north side of Wood Street, north side of Molesworth Street, south side of Arden Street, West side of Abbotsford Street, east side of Curzon Street, southwest side of Courtney Street, Flemington Road along the Royal Children's Hospital section.
- Submits that these examples constitute anomalies in Amendment C258.
- Submits a list of issues in the exhibited C258 Inventory.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

General Submission response

Changing the boundaries of heritage overlays is not within the scope of Amendment C258. In order to alter the boundaries of heritage overlays, a full heritage assessment is required. Such a full heritage assessment occurred as part of the WMHR2016 where the trees specified in the submission (at Arden Street, Hawke Street and Capel Street) were identified and assessed to be of heritage significance.

Apart from in West Melbourne, a fresh, comprehensive assessment of the heritage significance of properties was not part of Amendment C258. However, a priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program.

Recent full heritage reviews have been carried out in West Melbourne, the Arden Macaulay Area and City North Area, which includes portions of North Melbourne.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Many of the issues and suggestions raised in this submission about the heritage policies have been raised by other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management's response to main issues raised in submissions.

Heritage Inventory response

The potential anomalies raised in this submission have been investigated and

where relevant have been corrected. Corrections are shown in the corrected Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from December 2017 to 29 January 2018.

Recommendation Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

In response to this submission, a number of changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Heritage Inventory

In response to this submission, corrections were made to the C258 Heritage Inventory which was exhibited from December 2017 to 29 January 2018. See Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **68. Felicity Watson
National Trust**

Subject Land Whole Municipality

Key Issues General Submission
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)
Large Precincts Statements of Significance

Summary

- Congratulates the City of Melbourne for progressing a much-needed review of the City’s heritage policies and gradings.
- Acknowledges that Amendment C258 implements a number of objectives of planning in Victoria pursuant to Section 4 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, in particular:
 - *To provide for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land*
 - *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*
- Generally supports the methodology for the Heritage Gradings Review outlined in the “Methodology Report” by Lovell Chen, October 2015. It is submitted however that the documentation exhibited as part of the amendment does not provide the transparency required to demonstrate the integrity of the conversion process, and that a methodical and comprehensive peer review is required to ensure that properties have not “fallen through the cracks”.
- Assessments on individual properties made by Lovell Chen are not

available in the exhibited documentation.

- Notes that, as many of the current gradings have often not been reviewed since the early 1980s, simple translation is not necessarily sufficient, without at least a review set for a near future date.
- Considers that ungraded places within precincts need to be reviewed as a priority.
- Notes that property addresses in the exhibited inventory that have been amended to align with City of Melbourne's rate records, adds an additional layer of complexity, making it difficult to assess whether properties have been missed, or are simply listed under a different address.
- Lists apparent anomalies in exhibited Heritage Inventory in South Yarra.
 - 85 Hope Street (D3)
 - 16–18 Hope Street (D2)
 - 96–98 Hope Street (D3)
 - 2-4 Park Street (C2)
 - 405 St Kilda Road (B2)
 - 447–453 St Kilda Road (C3)
 - 52–56 Toorak Road West (C1)
 - 180 Toorak Road West (C3)
 - 37 Walsh Street (House) (C3)
 - 37 Walsh Street (Stable) (A3)
 - 242 Walsh Street (C3)
- Submits that where properties have been removed from the Heritage Inventory, documentation should be publicly exhibited to justify why this has occurred. Suggests Council provide a document or spreadsheet for public review, such as the Excel spreadsheet referred to in Lovell Chen's Methodology Report October 2015.
- Suggests a methodical and thorough peer review process should also be undertaken to ensure integrity of the Gradings Review.
- Concerned about a loss of detail in the planning scheme relating to the individual and streetscape values of heritage places within precincts, due to the translation to a simplified grading system.
- Concerned that the revised Statements of Significance combined with the revised gradings, provide only very generalised guidance that will not address the nuances of buildings and streetscapes across complex precincts. Suggests that this issue could be addressed through the development of more detailed sub-precinct citations.
- Notes that Clause 22.04 and 22.05 should be the same policy.
- Submits that the description on Policy Basis 22.04-1/22.05-1, "*These places date from the mid-nineteenth century through to more recent times*", is too narrow and does not capture the complexity of the City of Melbourne's tangible and intangible history and heritage, including Aboriginal heritage places and natural heritage. Notes the example of a description in

Boroondara's 22.05 Heritage Policy.

- Supports that the full demolition of significant or contributory buildings will not normally be permitted, and that partial demolition will not normally be permitted in the case of significant buildings. However does not believe the proposed policies go far enough to prevent “facadism” (Clause 22.04-5). Suggests that policy wording be amended to change “front or principal part” to “major street façades” and submits that more specific guidelines for the interpretation of “front or principle part of a building” should be developed for different building typologies, including factories and modernist office buildings, to prevent outcomes resulting in facadism. Stronger statements explicitly discouraging facadism should be incorporated into both 22.04 and 22.05, such as that included in the Greater Bendigo Planning Scheme—Heritage Policy 22.06.
- Strongly supports the statement the “poor condition of a significant or contributory place is not in itself justification for permitting demolition”. However suggest that stronger language should be included to explicitly discourage ‘demolition by neglect’, providing a mechanism for the City of Melbourne to refuse demolition where it is suspected that the place has deliberately been allowed to deteriorate – gave example of a provision in City of Whittlesea’s Heritage Conservation Policy 22.04.
- Submits that a clause to encourage adaptive reuse should also be included in 22.04/22.05 (gave example of City of Whittlesea’s policy).
- Strongly supports the statement that ‘a demolition permit should not be granted until the proposed replacement building or works have been approved’.
- Submits that guidelines regarding façade height should be strengthened (New buildings 22.04-7, 22.05-7) and a clear definition for the word “renovation” should be included in clause 22.05-18 Definitions - recommend that language in this policy be limited to terms defined in the Burra Charter, such as “conservation”, “preservation”, and “reconstruction”, to avoid ambiguity and ensure that outcomes are based on accepted best practice.
- Considers that overall, the policy for both 22.04 and 22.05 lacks clear direction relating to significant trees and gardens (22.04-10). Submits that a more prescriptive test regarding natural heritage elements should be included (e.g. Yarra Planning Scheme 22.02 Development Guidelines for sites in Heritage Overlay).
- Submits that further direction should be provided in the policies regarding relocation (22.04-11 and 22.05-11), and suggests developing a more comprehensive policy such as that contained in the Greater Bendigo Planning Scheme—22.06 Heritage Policy.
- Submits that the policy for new fences and gates (22.04-13) is too narrow and should be amended to also permit appropriate reproduction fences – gave example of City of Port Phillip fencing in heritage overlay areas guidelines.
- Submits that the Street Fabric and Infrastructure (22.05-15) provisions

should recognise and provide a policy basis for existing historic street fabric and infrastructure, such as memorials, drinking foundations, gas lamps, public seating, horse troughs, or bluestone kerbs and channelling.

- Suggests stronger guidelines regarding bluestone and kerb and channelling, similar to those in Port Phillip Planning Scheme 22.04-2 Heritage Policy.
- Suggests that there is policy that deals directly with archaeological sites – for example Yarra Planning Scheme – Clause 22.02-6 and also Boroondara Planning Scheme – 22.5 Heritage Policy: Archeological Sites.
- Notes that there are no specific guidelines for historic laneways in either 22.04 or 22.05; also concerned that as only Level 1 Streetscapes have been retained, has resulted in the loss of gradings for laneways and lane-scapes and rear wings of terrace houses and rear dunnies and outbuildings are becoming increasingly rare. Needs to be stronger guidelines for the protection of laneways in 22.04/22.05
- Considers that the Statements of Significance do not sufficiently address nuances of areas of special importance in these large precincts and encourages more detailed sub-precincts, to ensure that the specific values of diverse precincts are identified and can therefore be defended through the planning process.

Management Response

A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).

Large Precincts Statements of Significance response

Regarding the Statements of Significance, there may be justification for sub-precincts, or new discrete precincts within the larger precincts of the municipality. Identifying where this might occur was outside the scope of the current project.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response

Many of the suggestions and issues in this submission, raised about the policies were also raised in other submissions and have been addressed by recommended changes to the policies. Examples are tightening of provisions around facadism, and inclusion of provisions regarding adaptive reuse and tree protection. Please see Attachment 2 for details of the response to main issues raised in submissions.

Heritage Inventory response

The potential anomalies raised in this submission have been investigated and corrected as relevant. Corrections are shown in the corrected Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from December 2017 to 29 January 2018.

Recommendation

Large Precincts Statements of Significance

Relating to Statements of Significance, in response to this submission, no changes are recommended.

Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) and Heritage Inventory

In response to this submission, a number of changes are recommended to the heritage policies and Heritage Inventory. Please refer to Attachment 4 for details.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter **69. Jason and Sharon Vladusic**

Subject Land North Melbourne

Key Issues Heritage Policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Supports the review of the heritage policies though important that the policies remain relevant without imposing undue restrictions.
- Supports in principle the new grading system.
- Important that new policies facilitate the potential for heritage buildings to evolve into modern buildings and enable modern living.
- Updated policies should encourage a balance between these two drivers – i.e. maintaining respect for the character and aesthetic of heritage places while satisfying the expectations and requirements of modern living.
- Submits other suggested changes for the heritage policies to ensure the above balance is achieved.
- Submits that the grounds on which the Amendment is not supported are:
- The full scope and extent of the Amendment expands beyond the stated objectives
- The Amendment is overly stringent and will impose undue and unnecessary restrictions on the evolution of residential buildings to achieve modern standards of living

Management Response The issues and suggestions raised in this submission about the heritage policies have been raised by other submissions. It is considered that the policies strike an appropriate balance between the development and growth of the City and protecting its heritage places. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management’s response to main issues raised in submissions.

Recommendation In response to this submission, a number of changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **70. Samuel Lim**

Far East Organization

Subject Land Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission

 Gradings Conversion

 Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Submits that amendment provides direction on demolition to the front or principal part of contributory buildings that suggests a higher level of protection that exists currently.
- Seeks further engagement to understand heritage protection and indicates they would engage their own heritage consultant.
- Suggests working with Council to protect heritage while also seeking to realise the potential of heritage properties.
- Suggests it needs to be made clear that Clause 22.04 does not apply to sites included on the Victorian Heritage Register.

Management Response

Most of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. Refer to Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions) for an explanation of this.

In the Melbourne Planning Scheme, Clause 43.01-3 (Heritage Overlay) states that, *“No permit is required...to develop a heritage place which is included in the Victorian Heritage Register, other than an application to subdivide a heritage place of which all or part is included in the Victorian Heritage Register”*.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

71. Matt Chamberlain

Subject Land

North Melbourne

Key Issues

General Submission
Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)

Summary

- Supports review of the local heritage policies as policies need to frequently be revised but it is important that they do not impose under restrictions.
- In regards to 22.05 supports enhancing / conserving heritage places but feels the policies are ill-considered with respect to evolving heritage buildings to facilitate expectations and requirements for modern living. Suggests it is important that policies facilitate potential for heritage buildings to evolve into modern buildings and enable modern living such as adequate levels of amenity and sustainability. Updated policies should strike right balance between these two drivers. The proposed policies will jeopardise this balance by imposing an excessive and unnecessary level of stringency.
- Cites three clauses in the ‘additions’ section of the proposed 22.05 that are considered too stringent (E.g. 8 metre setback to achieve concealment, not

- to cantilever over the front part of building etc).
- Suggests a more discretionary approach rather than prescriptive is desirable to deal with site specific attributes / circumstances.
- Not supportive of requirement for Heritage Impact Statements as too onerous.
- Supports new grading system subject to revisions discussed above.

Management Response

Noted that the submitter is generally supportive of the new grading system.

It is considered that the policies do envisage the right balance of allowing appropriate redevelopment and that modern interpretive design is typically supported.

The requirement to provide a Heritage Impact Statement is at the discretion of council and not a mandatory requirement.

The requirement at Clause 22.04-7 “additions should not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building” allows for discretion and it is, important that there is clear guidance around what kinds of additions are appropriate in a heritage place.

Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters. All of the suggestions have been considered. For details, see Attachments 2 (response to main issues raised in submissions) and 4 (C258 amendment documents with recommended changes in response to submissions).

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.
Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter	72. Mary Kehoe Hotham History Group
Subject Land	Heritage Places in North and West Melbourne
Key Issues	General Submission West Melbourne Heritage Review Gradings Conversion Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciates the enormous amount of work that has gone into this extremely large and complicated amendment and the commitment of City of Melbourne Councillors and officers to improve protection of the city’s heritage. • Supports Amendment C258 but does not believe it is ready to proceed to the next stage. • Considers that the revised Local Policy 22.05 has strengthened the

guidelines for assessing development within the Heritage Overlay but feels the terminology is open to interpretation and does not provide the certainty everyone is looking for.

- Supports the introduction of Statements of Significance into the Planning Scheme. While most key attributes are included in the Statement of Significance for North & West Melbourne, the submitter is not convinced it is a strong enough assessment tool to protect the large number of lower graded buildings in North & West Melbourne, especially as they are not designated as significant in their own right.
- Suggests some additions to the North and West Melbourne Precinct Statement of Significance in relation to the history, description, criteria and additional key attributes. Also suggests that significant views should be protected and added to key attributes, and that sub-precincts should be identified with their own Statements of Significance.
- Also suggests that some notable people should be identified in Statements of Significance, in association with historic buildings and places in the precinct. Recommended additional text in relation to social housing, and to Modernist architecture in the precinct.
- Supports the new system of heritage grading but is not convinced the definition of 'contributory' in Amendment C258 will provide adequate protection for the precinct and would prefer the less ambiguous term "Local Significance' as per the State Government's Planning Practice Note 01.
- Questions why 364 Victoria Street North Melbourne, which is graded C in the 2016 Heritage Inventory, is not listed in the 2017 Inventory.
- Questions if discrepancies exist between the West Melbourne Heritage Review findings and the proposed C258 inventory.
- Appreciates that the new incorporated document Melbourne Planning Scheme Heritage Places Inventory 2017 has been the culmination of a very complicated process with revised heritage gradings from various other reviews incorporated into the one list. However, the submitter has identified a number of omissions and inconsistencies in the streets checked. It is imperative that the Inventory is as accurate as possible in its listing of the City of Melbourne's heritage, given the lengthy time it would take for future amendments to be incorporated into the system.
- Supports the changes made to the formatting of the Heritage Inventory following resolutions at Future Melbourne Committee Meeting on 5 July 2016. Requests that the major significant buildings be included in the inventory. Support removal of the non-contributory category from the inventory.
- Notes discrepancies between the 2016 Inventory and C258 2017 Inventory for places in North Melbourne.
- Considers that the proposed new incorporated document Melbourne Planning Scheme Heritage Places Inventory 2017 (North and West Melbourne) does not appear to be a complete listing of the heritage places in North & West Melbourne already adopted into the Planning Scheme. Identified errors/omissions and it is imperative that these are rectified.
- Requests that the Inventory be peer reviewed before the Amendment proceeds. Concerned about the lack of documentation to justify the gradings conversions particularly where the direct conversion didn't occur.
- Unable to view Heritage Overlay Map.
- Supports the West Melbourne Heritage Review. It appears to be a thorough

	<p>review of the suburb's heritage and also includes more recent buildings which reflect the changing nature of West Melbourne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that Criterion D of the HERCON criteria should also be identified. Criterion D: Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class or cultural places. This criterion is relevant to the many largely intact and distinctive Victorian building types and streetscapes which uniformly characterise the precinct.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p><u>West Melbourne Heritage Review response</u></p> <p>Submission is supportive of the West Melbourne Heritage Review. The anomalies in the C258 Heritage Inventory have been investigated and addressed (Refer Attachment 2 for a discussion about the Heritage Inventory).</p> <p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance response</u></p> <p>Regarding views and vistas, the precinct statement refers to landmarks and the visibility of prominent towers (North Melbourne Town Hall) and church buildings and spires, but does not specifically identify the location of the specific views and vistas. This is a separate exercise, and is commented on below for submission #73.</p> <p>One of the items identified for the protection of views (Weston Milling silos, Munster Terrace) is outside the precinct.</p> <p>Council's heritage consultant, Lovell Chen, do not consider that Criterion D applies. While it is relevant for parts of the precinct, the precinct as a whole is notably diverse in terms of its history and valued built form. Criterion D, which is about the precinct demonstrating the principal characteristics of a type of place, is not considered relevant due to its diversity.</p> <p>Regarding the suggestion that historic people be identified in the statement, Lovell Chen has for the most part avoided this in the statements. The preference is not to do so, as judgements have to be made about who should be referred to, and who should be left out. There can also be an imbalance of emphasis. The statement is also about the precinct as a place, how it evolved and what is physically important. It is not a social history of the precinct, and who lived there or was influential, which is a different exercise.</p> <p>Regarding social housing, the statement has been amended to clarify that most of this development is in fact outside the precinct boundary, and accordingly the reference is limited. Reference to Modernist architecture has also been left out. This is not a strong theme of the precinct, and some examples of Modernist buildings are also understood to be outside the precinct boundary.</p> <p><u>Heritage Inventory response</u></p> <p>Many of the issues raised in this submission about the exhibited C258 Inventory were raised in others. Please refer to Attachment 2 for the response to main issues raised in submissions.</p> <p>364 Victoria Street North Melbourne, which is graded C in the 2016 Heritage Inventory, was not listed in the C258 Heritage Inventory because, consistent with the Gradings Conversion methodology, this property was found to be</p>

	erroneously included in the current Heritage Inventory and was actually ungraded. Therefore the C258 Heritage Inventory has corrected this error of the current inventory.
Recommendation	<p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4).</p> <p><u>Heritage Policies</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, some changes are recommended to the C258 Heritage Policies Clauses 22.4 and 22.04. Please refer to Attachment 4 for details.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	73. Angela Williams
Subject Land	Whole municipality
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>West Melbourne Heritage Review</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports having an amendment to strengthen heritage policy. • Supports halting the demolition of heritage assets and that crafting policy to guide appropriate development are worthy goals. Notes that the City of Melbourne and its community want to protect heritage and every step should be taken to protect its retention and enhancement for future generations to enjoy. • Considers Amendment C258 needs more work before it can be adopted. • Does not support changes to the boundaries of Heritage precincts. • Concerned that post-development evaluations have not been undertaken to inform the policy review. This approach was requested in 2015 and does not appear to have been taken up. Short sighted to put the future of heritage into the assessment of just one heritage consultant. • Considers it is unclear how the proposed 22.05 policy flows from the considerations of the requirements of Clause 43.01, which is centred around whether the significance of the heritage place is adversely affected by works. • Does not support the discretionary nature of proposed policy Clause 22.05. • Notes that Clause 22.05 policy applies to areas within City North, an area of Urban Renewal. The Heritage review panel report C198 noted that the structure plan strategy for retention of heritage assets, the heritage policies and development aspirations were at odds, and recommended that Council address this in a heritage review. This does not appear to have been undertaken. • Notes further work is required to ensure that demolition and facadism are

arrested.

- Considers 'Assessed significance' is a pivotal term in proposed 22.05 policy – notes that many buildings proposed to be categorised as 'significant' do not have individual Statements of Significance – proposed policy states that "further information may be considered, including in relation to streetscapes where there is limited information in the existing citation or Council documentation' – this needs to be expanded and clarified. How is it intended that the assessed significance of a building will be decided, in the absence of a Statement of Significance [and this is understood to be the case for the majority of buildings within the City of Melbourne]. Will Precinct wide statements be robust enough?
- Questions if a contributory building can have significant fabric. If so, this should be expressly stated in the Statement of Significance.
- Makes a number of suggestions to for the wording to strengthen and tighten proposed 22.05 including to 22.05-2, 22.05-7 (New buildings), 22.05-3 (Permit Application Requirements), 22.05-5 to 22.05.8 Performance Standards for Assessing Planning Applications and 22.05-5 Demolition, 22.05-6 (Alterations) and 22.05-8 (Additions), 22.05 (New Buildings), 22.05-12 (Vehicle Accommodation and Access), 22.05-14 (Services and Ancillaries), Colour and Materials, 22.05-18 Definitions.
- Concerned that in relation to 22.05-demolition, contributory buildings will become a target for demolition, particularly flowing from the revised categorisation. In North and West Melbourne, where these represent 75% of building stock, I submit that the precinct is particularly vulnerable.
- Notes that assessed significance appears to have been omitted as a consideration for additions.
- Unclear why the Statements of Significance adopted within City North and Arden Macaulay are not sitting within the overall Statement of Significance section, to be able to see all documents within the one location.
- Significant views in the Statement of Significance for North and West Melbourne should be clarified and expanded and suggests additions to the Key Attributes in the precinct. . Notes that significant views/vistas of the town hall and roof, and major church spires and silos, should be clearly defined, with the statements noting where these views are important to be viewed from.
- Supports CRA's submission in relation to the new grading system particularly that 'State Significance' and 'Local Significance' must be used instead of the proposed significant and contributory. Suggests that building gradings are changes to State Significance and Local Significance, retaining all heritage assets as significant buildings.
- Suggests additions to the definition of a non-contributory place.
- Submits that the definitions of 'streetscape' and 'significant streetscape' are flawed and suggests rewording.
- Makes a number of suggestions for the formatting of the inventory.
- Suggests that the West Melbourne Review led to streetscapes that were not previously Level 1 being proposed to be significant [sections of Hawke St, King St].
- Suggests that background data Lovell Chen used for conversion should have been used.
- Welcomes the elevation of a building to the category significant, and the additional policy framework associated with the classification as a positive

	<p>for the Heritage Place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that it is premature to endorse the proposed inventory without future detail being provided. • Notes that there are some anomalies in the inventory.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Many of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p><u>Gradings Conversion methodology response</u></p> <p>As part of the grading conversion methodology, post-development evaluations have were undertaken in the form of desktop reviews to determine whether demolition or significant alteration had taken place which unambiguously diminished the significance of the properties.</p> <p><u>Heritage Policies response</u></p> <p>Many of the issues and suggestions raised in this submission about the heritage policies have been raised by other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management’s response to main issues raised in submissions.</p> <p>All individually significant heritage places and all heritage precincts should have their own Statement of Significance. However this was not done in the past when requirements and standards were different, but is being undertaken with each new heritage review undertaken by Council.</p> <p>The assessed significance of all heritage places is within the Statement of Significance for that place. Each individually significant place should have its own statement of significance. Each precinct should also have a statement of significance which identifies what is contributory in the precinct. However the proposed C258 policies recognise that at the time of assessment not all information may have been available to Council. In these circumstances “further information may be considered, including in relation to streetscapes, where there is limited information in the existing citation or Council documentation”.</p> <p>The Statements of Significance adopted within City North and Arden Macaulay are already incorporated into the Planning Scheme as separate incorporated documents. It is considered unnecessary and impractical to have all statements of significance in the one Incorporated document.</p> <p>As 22.04 has now be expanded to deal with all the heritage issues of areas with a mid-rise built form such as City North, it will apply to all parts of the Capital City zone</p> <p><u>West Melbourne Heritage Review response</u></p> <p>The West Melbourne Heritage Review was a comprehensive, fresh assessment of all of the properties and streetscapes in the West Melbourne Structure Plan area. The review in West Melbourne was different to the gradings conversion that occurred in all other parts of the municipality where it was a conversion of the gradings to the new system. This is why in West Melbourne some of the streetscapes which are not currently identified as Level 1 are now proposed to be significant – because they have recently been assessed to be significant. For the most part in the rest of the municipality, these assessments were done in the 1980s.</p>

	<p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance response</u></p> <p>Regarding Statements of Significance, particularly the issue of specifically identifying the significant views/vistas within the precinct, the statement refers to landmarks and the visibility of prominent towers and church buildings and spires. However, going beyond this to identify specific important views is a separate task, and requires a comprehensive views analysis. Such detailed work is out of scope for this project. Some municipalities, such as Yarra, have a local policy which identifies local landmarks, and seeks to protect views of them, but even this does not include detailed descriptions of where the most significant views are available from. This is a separate piece of work.</p> <p>Regarding the suggested additions to the key attributes of the precinct, some of these have been included.</p> <p>.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4).</p> <p><u>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel</p>
<p>Submitter</p>	<p>74. Michael Butcher Melbourne South Yarra Residents Group</p>
<p>Subject Land</p>	<p>South Yarra</p>
<p>Key Issues</p>	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that grading and conversion of gradings has been undertaken in an entirely ad hoc, inaccurate and unsatisfactory manner. It must be corrected and brought up-to-date as a matter of urgency. • Considers that the Statement of Significance is too broad in its description of HO6 to enable the clear identification of particular streets and areas within that precinct that have heritage importance and should be protected and submits that important streets should be identified as sub-precincts. • Considers statements of significance prepared by Nigel Lewis in 2015 should be referred to. • Submits that all current streetscape gradings must be retained until a full

	<p>review using new classifications has been completed and implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that the proposed definition of 'contributory' be amended. • Submits that the "non-contributory" classification should not be included in C258 • Suggests additional provision and wording for Clause 22.05 • Lists a number of alleged errors and omissions in inventory • Submits that the HO6 precinct is too broad <p>Questions how heritage places (not buildings) are identified</p>
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p><u>Gradings Conversion Methodology response</u></p> <p>The gradings conversion was undertaken with a methodical approach with the methodology carefully developed and tested by expert heritage consultants in consultation with the City of Melbourne and other heritage experts. The Methodology Report for the gradings conversion is available online (Attachment 3 of the report to the Future Melbourne Committee of 5 July 2016).</p> <p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance response</u></p> <p>Regarding the Statements of Significance, it was not within the scope of the project to review or revise the boundary of the precinct, which is acknowledged to be large and broad-ranging.</p> <p>There may be justification for sub-precincts, or new discrete precincts within the larger HO6. Identifying where this might occur was outside the scope of the current project, but Council may consider a review of this type in the future.</p> <p>Because the Statements of Significance cover broad areas only the main and/or most significant streets are identified.</p> <p>Regarding the 2015 Statements of Significance for sub-precincts/streets, as prepared by N. Lewis, this report has been reviewed and where relevant, information has been extracted and included in the precinct statement.</p> <p>It is important that where emphasis is given to specific areas, or streets, that this emphasis reflects the relative importance of these areas within the broader precinct. This is reflected at a broad level in the new Statements of Significance.</p> <p><u>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) response</u></p> <p>Many of the issues and suggestions raised in this submission about the heritage policies have been raised by other submissions and a number of changes are recommended to the Policies. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management's response to main issues raised in submissions.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p><u>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4).</p> <p><u>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</u></p> <p>In response to this submission, a number of changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these</p>

recommended changes.
Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **75. Chris Wren**
Stadiums Pty Ltd

Subject Land West Melbourne

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
West Melbourne Heritage Review

Summary

- Stadiums Pty. Ltd. objects to the inclusion of the site, Festival Hall, within the Heritage Overlay proposed by Amendment C258.
- The level of significance of the site and the building upon it does not warrant inclusion in the Overlay.
- The Statement of Significance overemphasises the historical and social significance of Festival Hall and inaccurately associates it with "John Wren (former Stadium)". John Wren had been dead for three years prior to the construction of the existing building on the site.
- The association of the site and the stadium with "John Wren II and Chris Wren (existing Stadium)" is not of historic or social significance.
- There is no architectural or technical aspect of the building warranting inclusion in the Overlay and in any event it has been significantly altered from its original condition.
- The holding of events such as sporting events or concerts is not of sufficient cultural significance to warrant inclusion within the Overlay and the holding of such events is not manifest in the fabric of the building.
- The inclusion of the site in the Overlay would defeat the aspirations of the proposed West Melbourne Structure Plan given the site is within a growth opportunity area and is a strategic site abutting other strategic sites.

**Management
Response**

West Melbourne Heritage Review response

This property has been assessed in the WMHR2016 as being C graded (under the current grading system) and significant with a proposed new Heritage Overlay (under the proposed grading system). The WMHR Consultant has considered the information provided in this submission and has reviewed the assessment of this property in light of this submission as follows:

No further evidence has been provided by the submitter regarding why the property is not significant and there is no inaccuracy in the Statement of Significance: 'The site and the stadium also have long associations with the notorious John Wren (former stadium), John Wren II and Chris Wren (existing stadium).'

No architectural value is claimed in the WMHR as the significance lies with the historical and social values as stated in the Statement of Significance. However the use of 2.5 inch thick prestressed concrete panels for the external walls was new for large public structures in Victoria, such that engineer Clive Steele was

requested by the City of Melbourne to seek testing from the Commonwealth Experimental Building Station in Sydney before sanctioning their use

The events associated with the stadium have been well documented and by the sheer volume of information available on the web is a clear indicator of the social value held by many for the place.

There is enough of the original fabric and form of the building to allow the association with ` Criterion G in the Victorian Planning Provision Practice Note, 'Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).'

The place has also been independently assessed as of potential State importance in the Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria by Heritage Alliance consultants, carried out for Heritage Victoria. The seminal work 'What is Social Value' carried out for the Australian Heritage Commission lists places of social value would be expected to be places that (among other things):

- *are accessible to the public and offer the possibility of repeated use to build up associations and value to the community of users; and*
- *places where people gather and act as a community, for example places of public ritual, public meeting or congregation, and informal gathering places.*

Examples of places of social value that can be grouped into the above categories included:

- *Public places*
- *Most people identified 'public places' or the 'public face' of all architecture (i.e. the parts of*
- *the 'private environment' that are part of the public sphere including streetscapes).*
- *Places of 'meeting'*
- *Informal meeting places e.g. Flinders Street Station clocks (Melbourne).*
- *Places of 'resort' and public entertainment*
- *Types of places suggested included theatres, showgrounds, cricket grounds, community halls, bushland reserves close to urban centres, beaches, piers, public parks and gardens.*
- *Specific examples in Melbourne included Kooyong tennis stadium and the Regent Theatre.*

Inclusion of the site in the Overlay is not a prohibition on development but provides for heritage to be considered when assessing a permit application. Heritage protection is a key aspect of the West Melbourne Structure Plan.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no change is recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommendations or associated Amendment C258 documents.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter	76. Sue Zhang Glossop Town Planning
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission General Submission Gradings Conversion
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that the Amendment does not provide a neutral translation of the existing controls, rather it seeks to elevate the level of protection afforded the site at 2-52 Gracie Street, North Melbourne (Lost Dog’s Home) as grading being modified from ‘D3’ to ‘significant’. • Objects to Amendment C258 on basis that 'significant' grading is not warranted, that it unduly elevates the heritage value of the site, and that it unreasonably constrains client's future use and development. Contest that subject site is consistent with the proposed C258 definition for a significant heritage place. • Submits that the question has already been resolved as part of Amendment C207 to the Melbourne Planning Scheme, which sought (among other things) to elevate the heritage grading attributed to the site from 'D' to 'C'. Panel ultimately recommended that subject site should not be regraded to C3 but remain as D3. • Submits that the change now proposed by Amendment C258 raises the same questions as those already resolved by C207 – unfair and unreasonable that the Council seeks to again advance its erroneous position. • Submits that elevating the sites significance adds unnecessary layers of control and restriction upon the reasonable future use and development of the site as submits that Clause 22.04 places far greater protection upon buildings graded ‘significant’ (as opposed to those graded ‘contributory’ or ‘non-contributory’). • Submits that the Heritage Overlay already impedes the ability of the site to contribute to the vision for the area, and raising its heritage value will only further reduce this ability. • Request that the amendment is modified to provide a more accurate and reasonable heritage grading for the site.
Management Response	<p>The Lost Dogs Home at 2-52 Gracie Street, North Melbourne has heritage protection under HO869. The proposed grading was determined by the consultants in accordance with the conversion methodology.</p> <p>Under the current grading system the property has a D grading in an individual Heritage Overlay. Places with individual Heritage Overlay controls were not proposed for review, but were transferred to the significant grading. Under the proposed grading system this property is significant.</p>

This property was also reviewed as part of Amendment C207 Arden Macaulay Heritage Review where the place was assessed to be of C grading but at Panel this was discussed and the Panel Recommended that the property remain as a D3 graded place in the Heritage Places Inventory.

The Statement of Significance for 2-52 Gracie Street, which is incorporated into the Planning Scheme at pg 50 of the 'Arden Macaulay Heritage Review 2012 Statements of Significance' states that it is the administration building and residence of 1934-5 that are the significant fabric on the site. This is a large site with many other buildings so it is recommended that this site be referred to as a precinct, rather than an individual heritage place and that the admin building and the residence of 1934-5 are listed in the inventory as the contributory heritage places.

Recommendation In response to this submission, it is recommended that the C258 Heritage Inventory 2017 be changed to show the administration building and the residence of 1934-5 listed in the inventory as contributory heritage places. Please see Attachment 4 for this details of this recommended change.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **77. Simon Martyn**
Fulcrum Urban Planning Pty Ltd

Subject Land The Walk Arcade, Bourke Street

Key Issues Site Specific Submission
Gradings Conversion

Summary

- Opposes the proposed significant classification of subject buildings.
- Notes that the subject site extends from Bourke Street (north) to Lt Collins Street (south) and is bordered by Union Lane to the east and The Causeway to the west, and a former laneway (Coles Place), access from Lt Collins Street, has been internalised within the site. It consists of eight buildings, namely:
 - 309-311 Bourke Street (Edment's Stores)
 - 313-317 Bourke Street (Diamond House), C graded
 - 319-321 Bourke Street (unnamed), Coles Place building (Arco House),
 - 323-325 Bourke Street (Public Bootery Building), (C,1 graded)
 - 288-290 Little Collins Street (The Book Buildings, (D,2 graded)
 - 292-296 Lt Collins Street (York House), (D, 2 graded)
 - 300-302 Lt Collins Street (Allans' building, also known as Sonara House), D, 2 graded)
- Submit that the proposed level of significance for each of the individual

buildings on the site have not been identified in the exhibited Heritage Places Inventory.

- Strongly object to significant grading to all buildings within the subject site as three buildings have no heritage qualities or value and are currently ungraded.
- Submits that the integrity of the current D graded buildings is questionable – for instance 288-290 Little Collins Street (The Book Building) is a significantly modified building.
- Submits that the that exhibited Heritage Places Inventory 2017 is flawed as it fails to recognise the wide variety of buildings on the subject site, ranging from relatively intact facades of Diamond House, Public Benefit Bootery and York House to the mid-twentieth century curtain wall façade to Edment's Stores buildings.

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others – refer to Attachment 2 for response to main issues raised in submissions.

Gradings Conversion response

All of the properties noted in this submission are known as the Walk Arcade, 309-325 Bourke Street, Melbourne which is in the Post Office Precinct Heritage Overlay HO509. Because this is identified as the one property in Councils address system, it is listed just once in the exhibited C258 Heritage Inventory as 309-325 Bourke Street, significant.

Having one property address, the whole property has been converted to significant, even though there are multiple buildings with different gradings on the property. It must be noted that this was a gradings conversion, not a full heritage assessment of the property and the converted gradings are an interim measure until a full heritage assessment occurs. Under a full heritage assessment of the property, the heritage grading of all properties of the site would be reassessed and it may be found that this site should be a precinct rather than an individual heritage place. Council is currently undergoing the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review for all land in the Hoddle Grid and the heritage of all buildings on this property will be reassessed as part of this review.

Site Specific Submission response

As part of the gradings conversion, two of the buildings in this property were upgraded from their existing grading of C to significant:

- 313-317 Bourke Street (Diamond House) - C upgraded to significant
- 323-325 Bourke Street (Public Bootery Building) – C upgraded to significant

The existing grading of all other buildings in the site are as follows:

- 309-311 Bourke Street (Edment's Stores) – Ungraded
- 319-321 Bourke Street (unnamed), Coles Place building (Arco House), - ungraded
- 288-290 Little Collins Street (The Book Buildings, B graded
- 292-296 Lt Collins Street (York House), C graded
- 300-302 Lt Collins Street (Allans' building, also known as Sonara House), C

	graded
Recommendation	No changes to Amendment C258 are recommended in response to this submission. Refer Submission to Panel
Submitter	78. Enid Hookey
Subject Land	Kensington
Key Issues	General Submission
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barnett Street, Collett Street, Eastwood Street (north of Macaulay Road), Lambeth Street, Macaulay Road (east of Eastwood Street), Nottingham Street, Parsons Street, Pridham Street, Rankins Road, Robertson Street in Kensington were reviewed by the submitter. Reviewed entries with respect to Moonee Ponds Creek between Racecourse Road and Dynon Road – waterways, bridges, infrastructure, pumping stations, drainage channel and banks are missing from proposed inventory. Assumes this is a mistake as whole area was included in HO as part of C207. Recommends that management review whole document.
Management Response	Some of the potential omissions and anomalies raised in this submission were also raised in other submissions and were investigated and corrected. See Attachment 2 for management's detailed response to this.
Recommendation	The anomalies in the Inventory have been corrected and are shown in the Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. Please refer to Attachment 4 for details. Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	79. Heather R. Matthew
Subject Land	Parkville
Key Issues	General Submission Large Precincts Statements of Significance
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers it is vital that the issue of precedent is addressed to protect and preserve the marvellous Victorian heritage. Notes that errors are in inventory such as the spelling of Bayles Street misspelled 'Bayliss', Fitgibbon Street is 'Fitgibbons' (p37 Clause 81

	<p>Schedule) and Story Street appears as 'Storey'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding statements of significance, submits that the newspaper quotation on page 37 paragraph 3 appears to be contradicted by the following paragraph. • Submits that the dairies, and even animal grazing, operating in Parkville is a significant part of the early history of South Parkville and should be in the Statement of Significance. • Notes that numerous houses were purpose built for nearby cattle / horse market workers.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Regarding Statements of Significance, information contained in this submission has been reviewed, and where relevant and verified, has been included in the statement.</p> <p>We do not agree that dairying was a significant early industry or activity in the precinct. Dairying occurred throughout inner Melbourne, wherever parkland was available for grazing. While we acknowledge it likely occurred in Parkville, it was not of an order of importance as to be highlighted or emphasised in the statement.</p> <p>Regarding the apparent contradiction with the newspaper article that has been referred to, this has been checked with some added extra text, but the point is otherwise a minor one.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4). Refer Submission to Panel</p>

Submitter	80. Mervyn Fennell
Subject Land	North Melbourne
Key Issues	Heritage Inventory Heritage Policies (Clauses 22.04 and 22.05)
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enquires as to whether 28-34 Canning Street deserves a better rating than Contributory • Concerned that status of property was assessed based on current appearance following neglect and destruction since 2009. • Submits that the definition of streetscape should be expanded or interpreted to allow the concept that buildings are collected around an intersection, particularly this intersection

- Submits that the Barkly-Faraday-Canning intersection and roundabout be reassessed as a Significant Streetscape.

Management Response

The issues raised in this submission have been raised by other submissions. Please refer to Attachment 2 for details of management’s response to main issues raised in submissions.

28-34 Canning Street is located on the intersection of Canning, Barkly and Faraday Streets. The current Heritage Inventory 2016 has this property listed as 70-74 Barkly (Building Grading C and Streetscape Grading Level 2). Under Amendment. It is in the Carlton Precinct Heritage Overlay (HO1).

On Council’s system, this address is now known as 28-34 Canning Street and this is the address that appears in the C258 Heritage Inventory. This property is proposed to be converted to contributory/- which is consistent with the Gradings Conversion methodology.

In regards to the Barkly-Faraday-Canning intersection and roundabout, these are all included in the Carlton Precinct which has a new statement of significance proposed as part of Amendment C258.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, some changes to the C258 Clauses 22.04 and 22.05 are recommended. Please see Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

No changes to the C258 Heritage Inventory are recommended in response to this submission.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter	81. Lucille Voullaire
Subject Land	South Parkville
Key Issues	General Submission Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that lanes were also used for trading of dairy by owners who grazed cattle on Royal Park, as well as baking and vegetables. Sale points typically through small windows through the rear wall. Many of these have been destroyed but some still exist. Considers that for these historic and social reasons laneways should remain predominantly pedestrian thoroughfares only utilised for private vehicle residential access. • Submits that as is acknowledged by the policy laneways contain indications of their historic functions, such as original built-in lavatories, quoins that prevent wheels/vehicles damaging walls or windows and door features in walls and stables being the sole double storey structures. The cobbles are also characteristic.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that heritage houses and laneways are frequently on television and films further demonstrating their importance and the imperative of maintaining as many of their original features as possible. All these features should be specifically mentioned in the policy.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>The statement of significance has been reviewed and enhanced with reference to the laneways, and these are considered to be adequately covered.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4). Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>82. Helen Watson Parkville Association Inc</p>
Subject Land	<p>Parkville</p>
Key Issues	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05)</p> <p>Large Precincts Statements of Significance</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers that it would be appropriate for an Independent Panel to be appointed to review submissions and provide advice to the Melbourne City Council on the final form of the Amendment. If such a Panel is appointed, the Association would wish to present at a Panel Hearing. Submits that this policy review should not be seen by Council as the last word on heritage planning for heritage places outside the Capital City Zone (CCZ) especially for Parkville. There is an on-going need for further heritage information gathering and analysis and preparation and communication of guidelines to assist property owners to achieve identified heritage outcomes when planning alterations and additions to significant heritage places. Concerned that the assessment of applications for proposed alterations and additions to the rear of 'significant' or 'contributory' places within the Parkville Precinct and which are visible from and/or directly abut rear lanes - not convinced that Clauses 22.05-6 and 22.05-8 will give sufficient clear direction as to planning and design elements that are consistent with the original fabric and form as well as heritage significance of elements other than the 'front or principal part of a building'. Concerned about the content of the Statement of Significance and how will be used to inform the assessment of planning permit applications. Essentially, the Association considers that the Statement needs amendment and strengthening to provide a robust basis to assist in the achievement of

	<p>the Policy Objectives set out in Clause 22-05-2 through the assessment of planning permit application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that Council should use the Policy Objectives contained in Clause 22.05-2 as 'key performance indicators' to report on the achievement of heritage protection in relation to discrete areas such as the Parkville Precinct. • Submits a number of detailed comments and suggestions for the following provisions in C258; Clause 22.05-1 – Policy Basis, Clause 22.05-3, Clause 22.05-4, Clause 22.05-5 Demolition, • Clause 22.05-6 Alterations Clause 22.05-7 New Buildings, Clause 22.05-8 Additions, Clause 22.05-9 Restoration and Reconstruction, Clause 22.05-12 Vehicle Accommodation and Access, Clause 22.05-15 Street Fabric and Infrastructure, Clause 22.05-17 Gradings of heritage places, Clause 22.05-18 – Definitions, • Welcomes the preparation of a Statement of Significance in relation to HO4 which applies to most of the residential areas of Parkville though has a number of queries, suggestions, corrections for the SoS included in marked up document. Considers that Statement needs amendment and strengthening to provide a robust basis to assist in the achievement of the Policy Objectives set out in Clause 22- 05-2 through the assessment of planning permit application. • Considers that there is a need for an updated Conservation Study for Parkville - some of the content of the 1979 study, while providing some useful information, would not be consistent with the Model Consultant's brief For Heritage Studies (January 2010) issued by Heritage Victoria for such studies, for example, as the preparation of a comprehensive Thematic Environmental History for Parkville. Such a History is an important basis for preparing the Statement of Significance. • Considers there is a need to review and update coverage of Heritage Overlay in Parkville for example along Royal Parade north of McArthur Road and the southern section of Gatehouse Street and section of Flemington Road adjacent to the 'returned' section of Royal Park which is covered by HO1093. • Considers there are a number of issues with draft Heritage Inventory including; the transfer of existing Gradings of heritage places to 'significant and 'contributory', why some streetscapes in South Parkville in particular are identified as 'significant' when the majority or all of adjoining buildings are identified as 'contributory', urgent need for all rear lanes in the Parkville Precinct to be assessed and, where appropriate, identified as significant streetscapes in their own right and included in the Clause 81 Inventory (eg east and west sides of levers Reserve between Bayles Street and Flemington Road). • Disappointed that mapping of heritage inventory not available as part of exhibition material.
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Regarding Statements of Significance, the corrections, queries and suggestions</p>

	identified in the submission have for the most part been incorporated into the Statement.
Recommendation	In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4). Refer Submission to Panel.
Submitter	83. Ray Cowling
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	General Submission Heritage Policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) Large Precincts Statements of Significance
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an example in William Street where Council did not include a condition requiring restoration but VCAT eventually ruled it was appropriate to do so. Notes that there is a huge amount of building stock requiring restoration / reconstruction, particularly Victorian buildings which typically have damage to ledge, linear protrusions, urns, orbs for instance. Seeks a Clause within the policies that specifically states that restoration / reconstruction is normally required for heritage features as a condition of significant additions. Provides example of what could be in policy as 'For both contributory and significant buildings, where there is structural damage, alterations or loss of features as viewed from the street, these will normally be expected to be restored / reconstructed as a condition to any significant additions.' Queries whether a Heritage Impact Statement is always necessary when it is obvious that restoration is required? Suggests importance should be given to hiding inappropriate or ugly parts of buildings in the additions section of the policy. Wishes for the Statement of Significance to acknowledge that part of the value of Flagstaff Gardens is that it is a viewing point so culturally very important to preserve.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>In response to this submission the Statement of Significance for the precinct has been updated with reference to Flagstaff Gardens, and Flagstaff Hill.</p>
Recommendation	In response to this submission, changes are recommended to the C258 Incorporated Document Precinct Statement of Significance (refer Attachment 4). Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter	84. Jason and Sharon Vladusic
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>General Submission</p> <p>West Melbourne Heritage Review</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the amendment to protect heritage, specifically the subject site at 488 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne. • Supports any heritage policies to preserve the character and rich history of the city of Melbourne. States that the amendment is welcome and necessary. • Supports the grading system. • 488 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne (Tinsmith building) has important heritage character and is a significant representation of the shift in industry in Melbourne. Has been overlooked for too long due to apparent ministerial failures. • Requests that interim heritage protection be given to this building as currently under threat from a proposed planning application to demolish and replace with tower. • Supports policies that preserve the character and rich history of Melbourne. Far too many politicians putting profit before people and selling out to the foreign investors keen to turn us into a skyscraper landscape. • Preserving heritage buildings is essential part of Melbourne's strategic plan / Statement of Significance. • Very positive in regard to the West Melbourne review.
Management Response	<p>A number of the issues raised in this submission were also raised by other submitters (see Attachment 2 for management response to main issues raised by submissions).</p> <p>Noted that the submitter supports the West Melbourne Heritage Review.</p> <p>In regards to the request to include 488 La Trobe Street in the interim heritage overlay (Amendment C273), Council did request that the Minister for Planning approve the heritage overlay on an interim basis to 26 sites assessed to be of heritage significance (and not currently in the HO) in the WMHR2016 – this requested included 488 La Trobe Street. The Minister did not approve C273 to the following sites which were part of the original request:</p> <p>HO1182 Elm ('Ulmus' sp.) street trees x2, near 80, 86 Capel Street, West Melbourne</p> <p>HO1184 Elm ('Ulmus' sp.), Hawke and Curzon Street Reserve, 2A Hawke Street, West Melbourne</p>

HO1185 Elms (x6), street trees, near 81-141 Jeffcott Street, West Melbourne

HO1186 Elm, Hawke Street and King Street Reserve, near 446 King Street, West Melbourne

HO1189 Tame and Company factory, 511 King Street, West Melbourne

HO1190 Edward J. and Samuel Spink workshop, also J. B. Watson's stores, later Molloy and Co, hide and skin merchants, 488-494 La Trobe Street, West Melbourne

HO1193 Dixon and Co. cordial factory, later Felton Grimwade and Duerdins Pty. Ltd. Chemical laboratory, factory and store complex, 109-133 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne

HO1194 Australian Biscuit Company Ltd. stores, 300 Rosslyn Street, West Melbourne

HO1195 Melbourne Remand Centre, later Assessment Prison, 317 Spencer Street, West Melbourne

HO1196 Brown's factory, later Preston Motors Pty.Ltd., 445 Spencer Street, West Melbourne

HO1180 Canary Island pines (x2 'Pinus canariensis'), Howard Street and William Street Reserve

Please note that all of these above sites are proposed to be included in the heritage overlay on a permanent basis under Amendment C258.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes are recommended to the West Melbourne Heritage Review or to the associated C258 Amendment documents.
Refer Submission to panel

Submitter	85. Robert Ford Perry Town Planning on behalf of the CFMEU
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	Site Specific Submission West Melbourne Heritage Review related Gradings Conversion
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the property in West Melbourne is currently graded as C3 and includes the current definition. Notes that under C258, the proposed grading is 'significant' and cites the

definition.

- Notes that the site is in an area dominated by commercial and industrial properties with various sizes, ages and forms, with few properties in the immediate area included within an HO.
- Notes that surrounding the site, land within the Mixed Use Zone is in the process of transformation into residential apartments and notes that a property north of the site was removed from the HO in C207
- States that the site has been used by a variety of purposes (building materials store, trade sales office, and union office) and the varied use limits its historical significance, and does not sustain any argument which would accrue any historic significance to justify the grading. Building supplies were a common use, further detracting from this significance of the building.
- Notes that the Miller Street building was one of many regional sales offices in Australia to local store and sell Sisalkraft products, and it is clear that the link between the Sisalkraft Company and the site has been overstated
- Notes that the prominent architect Marcus Martin is more renowned for elegant white houses in South Yarra and Toorak and kindergartens and maisonettes/townhouses, rather than functional buildings such as the subject site. 152-160 Miller Street is not representative of Martin's architectural themes.
- Considers that the building does not feature a style or application of materials which would present as a significant example of Marcus Martin's work. It is an unremarkable and purely functional example of 1950s commercial buildings, of which there are numerous examples across West Melbourne and Victoria.
- Notes that the 2013 Statement of Significance exhibited with C207 stated that although not a remarkable building the building is externally well preserved with the only major change being the matching bricking in of one of the loading doors on the north east elevation (p158).
- Over time, there have been many alterations and additions which have changed the appearance and structure which distance it from the original design (loading bay disrupts the appearance of the window features for instance)
- Over the past 11 years, 3 planning permits have been granted for significant building changes on the site, two of which included substantial alterations and extensions. Other significant changes have altered presentation to Miller Street and Anderson Street at ground level
- Considers that any aesthetic qualities of the building have been eroded over time and notably, second storey additions have been introduced to the east and west elevations. States that the architectural detail of the building is relatively minor and any association with the architectural work of Marcus Martin is limited.
- Suggests that with time, the site should be considered for redevelopment considering its location in Arden-Macaulay
- Submits that the significant grading prevents opportunities that would be possible under the Mixed Use grading, unnecessarily compromising

	<p>development potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the grading be changed to non-contributory in recognition of the unremarkable features of the existing building and the varied uses over time, which lessen historical significance.
Management Response	<p>The property in West Melbourne has heritage protection under HO1119 which was introduced as part of Amendment C207 Arden Macaulay Heritage Review with the current grading listed as C.</p> <p>The proposed grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the Arden Macaulay Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the Arden Macaulay Heritage Review conversion methodology, the property is significant.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel</p>

Submissions received in response to re-exhibition of the corrected Heritage Inventory

Submitter	86. Paul Bell Brunswick Group Pty Ltd
Subject Land	West Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>West Melbourne Heritage Review</p> <p>Heritage Inventory</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits that 2 Hawke Street (West Melbourne Baptist Church manse) was demolished in September 2016, pursuant to following permits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Town Planning Permit issued by City of Melbourne on 16 April 2015, number TP-2014-200 (in relation to a development on the site that involved the demolition of the existing buildings) ○ Section 29A Demolition Consent and Report issued by City of Melbourne on 19 August 2016, number 29A-2016-131 ○ Building Permit (in relation to the demolition work) issued by Gardner Group Pty Ltd on 1 September 2016, number 14734/160168/0 • Submits that because this building has been demolished, it should be removed from the proposed C258 Heritage Inventory.
Management	2 Hawke Street, West Melbourne (the West Melbourne Baptist Church manse)

Response	<p>was assessed in the WMHR2016 to have a grading of C and Streetscape Level of 3 (under the old grading system) and was assessed to by both individually significant and contributory to the North and West Melbourne heritage precinct (HO3).</p> <p>This building, however, has since been demolished and consent and approval to this demolition was provided under the permits and approvals specified in the submission (see above summary). It is therefore recommended that the West Melbourne Baptist Church Manse at 2 Hawke Street, West Melbourne should be removed from the C258 Heritage Places Inventory and from the Incorporated Document: West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016.</p>
Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, it is recommended that the West Melbourne Baptist Church Manse at 2 Hawke Street, West Melbourne it should be removed from the C258 Heritage Places Inventory and from the Incorporated Document: West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016. See Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel</p>
Submitter	<p>87. Marjorie Kennedy</p> <p>SJB Planning</p>
Subject Land	Melbourne
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the upgrading (C to significant) of property sought by Amendment C258 and lack of justification provided within exhibited material
Management Response	<p>The property at 543-547 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne has heritage protection under HO1124 (Elizabeth Street North Boulevard Precinct) which was introduced in 2015 as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review. The subject property was assessed to be graded C2 under Amendment C198, which is the current listing of this property in existing C258 Heritage Places Inventory. There is a statement of significance for the Elizabeth Street North Boulevard Precinct HO1124 in the Incorporated Document, City North Heritage Review 2012 – Statements of Significance.</p> <p>For properties in areas of recent heritage reviews, including City North, the converted grading in C258 was determined by the assessment or conversion methodology established as part each particular Review. For the City North Heritage Review, the conversion methodology was for C graded places to be converted to significant.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, 543-547 Elizabeth Street is significant and this was shown in the exhibited C258 Heritage Places Inventory.</p>

Recommendation	<p>In response to this submission, no changes to Amendment C258 are recommended.</p> <p>Refer Submission to Panel.</p>
Submitter	<p>88. Cathy Pearl</p> <p>SJB Planning on behalf of Middlefield Group</p>
Subject Land	<p>West Melbourne</p>
Key Issues	<p>Site Specific Submission</p> <p>Gradings Conversion</p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed change in grading from 'D' to 'significant' • Notes that two double storey buildings exist on the land, however, approval has previously been granted for demolition of the D grade buildings under Permit TP-2015-432, which was recently granted an extension of time • Notes that a report prepared by Bryce Raworth confirmed that both buildings are located in a 'Level 3 Streetscape', the lowest level of importance accorded to a street which 'may contain significant buildings, but ...from diverse periods or styles, and of low individual significance or integrity.' • States that more recent adjacent development construction at 435 Spencer Street, West Melbourne and development approval at 91 – 95 Dudley Street both multi storey infill proposals, further impact on the integrity of the heritage streetscape.
Management Response	<p>The properties at 437-441 Spencer Street, West Melbourne already have heritage protection under HO780 and were reviewed as part of Amendment C258 West Melbourne Heritage Review.</p> <p>437 Spencer Street was previously graded D and the West Melbourne Heritage Review confirmed the D grading. Management agrees with the submitter that this property was listed as significant in error. The West Melbourne Heritage Review consultant report, confirms that the property is contributory.</p> <p>441 Spencer Street was previously graded D and the West Melbourne Heritage Review recommends a change to a C grading, which is significant in the proposed grading system.</p> <p>Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the West Melbourne Heritage Review conversion methodology, 437 Spencer Street is contributory and 441 Spencer Street is significant,</p>
Recommendation	<p>The incorrect listing of 437 Spencer Street as significant in the Inventory has been corrected and this address is now listed as contributory in the corrected Heritage Places Inventory 2017 which was exhibited from 7 December 2017 to 29 January 2018.</p>

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **89. Carlton Residents Association (CRA)**

Subject Land Various properties in Carlton and Parkville

Key Issues

- Supplementary submission in relation to the Heritage Places Inventory
- Gradings conversion

Summary

- CRA provide an analysis of two sample heritage blocks, one in Carlton, within the City North area, and the other in Parkville, opposite the University of Melbourne.
- Both blocks have a majority of C grade heritage places; with the Carlton sample block having no Level 1 Streetscapes and all the streets in the Parkville sample block with a Level 1 Streetscape.
- CRA highlights the difference in gradings recommendation for these two sample blocks; Carlton block, most of the C graded heritage places are to be translated to 'significant' and the Parkville all the C graded heritage places are to be translated to 'contributory'.
- Key problem with the Heritage Review is that those suburbs that have been the subject of recent Heritage Reviews (ie West Melbourne & City North), the 2014 translation principles have been applied and for the remainder of the municipality, the default translation of the C graded heritage places has been to 'contributory'.
- Two very different translation principles have been applied in the review of C graded buildings.
- The June 2016 Heritage Places Inventory includes 1160 records of C graded heritage places in the Carlton area. All these records had the same grading status in June 2016. Following the review about 430 records translated to 'significant' and 730 to 'contributory'.
- CRA concludes that Carlton area has experienced an uneven outcome in the grading status, those buildings with a c grading in the City North area have fared vastly better than those in Carlton, east of Swanston Street.
- The application of different translation principles in the same heritage review does not result in a credible outcome.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in other submissions and also in the previous submission from the Carlton Residents Association. Please refer to the response to submission #29 and to Attachment 2 – Response to Main Issues Raised in Submissions.

In regards to submission about 'different translation principles' being applied in the same review the following is noted:

There have been four recent area heritage reviews in the City of Melbourne where properties have been assessed, graded and this has been implemented

in the Planning Scheme as follows:

- Amendment C198 (approved 2015) - City North Heritage Review
- Amendment C207 (approved 2016) – Arden Macaulay Heritage Review
- Amendment C215 (approved 2015) – Kensington Heritage Review
- Amendment C258 (proposed) – West Melbourne Heritage Review

For three (Arden Mac, Kensington and West Melbourne) of these heritage reviews, heritage places were assessed under the old letter grading system as well as under the contemporary significant/contributory/non-contributory system. Just one of these reviews – City North - assessed under only the old letter grading system but having reviewed all properties included a conversion methodology across to the new system as follows:

- A, B and C to significant and D to contributory.

It must also be noted that part of the C258 gradings conversion methodology was for any singular properties in an individual heritage overlay to be converted to significant, regardless of current letter grading.

In regards to the submission that ‘those buildings with a C grading in the City North area have fared vastly better than those in Carlton, east of Swanston Street’, this could be because the land in City North has undergone a much more recent (2015) full heritage assessment than those properties in other parts of Carlton (many most recently assessed in the 1980s and 1990s).

Apart from in West Melbourne, a full, heritage assessment of the heritage significance of properties was not part of Amendment C258. However, a priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program and all areas of the municipality, including Carlton, will receive a full heritage review.

Recommendation In response to this submission,
Refer submission to Panel

Submitter **90. Ray Cowling**

Subject Land 65-67 Peel Street “The Drunken Poet”

Key Issues Gradings conversion

Summary

- Requests the regrading of 65-67 Peel Street “The Drunken Poet” from contributory to significant

Management Response The WMHR2016 assessed 65-67 Peel Street – ‘Dean's House’ to be contributory.

Recommendation In response to this submission, no changes to Amendment C258 are

recommended.
Refer Submission to panel.

Submitter **91. Liam Riordan**
Tract on behalf of Alan Kras

Subject Land Carlton

Key Issues Gradings Conversion
Heritage Policies

Summary

- Does not consider the building at 15-17 Lincoln Square South satisfies the threshold for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay on an individual basis and that it is currently appropriately graded 'C' in the 2016 Inventory on the basis of RBA's 2013 Heritage Study. On that basis considers the building at 15-17 Lincoln Square South strongly accords with the definition for contributory and not significant as proposed in Amendment C258.
- Highlights that the façade of the building 19-21 Lincoln Square South has been substantially altered although the overall form of the single storey interwar factory building remains legible. Agrees with the Grading conversion of Amendment C258 from 'D' grading to 'contributory*.
- The proposed policy removes the "exemptions" relating to concealed upper level development and infill height in CCZ5. Considers that this change does not provide for the reasonable redevelopment opportunities that can be accommodated in the more robust former factory and warehouse building forms found on the subject site, in the Lincoln Square South Precinct generally, and elsewhere in the areas immediately north and west of the Hoddle Grid.
- Considers that Clause 22.05 should include a specific policy for former industrial buildings that acknowledges the often larger scale form and generally more robust nature of the heritage fabric of these buildings in comparison with domestic architecture. Such a policy should allow for the greater redevelopment opportunities that these buildings generally afford, and recognise that it is not normally necessary for new additions to former industrial buildings to be 'concealed' or 'partly concealed' as defined in the proposed Clause 22.05.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others – please see Attachment 2 – response to main issues raised in submissions.

15-17 and 19-21 Lincoln Square South has heritage protection under HO1122 which was introduced as part of Amendment C198 City North Heritage Review with the gradings listed as C and D in the current Heritage Inventory.

The proposed C258 grading was determined by the conversion methodology established as part of the City North Heritage Review where a C grading is converted to significant and a D grading was converted to contributory.

Under the proposed grading system and in accordance with the City North Heritage Review conversion methodology, 15-17 Lincoln Square South is significant and the 19-21 Lincoln Square South is contributory.

Issues surrounding the development of the site or parts of the site can be dealt with in a planning application.

Many of the requirements at proposed Clause 22.04-7 (additions) allow for discretion and it is important that there is clear guidance around what kinds of additions are appropriate in a heritage place. In response to submissions, changes to the heritage policies are recommended to allow for greater guidance of different buildings types (such as former industrial buildings).

Recommended Change/s

In response to submissions, some changes are recommended to the proposed C258 heritage policies (Clause 22.04 and 22.05) – see Attachment 4 for details.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

92. Ewan Ogilvy

Subject Land

University of Melbourne

Key Issues

- Errors and omissions to the Heritage Places Inventory 2017

Summary

- Provided a case study of University of Melbourne
- Requests an independent review of the deletions and amendments to the June 2016 Inventory and/or the original Heritage Studies and re-exhibition of the new inventory.
- Queries the order of the University of Melbourne Main Campus Heritage Places which were previously in the Carlton section of the Inventory and are now sandwiched between The Avenue and Wimble Street in the Parkville listing
- Concerned about the number of deletions and amendments that have been made to the Parkville Precinct June 2016 Inventory and has requested a number of corrections-
 - HO331 (Colonial Bank Door) is not mapped
 - HO333 (Cricket Pavilion and Scoreboard) is mapped incorrectly
 - HO354 has been demolished
 - HO316 is mapped at 155 Royal Parade
 - HO872 is mapped incorrectly
- Important heritage fabric has been deleted from the 2016 Inventory
 - Descriptions of Heritage Places including:
 - HO343 –fabric at the NE corner of Grattan St and Royal Pde is not mapped
 - HO324- reference to the garden and fence has been omitted
 - HO355- reference to the System Garden has been omitted
- Several significant Heritage Places in Ormond and Trinity Colleges that

were separately identified in the 2016 Inventory have been omitted and other significant Heritage Places have been excluded and remain un-mapped such as Babe which was designate as “High Heritage Value” in the 2008 University Master Plan

- Concerned with the lack of consistency in the way Heritage Precincts are designate. For example queries why HO 342 which includes 4 heritage places is considered a Heritage precinct.
- States that the names given to Heritage Places on the Main Campus is inconsistent with the University Map (for example the Frank Tate building) and the order the places are listed in are unhelpful. Suggests that when Heritage Places are not named after a significant person or philanthropist consideration should be given to using a unique identifying feature of the original building and/or the foundation date.
- Requests that the street should be used in determining the listing order in the revised Inventory.
- Submitted that there was an error in the corrected C258 Heritage Places Inventory in that 98 Drummond Street was listed as contributory but that 94 and 96 Drummond Street, where are parts of the same building, are not listed.

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others – see Attachment 2 for response to main issues raised in Submissions.

The main campus of Melbourne University is located in the suburb of Parkville according to Council GIS system and rates records so this is why the Melbourne University properties appear in the Parkville suburb in the C258 Heritage Places Inventory.

The reason that many places have been ‘added’ or ‘deleted’ to the Heritage Inventory is because the C258 Heritage Inventory has been drafted so that all and only places in a Heritage Overlay are included in the Heritage Inventory. The current Heritage Places Heritage Inventory 2016 in the planning scheme erroneously contains many properties that are no in a Heritage Overlay and is missing properties that are in a Heritage Overlay, such as VHR places, that should be included. The C258 Heritage Inventory is correcting this.

Statements of Significance will be exhibited as part of full heritage reviews that will be implemented through Planning Scheme Amendments.

The reason why some ‘important heritage fabric’ or heritage elements are no longer shown in the Heritage Inventory is because it was part of the Gradings Conversion methodology to convert VHR places and precincts (such as HO324 which is VHRH1508) to significant. This is because the most up to date statements of significance for these places are the VHR statements which set out all of the contributory fabric and elements in it. A planning permit is not required from the City of Melbourne for proposals for VHR places but rather is from Heritage Victoria. So therefore it considered appropriate that the details of fabric and elements of VHR places is not included in the City of Melbourne Planning provisions.

The City of Melbourne has conducted a thorough analysis of the Heritage Inventory in response to submissions received last year. While every effort has

been made to rectify every error, it is reasonable to expect some margin of error in a data set of such magnitude and complexity. It should be noted that the full details, condition and status of heritage places is assessed when full heritage reviews occur. The gradings conversion is an interim measure for some areas and must be done so that full heritage reviews can be conducted in these areas. The State Government has advised that no more full heritage reviews will be accepted until we move to this system. It should also be noted that the role of the Independent Planning Panel that is appointed by the Planning Minister is to review all submissions to an amendment and the actual amendment itself. It is considered that an independent review of proposed changes in Amendment C258, beyond the review to be conducted by the Planning Panel, is not required.

The naming of properties in the C258 Heritage Places Inventory is consistent with the property names in the current City of Melbourne GIS system – these have been altered and updated over time so this is why some appear different to those listed in the current Heritage Inventory (many are the outdated property names/addresses from the 1980s/1990s).

In regards to 94-98 Drummond Street, Carlton, the reason only the address of 98 Drummond Street was listed in the C258 Heritage Inventory is because this property was known as 98 Drummond Street since the heritage study was originally undertaken in 1981. The current Heritage Inventor92y refers to it as 98 Drummond Street. However, the address has now changed and there are now three separate titles with 3 addresses or the one building. It is considered that the C258 Heritage Places inventory be updated to also show 94 and 96 Drummond Street as contributory (and in a significant streetscape).

Recommendation In response to this submission, a change to the C258 Heritage Places Inventory is recommended to show 94 and 96 Drummond Street as contributory (and in a significant streetscape) (see Attachment 4).

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **93. Sylvia Black (East Melbourne Historical Society) and Barbara Paterson (Heritage and Planning East Melbourne Group)**

Subject Land East Melbourne sites (various)

Key Issues Heritage Inventory
General Submission

Summary

- Errors and omissions to the Heritage Places Inventory 2017
- Requests a new Heritage Review of East Melbourne to be undertaken as a matter of priority
- **Identified street numbering mistakes**
 - Garden Avenue 10 - vacant land (gradings conversion methodology A in existing Heritage Inventory)
 - Hotham Street 29-33 - two non-matching separate buildings, should be listed separately (one property on GIS and one in HI)
 - Hotham Street 152-156 - also listed as 154-156. 152 is a separate building (the individual HO149 applies to 154-156 Hotham Street and the precinct

HO applies to 152-156)

Jolimont Road 128-138 - 128 is Vic house incorporated into large modern building, leave as 128 (two separated addresses on GIS, however there was a typo in C258HO – should be 128-136 – has been updated)

Powlett Street 50-52 - also listed as 52 (inconsequential drafting error, new address system)

Victoria Parade 86-196 - 86-96? (known as 3 diff addresses, address which covers entire heritage place used)

Victoria Parade 448-550 - 448 refers to new apartments built behind 550. (448 not listed in C258 Hi), 548-550 (548-550 applies to entire heritage place as listed in current HI as B – converted to significant).

- **Missing information recorded in previous inventory**

George Street 125A - A graded house – missing (Address name different - same property - correct grading)

George Street 1258 - C graded house - missing 1125-t27 is a separate house (as above)

Grey Street 84 - D graded flats, match, but separate from, 147-163 Powlett Street – missing (On compass, part of 147-163 Powlett Street, no need for separate listing for 84, Grading correct - address confusion - individual HO – VHR)

Hotham Street 189 - C graded house, now with substantial repro extension - missing

Hotham Street 146 - A graded house, now ungraded

Hotham Street 148 - A graded house, now ungraded

Jolimont Street 85 - C graded house converted to office - missing

Lansdowne Street 12 - added as contributory - now missing

Palmer Street cnr Charles - C graded fence - missing

Powlett Street 120 - Streetscape 1 - now streetscape not graded

Powlett Street 105 - C graded cottage, belongs to Magnolia Court - Missing

Powlett Street 107 [109] - D graded house - missing

Powlett street 129 - B graded house in terrace of four - now ungraded

Powlett Street 131- B graded house in terrace of four - now ungraded

Powlett Street 133 - B graded house in terrace of four - now ungraded

Powlett Street 135 - B graded house in terrace of four - now ungraded

Simpson Street 8 - A graded house - missing

Simpson Street 10 - A graded house - missing

Simpson Street 46-48 - added as contributory - now missing

Vale Street 8 - C graded house -missing

Vale Street 10 - C graded house - missing

Victoria Parade 108-122 - newly added but unidentified

Victoria Parade 185 - A graded Greek Orthodox Church - missing

Victoria Parade 376 - A graded house - missing

Victoria Parade 378 - A graded house - missing

Victoria Parade /145-452 - part of old brewery - missing

Victoria Parade 488 - D graded house – missing

- **Numbers which no longer accurately reflect existing conditions**

Grey Street 12-L4 - 72 is 1950s extension (correct grading, desktop review)

Grey Street 35-42 - 35-40 1970s units ((correct grading, desktop review)

- **New properties to add to the Inventory**

Albert Street 19-29 (c.1939)- flats

Albert Street 97 (1935) - flats

Albert Street 99 - flats

Albert Street 103 (1925) - flats

Albert Street 246 (1940) - Sherwood flats

Burchett Lane 15-21 (c.1923) - Garage/workshop converted to residence

Grey Street 1 (1939) - flats

Grey Street 18-30 flats (1938)
 Hoddle Street 1081 (1940)- Ascot Lodge studio flats
 Hoddle Street 1085 (1940)- Millhayes studio flats
 Jolimont Terrace 36-38 - flats
 Hotham Street 21 (1928)- Beverley Mansions flais
 Hoddle Street 1123-1133 or 9 Hotham Street (1938)- flats cnr Hotham
 Hoddle Street 1235 (c.1939) - flats cnr Albert
 Palmer Street 15 (1937) - flats
 Powlett Reserve - substation
 Powlett Reserve - tennis pavilion?
 Simpson Street 65 (1939) - flats
 Victoria Parade 552-554 (1935) - flats
 Wellington Parade 12 (1939) - studio flats
 Wellington Parade L34-L42 (1924) - shops
 Wellington Parade - Jolimont Station

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others – see Attachment 2 for response to main issues raised in submissions.

The list of properties that it is submitted should be added to the Heritage Inventory are noted. However this is not within the scope of Amendment C258. For these properties to be added to the inventory, a full heritage review of the area is required. A priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program.

Heritage Inventory response

Each of the potential anomalies raised in this submission have been investigated and it has been found that most of them are not actual anomalies but rather due to address naming changes. For many the grading listed was correct but the property is now known as a different address than shown in the current Heritage Inventory. Some of these perceived anomalies were also due to the current Heritage Inventory listing properties that are not in the Heritage Overlay.

The actual anomalies are recommended to be corrected as shown in the marked up C258 Heritage Places Inventory (see Attachment 4) and listed below:

- Jolimont Road 128-138 – is two separated addresses on GIS, however there was a typographical error and it should be 128-136)
- Powlett Street 50-52 – is listed as 52 which is a drafting anomaly, should be listed as 50-52
- Hotham Street 146 and 148 and 129 to 135 Powlett Street – there is a drafting anomaly; the properties should be listed as significant, in significant streetscapes.

Recommendation

Some changes to the C258 Heritage Places Inventory are recommended in response to this Submission – see Attachment 4 for details.

Refer submission to Panel.

Submitter

94. Gareth Holdstock

CBRE on behalf of Volker Gladis

Subject Land Melbourne

Key Issues

- Site specific correction to the Heritage Inventory

Summary

- Two buildings occupy the site (655 & 661-667 Bourke Street) and the Amendment proposes to include the whole site in the Heritage Inventory as a significant heritage place. The effect of this is to identify both the former Hudson's Store and the non-significant 1980's office tower as significant buildings.
- States that the office building at 661-667 does not contribute to the heritage value of HO501 Bourke Street West Precinct and should be deleted from the Inventory. This will have the effect of identifying only 655 Bourke Street (former Hudson's Store) as being significant within HO501

Management Response

These buildings are now known as the one address of 661 Bourke Street on Council's System. This site is in in HO501 (Bourke Street West Heritage Precinct) so both buildings are protected by the Heritage Overlay. One aspect of the gradings conversion methodology was to convert the grading of a property as a whole, not of its component buildings – therefore, this property was converted to significant and was listed as such in the C258 Heritage Inventory.

Please note that the full heritage review of the Hoddle Grid is currently underway and this property and these buildings will be assessed as part of that.

Recommendation

No changes to Amendment C258 are recommended in response to this Submission.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

95. Sally Macindoe
University of Melbourne

Subject Land University of Melbourne

Key Issues

- Gradings conversion and policy implications

Summary

- Maintains the position put forward in the previous submission dated 12 May 2017
- Considers the approach skews the gradings of heritage places by converting all places with a site specific heritage overlay to a significant grading regardless of the grading that is currently attributed to the place.

- Considers the changes to heritage policy place an unreasonable impediment on the planned development of the University.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others including previously by this submitter. Please see Attachment 2 for response to main issues raised in submissions.

It is considered that the approach to convert all places in a site specific heritage overlay to significant is logical as each place is listed individually in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay. This is how the Heritage Overlay schedule operates and is set out.

It is considered that the changes to heritage policy provide clear, improved guidelines as to how heritage places may be redeveloped. Please refer to the response to Submission #65.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, no changes to Amendment C258 are recommended.

Refer Submission to Panel.

Submitter

96. Parkville Association

Subject Land

Parkville sites (various)

Key Issues

- Heritage Inventory
- Grading conversion

Summary

- Highlights anomalies in the transfer of graded buildings to significant or contributory in South Parkville that appear to be related more to change of ownership rather than heritage significance. Examples given:
 - 21-23 Royal Parade (A graded) has been downgraded to contributory)
 - 21 and 31-37 Bayles Street (Parkville Post Office) 39-43 Degraves Street (neighbouring houses to Wardlaw) have been introduced into the new Inventory as significant.
- Queries why exceptions to the stated methodology has been made for these buildings (examples above) and requests an explanation as to why these exceptions have been made yet for the rest of Parkville reliance is still placed on assessments and citations that were made as part of the original Parkville Conservation Study in 1979.
- Reiterates the request for an up-to-date evidence base for the heritage inventory rather than relying on the 1979 Heritage Study.
- Considers that there is likely to be a higher threshold of assessment for change to an individual building identified as significant compared to one identified merely contributory even if it is located in a significant streetscape.
- Requests that the heritage value of South Parkville relates to the whole built form of the area, not just the views obtainable from and to significant buildings.

- Suggest that the inclusion of descriptive names for building and places would assist for example 188 Gatehouse Street as the former college hall and an address within the University.

Management Response

In response to the potential anomalies raised, the response is below:

The property previously known as 21-23 Royal Parade (A graded) is now known as 21-27. Numbers 25-29 are contributory but 21-23 are significant – this has been updated in the Inventory.

Numbers 21 and 31-37 Bayles Street (Parkville Post Office) are in an individual HO – HO311 which is a VHR place as well so therefore it is correct and consistent with the Gradings Conversion methodology to list this property in the C258 Heritage Inventory as significant.

Numbers 39-43 Degraeves Street (neighbouring houses to Wardlaw) is in an individual HO HO896 and is also a VHR place so therefore it is correct and consistent with the Gradings Conversion methodology to list this property in the C258 Heritage Inventory as significant.

There have been no exceptions to the Gradings Conversion methodology for the above buildings or for any properties across the entire municipality.

For the evidence base to be updated for the Heritage Inventory and for the whole built form of the area to be recognised, a full heritage review of the area would need to occur (noting that Amendment C258 was a Gradings Conversion process, not a full heritage review). A priority action of the City of Melbourne's Heritage Strategy 2013 is to ensure that the heritage of all areas of the municipality is assessed in due course. These reviews and assessments are being carried out as part of Council's heritage program.

The inclusion of descriptive names for buildings and places was out of scope of Amendment C258.

Recommendation

One change to the C258 Heritage Inventory is recommended in response to this submission – See Attachment 4 for details.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter

97. Hotham History Project

Subject Land

North and West Melbourne (various)

Key Issues

- Heritage Inventory

Summary

- Applauds the number of anomalies that have been corrected from the previous version, particularly with the numbering system and many of the identified discrepancies.
- Notes that there are still errors in the Inventory and therefore requests an Independent review before the Amendment proceeds.
- Requests an amendment to the Inventory to reflect demolitions that have

taken place since the review (as listed):

2 Hawke Street

104 Hawke Street

187 Stanley Street

- Highlights a discrepancy in considering historical and social significance using the Benevolent Asylum Estate as a sample area. The estate is bounded by Curzon, Elm, and Abbotsford Street and straddles North Melbourne and West Melbourne. The West Melbourne Heritage Review has taken into account historical and social significance with the places in North Melbourne being assessed under a different criterion (from the North and West Melbourne Conservation Study 1985) with an emphasis on architectural merit.

- Concerned that a number of buildings were not identified for heritage protection due to minor inappropriate works such as fences or balustrades. Using the Benevolent Asylum Estate as an example, most buildings on the West Melbourne side of the Asylum Estate along Victoria Street are now listed in the Inventory as either contributory or significant but the North Melbourne side of the Estate has not fared so well.

552 Victoria Street has been removed since the 2016 Inventory.

588, 602-630 Victoria Street and 1 Elm Street have never been recognised.

3, 9-11 and 19 Elm Street were included in the November 2017 Inventory but were not in earlier inventories. This has been done without any documented explanation. (highlighted in submission 14 February 2016)

- Highlights that the Inventory states: "The performance standards applied by Council when considering relevant permit applications are dependent on the particular building grading and whether it is in a significant streetscape". As most of the streetscapes in North & West Melbourne are no longer assessed as significant it means that mistakes, inconsistencies and anomalies in The North and West Melbourne Conservation Study 1983 can have a fatal impact on all those places that are affected. Already many recognised heritage buildings have been lost. Therefore does not believe the claim that heritage protection will be stronger without level 2 and 3 streetscapes

**Management
Response**

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised by others. Please see Attachment 2 for the response to main issues raised in submissions.

The City of Melbourne has conducted a thorough analysis of the Heritage Inventory in response to submissions received last year. While every effort has been made to rectify every error, it is reasonable to expect some margin of error in a data set of such magnitude and complexity. It should be noted that the full details, condition and status of heritage places is assessed when full heritage reviews occur but was not part of the gradings conversion process. It should also be noted that the role of the Independent Planning Panel that is appointed by the Planning Minister is to review all submissions to an amendment and the actual amendment itself. It is considered that an independent review of proposed changes in Amendment C258, beyond the review to be conducted by the Planning Panel, is not required.

Evidence that demolitions have actually occurred (not just approved or consented to) must be considered before places can be removed from existing or proposed heritage provisions and policy. This is because applicants do not always act on approvals and permits.

Since the exhibition of Amendment C258, the following properties in West Melbourne have been demolished:

- 104 Hawke Street,
- 2 Hawke Street
- 187 Stanley Street

Therefore, in response to this (and other submissions that raised the same issue), it is recommended that these three properties should be removed from the C258 Heritage Places Inventory and from the Incorporated Document: West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016. See Attachment 4 for details of these recommended changes.

In regards to the properties on the north side of Victoria Street (including particular properties in the former Benevolent Asylum) not being assessed as comprehensively as the properties on the south side, this is because the boundary of the WMHR2016 was at Victoria Street. The WMHR2016 was a full heritage review of the West Melbourne Structure Plan area. The properties outside this area were subject to the gradings conversion which would not include currently ungraded properties as a full heritage review would do. (See Attachment 2, response to main issues raised in submissions for discussion of this issue).

552 Victoria Street was not removed but as part of the C258 Gradings Methodology (where all C and D graded properties in North Melbourne underwent a desktop review), this property was found to have been significantly altered so it is considered to no longer be contributory.

588, 602-630 Victoria Street and 1 Elm Street do not appear in the current inventory because they were not graded in the past. All ungraded places have been converted to non-contributory in accordance with the gradings conversion methodology.

As part of the Gradings Review methodology 3, 9-11 and 19 Elm Street were subject to the desktop review and it was recommended that these properties are contributory – as such they are listed as contributory in the C258 Heritage Inventory.

Recommendation In response to this submission, some changes are recommended to the C258 Heritage Places Inventory and to the Incorporated Document: West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016. See Attachment 4 for details.

Refer Submission to Panel

Submitter **98. Melbourne Heritage Action**

Subject Land Melbourne (various)

Key Issues Heritage Inventory

Summary

- The submission lists various entries in the proposed inventory that are either missing, listed with a different grading or have an incorrect or confusing address – properties in the central city only, are listed
- The submitter recommends that where there is a building row i.e. a series of terraces all built as one, that they should be listed as a single address covering the whole building. In cases where addresses in the row have separate gradings, separate listing should be used.

Management Response

Some of the issues raised in this submission have been raised in others. Please see Attachment 2 for response to main issues raised in submissions.

The converted gradings for all the properties in the central city were done in accordance with the Gradings Conversion Methodology – part of which was to consider all properties in an individual HO as individually significant. It was considered that they are already classified as individually significant by virtue of having an individual HO and a separate listing in the HO schedule.

Each of the potential anomalies raised in this submission has been investigated and it has been found that most of them are due to address changes - for many the properties, the grading listed was correct but the property is now known as a different address that shown in the current Heritage Inventory.

The potential anomalies raised in this submission relate to properties in the central city only. Many relate to the current heritage overlay boundaries, address names and the current grading of properties in the Hoddle Grid. While these issues are out of scope of the Grading Conversion and of Amendment C258, all of these issues are being addressed through the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review that the City of Melbourne is currently undertaking which is a full heritage review of the heritage of the Hoddle Grid. All of the issues and suggestions for the Hoddle grid in this submission have been noted and will be considered in the Hoddle Grid Heritage Review.

It was found that properties in the Bourke Hill area (Amendment C240) were not included in the exhibited C258 inventory. This is because the properties in Amendment C240 were assessed under the contemporary gradings system using a gradings conversion methodology that was different to the C258 Gradings Conversion Methodology. These properties and their gradings are listed in the 'Bourke Hill Precinct Heritage Review Amendment C240' reference document, so are already included in the Planning Scheme. However, it is suggested that for clarity these properties should be also listed in the C258 Heritage Inventory so these changes are recommended.

Recommendation

In response to this submission, some changes are recommended to the C258 Heritage Places Inventory – please see Attachment 4 for details.

Refer Submission to Panel.

22.04 HERITAGE PLACES WITHIN THE CAPITAL CITY ZONE

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

This policy applies to places included in the Heritage Overlay within the Capital City Zone, excluding land within Schedule 5 to the Capital City Zone (City North).

22.04-1 Policy Basis

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Melbourne's Municipal Strategic Statement identifies heritage as a defining characteristic of the municipality, and a major part of Melbourne's attraction. Heritage places enhance the city's appeal as a place in which to live, work, invest and visit.

The heritage of the Capital City Zone (CCZ) encompasses ~~heritage precincts, individual heritage places both within and outside of and heritage precincts, and historic streets and lanes.~~ These places ~~date from the mid nineteenth century through to more recent times, and~~ are variously of heritage value for their historic, aesthetic, social, spiritual and scientific significance.

The places reflect the significance of the CCZ as the cultural, administrative and economic centre of the state. The places are fundamental to the depth of historic character of the CCZ, as it developed on, and extended from, the Hoddle Grid.

This policy provides guidance on conserving and enhancing the heritage places of the CCZ and is informed by the conservation principles, processes and practices of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. ~~It encourages the conservation, preservation and restoration of heritage places, and development which enhances the heritage place and~~ is compatible and in keeping with ~~their~~ their cultural heritage values. ~~The policy recognises that heritage places are living and working places; and that the CCZ will continue to attract business and investment with related development subject to the heritage policy objectives.~~

This policy should be read in conjunction with Statements of Significance ~~listed~~ as incorporated into this Scheme.

22.04-18 Definitions

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Term	Definition
Alteration	An alteration is to modify the fabric of a heritage place, without undertaking building works such as an addition.
Assessed significance	The assessed significance of an individual heritage place or heritage precinct is identified in the relevant statement of significance, as contained in the place citation. This normally identifies what is significant, how it is significant, and why it is significant.
Concealed/partly concealed	Concealed means cannot be seen from a street (other than a lane, unless the lane is classified as significant) or public park, visible from any part of the street serving the front or principal part of the building, as defined under 'visible'. Partly concealed means that some a limited amount of the addition or higher rear part may be visible, provided it does not <u>visually</u> dominate <u>or reduce the prominence of the appearance of the existing</u> building's <u>façade(s)</u> and the streetscape.
Conservation	Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place to retain its heritage significance. It may include one or more of maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation.
Context	<u>The cContext means the setting</u> of a heritage place; <u>can include: its setting</u> (as defined under 'setting'), including the immediate landholding, adjoining significant or contributory places, and the

Term	Definition
	surrounding area.
Contextual design	A contextual design for new buildings and additions to existing buildings is one which adopts a an interpretive design approach, derived through analysis of the subject property and its heritage context. Such an approach requires allows new development to comfortably and harmoniously integrate with the site and its streetscape character. The approach can include respectful contemporary architecture.
Cultural significance	Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.
Development	Development includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction or exterior alteration of a building • demolition or removal of a building or works • construction or carrying out of works • subdivision or consolidation of land, including buildings or airspace • placing or relocation of a building or works on land • construction or putting up for display of signs or hoardings
Enhance	Enhance means to improve the presentation and appearance of a heritage place through restoration, reconstruction or removal of unsympathetic or intrusive elements, and through appropriate development.
Fabric	Fabric means all the physical material of the heritage place.
<u>Facadism</u>	<u>The retention of the exterior face/faces of a building without the three-dimensional built form providing for its/their structural support, and, without retention of an understanding of the function of the three-dimensional building form.</u>
Front or principal part of a building	The front or principal part of a building is generally considered to be the front two rooms in depth, –complete with the structure and cladding to the roof ; or that part of the building associated with the primary roof form, whichever is the greater. For residential buildings this is generally 8 metres in depth. For most non-residential buildings, the front part is generally considered to be one full structural bay in depth complete with the structure and cladding to the roof. This is generally 8 – 10 metres in depth, including the roof. For corner sites, the front or principal part of a building includes side and rear elevations. For sites with more than one frontages, the front or principal part of a building relates to each frontage.
Heritage place	A heritage place has been assessed to have natural or cultural identified heritage value and can include a site, area or space, building or other works, structure, group of buildings, streetscapes, precinct,

Term	Definition
	archaeological site, landscape, garden or tree.
Heritage precinct (as referred to in this policy)	A heritage precinct is an area which has been identified as having heritage significance. It is identified as such in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and mapped in the Planning Scheme Heritage Overlay Maps.
Individual heritage place (as referred to in this policy)	An individual heritage place is equivalent to a significant heritage place. It may be graded significant within a heritage precinct. It may also have an individual Heritage Overlay control, and be located within or outside a heritage precinct.
Key attributes	The key attributes or important characteristics of a heritage precinct are identified in the precinct statement of significance.
Lane	Includes reference to public and or private lanes, and ROWs.
Maintenance	Maintenance means the continuous protective care of a place, and its setting, and is distinguished from repair which involves restoration or reconstruction.
Massing	Massing means the arrangement of a building's bulk and its articulation into parts.
Preservation	Preservation is maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.
Reconstruction	Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state, and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material.
Respectful and interpretive	When used in relation to design, respectful and interpretive refers to design that honestly admits its modernity while relating to the historic or architecturally significant character of its context. Respectful means a modern design approach to new buildings, additions and alterations to buildings, in which historic building size, and form are adopted; and , proportions and details are referenced but not directly copied; and sympathetic colours and materials are used. Interpretive means a looser and simplified modern interpretation of historic building form, details and materials.
Restoration	Restoration means returning a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or later additions, or by reassembling existing elements. It is distinguished from reconstruction through not introducing new material.
Services and ancillaries	Services and ancillaries include, but are not limited to, satellite dishes, shade canopies and sails, solar panels, water storage tanks, disabled access ramps and handrails, air conditioners, cooling or heating systems and hot water services.
Setting	Setting means the immediate and extended environment of a heritage place that is part of or contributes to its significance.
Streetscape	A streetscape is a collection of buildings along a street frontage. When referred to in relation to a precinct, a streetscape typically contains a majority of buildings which are graded significant or contributory.
Significant streetscape (as referred to in	Significant streetscapes are collections of buildings outstanding either because they are a particularly well preserved group from a similar period or style, or because they are a collection of highly significant

Term	Definition
this policy)	buildings <u>significant</u> in their own right.
Use	Use means the functions of a place, including the activities and traditional and customary practices which may occur at the place or are dependent on the place.
Visible	Visible means anything that can be seen from a street (other than a lane, unless the lane is classified as significant) or public park.

22.04-17 Grading of heritage places

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The grading (significant, contributory or non-contributory) of properties within the Capital City Zone (CCZ) is identified in this incorporated document *Heritage Places Inventory 2017*. Significant Streetscapes are also identified in the incorporated document.

‘Significant’ heritage place:

A ‘significant’ heritage place is individually important at state or local level, and a heritage place in its own right. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the municipality. A ‘significant’ heritage place may be highly valued by the community; is typically externally intact; and/or has notable features associated with the place type, use, period, method of construction, siting or setting. When located in a heritage precinct a ‘significant’ heritage place can make an important contribution to the precinct.

‘Contributory’ heritage place:

A ‘contributory’ heritage place is important for its contribution to a heritage precinct. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the heritage precinct. A ‘contributory’ heritage place may be valued by the community; a representative example of a place type, period or style; and/or combines with other visually or stylistically related places to demonstrate the historic development of a heritage precinct. ‘Contributory’ places are typically externally intact, but may have visible changes which do not detract from the contribution to the heritage precinct.

‘Non-contributory’ place:

A ‘non-contributory’ place does not make a contribution to the heritage cultural significance or historic character of the heritage precinct.

22.04-2 Policy Objectives

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

- To conserve and enhance Melbourne’s heritage places.
- To retain ~~conserve~~ fabric ~~of historic, aesthetic, social, spiritual and scientific heritage value,~~ which contributes to the significance, character or ~~and~~ appearance of heritage places and precincts.
- To recognise and conserve the assessed significance of heritage places and streetscapes, as referenced in this policy or incorporated into this planning scheme adopted by Council, as the basis for consideration of development and works. Further information may be considered, including in relation to streetscapes, where there is limited information in the existing citation or Council documentation.
- To ensure new development is respectful of the assessed significance of heritage places.
- To ensure new development is respectful of the character and appearance of heritage places.

- To encourage high quality contextual design for new development, ~~which and generally~~ avoids replication of historic forms and details.
- ~~To encourage retention of the three dimensional fabric and form of a building and to discourage façadism.~~
- ~~To encourage the adaptive reuse of heritage places.~~
- To ensure new development is ~~consistent with~~~~informed by~~ the conservation principles, processes and practices of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter.
- To enhance the presentation and appearance of heritage places through restoration and, where evidence exists, reconstruction of original or contributory ~~fabric elements.~~
- To protect significant views and vistas to heritage places.
- ~~To promote the protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage.~~

22.04-3 Permit Application Requirements

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The following, where relevant, may be required to be lodged with a permit application.

- Where major or consequential development is proposed to significant heritage places, the responsible authority may require preparation of a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), ~~which is accordance with the Heritage Council of Victoria's 'Conservation Management Plans: Managing Heritage Places A Guide 2010' -~~
- ~~For all applications involving significant or contributory heritage places, other than minor works, -~~ The responsible authority may require preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS), ~~which is in accordance with Heritage Victoria's 'Guidelines for preparing Heritage Impact Statements'.~~ In a heritage precinct, the HIS should address impacts on adjoining significant or contributory buildings and the immediate heritage context, in addition to impacts on the subject place.
- Where works are associated with significant vegetation (as listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay or vegetation of assessed significance), an arboricultural report should be prepared. The report should, where relevant, address landscape significance, arboricultural condition, impacts on the vegetation and impacts on the ~~assessed significance of the~~ heritage precinct.
- ~~For development in heritage precincts, the responsible authority may require sight lines, and heights of existing and adjoining buildings, streetscape elevations, photos and 3D model, as necessary, to determine the impact of the proposed works.~~
- ~~A comprehensive explanation as to how the proposed development achieves the policy objectives~~

22.04-4 Performance Standards for Assessing Planning Applications

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The performance standards set out below outline the criteria by which heritage aspects of planning applications will be assessed. ~~Definitions of words used in these performance standards are included at the end of this policy.~~

~~Variation from the performance standards requires a readily understandable reasoned explanation of how the policy objectives are addressed.~~

22.04-5 Demolition

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The demolition of a non-contributory place will generally be permitted.

Full demolition of significant or contributory buildings ~~will not normally be permitted. would only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.~~

Partial demolition will not ~~generally normally~~ be permitted in the case of significant buildings ~~or and of~~ the front or principal part of contributory buildings.

Retention of the three dimensional form is encouraged; facadism is discouraged.

The poor condition of a significant or contributory building ~~is will not be considered in itself~~ justification for permitting demolition.

A demolition permit should not be granted until the proposed replacement building or works have been approved.

Where approval is granted for full demolition of a significant building, a recording program including, but not limited to, archival photographic recording and/or measured drawings may be required prior to demolition, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

~~The d~~Demolition of ~~front~~ fences and outbuildings which contribute to the cultural significance of the heritage place, ~~is discouraged. will not normally be permitted.~~

Before deciding on an application for full or partial demolition, the responsible authority will consider, as appropriate:

- The assessed significance of the ~~heritage place or~~ building.
- The character and appearance of the building or works and its contribution to the historic, social and architectural values, character and appearance of the heritage place.
- The significance of the fabric or part of the building, and the degree to which it contributes ~~to the perception o to the~~ the three-dimensional form ~~and depth~~ of the building, regardless of whether it is visible.
- Whether the demolition or removal of any part of the building contributes to the long-term conservation of the significant fabric of the building.

22.04-6

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Alterations

External fabric which contributes to the cultural heritage significance of the heritage place, on any part of a significant building, and on any visible part of a contributory building, should be preserved.

Alterations to non-contributory buildings and fabric must be respectful of, and not detract from the assessed significance of the heritage precinct.

Sandblasting of render, masonry or timber surfaces and painting of previously unpainted surfaces will not ~~generally normally~~ be permitted.

Before deciding on an application to alter the fabric of a significant or contributory building, the responsible authority will consider, as appropriate:

- The assessed cultural significance of the building and heritage place.
- The degree to which the works would detract from the significance, character and appearance of the building, and heritage place.
- Its structural condition.
- The character and appearance of the proposed replacement materials.

- ~~Whether The degree to which~~ the works can be reversed without ~~an unacceptable~~ loss of fabric which contributes to significance.

Removal of paint from originally unpainted masonry or other surfaces is encouraged providing this can be undertaken without damage to the heritage fabric.

The introduction of awnings and verandahs to ground floor façades and shopfronts may be permitted where:

- The works reconstruct an original awning or verandah, based on evidence of the original form, detailing and materials; or
- The awning is an appropriate contextual design response, compatibly placed in relation to the building, and can be removed without ~~an unacceptable~~ loss of fabric which contributes to cultural heritage significance.

22.04-7
--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Additions

Additions to buildings in a heritage precinct ~~must should~~ be respectful of and in keeping with:

- Identified 'key attributes' of the heritage precinct.
- Precinct characteristics including building height, massing and form; style and architectural expression; details; materials; front and side setbacks; and orientation.
- Character and appearance of nearby adjoining significant and contributory buildings.

Additions should not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building.

Where abutting a lane, additions ~~must should~~ be respectful of the scale and form of heritage fabric ~~historic and~~ development to the lane.

Additions to significant or contributory buildings should:

- Be respectful of the building's character and appearance, scale, materials, style and architectural expression.
- Not visually dominate or visually disrupt the appreciation of the building as it presents to the streetscape(s).
- Maintain the prominence ~~perception~~ of ~~the three dimensional form and depth~~ of the building by setting back the addition behind the front or principal part of the building, and from other visible parts ~~secondary elevation(s)~~.
- Retain significant roof form within the setback from the building façade together with any chimneys or similar roof elements of original fabric.
- New additions must not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building.
- Not obscure views of façades or elevations associated with the front or principal part of the building.
- Be distinguishable from the original fabric of the building.
- Not employ external column/structural supports through the front or principal part of the building.

The design of additions ~~must should~~:

- Adopt high quality and respectful contextual design.
- Avoid ~~a~~ direct reproduction of the form of historic fabric ~~elements~~.

- Adopt an interpretive design approach to other details such as verandahs, fences, and shopfronts.

22.04-8 New Buildings

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

New buildings ~~must should~~ be respectful of—not detract from the assessed cultural heritage significance of the heritage place and streetscape.

New buildings- ~~must should~~:

- Be respectful of the heritage place and in keeping with:
 - ~~Identified K~~ 'key attributes' of the heritage precinct, such as: -
 - ~~Precinct characteristics including~~ Building height, massing and form; style and architectural expression; details; materials; front and side setbacks; and orientation and fencing.
 - Prevailing streetscape height and scale.
 - Not obscure views from the street(s) and public parks of the front or principal part of adjoining significant or contributory heritage place or buildings.
 - Not visually dominate or visually disrupt the appreciation of the heritage place by:
 - maintaining a façade height which is consistent with that of adjoining significant or contributory buildings, whichever is the lesser, and
 - setting back higher rear building components.
 - Not adopt a façade height which is significantly lower than prevailing heights in the streetscape.
 - Be positioned in line with the prevailing building line in the streetscape.
 - Not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of an adjoining significant or contributory building.
 - Where abutting a lane, be respectful of the scale and form of historic ~~fabricelements~~ of heritage places abutting the lane.

The design of new buildings ~~must should~~:

- Adopt high quality and respectful contextual design.
- Adopt an interpretive design approach to other details such as verandahs, fences and shopfronts and points of entry.

22.04-9 Restoration and Reconstruction

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Where there is evidence of what a building originally looked like, buildings and works ~~renovation of on~~ any part of a significant building, or any visible part of a contributory building, should form part of an authentic restoration or reconstruction process, or should not preclude such a process at a future date (evidence of what a building used to look like might include other parts of the building or early photographs and plans).

22.04-10 Subdivision

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Subdivision of a heritage place should:

- Reflect the pattern of development in the streetscape or precinct, whichever is most relevant to the place.

- ~~Ensure that Maintain an appropriate settings to the and contexts for significant and contributory to heritage buildings and places are maintained including the retention or any original garden areas, large trees and other features which contribute to the significance of the heritage place, the significant or contributory building.~~
- Not provide for future development which will visually disrupt the setting and impact on the presentation of the significant or contributory building
- Provide for three dimensional building envelopes for future built form to each lot proposed.

Subdivision of airspace above heritage buildings, to provide for future development, is discouraged.

~~22.04-12~~ ~~22.04-11~~ **Relocation**

~~. A proposal to relocate a significant or contributory building or structure may be permitted where the existing location of the heritage place is not part of its significance.~~

~~22.04-12~~ **Vehicle Accommodation and Access**

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The introduction of on-site car parking, garages and carports, and vehicle crossovers is discouraged and should~~may only~~ be permitted where:

- The On grade car parking is located to the rear of the property, ~~and or to the side setback, where~~ this is an established streetscape characteristic, ~~and.~~
- ~~The new vehicle crossover is no wider than three metres, and crossovers are common elements of the streetscape.~~
- For a significant or contributory building, the new garage or carport is placed behind the principal or front part of the main building ~~line~~ (excluding verandahs, porches, bay windows or similar projecting features), and:
 - it will be visually recessive;
 - ~~the height is below that of the main roof form of the building;~~
 - it will not conceal an original contributory element of the building (other than a plain side wall); and
 - the form, details and materials are respectful of the building, but do not replicate details of the building.
- Where this is an established characteristic of the streetscape or precinct, ramps to basement or sub-basement car parking are located to the rear of the property, or to a side street or side lane boundary, where they would not visually disrupt the setting of the significant or contributory building, or impact on the streetscape character.

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

~~22.04-13~~ **Fences and Gates**

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

New or replacement fences or gates to the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building may be permitted where:

- the works reconstruct an original fence or gate, based on evidence of the original form, detailing and materials; or
- the new fence is an appropriate contextual design response, where the style, details and materials are interpretive and consistent with the architectural period of the heritage place and established streetscape characteristics.

New fences and gates should also:

- not conceal views of the building; and
- be a maximum height of 1.2 metres ~~to-if solid, -or~~ 1.5 metres; ~~-if-and~~
- more than 50% transparent.

22.04-XX Trees

Ensure buildings and works respect trees with assessed significance (noted in the schedule to this overlay) by siting proposed new development at a distance that ensures the ongoing health of the tree.

New buildings and works should also comply with the Australian Standard AD 4970-2009 Protection of trees on development sites for vegetation of assessed significance. :

22.04-14 Services and Ancillaries

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The installation of services and ancillaries, in particular those that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions or water consumption such as solar panels, solar hot water services or water storage tanks, may be permitted on any visible part of significant or contributory buildings where it can be demonstrated there is no feasible alternative and the services and ancillaries will not detract from the character and appearance of the building or heritage place. Items affixed to roofs, such as solar panels, should align with the profile of the roof.

Services and ancillaries should be installed in a manner whereby they can be removed without damaging significant fabric.

For new buildings, services and ancillaries should be concealed, integrated or incorporated into the design of the building.

22.04-15 Street Fabric and Infrastructure

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Street furniture, including shelters, seats, rubbish bins, bicycle racks, drinking fountains and the like, should be designed and sited to avoid:

- impacts on views to significant or contributory places and contributory elements; and
- physical impacts on bluestone kerbs, channels and gutters, ~~and~~ other historic street infrastructure, and historic street tree plantings.

For existing significant and contributory street fabric and infrastructure, it is policy that:

- restoration, reconstruction and maintenance- should be carried out in a way that retains the original fabric, form and appearance.

22.04-16 Signage

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

new signage associated with heritage places should:

- Minimise visual clutter.
- Not conceal architectural features or details which contribute to the significance of the heritage place.
- Not damage the fabric of the heritage place.
- Be in keeping with historical signage in terms of size and proportion in relation to the heritage place.
- Be readily removable.

Advertising signs may be placed in locations where they were traditionally placed.

The historical use of signage may be justification for new or replacement signage.

Existing signage that is deemed to have heritage value should be retained, and not altered or obscured, including historic painted signage.

22.04-17 — Grading of heritage places

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

~~The grading (significant, contributory or non-contributory) of properties within the Capital City Zone (CCZ) is identified in the incorporated document *Heritage Inventory 2016*. Significant streetscapes are also identified in the incorporated document. Other streetscapes may also be significant and other information may be considered in determining the significance of a streetscape where limited information is provided in the existing citation or Council documentation.~~

~~‘Significant’ heritage place:~~

~~A ‘significant’ heritage place is individually important at state or local level, and a heritage place in its own right. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the municipality. A ‘significant’ heritage place may be highly valued by the community; is typically externally intact; and/or has notable features associated with the place type, use, period, method of construction, siting or setting. When located in a heritage precinct a ‘significant’ heritage place can make an important contribution to the precinct.~~

~~‘Contributory’ heritage place:~~

~~A ‘contributory’ heritage place is important for its contribution to a heritage precinct. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the heritage precinct. A ‘contributory’ heritage place may be valued by the community; a representative example of a place type, period or style; and/or combines with other visually or stylistically related places to demonstrate the historic development of a heritage precinct. ‘Contributory’ places are typically externally intact, but may have visible changes which do not detract from the contribution to the heritage precinct.~~

~~‘Non-contributory’ place:~~

~~A ‘non-contributory’ place does not make a contribution to the heritage significance or historic character of the heritage precinct.~~

22.04-18 — Definitions

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Term	Definition
Alteration	An alteration is to modify the fabric of a heritage place, without undertaking building works such as an addition.
Assessed significance	The assessed significance of an individual heritage place or heritage precinct is identified in the relevant statement of significance, as contained in the place citation. This normally identifies what is significant, how it is significant, and why it is significant.
Concealed/partly concealed	Concealed means not visible from any part of the street serving the front or principal part of the building, as defined under ‘visible’. Partly concealed means that a limited amount of the addition or higher rear part may be visible, provided it does not dominate the appearance of the building’s façade and the streetscape.
Conservation	Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place to retain its heritage significance. It may include one or more of maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation.
Context	Context means the setting of a heritage place, as defined under

Term	Definition
	'setting', including the immediate landholding, adjoining significant or contributory places, and the surrounding area.
Contextual design	A contextual design for new buildings and additions to existing buildings is one which adopts an interpretive design approach, derived through analysis of the subject property and its heritage context. Such an approach allows new development to comfortably and harmoniously integrate with the site and its streetscape character. The approach can include respectful contemporary architecture.
Cultural significance	Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.
Development	Development includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction or exterior alteration of a building • demolition or removal of a building or works • construction or carrying out of works • subdivision or consolidation of land, including buildings or airspace • placing or relocation of a building or works on land • construction or putting up for display of signs or hoardings
Enhance	Enhance means to improve the presentation and appearance of a heritage place through restoration, reconstruction or removal of unsympathetic or intrusive elements.
Fabric	Fabric means all the physical material of the heritage place.
Front or principal part of a building	The front or principal part of a building is generally considered to be the front two rooms, with roof; or that part of the building associated with the primary roof form, whichever is the greater. For most non-residential buildings, the front part is generally considered to be one full structural bay in depth or 8 metres, including the roof.
Heritage place	A heritage place has identified heritage value and can include a site, area or space, building or other works, structure, group of buildings, precinct, archaeological site, landscape, garden or tree.
Heritage precinct (as referred to in this policy)	A heritage precinct is an area which has been identified as having heritage significance. It is identified as such in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and mapped in the Planning Scheme Heritage Overlay Maps.
Individual heritage place (as referred to in this policy)	An individual heritage place is equivalent to a significant heritage place. It may be graded significant within a heritage precinct. It may also have an individual Heritage Overlay control, and be located within or outside a heritage precinct.
Key attributes	The key attributes or important characteristics of a heritage precinct are identified in the precinct statement of significance.
Lane	Includes reference to public or private lanes, and ROWs.
Maintenance	Maintenance means the continuous protective care of a place, and its setting, and is distinguished from repair which involves restoration or reconstruction.

Term	Definition
Massing	Massing means the arrangement of a building's bulk and its articulation into parts.
Preservation	Preservation is maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.
Reconstruction	Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state, and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material.
Respectful and interpretive	When used in relation to design, respectful and interpretive refers to design that honestly admits its modernity while relating to the historic or architecturally significant character of its context. Respectful means a modern design approach to new buildings, additions and alterations to buildings, in which historic building size, form, proportions and details are referenced but not directly copied, and sympathetic colours and materials are used. Interpretive means a looser and simplified modern interpretation of historic building form, details and materials.
Restoration	Restoration means returning a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or later additions, or by reassembling existing elements. It is distinguished from reconstruction through not introducing new material.
Services and ancillaries	Services and ancillaries include, but are not limited to, satellite dishes, shade canopies and sails, solar panels, water storage tanks, disabled access ramps and handrails, air conditioners, cooling or heating systems and hot water services.
Setting	Setting means the immediate and extended environment of a place that is part of or contributes to its significance.
Streetscape	A streetscape is a collection of buildings along a street frontage. When referred to in relation to a precinct, a streetscape typically contains a majority of buildings which are graded significant or contributory.
Significant streetscape (as referred to in this policy)	Significant streetscapes are collections of buildings outstanding either because they are a particularly well preserved group from a similar period or style, or because they are highly significant buildings in their own right.
Use	Use means the functions of a place, including the activities and traditional and customary practices which may occur at the place or are dependent on the place.
Visible	Visible means anything that can be seen from a street (other than a lane, unless the lane is classified as significant) or public park.

22.04-19 Reference Documents

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

- Central Activities District Conservation Study 1985
- Harbour, Railways, Industrial Conservation
- South Melbourne Conservation Study 1985

Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011

Bourke Hill Precinct Heritage Review Amendment C240 2015

City North Heritage Review, RBA Architects 2013

~~C258 Heritage Precincts Statements of Significance 2017~~

22.05

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

HERITAGE PLACES OUTSIDE THE CAPITAL CITY ZONE

This policy applies to all places within the Heritage Overlay Area excluding the Capital City Zone Schedules 1, 2, 3 and 4 and the Docklands Zone.

22.05-1

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Policy Basis

Melbourne's Municipal Strategic Statement identifies heritage as a defining characteristic of the municipality, and a major part of Melbourne's attraction. Heritage places enhance the city's appeal as a place in which to live, work, invest and visit.

Heritage places outside the Capital City Zone (CCZ) encompass ~~heritage precincts, individual heritage places and within and outside heritage precincts, and historic streets and lanes.~~ These places ~~date from pre-European settlement, to the mid-nineteenth century through to more recent times, and~~ are variously of heritage value for their historic, aesthetic, social, spiritual and scientific significance.

The places include some of metropolitan Melbourne's most significant urban developments. They incorporate dwellings, institutions, industrial, manufacturing and commercial places, road and rail infrastructure, parks, gardens and places of recreation.

This policy provides guidance on conserving and enhancing heritage places outside the CCZ- ~~and is informed by the conservation principles, processes and practices of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter.~~ It encourages the conservation, preservation and restoration of heritage places, and development which enhances the heritage place and is compatible and in keeping with their-its cultural heritage values. The policy recognises that heritage places are living and working places; and that development should be considered in the context of the heritage policy objectives.

~~This policy seeks to ensure that heritage buildings are retained in their three dimensional form, not as two dimensional facades.~~

This policy should be read in conjunction with Statements of Significance as incorporated into this Scheme.

22.05-18

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Definitions

Term	Definition
Alteration	An alteration is to modify the fabric of a heritage place, without undertaking building works such as an addition.
Assessed significance	The assessed significance of an individual heritage place or heritage precinct is identified in the relevant statement of significance, as contained in the place citation. This normally identifies what is significant, how it is significant, and why it is significant.
Concealed/partly concealed	Concealed means <u>cannot be seen from a street (other than a lane, unless the lane is classified as significant) or public park. not visible from any part of the street serving the front or principal part of the building, as defined under 'visible'.</u> Partly concealed means that <u>a limited amount</u> some of the addition or higher rear part may be visible; provided it does not <u>visually</u> dominate <u>or reduce the prominence of</u> the <u>appearance of the existing</u> building's façade(s) and the streetscape.
Conservation	Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place to retain its heritage significance. It may include one or more of maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation.
Context	The c Context means the setting of a heritage place <u>can include: its setting</u> (-as defined under 'setting'), <u>including</u> the immediate

Term	Definition
	landholding, adjoining significant or contributory places, and the surrounding area.
Contextual design	A contextual design for new buildings and additions to existing buildings is one which adopts an interpretive design approach, derived through analysis of the subject property and its heritage context. Such an approach requires allows new development to comfortably and harmoniously integrate with the site and its streetscape character. The approach can include respectful contemporary architecture.
Cultural significance	Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.
Development	<p>Development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction or exterior alteration of a building • demolition or removal of a building or works • construction or carrying out of works • subdivision or consolidation of land, including buildings or airspace • placing or relocation of a building or works on land • construction or putting up for display of signs or hoardings
Enhance	Enhance means to improve the presentation and appearance of a heritage place through restoration, reconstruction or removal of unsympathetic or intrusive elements; <u>and through appropriate development.</u>
Fabric	Fabric means all the physical material of the heritage place.
<u>Facadism</u>	<u>The retention of the exterior face/faces of a building without the three-dimensional built form providing for its/their structural support, and, without retention of an understanding of the function of the three-dimensional building form.</u>
Front or principal part of a building	<p>The front or principal part of a building is generally considered to be the front two rooms <u>in depth, complete</u> with <u>the structure and cladding to the</u> roof; or that part of the building associated with the primary roof form, whichever is the greater. <u>For residential buildings this is generally 8 metres in depth.</u></p> <p>For most non-residential buildings, the front part is generally considered to be one full structural bay in depth <u>-complete with the structure and cladding to the roof. This is generally 8 – 10 metres in depth. or 8 metres, including the roof.</u></p> <p><u>For corner sites, the front or principal part of a building includes side and rear elevations.</u></p> <p><u>For sites with more than one frontage, the front or principal part of a building relates to each frontage.</u></p>
Heritage place	A heritage place has been assessed to have <u>been assessed to have natural or cultural identified</u> heritage value and can include a site, area or space, building or other works, structure, group of buildings, precinct, archaeological site, landscape, garden or tree.
Heritage precinct (as referred to in this policy)	A heritage precinct is an area which has been identified as having heritage significance. It is identified as such in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and mapped in the Planning Scheme Heritage Overlay Maps.

Term	Definition
Individual heritage place (as referred to in this policy)	An individual heritage place is equivalent to a significant heritage place. It may be graded significant within a heritage precinct. It may also have an individual Heritage Overlay control, and be located within or outside a heritage precinct.
Key attributes	The key attributes or important characteristics of a heritage precinct are identified in the precinct statement of significance.
Lane	Includes reference to public or private lanes, and ROWs.
Maintenance	Maintenance means the continuous protective care of a place, and its setting, and is distinguished from repair which involves restoration or reconstruction.
Massing	Massing means the arrangement of a building's bulk and its articulation into parts.
Preservation	Preservation is maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.
Reconstruction	Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state, and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material.
Respectful and interpretive	When used in relation to design, respectful and interpretive refers to design that honestly admits its modernity while relating to the historic or architecturally significant character of its context. Respectful means a modern design approach to new buildings, additions and alterations to buildings, in which historic building size <u>and</u> form <u>are adopted</u> ; <u>and</u> , proportions and details are referenced but not directly copied, and sympathetic colours and materials are used. Interpretive means a looser and simplified modern interpretation of historic building form, details and materials.
Restoration	Restoration means returning a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or later additions, or by reassembling existing elements. It is distinguished from reconstruction through not introducing new material.
Services and ancillaries	Services and ancillaries include, but are not limited to, satellite dishes, shade canopies and sails, solar panels, water storage tanks, disabled access ramps and handrails, air conditioners, cooling or heating systems and hot water services.
Setting	Setting means the immediate and extended environment of a <u>heritage</u> place that is part of or contributes to its significance.
Streetscape	A streetscape is a collection of buildings along a street frontage. When referred to in relation to a precinct, a streetscape typically contains a majority of buildings which are graded significant or contributory.
Significant streetscape (as referred to in this policy)	Significant streetscapes are collections of buildings outstanding either because they are a particularly well preserved group from a similar period or style, or because they are <u>a collection of highly significant buildings</u> <u>significant</u> in their own right.
Use	Use means the functions of a place, including the activities and traditional and customary practices which may occur at the place or are dependent on the place.
Visible	Visible means anything that can be seen from a street (other than a

Term	Definition
	lane, unless the lane is classified as significant) or public park.

22.05-17 Grading of heritage places

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The grading (significant, contributory or non-contributory) of properties outside the Capital City Zone is identified in the incorporated document *Heritage Places Inventory 2017*. Significant Streetscapes are also identified in this incorporated document. ~~Other streetscapes may also be significant and other information may be considered in determining the significance of a streetscape where limited information is provided in the existing citation or Council documentation.~~

‘Significant’ heritage place:

A ‘significant’ heritage place is individually important at state or local level, and a heritage place in its own right. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the municipality. A ‘significant’ heritage place may be highly valued by the community; is typically externally intact; and/or has notable features associated with the place type, use, period, method of construction, siting or setting. When located in a heritage precinct a ‘significant’ heritage place can make an important contribution to the precinct.

‘Contributory’ heritage place:

A ‘contributory’ heritage place is important for its contribution to a heritage precinct. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the heritage precinct. A ‘contributory’ heritage place may be valued by the community; a representative example of a place type, period or style; and/or combines with other visually or stylistically related places to demonstrate the historic development of a heritage precinct. ‘Contributory’ places are typically externally intact, but may have visible changes which do not detract from the contribution to the heritage precinct.

‘Non-contributory’ place:

A ‘non-contributory’ place does not make a contribution to the ~~cultural heritage~~ significance or historic character of the heritage precinct.

22.05-2 Policy Objectives

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

- To conserve and enhance Melbourne’s heritage places.
- To ~~retain~~ conserve fabric of historic, aesthetic, social, spiritual and scientific heritage value, which contributes to the significance, character ~~or and~~ appearance of heritage places ~~and precincts~~.
- To recognise ~~and conserve~~ the assessed significance of heritage places and streetscapes, as ~~referenced in this policy or incorporated into this planning scheme~~ ~~adopted by Council~~, as the basis for consideration of development and works. Further information may be considered, including in relation to streetscapes, where there is limited information in the existing citation or Council documentation.
- ~~To ensure new development is respectful of the assessed significance of heritage places.~~
- To ensure new development is respectful of the character and appearance of heritage places.
- ~~To encourage high quality contextual design for new development, which and generally avoids replication of historic forms and details.~~
- ~~To encourage retention of the three dimensional fabric and form of a building and to discourage façadism.~~
- ~~To encourage the adaptive reuse of heritage places.~~
- To ensure new development is ~~consistent with informed by~~ the conservation principles, processes and practices of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter.

- To enhance the presentation and appearance of heritage places through restoration and, where evidence exists, reconstruction of original or contributory fabric elements.
- To protect significant views and vistas to heritage places.
- To promote the protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage.

22.05-3 Permit Application Requirements

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The following, where relevant, may be required to be lodged with a permit application.

- Where major or consequential development is proposed to significant heritage places, the responsible authority may require preparation of a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), which is in accordance with the Heritage Council of Victoria's 'Conservation Management Plans: Managing Heritage Places A Guide 2010'.
- ~~For all applications involving significant or contributory heritage places, other than minor works,~~ The responsible authority may require preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS), which is in accordance with Heritage Victoria's 'Guidelines for preparing Heritage Impact Statements'. In a heritage precinct, the HIS should address impacts on adjoining significant or contributory buildings and the immediate heritage context, in addition to impacts on the subject place.
- Where works are associated with significant vegetation (as listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay or vegetation of assessed significance), an arboricultural report should be prepared. The report should, where relevant, address landscape significance, arboricultural condition, impacts on the vegetation and impacts on the assessed significance of the heritage precinct.
- For development in heritage precincts, the responsible authority may require sight lines, and heights of existing and adjoining buildings, streetscape elevations, photos and 3D model, as necessary to determine the impact of the proposed works.
- A comprehensive explanation as to how the proposed development achieves the policy objectives.

22.05-4 Performance Standards for Assessing Planning Applications

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The performance standards set out below outline the criteria by which heritage aspects of planning applications will be assessed. ~~Definitions of words used in these performance standards are included at the end of this policy at 22.05-18.~~

~~Variation from the performance standards requires a readily understandable reasoned explanation of how the policy objectives are addressed.~~

22.05-5 Demolition

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The demolition of a non-contributory place will generally be permitted.

Full demolition of significant or contributory buildings ~~will not would~~ normally only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.

Partial demolition will not generally normally be permitted in the case of significant buildings, and of significant elements or the front or principal part of contributory buildings.

Retention of the three dimensional form is encouraged; facadism is discouraged.

The adaptive reuse of a heritage place is encouraged.

The poor condition of a significant or contributory building will is not be considered in itself justification for permitting demolition.

A demolition permit should not be granted until the proposed replacement building or works have been approved.

Where approval is granted for full demolition of a significant building, a recording program including, but not limited to, archival photographic recording and/or measured drawings may be required prior to demolition, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

~~The Demolition of front-fences and outbuildings which contribute to the cultural significance of the heritage place is discouraged~~~~will not normally be permitted.~~

Before deciding on an application for full or partial demolition, the responsible authority will consider, as appropriate:

- The assessed significance of the heritage place ~~and/or~~ building.
- The character and appearance of the building or works and its contribution to the historic, social and architectural values, character and appearance of the heritage place.
- The significance of the fabric or part of the building, and the degree to which it contributes to ~~the perception of~~ the three-dimensional form ~~and depth~~ of the building, regardless of whether it is visible.
- Whether the demolition or removal of any part of the building contributes to the long-term conservation of the significant fabric of the building.
- Whether the demolition is detrimental to the conservation of the heritage place

22.05-6 Alterations

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

External fabric which contributes to the cultural heritage significance of the heritage place, on any part of a significant building, and on any visible part of a contributory building, should be preserved.

Alterations to non-contributory buildings and fabric must be respectful of, and not detract from the assessed cultural significance of the heritage precinct.

Sandblasting of render, masonry or timber surfaces and painting of previously unpainted surfaces will not generally normally be permitted.

Before deciding on an application to alter the fabric of a significant or contributory building, the responsible authority will consider, as appropriate:

- The assessed cultural significance of the building and- heritage place ~~building.~~
- The degree to which the works would detract from the significance, character and appearance of the building and heritage place.
- Its structural condition.
- The character and appearance of the proposed replacement materials.
- Whether ~~The degree to which~~ the works can be reversed without ~~an unacceptable~~ loss of fabric which contributes to significance.

Removal of paint from originally unpainted masonry or other surfaces is encouraged providing this can be undertaken without damage to the heritage fabric.

The introduction of awnings and verandahs to ground floor façades and shopfronts may be permitted where:

- The works reconstruct an original awning or verandah, based on evidence of the original form, detailing and materials; or
- The awning is an appropriate contextual design response, compatibly placed in relation to the building, and can be removed without ~~an unacceptable~~ loss of fabric which contributes to cultural heritage significance.

22.05-8 Additions

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Additions to buildings in a heritage precinct must be respectful of and in keeping with:

- Identified 'key attributes' of the heritage precinct.
- Precinct characteristics including building height, massing and form; style and architectural expression; details; materials; front and side setbacks; and orientation.

- Character and appearance of adjoining-nearby significant and contributory buildings.

Where abutting a lane, additions must be respectful of the scale and form of heritage fabric to the lane.

Additions to significant or contributory buildings should:

- Be respectful of the building's character and appearance, scale, materials, style and architectural expression.
- Not visually dominate or visually disrupt the appreciation of the building as it presents to the streetscape(s).
- Maintain the perception-prominence of the three dimensional form and depth of the building by setting back the addition behind the front or principal part of the building, and from other visible secondary elevation(s) and moderating height.
- Not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of the significant or contributory building.
- ~~Retain~~ significant roof form within the setback from the building façade together with any chimneys or similar roof elements of original fabric.
- Not obscure views of façades or elevations associated with the front or principal part of the building.
- Be distinguishable from the original fabric of the building.

The design of additions must:

- Adopt high quality and respectful contextual design.
- Avoid a direct reproduction of the form of historic fabric ~~elements~~.
- Adopt an interpretive design approach to other details such as verandahs, fences, and shopfronts.

Concealment of additions:

Additions to a significant or contributory building ~~should~~ must be concealed in significant streetscapes.

In other streetscapes, additions to significant buildings ~~should always~~ must be concealed. In other streetscapes, additions and to contributory buildings should be partly concealed - some of the addition or higher rear part may be visible, provided it does not dominate or reduce the prominence of the building's façade(s) and the streetscape:

- For a second-storey addition to a single storey building, concealment is often achieved by setting back the addition at least 8 metres behind the front facade.
- A ground level addition to the side of a building should be set back behind the front or principal part of the building.

Additions to corner properties may be visible, but should be respectful of the significant or contributory building in terms of scale and placement, and not dominate or ~~visually disrupt the appreciation of the building~~ diminish the prominence of the building or adjoining contributory or significant building .

22.05-7 New Buildings

--(201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

New buildings must be respectful of and should not detract from the assessed cultural heritage significance of the heritage place.

New buildings ~~-must~~ should:

- Be respectful of the heritage place and in keeping with:
 - Identified 'Key attributes' of the heritage precinct such as:
 - ~~Precinct characteristics including~~ Building height, massing and form; style and architectural expression; details; materials; front and side setbacks; and orientation and fencing.
- Prevailing streetscape height and scale.

- Not obscure views from the street(s) and public parks of the front or principal part of adjoining significant or contributory places or buildings.
- Not visually dominate or visually disrupt the appreciation of the heritage place by:
 - maintaining a façade height which is consistent with that of adjoining significant or contributory buildings, whichever is the lesser, and
 - setting back higher rear building components.
- Not adopt a façade height which is significantly lower than prevailing heights in the streetscape.
- Neither be positioned forward of the façade of adjoining significant or contributory heritage places or buildings, or set back significantly behind the prevailing building line in the streetscape.
- Not build over or extend into the air space above the front or principal part of an adjoining significant or contributory building or place.
- Where abutting a lane, be respectful of the scale and form of historic fabric-elements of heritage places abutting the lane.

The design of new buildings- ~~must~~ should:

- Adopt high quality and respectful contextual design.
- Adopt an interpretive design approach to other details such as verandahs, fences and shopfronts.

In significant streetscapes, higher rear parts of a new building should be concealed.

In other streetscapes, higher rear parts of a new building should be partly concealed - ~~some~~ of the addition or higher rear part may be visible, provided it does not dominate or reduce the prominence of the building's façade(s) and the streetscape.

22.05-9 Restoration and Reconstruction

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Where there is evidence of what a building originally looked like, ~~renovation-buildings and works~~ on any part of a significant building, or any visible part of a contributory building, should form part of an authentic restoration or reconstruction process, or should not preclude such a process at a future date (evidence of what a building used to look like might include other parts of the building or early photographs and plans).

22.05-10 Subdivision

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Subdivision of a heritage place should:

- Reflect the pattern of development in the streetscape or precinct, whichever is most relevant to the place.
- Ensure that ~~Maintain an~~ appropriate setting s and contexts for significant and contributory heritage buildings and places are maintained including the retention or any original garden areas, large trees and other features which contribute to the significance of the heritage place, to the significant or contributory building.
- Not provide for future development which will visually disrupt the setting and impact on the presentation of the significant or contributory building.
- Provide for three dimensional building envelopes for future built form to each lot proposed.

Subdivision of airspace above heritage buildings, to provide for future development, is discouraged.

22.05-11 ~~Relocation~~

~~201-~~
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

~~A proposal to relocate a significant or contributory building or structure may be permitted where the existing location of the heritage place is not part of its significance.~~

22.05-12 Vehicle Accommodation and Access

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The introduction of on-site car parking, garages and carports, and vehicle crossovers is discouraged and should only may be permitted where:

- The On-grade car parking is located to the rear of the property, and or to the side setback where this is an established streetscape characteristic.
- ~~The new vehicle crossover is no wider than three metres, and crossovers are common elements of the streetscape.~~
- For a significant or contributory building, the new garage or carport is placed behind the principal of front part of the main building line (excluding verandahs, porches, bay windows or similar projecting features), and:
 - it will be visually recessive;
 - ~~the height is below that of the main roof form of the building;~~
 - it will not conceal an original contributory element of the building (other than a plain side wall); and
 - the form, details and materials are respectful of the building, but do not replicate details of the building.
- Where this is an established characteristic of the streetscape or precinct, rRamps to basement or sub-basement car parking are located to the rear of the property, or to a side street or side lane boundary, where they would not visually disrupt the setting of the significant or contributory building, or impact on the streetscape character.

22.05-13 Fences and Gates

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

New or replacement fences or gates to the front or principal part of a significant or contributory building may be permitted where:

- the works reconstruct an original fence or gate, based on evidence of the original form, detailing and materials; or
- the new fence is an appropriate contextual design response, where the style, details and materials are interpretive and consistent with the architectural period of the heritage place and established streetscape characteristics.

New fences and gates should also:

- not conceal views of the building; and
- be a maximum height of 1.2 to metres if solid, or 1.5 metres; and
- if more than 50% transparent.

22.04-XX Trees

Ensure buildings and works respect trees with assessed cultural significance (noted in the schedule to this overlay) by siting proposed new development at a distance that ensures the ongoing health of the tree.

New buildings and works should also comply with the Australian Standard AD 4970-2009 Protection of trees on development sites for vegetation of assessed significance.

22.05-14 Services and Ancillaries

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

The installation of services and ancillaries, in particular those that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions or water consumption such as solar panels, solar hot water services or water storage tanks, may be permitted on any visible part of significant or contributory buildings where it can be demonstrated there is no feasible alternative and the services and ancillaries will not detract from the character and appearance of the building or heritage place.

Items affixed to roofs, such as solar panels, should align with the profile of the roof.

Services and ancillaries should be installed in a manner whereby they can be removed without damaging significant fabric.

For new buildings, services and ancillaries should be concealed, integrated or incorporated into the design of the building.

22.05-15 Street Fabric and Infrastructure

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Street furniture, including shelters, seats, rubbish bins, bicycle racks, drinking fountains and the like, should be designed and sited to avoid:

- impacts on views to significant or contributory places and contributory elements; and
- physical impacts on bluestone kerbs, channels and gutters, ~~and~~ other historic street infrastructure ~~and historic street tree plantings.~~

For existing significant and contributory street fabric and infrastructure, it is policy that:

- restoration, reconstruction and maintenance should be carried out in a way that retains the original fabric, form and appearance.

22.05-16 Signage

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

New signage associated with heritage places should:

- Minimise visual clutter.
- Not conceal architectural features or details which contribute to the significance of the heritage place.
- Not damage the fabric of the heritage place.
- Be in keeping with historical signage in terms of size and proportion in relation to the heritage place.
- Be readily removable.

Advertising signs may be placed in locations where they were traditionally placed.

The historical use of signage may be justification for new or replacement signage.

Existing signage that is deemed to have heritage value should be retained, and not altered or obscured, including historic painted signage.

22.05-19 Reference Documents

--/201-
Proposed
C258
Exhibition

Central Activities District Conservation Study 1985
Harbour, Railways, Industrial Conservation
South Melbourne Conservation Study 1985
Central City (Hoddle Grid) Heritage Review 2011
Bourke Hill Precinct Heritage Review Amendment C240 2015
City North Heritage Review, RBA Architects 2013
East Melbourne & Jolimont Conservation Study 1985
Parkville Conservation Study 1985
North & West Melbourne Conservation Study 1985, & 1994
Flemington & Kensington Conservation Study 1985
Carlton, North Carlton and Princes Hill Conservation Study 1994 & 1985
South Yarra Conservation Study 1985
South Melbourne Conservation Study 1985 & 1998
Harbour, Railway, Industrial Conservation Study 1985
Kensington Heritage Review, Graeme Butler 2013
Review of Heritage Buildings in Kensington: Percy Street Area, Graeme Butler 2013

~~[City North Heritage Review, RBA Architects 2013](#)~~

~~[Arden Macaulay Heritage Review, Graeme Butler 2012](#)~~

West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016

MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME

Incorporated Document

West Melbourne Heritage Review Statements of Significance 2016

~~West Melbourne Baptist Church manse~~~~2 Hawke Street, WEST MELBOURNE~~

New grading system:	Significant and Contributory
Place type:	House
Date(s):	1917
View of place:	2015

~~Statement of Significance~~~~What is significant?~~

~~West Melbourne Baptist Church commissioned builder (and designer?) R J Werner, of 16 Ross Street, Port Melbourne, to build this brick manse in 1917 for an estimated cost of £900. The house included an entry hall, front bedroom, study, dining, bathroom, two bedrooms, breakfast room, kitchen at the rear, pantry, wash house, and a WC was attached. The house was declared finished 10/11/1917. Clergy such as the Rev T. P. Trinham, Rev Edwin Bungey, and the Rev Thos. A. V. Paul lived here.~~

~~The Baptist Church was located on the west side of this triangular block, an allotment permanently reserved for the Baptists to allow a stone church to be erected there in 1866. The land was first aside by the Colonial Government in 31 July 1865 as the 'Hotham Baptist Church' with trustees Edward Gibbs, William Smith, Robert Harvey, Thomas McFarlane and William Bryant. The site was conveniently located just east of the Benevolent Asylum.~~

~~Church historian Rev Wilkin observed in 1938:~~

~~'...With such a history and with such pastors and fellow labourers, it is no wonder that for many years West Melbourne was one of the most important in the Denomination, but in the course of years its surroundings have completely changed. It has ceased to be a desirable residential district; many of its members moved away to Footscray, Newmarket, etc., and others have not yet been received in their place. Possibly in coming years some at least of the former experiences may be revived.'~~

~~This was not the case and in the 1960s the congregation abandoned the church and sought to develop the land for other purposes that involved demolition of the 1866 stone church.~~

~~Adjoining the rear of the manse is a complex designed by noted architects Edmond and Corrigan which includes a new chapel and meeting room hall with vestry and toilet facilities, and two residential units for crisis accommodation (address 4 Miller Street) completed in 1990.~~

~~Contributory elements include:~~

- ~~• detached brick single-storey Arts and Crafts Bungalow on an island site;~~
- ~~• rough cast stucco main wall finish with red brick featured in gable ends and as dado;~~
- ~~• gabled roof form clad with unglazed Marseilles pattern terra cotta tiles, with red brick chimneys and pots, and louvered gable vents;~~
- ~~• distinctive Arts and Crafts arched and buttressed porch, arches trimmed with red rubbed brickwork, also used as~~

- ~~window headers elsewhere;~~
- ~~▲ flat roof boxed and faceted window bays, with leaded toplight;~~
- ~~▲ entry door with top and side lights; and~~
- ~~▲ symbolic link with former church occupation of site.~~

How is it significant?

~~The West Melbourne Baptist Church manse is significant historically and aesthetically to West Melbourne.~~

Why is it significant?

~~The West Melbourne Baptist Church manse is significant.~~

- ~~▲ Historically, as the only physical link with the long and rich history of the Baptist congregation in West Melbourne on this reserve and, itself, the place for near to 100 years of occupation by the church; and~~
- ~~▲ Aesthetically, a well-preserved and early example of an Arts and Crafts Bungalow style manse, distinctive among the pervading Victorian era character of West Melbourne.~~

Edward J. and Samuel Spink workshop, also J. B. Watson's stores, later Molloy and Co, hide and skin merchants

488-494 La Trobe Street, WEST MELBOURNE



New grading system:	Significant
Place type:	Factory, store
Date(s):	1882
View of place:	2015

Statement of Significance

What is significant?

Builder Kay Noble of Erin Street Richmond erected this factory-workshop in 1882 for the Spink Brothers, wholesale and retail tinsmiths, jam and fruit preservers of Melbourne. Noted architect, Thomas Watts, was the designer.

The Spink Brothers' tin works was at this address and their preserving works at La Trobe Street East. By 1890, Edward John Spink and Samuel Spink were declared insolvent due to insufficient capital, arising from having sold goods too cheaply to compete; Samuel was dead by 1897. The JB Watson Trust and later Joseph W Ellis were the next major owners, leasing the building to firms such as Sass and Cockram.

The complex has developed over time with the 1895 plan showing the probable 1880s extent. Now the building extends further into the block with new fibre cement sheet clad sawtooth roofing abutting and replacing the original roofline, possibly for use by Molloy and Co, hide and skin merchants or C. N. Meyers, paper merchants.

The growth of industry in the north and west of Melbourne is reflected by the location of this workshop, reflecting the growing railway and shipping connections forged by the Coode canal construction from the 1870s to its completion in 1886, linking the port and shipping with the vast inland railway network to provide produce for food processing in works such as Spinks. Factories and warehouses were grouped once again around the transport links on the west side of Melbourne's commercial area, after the initial limited port facilities offered by the Yarra River at the founding of the City in the 1830s.

The architect Thomas Watts was responsible for a number of large Victorian-era commercial projects including part of Felton Grimwade and Company's early chemical works, West Melbourne, and the now demolished Robb's Building (similar elevation to this building). The firm has a number of places listed on the Victorian Heritage Register and some 269 entries in the Australian Architecture Index.

Victorian Heritage Register examples associated with Watts include:

- Dalmeny House etc 21, 23 Queensberry Street, Carlton, erected in 1888 by the Paterson family;
- Malvern House Willoby Avenue, Glen Iris built in 1891-2;
- Bontharambo Homestead Boorhaman Road, Wangaratta;
- Prince's Park Grandstand Park Street, Maryborough;
- CSR Complex Whitehall Street, Yarraville, 1870s wing; and
- Bank Of Victoria Camp Street, Beechworth.

This building was identified in the Central Activities District (CAD) Conservation Study of 1985, with the note that it possessed 'high integrity for type and scale in the CAD'. This integrity has been reduced since.

Contributory elements include:

- 2 storey cemented parapeted Italian Renaissance Revival style façade;
- simple cornice and entablature;
- double-hung sash windows to upper level with cemented architraves;
- double-hung sash windows to east side wall;
- red brick saw-tooth rear wings potential early 20th century visible on west;
- original side wall, fenestration and roofline on east side (loading doors changed); and
- ground level segmentally arched openings, with identified significant window joinery and openings extended to near ground level since 1985.

Changes to ground level as above, former lobby door entry changed since 1985; bricks painted over east side wall, openings and loading doors changed. Sawtooth wall and roofing added.

How is it significant?

Edward J and Samuel Spink's tinsmith workshop is significant historically and aesthetically to West Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

Edward J. and Samuel Spink's tinsmith workshop is significant.

- Historically, as an early and relatively well-preserved industrial building in the Melbourne Central Activities District, linked with jam making, fruit preserving and the Spink brothers; brothers; **also a reflection, by its location, of the access to the growing transport networks in this part of the City linking manufacturers to markets and suppliers;** and
- Aesthetically, as a custom workshop design by renowned architect, Thomas Watts in the prevailing commercial style **and inclusion of valuable early shopfront joinery.**

Thomas Hulse house, later Haddon's house, part 159 -163 Roden Street, West Melbourne



163 Roden Street, WEST MELBOURNE

New grading system:	Significant and Contributory
Place type:	House
Date(s):	1864-5
View of place:	2015

Statement of Significance

What is significant?

This formerly four room stone house was built for Thomas Hulse 1864-5. Thomas Hulse, born in Cheshire, England, in 1834 and dying at Middle Park in 1915, was a Running Loco Foreman in the Victorian Railways and active on the railways from the 1850s-1890s. Thomas and his brother Allan were prominent pioneering engine drivers on the Melbourne to Bendigo from when it reached Sunbury in 1859. Thomas was involved in a number of high profile investigations into deaths on the railways, reported in the Melbourne press. Retiring in 1895, he was retained as a railways engineering consultant by the Railways Department until after 1900. Hulse epitomises the close association of West Melbourne with the vast railway complex adjoining. Hulse died wealthy.

The house was later owned and occupied by mining investor and engineer Robert Haddon in the 1860s. It was a twin to the house at 167 owned and occupied by John McFarlane. Robert and wife Mary were to later own and occupy nearby 154 Roden Street (q.v.) Ownership from the 1880s-1890s included two Victorian Railways employees, Charles Bath fireman and Robert Moore, a Roden Street engine driver, who had joined the service in 1874.

The house has the characteristic high hipped roof form of an early Victorian-era residence with its underlying stone construction a link to nearby stone quarrying and early building practice before local brick making created a more reliable product. By the 1980s however the stone had been rendered over and the verandah removed: it has since been recreated.

Contributory elements include:

- double fronted early Victorian-era house;
- symmetrical simple façade;
- high hipped roof typically clad with shingles, now clad with corrugated iron or similar;
- stone (?) chimney with distinctively early slim cornice detailing;
- double-hung sash windows;
- central doorway and toplight; and
- relationship with the adjoining early house, 159 Roden Street and contribution to early Victorian-era streetscape with 171-177 Roden Street.

Integrity is fair despite the added timber verandah and picket front fence which are related to the house period, side wall rendering, and new openings. The publicly visible two-storey rear addition is unrelated to the historical scale and character of the house.

How is it significant?

Thomas Hulse later Haddon's house at 163 Roden Street is of contributory significance to the row 159-163 Roden Street which is significant historically to West Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

Thomas Hulse later Haddon's house at 163 Roden Street is significant.

- Historically, as a perceptibly early house in West Melbourne as shown by its simple high-hipped form and small scale, also indicative of the first stages of building in the area, and for a long time associated with two railways employees, Bath and Moore, and Robert Haddon who as a gold mining investor and engineer represented the influx of population into Melbourne at this time; also associated with engine driver, Thomas Hulse, who received publicity in the Melbourne press as well as high rank within the Victorian Railways workforce.

Briscoe and Co ironmongers warehouse complex, part, 135-141 Hawke Street wing

164-170, part Roden Street, WEST MELBOURNE



New grading system:	Significant and Contributory
Place type:	Warehouse
Date(s):	1925
View of place:	2015

Statement of Significance

Part Briscoe and Co ironmongers warehouse complex, 164-184 Roden Street (includes 135-141 Hawke Street), West Melbourne.

What is significant?

Renowned architects Oakden, Addison and Kemp designed the first stage of this large warehouse complex at the corner of Adderley and Roden Streets for successful ironmongers, Briscoe and Co. as part of their iron yard. The MMBW Detail Plans 730, 731 (1895) show Briscoe and Company as occupying 143-159 Hawke Street, 172-180 Roden Street, and 216 Adderley Street, as one large building with three pitched crossings to Adderley and one each to Roden, Hawke Streets.

The 1895 MMBW plan shows 164-170 Roden Street as adjoining houses. However these were replaced in 1925 when Purchas and Teague designed this new warehouse addition to the north of the complex. The company continued to occupy the building into the 1940s. By the 1970s, the building was occupied by Universal Pipelines Pty. Ltd..

Contributory elements include:

- double-storey rendered masonry Interwar industrial building;
- a corrugated galvanised steel transverse gabled and sawtooth roof concealed behind a parapet;
- two street frontages, to Hawke Street and Roden Street, each dominated by a distinctive large semi-circular arched entrance linked by an internal roadway; and
- three wide but shallow piers which stop short of a moulded string course as the sole decoration.
- There are six non-original windows over two levels on the Hawke Street elevation.

How is it significant?

The former Briscoe and Co. building at 164-170 Roden Street and 135-141 Hawke Street, West Melbourne, is of contributory significance historically and aesthetically to the Briscoe and Co ironmongers warehouse complex and West Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

The former Briscoe and Co. building at 164-170 Roden Street and 135-141 Hawke Street, West Melbourne, is of contributory significance to the Briscoe and Co ironmongers warehouse complex.

- Historically, the building is representative of the Interwar surge in West Melbourne industrial development, in this case as expansion of an existing large and important late-nineteenth century industrial complex, Briscoe and Company, in West Melbourne; and
- Aesthetically, as a reasonably intact industrial building which is characterised by its austere facades to Hawke and Roden Streets, both of which incorporate impressive arched openings.



Melbourne Planning Scheme

Incorporated Document

Amendment C258:

Heritage Precincts Statements of Significance 2017

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

Contents

Precincts within the Capital City Zone	5
1.0 Bank Place	5
1.1 Statement of Significance.....	5
1.2 Key Attributes	5
2.0 Bourke Hill precinct	5
2.1 What is Significance	5
2.2 How is it Significant	6
2.3 Why is it Significant	6
3.0 Bourke West Precinct.....	7
3.1 Statement of Significance.....	7
3.2 Key Attributes	7
4.0 Collins East Precinct	8
4.1 Statement of Significance.....	8
4.2 Key Attributes	8
5.0 Flinders Gate Precinct.....	8
5.1 Statement of Significance.....	8
5.2 Key Attributes	9
6.0 Flinders Lane Precinct.....	9
6.1 Statement of Significance.....	9
7.2 Key Attributes	9
7.0 Little Bourke Precinct	10
7.1 Statement of Significance.....	10
7.2 Key Attributes	10
8.0 Post Office Precinct.....	10
8.1 Statement of Significance.....	10
8.2 Key Attributes	11
9.0 The Block Precinct	11
9.1 Statement of Significance.....	11
9.2 Key Attributes	11
10.0 The Queen Victoria Market Precinct	12
10.1 Statement of Significance.....	12
10.2 Key Attributes	12
11.0 Little Lon Precinct.....	12
11.1 Statement of Significance.....	12

11.2 Key Attributes	12
Precincts outside the Capital City Zone.....	14
1.0 HO1 – Carlton Precinct.....	14
1.1 History	14
1.2 Description.....	16
1.2.1 Pattern of development	17
1.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	18
1.3 Statement of Significance.....	18
What is significant?	19
How is it significant?	20
Why is it significant?	20
2.0 HO2 – East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct	21
2.1 History	21
2.2 Description.....	24
2.2.1 Pattern of development	25
2.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	26
2.3 Statement of Significance.....	27
What is significant?	27
How is it significant?	28
Why is it significant?	28
3.0 HO3 – North and West Melbourne Precinct	29
3.1 History	29
3.2 Description.....	32
3.2.1 Pattern of development	33
3.2.2 Topography	34
3.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	34
3.3 Statement of Significance.....	34
How is it significant?	36
Why is it significant?	36
4.0 HO4 – Parkville Precinct.....	37
4.1 History	37
4.2 Description.....	39
4.2.1 Pattern of development	40
4.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	41
4.3 Statement of Significance.....	41
What is significant?	42
How is it significant?	43

Why is it significant?	43
5.0 HO6 – South Yarra Precinct	44
5.1 History	44
5.2 Description.....	47
5.2.1 Pattern of development	48
5.2.2 Topography	49
5.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	49
5.3 Statement of Significance.....	49
What is significant?	50
How is it significant?	51
Why is it significant?	51
6.0 HO9 – Kensington Precinct	52
6.1 History	52
6.2 Description.....	54
6.2.1 Pattern of development	55
6.2.2 Topography	56
6.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings.....	56
6.3 Statement of Significance.....	56
What is significant?	56
How is it significant?	57
Why is it significant?	57

Precincts within the Capital City Zone

1.0 Bank Place

1.1 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.

1.2 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.

2.0 Bourke Hill precinct

2.1 What is Significance

The Bourke Hill Precinct, located in the north east of the CBD, comprises Spring, Little Bourke, Bourke, Little Collins and Exhibition Streets and the network of laneways between the major streets. It contains a range of buildings that predominantly date from the nineteenth century, with a number of significant buildings dating from the early twentieth century through to the Postwar period. The precinct contains a number of landmark buildings.

Elements which contribute to the significance of the precinct include (but are NOT limited to):

- All buildings and land identified as significant and / or contributory;
- The regularity of the Hoddle Grid;
- The hierarchy and network of streets, lanes and alleyways;
- The early street materials including bluestone pitchers, kerbs and gutters;
- The distinctive character between the streets and lanes notably: the change in scale, visual contribution of the side and rear elements of the significant built forms, and cohesive materials;
- The character of various laneways, formed by the heritage buildings that face onto them, along with the side and rear walls of buildings that face into the main streets;
- The side elevations, rear elevations, roof forms (including chimneys) and rear walls, etc. that are visible throughout the precinct due to the particular configuration of laneway development in combination with the regular layout of main and sub-streets;
- The pre-1875 (pre land boom) buildings, as a rare collection of early buildings;

- The diverse architectural expression linking the key periods of Melbourne's development (from pre gold rush to the Postwar period), seen throughout the precinct;
- Evidence of layering through the application of later change and the influence of various cultures, seen throughout the precinct;
- The low scale of the buildings to Bourke Street and the precinct as a whole;
- Narrow frontages to Bourke Street;
- Cohesive massing and use of materials present on Bourke Street;
- The continuing presence of a retail, restaurant and café culture within the precinct;
- Visual dominance of the three landmark buildings: Hotel Windsor, Princess Theatre and Parliament House (including steps and 'piazza');
- Vista along Bourke Street East towards Parliament House taking in the consistent diminutive scale of Bourke Street East and its contrast with the monumentality of Parliament House and steps at the street's eastern termination. Vista includes the junction of Spring and Bourke Streets that form a 'piazza' to Parliament House;
- The vista along Bourke Street from the main entrance to Parliament House with expansive views of open sky that reinforces the consistent diminutive scale of the eastern end of Bourke Street and which, by comparison, increases the monumentality of Parliament House;
- The views to the Parliament Gardens from Little Bourke Street;
- The cohesive scale, architectural expression and materiality of the red brick buildings located on Little Bourke Street; and;
- The cohesive scale, Interwar & Postwar character and materiality of Crossley Street.

2.2 How is it Significant

The Bourke Hill Precinct is of aesthetic, architectural, historic, scientific and social significance to the City of Melbourne.

2.3 Why is it Significant

The Bourke Hill Precinct is of local significance to the City of Melbourne.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically significant as the land upon which the precinct sits and the site now occupied by Parliament House and steps is historically connected to its traditional owners, the Kulin clan as a meeting point prior to European settlement.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically significant as it demonstrates the early structure of the Hoddle Grid through its layout of main and sub-streets, interspersed with sporadic laneway development.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically and aesthetically significant as a longstanding section of the CBD, which demonstrates all aspects of growth and consolidation of the city from its early post-European beginnings through to the Postwar period seen in the early built form and layering of subsequent eras.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically and aesthetically significant as it contains the only surviving main CBD thoroughfare that retains a character and scale of the pre land boom era, and possesses a large collection of central city buildings surviving from the pre land boom era.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically significant as it demonstrates the pattern of immigration beginning from the first Jewish and European immigrants, to the wave of Italian immigration in the Postwar period. The

character of the precinct is a direct result of those different nationalities that have lived and worked in the area, making their mark on all aspects of the precinct.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically and socially significant as an entertainment and leisure precinct, containing well known cultural places such as Pellegrini's and Florentino's cafes and the Princess and Palace Theatres.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is aesthetically significant for its fine collection of landmark buildings that provide an outstanding streetscape along Spring Street.

The Precinct is aesthetically significant as it contains the unique vista east along Bourke Street terminating with the monumental presence of Parliament House and its setting. This vista is of high aesthetic value to the City of Melbourne and Victoria as a whole.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is of architecturally significant for its rich and varied architectural expression. It encompasses a range of styles from Early and Late Victorian, Federation, Interwar, Moderne and Postwar styles. The stylistic development of the precinct, seen not only in the expression of individual buildings, but also in the layering of subsequent eras, architectural expression and cultural influences, is of aesthetic and historic significance.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is of scientific significance through the presence of Turnbull Alley, and a notable collection of pre-gold rush buildings. The area is an extremely important and sensitive archaeological site within the CBD.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is of social significance for its connections to a large number of cultural, community and professional groups, and individuals. The precinct contains Parliament House a place of community gathering and it contains a strong association with many cultures that arrived as migrants from the early days of settlement.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is historically and socially significant as it contains Parliament House and connections with the Salvation Army. Parliament House is a place of importance in the operation of the State of Victorian and formerly Australia, and as a place for civic events and public meeting. At their City Temple, the Salvation Army, has provided religious and moral guidance and welfare services since the late nineteenth century.

The Bourke Hill Precinct is significant for its association with the following Victorians who have played a role in the development of the city: Robert Hoddle, surveyor of the original city grid and Sir Richard Bourke Governor of NSW.

3.0 Bourke West Precinct

3.1 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.

3.2 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.

4.0 Collins East Precinct

4.1 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 Chanonry 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.

4.2 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.

5.0 Flinders Gate Precinct

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

6.0 Flinders Lane Precinct

6.1 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.

7.2 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.

7.0 Little Bourke Precinct

7.1 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.

7.2 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.

8.0 Post Office Precinct

8.1 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.

8.2 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.

9.0 The Block Precinct

9.1 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.

9.2 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.

10.0 The Queen Victoria Market Precinct

10.1 Statement of Significance

The Queen Victoria Market precinct is of historic and social significance as Melbourne's premier market in operation for over 130 years (since the late 1870s), with origins dating back to 1859. It is the last surviving 19th century market established by the City of Melbourne, and has been an important hub of social life in the city. The Meat Hall, the oldest extant building, was constructed in 1869. It is one of the earliest, purpose-built market complexes in Australia, with its single span roof only the second of its type when erected. The market has evolved throughout its history in line with changing requirements, with several phases of expansion.

The Queen Victoria Market precinct is of aesthetic significance as a fine example of a Victorian era market which retains much of its original 19th century fabric intact. Its present configuration is largely that which was established by the end of the Interwar period. Architecturally, there is a mixture of utilitarian buildings – the sheds – and more elaborate brick buildings, with the most exuberant being the 1884 façade of the Meat Hall, by noted architect William Salway. The later but more intact Dairy Produce Hall (1929) features a distinctive Georgian Revival style to the upper part of the façade in combination with Art Deco style to the lower part (canopy, tiling and shop fronts). The groups of shops to Victoria and Elizabeth Streets are rare examples of such extensive, intact rows of Victorian period commercial buildings, as are the Interwar period shops to Franklin Street.

10.2 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.

11.0 Little Lon Precinct

11.1 Statement of Significance

The precinct is locally significant, historically, socially and aesthetically to the City of Melbourne. The building group, which epitomises the much publicised and interpreted 'Little Lon' district and its colourful past, represents three key development phases in the City's history, the immediate post golden era boom of the late 1850s and early 1860s, the development boom of the 1880s leading to the great Depression of the 1890s, and the Edwardian-era recovery with development of local manufacturing that also saw the establishment of a greater Chinatown in the street.

The building group commences with the gold rush era Exploration Hotel and develop through the 19th century with the associated boarding and row houses at 120-122 Little Lonsdale Street and the Leitrim Hotel, itself erected on an old hotel site. The next phase of building is from the Edwardian era with factory warehouse construction that was to serve the Chinese cabinet making and furniture trade.

11.2 Key Attributes

- A single and strong architectural expression derived from classical revival architecture that emerged in the Colony during the 1860s and is seen here extending into the Edwardian-era.

- Contributory elements include external walls and finishes, parapeted form, mouldings, fenestration, joinery two and three-storey scale, and roof form, along with any new material added in sympathy to the original fabric it replaced.
- The architecturally significant Leitrim Hotel displays a strong boom-era dynamism in its façade ornament.

Precincts outside the Capital City Zone

1.0 HO1 – Carlton Precinct¹

1.1 History

Carlton Precinct is located within the suburb of Carlton. The suburb was developed as part of the extension of Melbourne to its north in the mid-nineteenth century.

By the late 1840s, there were calls to extend the city boundaries to the north, with the *Argus* newspaper arguing 'there seems no good reason why the city should not be allowed to progress'.² In 1850, the site of the new Melbourne General Cemetery was approved, located a then suitable two miles from the north city boundary. In 1852, during Robert Hoddle's tenure as Surveyor General, survey plans were prepared by Charles Laing for the first residential allotments north of Victoria Street in what became Carlton and North Melbourne.³ The first sales of allotments south of Grattan Street took place in this period, and in 1853 the site of the University of Melbourne was reserved to the south of the new cemetery. An 1853 plan prepared by the Surveyor General's office shows the 'extension of Melbourne called Carlton' as being the area bounded by Victoria, Rathdowne, Grattan and Elizabeth streets.⁴

The slightly later 1855 Kearney plan shows subdivision of the suburb ending at a then unnamed Faraday Street and the site of the university. By 1857, when land between Grattan and Palmerston streets was auctioned, government notices identified the area as being in 'North Melbourne at Carlton'.⁵ The naming of the 'Carlton Gardens' reserve was another use of 'Carlton' as a designator of the area, although the suburb was still commonly referred to as North Melbourne through the 1860s.⁶

Numerous small buildings were constructed in Carlton in the early period of its development, many of which were one or two room timber cottages or shops.⁷ These buildings were mostly replaced throughout the later nineteenth century with more substantial and permanent brick and stone dwellings. This also followed the introduction of tighter building regulations in the 1870s, with the extension of the *Building Act* to cover Carlton in 1872.⁸

The *Sands & Kenny* directory of 1857 identifies occupants of buildings in Bouverie, Cardigan, Drummond, Leicester, Lygon, Queensberry, Rathdowne and Victoria streets. Cardigan and Bouverie streets included some commercial development with grocers, general stores and butchers listed along with boot makers, coach makers, plumbers and cabinet makers.⁹ In 1865, allotments along the western edge of Drummond Street were subdivided for sale, prompting objections by some residents as this portion of the suburb had originally been reserved for public uses.¹⁰

Princes Park was part of an early large reservation north of the city, set aside by Charles La Trobe, Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, in the 1840s.¹¹ It subsequently evolved from a grazing ground and nightsoil depository, to a reserve used for recreation and sporting activities. Its establishment can also be understood in the context of a proposal, largely credited to La Trobe, to surround the city of Melbourne with a ring of parks and gardens, including land set aside for public purposes. The result was an inner ring of gardens, including Fitzroy, Treasury, Parliament, Alexandra, Domain and the Royal Botanic Gardens; and an outer ring including Yarra, Albert, Fawkner, Royal and Princes parks. The former were generally more formally designed spaces, intended for passive recreation; while the latter were developed in a less sophisticated manner for both active and passive recreation.¹²

In the latter nineteenth century, the use of Princes Park by Carlton sporting clubs was contentious. However the clubs were ultimately granted permissive occupancy, most notably the Carlton Football Club.¹³ The

'Blues' had formed in 1864, being one of the earliest Australian Rules Football clubs. They formally occupied part of Princes Park from the late 1870s, having been granted 11 acres in 1878 on which to establish their home ground. The first oval ('Princes Oval') was in the southern area of the park, before moving to the current location further north. Although in occupation of the park, the Blues still played their 'home' games elsewhere in these years, including at the Melbourne Cricket Ground.¹⁴

Carlton Gardens, later to be associated with the Royal Exhibition Building and international exhibitions, was originally laid out by Edward Latrobe Bateman in the mid-1850s. Further redesign was undertaken in subsequent years, leading up to 1879-1880, when the gardens hosted the International Exhibition of October 1880, and the Royal Exhibition Building (REB) was completed.¹⁵ The REB and Carlton Gardens were inscribed in the World Heritage List in 2004, in recognition of the World Heritage (outstanding universal) values of the place, as derived from it being a surviving 'Palace of Industry' in its original setting, associated with the international exhibition movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.¹⁶

By the 1870s, Carlton was a substantially developed residential suburb.¹⁷ Grand terrace rows had been constructed along Drummond Street to the south, including Carolina, Erin and Warwick terraces. On the diagonal Neill Street between Rathdowne and Canning streets, some 43 properties could be counted.¹⁸ Commercial precincts had also developed in Barkly and Lygon streets. The north side of Barkly Street was a small service centre, with a number of timber shops housing grocers and butchers; while the more extensive Lygon Street retail centre was increasingly diverse, accommodating hairdressers, tailors and stationers.¹⁹ Concurrent with this development was the construction of hotels in the suburb, which numbered approximately 80 by 1873.²⁰ Local bluestone, which was readily available by the 1850s and more reliable than bricks produced at the time, was used in the construction of a relatively high proportion of early buildings, including houses.²¹ The main material for the façade of seven of the ten houses constructed in Murchison Street by 1868, for example, was stone,²² and many of these houses were built by Scottish stonemasons.²³

In 1876, the Hospital for Sick Children was established in the former residence of Sir Redmond Barry in Pelham Street, to address the significant health issues faced by working class children. Founded by doctors John Singleton and William Smith in 1870, it was reportedly the first paediatric hospital in the southern hemisphere.²⁴ Between 1900 and 1923, the hospital committee engaged in a large scale building program, constructing pavilions and buildings designed for the hospital's requirements.²⁵

The more prestigious developments in the suburb were complemented by London-style residential squares, which were generally anticipated in the early subdivisions, with residences surrounding and facing the squares. These included Macarthur Place, Murchison Square, Argyle Square and University (Barry) Square; Lincoln Square is outside the precinct. University and Argyle square are the largest, and by the late nineteenth century they included recreational facilities such as bowling greens and tennis courts within their boundaries, in addition to open and treed spaces. John Guilfoyle, brother of noted landscape designer William Guilfoyle, was curator of Melbourne's reserves and redesigned University Square to incorporate diagonal paths, a temperance fountain and new plane trees in 1904-1906. Murchison and Macarthur Place squares were smaller, appear to have been less formal, and without the recreational facilities.

The re-subdivision of earlier allotments and small-scale speculative development was also a feature of the second half of the nineteenth century in Carlton. This resulted in some irregular allotment sizes, and consequently atypical building plans and designs, including dwellings with asymmetrical frontages, terraces of inconsistent widths, and row houses off-alignment to the street.²⁶

By the late nineteenth century, some distinction had emerged between development in the north and south of the precinct. With the construction of the REB and development of Carlton Gardens, the main thoroughfares in the south attracted more affluent middle-class development, including larger houses which often replaced earlier more modest dwellings, and named rows of terraces. These developments complemented the London-style residential squares of the suburb, which were generally anticipated in the early subdivisions, and included University Square, Macarthur Place, Murchison Square and Argyle Square. Small workers' cottages tended to be constructed on secondary streets, including narrow ROWs behind larger properties. In the north,

modest cottage rows on small allotments were more typical, reflecting the working class demographic of this area of Carlton. However, cottage rows were still named, as evidenced by Canning Street to the north of Kay Street which was occupied by Theresa cottages, Crimple cottages and Henrietta cottages. Such cottages tended to be of three or four rooms, compared to the much larger residences of generally eight rooms to the south.²⁷

In the early decades of the twentieth century, the demographics of Carlton began to change, with recent arrivals from Eastern Europe including Jewish families.²⁸ The rapid development of the nineteenth century, which had included construction of tiny cottages in rear lanes, became the focus of the so-called 'slum clearance' movement from the interwar period. In the mid-twentieth century, Carlton remained characteristically a working class suburb, its residents predominantly low-income workers and immigrants.²⁹

The most high profile of the immigrant groups to arrive in Carlton in the post-war period were the Italians, with the suburb becoming known as 'Little Italy'; Greek and Lebanese families also arrived in large numbers. Post-war migration had a significant impact on the suburb, not least in the transformation of Lygon Street. In the section between Queensberry and Elgin streets, there were 14 Italian proprietors in 1945, increasing to 47 by 1960, many of whom were restaurant operators.³⁰ Melbourne's inner suburbs in the post-war period offered cheaper housing and access to manufacturing work, and by 1960 there were an estimated 6,500 Italian residents in Carlton, approximately one quarter of the suburb's population.³¹

Students have been associated with Carlton since the establishment of the University of Melbourne in the 1850s. However, more affordable tertiary education, and the (then) relatively cheap cost of housing, brought large numbers of students to the suburb from the 1960s.³² This led to another cultural shift in Carlton, as the suburb became synonymous with new and alternative social and artistic movements in literature, film and theatre. La Mama Theatre and the Pram Factory were innovators in the theatrical arts. The suburb was also documented in popular film and television.

In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, Carlton again underwent a transformation, with gentrification and intensified residential development, and the restoration of its many historic buildings.

1.2 Description

The extent of the Carlton Precinct is identified as HO1 in the planning scheme maps.

The Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens, together with the World Heritage Environs Area precinct (HO992), adjoin the precinct to the south-east; the University of Melbourne and Melbourne General Cemetery adjoin to the north-west.

Significant and contributory development in the precinct dates from the mid nineteenth century through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range.

The precinct is mainly residential, but with commercial streets and historic shops and hotels scattered throughout, including to street corners. Small scale former manufacturing and industrial development, mostly dating from the early decades of the twentieth century, is also located in some residential streets albeit limited in extent.

The precinct incorporates a broad range of dwelling types, including modest single storey cottages, terrace rows on narrow allotments, larger single storey dwellings, two-storey terraces in pairs and rows, some very large three-storey terraces, and villas on more generous allotments. Generally, development in the north tends to be modest in size, and more substantial in the south.

The precinct typically has buildings of one and two-storeys, with three-storeys more common in the south, particularly on Drummond Street. Building materials include brick and rendered masonry, with some timber, and a relatively high proportion of stone buildings. The stone and timber buildings generally date from the

1850s and 1860s. Other characteristics of residential buildings include hipped roofs with chimneys and often with parapets; verandahs with decorative cast iron work and tiled floors; iron palisade fences on stone plinths to front property boundaries; limited or no front and side setbacks; lower-scale rear wings to larger terraces and dwellings; and long and narrow rear yards. Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

Residential streets can have consistent or more diverse heritage character. Examples of the former include parts of Canning Street with intact rows of single-storey terraces, and the southern end of Drummond Street with long rows of large two-storey terraces. The more diverse streets have a greater variety of building and allotment sizes, and dwelling heights, styles, materials and setbacks. Examples include the streets located between Carlton and Elgin streets, and Kay and Pitt streets in the north of the precinct. The diversity reflects development extending over a long period within a single street.

Another precinct characteristic are buildings with no setbacks and pointed or sharply angled corners, located to the junction of streets which meet at sharp angles; and those which return around corners with canted or stepped facades. Irregular allotment plans, including those associated with later re-subdivision of the early Government allotments, have also given rise to buildings which diverge from the norm in their form and siting.

Development on lanes to the rears of properties is another precinct characteristic, including occasional historic outhouses such as water closets, stables and workshops. Rear boundary walls vary, with many original walls removed or modified to accommodate vehicle access.

In the post-war period, the impact of the Italian community is also evident. Dwellings were often rendered, original verandahs replaced with simple awnings on steel posts, and steel windows introduced to facades.

Commercial buildings in the precinct are typically two-storey, of brick or rendered masonry, with no setbacks, and intact first floor (and upper level) facades and parapets. Many ground floor facades have been modified, but some original or early shopfronts survive, as do iron post-supported verandahs with friezes, including return verandahs to street corners. Commercial streets or sections of streets include Lygon, Elgin, Rathdowne, Nicholson, Faraday and Grattan streets.

Historic civic development including the former police station, post office and court house, is located on Drummond Street near the intersection with Elgin Street. Other non-residential development located on or near the perimeter of the precinct includes Trades Hall, Queen Elizabeth Maternal & Child Health Centre, the original site of the Royal Children's Hospital, Carlton Gardens Primary School, Carlton Baths and St Jude's Church.

Social and economic developments of the latter decades of the twentieth century, associated with changing inner Melbourne demographics and rising land values, have wrought physical changes to the precinct. These are evidenced in extensions and additions to dwellings, and conversion of historic commercial, industrial and institutional buildings to residential uses. Large scale residential buildings and apartment blocks have also been constructed on development sites.

1.2.1 Pattern of development

The street layout of the precinct demonstrates the overall subdivision pattern established in the official surveys of the 1850s. This includes a hierarchical and generally regular grid of wide and long north-south and east-west running streets, with secondary streets and a network of lanes. In terms of allotment sizes, the general pattern is one of finer grain to residential streets, and coarser grain to principal streets and roads.

Breaking with the regular street grid are several streets on the diagonal, including Barkly, Neill and Keppel streets. The private re-subdivision of the early Government allotments also gave rise to some narrow streets and smaller allotments, as occurred for example in Charles and David streets. Charles

Street is distinguished in this context as a narrow street with bluestone pitchers, and a high proportion of intact modest cottages.

Lanes provide access to the rears of properties, and also act as minor thoroughfares, providing pedestrian and vehicle access between streets and through dense residential blocks.

The wide, straight and long streets of the precinct have a sense of openness due to their width, and afford internal views and vistas, as well as views out of the precinct. Views to the dome of the Royal Exhibition Building are afforded from the west on Queensberry Street, with other views of the World Heritage site from streets running west of Rathdowne Street, and south of Grattan Street.

Important nineteenth century roads or boulevards are located on the boundaries of the precinct, including Victoria Parade and Nicholson Street.

In terms of infrastructure, streets in the precinct variously retain bluestone kerbs and channels, while lanes generally retain original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.

1.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings

Public parks and smaller public squares or gardens within or immediately adjoining the precinct, are another legacy of the nineteenth century surveys and subdivisions. The latter were influenced by London-style squares and include Argyle, Murchison, Macarthur and Barry (University) squares, ~~with residential development laid out around the squares. These have historically provided landscaped spaces for informal recreation in the densely developed precinct area. Murchison and Macarthur Place squares remain largely surrounded by the associated nineteenth century residential development. Argyle Square in part retains its historic surrounds, although less so on the west side where Cardigan Street is not included in the precinct. University Square retains less of its original surrounds and context. All of the squares in the precinct largely retain their original boundaries.~~

Princes Park is wholly within the precinct, albeit located north-west of the main precinct area. The park extends for approximately 39 hectares, stretching for two kilometres along the east side of Royal Parade. Princes Oval, Carlton Football Club's home ground and headquarters, is located in the centre of the park, with sporting fields to the south and passive recreation areas to the north. The park combines treed areas and open space, with the latter providing generous vistas across the park, including views of the established plantings and tree rows lining pathways and bordering the park. Surviving nineteenth century plantings include elm rows and avenues, Moreton Bay Figs, and River Red Gums. Later plantings include Canary Island Palm rows, the Princes Park Drive plantation, and various Mahogany Gums. Historic buildings include the Park Keeper's cottage (1885), tennis pavilion (1926), and north and south sports pavilions (1937).

The landscapes of the Melbourne General Cemetery and Carlton Gardens are located outside the precinct boundary, but are visible from within the precinct.

Several of the principal streets have mature street or median plantings, including Keppel, Grattan, Cardigan, Canning and Drummond streets.

1.3 Statement of Significance

Carlton Precinct (HO1) is of local significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).

- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

Carlton Precinct was developed from the mid-nineteenth century as part of the extension of Melbourne to its north during a period of significant population growth. Significant and contributory development in the precinct dates from the mid nineteenth century through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range. The precinct is mainly residential, with some commercial streetscapes and commercial buildings scattered throughout; institutional development; and limited small scale former manufacturing and industrial development, mostly dating from the early twentieth century.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical nineteenth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of face brick and rendered masonry building materials, with timber and bluestone indicating earlier buildings.
 - Hipped roof forms with chimneys and parapets; verandahs with decorative cast iron work and tiled floors; iron palisade fences on stone plinths; and limited or no front and side setbacks.
- Later development as evidenced in Edwardian and interwar buildings.
- Typically low scale character, of one and two-storeys, with some larger three-storey buildings.
- Streets of consistent scale, or with greater scale diversity incorporating modest and larger buildings.
- Streets of consistent historic character, contrasting with those of more diverse character.
- Streets which are predominantly residential and others which are predominantly commercial; with historic shops and hotels including corner hotels distributed across the precinct.
- Importance of Lygon Street, one of inner Melbourne's most iconic commercial streets.
- Views from lanes to historic outbuildings and rears of properties, providing evidence of historic property layouts.
- Buildings which diverge from the norm in their form and siting, constructed to irregular street intersections with sharp corners, and on asymmetrical allotments.
- Early twentieth century small scale manufacturing and industry in some residential streets.
- 'Layers' of change associated with phases of new residents and arrivals, including Eastern Europeans, Italian immigrants, and students of the 1960s and 1970s.
- Nineteenth century planning and subdivisions as evidenced in:
 - Hierarchy of principal streets and lanes.
 - Generally regular grid of wide, straight and long north-south and east-west streets, with secondary streets and a network of lanes.
 - Pattern of finer grain allotment sizes to residential streets, with coarser grain to principal streets and roads.
 - Lanes which provide access to rears of properties and act as important minor thoroughfares.

- Distinctive small public squares, influenced by London-style development, including Macarthur Place, Murchison Square, Argyle Square and University (Barry) Square.
- Importance of Princes Park as one of La Trobe's historic ring of parks and gardens surrounding Melbourne.
- Principal streets characterised by their width and open character, with vistas available along their length; these are sometimes distinguished by later central medians and street tree plantings.
- Views of the Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens from the west on Queensberry Street, and from other streets west of Rathdowne Street and south of Grattan Street.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels, and lanes with original or relayed bluestone pitches and central drains.
- Vehicle accommodation which is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

How is it significant?

Carlton Precinct is of historical, aesthetic/architectural and social significance to the City of Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

Carlton Precinct is of **historical significance**, as a predominantly Victorian-era precinct which reflects the early establishment and development of Carlton, on the northern fringe of the city. It was planned on the basis of early 1850s surveys undertaken during Robert Hoddle's tenure as Surveyor General, with the first residential allotments located to the north of Victoria Street. The precinct retains a comparatively high level of intactness, and a very high proportion of pre-1900 buildings, including terrace (row) housing, complemented by historic shops, institutions and public buildings. Surviving 1850s and 1860s buildings in particular attest to the precinct's early development. Parks and squares, including University Square, Macarthur Place, Murchison Square, ~~and~~ Argyle Square and University (Barry) Square, also provide evidence of early planning. Princes Park is of historical significance, having been reserved in the 1840s by Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, Charles La Trobe. This visionary action resulted in a ring of parks and gardens surrounding inner Melbourne, of which Princes Park is a stand out example. Part of the park, and later specifically Princes Oval, has been the home of the Carlton Football Club since the late 1870s. By the late nineteenth century, some distinction had emerged between development in the north and south of the precinct. Modest cottages and terrace rows on small allotments were more typical of the north, reflecting the historic working class demographic of this area of Carlton. The suburb is also home to a number of important institutions, namely Trades Hall, the first Royal Children's Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Maternal Health centre. In the south, the proximity to the city and, notably, the prestige associated with the Royal Exhibition Building (REB) and Carlton Gardens, and the International Exhibitions of the 1880s was reflected in grander residential development. The World Heritage Listing of the REB and Carlton Gardens in 2004 was in recognition of the outstanding universal values associated with this site and its role in the international exhibition movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Carlton Precinct is of **historical and social significance** for its later 'layers' of history and culture, including an ongoing connection with migrant groups. The arrival of people from Eastern Europe in the early twentieth century, followed by Italian immigrants, wrought significant change to the precinct. Lygon Street evolved into an iconic inner Melbourne commercial strip, much valued by Melburnians for its Italian culture and colour. In the 1960s and 1970s, students also moved into Carlton in great numbers, with the suburb becoming synonymous with new and alternative social and artistic movements. This cultural awakening had wider ranging impacts on Australian arts, including literature and theatre. Carlton, in turn, has been well documented in popular culture, and featured in film and television. Princes Park is also of social significance, being highly

valued by the community for providing opportunities for passive recreation and more formal sporting activities; and as the home of the Carlton Football Club.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the Carlton Precinct largely rests in its Victorian-era development, including terrace and row housing, complemented by more limited Edwardian and interwar development. The pattern of nineteenth century subdivisions and land uses is reflected in the dense residential streetscapes, with commercial buildings in principal streets and sections of streets, and historic shops and hotels to residential street corners. Nineteenth century planning is also evident in the regular grid of wide, straight and long north-south and east-west streets, with secondary streets and a network of connecting lanes. The latter are demonstrably of nineteenth century origin and function, and continue to provide access to the rears of properties, as well as performing the important role of minor thoroughfares through dense residential blocks. This reinforces the 'permeable' character and pedestrian nature of the precinct. Residential development in the precinct is also significant for its diversity, with a variety of building and allotment sizes, and dwelling heights, styles, materials and setbacks. Streetscapes can have consistent heritage character, or more diverse character, reflecting stop-start bursts of building activity, changing styles and dwelling preferences, and later re-subdivision. Aesthetically, the principal streets are distinguished by central medians and tree plantings, with a sense of openness due to their width, and vistas available along their length. The parks and smaller squares, influenced by London-style development, also enhance the aesthetic significance.

2.0 HO2 – East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct

2.1 History

The East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is located within the suburbs of the same name. Development in the precinct was amongst some of Melbourne's earliest outside the original town centre.

In the pre-European period, Aboriginal people utilised the parklands on the north side of the Yarra River for gatherings and to exploit the rich natural resources of the riverine environment. The future Yarra Park, which adjoins the south side of the precinct, was an important ceremonial and camping place, and retains evidence of Aboriginal use, including scarred river red gums. Another scar tree is believed to survive in the Fitzroy Gardens, which also adjoins the precinct. Superintendent C J de Villiers established a short-lived Native Police Corps in 1838 in this same area, on the north bank of the Yarra River.

East Melbourne was surveyed by Robert Hoddle in 1837 as part of his wider survey of Melbourne. His plan included the Government Paddock and Police Magistrates Paddock, between what is now Wellington Parade and the Yarra River, in the area generally occupied by the present day Yarra Park. Between 1836 and 1839, the Police Magistrate, Captain William Lonsdale, occupied a residence in the Police Paddock, near the corner of Wellington Parade and Flinders Street.³³

The first mounted police arrived from Sydney in early 1838, and the area between the Police Magistrates Paddock and Punt Road (again now within Yarra Park) was reserved for the grazing of their horses. The Mounted Police Barracks was developed at the south-west corner of Wellington Parade and Punt Road, and as shown on -plans of 1855 and 1866, the complex came to include barracks, a hospital and gaol, as well as stabling

In 1839 Charles La Trobe, Superintendent of the Port Phillip District constructed his residence on approximately 12 acres in the Government Paddock. The presence of both Lonsdale and La Trobe, coupled with that of the mounted police, emphasises the convenient situation of East Melbourne in this very early period of Melbourne's history, and its important location in terms of early colonial administration and law enforcement.

Hoddle in 1842 also prepared a grid plan for residential subdivision in East Melbourne, which was revised in 1848 to accommodate a north-south creek within a large park which later became the Fitzroy Gardens. The

first residence constructed in this area of East Melbourne was Bishopscourt, on the east side of the gardens, the site of which had been selected by Anglican Bishop Perry in 1848. The original bluestone component of the Episcopal residence was completed in 1853; its construction helped to establish East Melbourne as a prestigious residential area.

While early Melbourne was aligned to maximise frontage to the Yarra River, East Melbourne was laid out on Hoddle's regular grid, with allotments on north-south and east-west axes, and alternating broad streets and narrow service lanes.³⁴ The suburb was established on a rise to the east of Melbourne, and was associated with Eastern Hill to its north-west. The hill then dropped away, eastwards to Hoddle Street and southwards to the Yarra River.

Eastern Hill became the focus of civic, ecclesiastical, educational and institutional development from the 1840s. This was in no small part due to the colonial Government making land grants available for education and religious purposes. In December 1851, when the colony of Victoria separated from New South Wales, a site at the top (east end) of Bourke Street, in Spring Street, and on the western boundary of East Melbourne, was chosen for the new Parliament House. Construction commenced in 1856.³⁵ The first Metropolitan Fire Brigade Headquarters was (and remains) located here. The early sites of St Peter's Church and the Lutheran Church were also in Eastern Hill, as was that of St Patrick's Cathedral at the intersection of Gisborne and Albert streets, where construction began in 1857. This helped to establish a long history of Catholic Church property ownership in and adjoining the precinct area. The Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital also opened in Albert Street in 1863.³⁶ Other notable developments in this area included the early campuses of prestigious schools such as Scotch College, Cathedral College and Presbyterian Ladies College.

A map of Melbourne of 1872 illustrates the ongoing concentration of ecclesiastical development in and adjoining the precinct. Indicated on the plan are St Peter's Church, St Patrick's Cathedral, the Baptist Church, Church of England, Bishopscourt and Cathedral Reserve, and Presbyterian, Lutheran, Scotch, Unitarian and Congregational churches.³⁷

Notwithstanding the earlier residential occupations of La Trobe, Lonsdale, and the acquisition of land for Bishopscourt, the first Crown land sales in East Melbourne took place in 1852. Allotments were sold on Albert Street in the north of the suburb; and between Wellington Parade and George Street in the suburb's south, overlooking the parklands which became Yarra Park.³⁸ The delay in selling these allotments, after the late 1840s subdivision, coincided with increasing affluence and population growth in Melbourne due to the gold rushes.³⁹ East Melbourne rapidly became an attractive place of residence for professional and business classes, and government officials. Further land sales took place in 1853, with allotments sold between George Street and Victoria Parade.⁴⁰ The Kearney Plan of 1855 shows a National School had been established on the corner of Grey and Powlett streets, with Scots School on the corner of Albert and Eades streets. The first buildings on the Victoria Parade Brewery site are also visible, as is the Parade Hotel on Wellington Parade, with the land purchased by both speculators and city-based professionals.⁴¹

[The Kearney Plan of 1855 shows a National School had been established by this time on the corner of Grey and Powlett streets, with Scots School on the corner of Albert and Eades streets. The first buildings on the Victoria Parade brewery site \(later known as Victoria Brewery\), established by Thomas Aitken in 1854, are also visible in the plan, as is the Parade Hotel on Wellington Parade.](#)

On his departure from Victoria in 1854, La Trobe gave instructions for his property to be subdivided. Jolimont Estate was sold in the late 1850s and 1860s, with prospective purchasers directed to take note of the 'many and great advantages' of the allotments including their proximity to the city.⁴² Jolimont Square, as it is known, is bounded by Wellington Parade South, and Agnes, Palmer and Charles streets. The Adult Deaf Society acquired the site in the 1920s and developed it with various facilities. In more recent times, the square has been returned to residential use, including modern townhouse development.

The building and safety standards of the Melbourne *Building Act* of 1849 applied early to East Melbourne, resulting in construction of few timber buildings.⁴³ Stone was an early construction material, with brick and masonry predominating.

By the early 1860s, a number of terrace rows had been constructed in the precinct, including on Wellington Parade, Victoria Parade, Hotham Street and Clarendon Street.⁴⁴ Residents of the 1860s included many of Melbourne's more prominent figures, such as architects Leonard Terry and J J Clark; politicians Edward Cohen MLA and John McCrae MLC; artist Eugene von Guerard; surveyor Clement Hodgkinson; and numerous teachers, medical and legal professionals.⁴⁵ The reputation of the suburb remained strong through the nineteenth century, with Sir William John and Janet Lady Clarke's remarkable Cliveden mansion constructed on the corner of Clarendon Street and Wellington Parade in 1888. The couple hosted numerous social functions at their opulent residence including balls, dinners and garden parties.⁴⁶

In 1881, the former police barracks land at the south-west corner of Wellington Parade and Punt Road was subdivided into 83 residential allotments and sold. The former police hospital at the corner of Berry and Vale streets was purchased by the Victorian Infants Asylum, and the institution later became known as the Berry Street Babies Home and Hospital.⁴⁷

By the mid-1890s, both suburbs were substantially developed, with some large detached residences situated in the elevated area closer to Fitzroy Gardens and Yarra Park; substantial two-storey terrace rows and detached villas along Powlett and Hotham streets; and single storey terraces and more modest houses in the east of the suburb towards Hoddle Street.⁴⁸

The development of parks was important to the precinct. This can be understood in the context of a proposal, largely credited to La Trobe, to surround the city of Melbourne with a ring of parks and gardens, including land set aside for public purposes. The result was an inner ring of gardens, including the Fitzroy, Treasury, Parliament, Alexandra and Royal Botanic Gardens and the Domain; and an outer ring including Yarra, Albert, Fawkner, Royal and Princes parks. The former were generally more formally designed spaces, intended for passive recreation; while the latter were developed in a less sophisticated manner for both active and passive recreation.⁴⁹

'Fitzroy Square' had been set aside in 1848, but it was as 'Fitzroy Gardens' that the park was developed between 1859 and the mid-1860s, under the supervision of Assistant Commissioner of Lands and Survey, Clement Hodgkinson (a local resident) and head gardener, James Sinclair.⁵⁰ The smaller squares of Darling Square and Powlett Reserve were also developed in the mid-nineteenth century, with simple path layouts and plantings, and Powlett Reserve incorporating sporting facilities.⁵¹

Further south, the Government Paddock was used for sport and recreation purposes from as early as 1853, when the Melbourne and Richmond cricket clubs were each granted a portion of the reserve. Yarra Park was officially reserved as a recreation ground in 1862 and named by 1867.⁵² The first game of Australian Rules football was played in Yarra Park in 1858. Melbourne Cricket Club also established a cricket ground, which evolved to become the internationally renowned stadium, the Melbourne Cricket Ground (MCG). The MCG was also home to the Melbourne Football Club which was established in 1859 and is the oldest Australian Rules football club, and one of the oldest of any football code, in the world. The stadium also hosted the 1956 Olympic Games. Richmond Cricket Club developed its own ground, the Punt Road Oval, which in turn was home to the Richmond Football Club, as established in 1885.

Jolimont was historically close to the railways and Jolimont rail yards, including substantial railway infrastructure such as workshops and maintenance sheds, much of which has been demolished.

In the early twentieth century, with the growing preference for garden suburbs in the city's east, East Melbourne's popularity as a prestigious suburb began to decline. A number of larger residences were converted for boarding house or apartment use. By 1924, there were a reported 280 boarding houses in East Melbourne, with the Health Commission expressing concern about their operation. Some had kitchens located on balconies and in landings, and in some cases combined with bathrooms.⁵³ Such was the number of boarding house keepers in the suburb in this period, that a meeting to protest the imposition of boarding house regulations was held in a church in East Melbourne in 1925.⁵⁴ The Old Men's Shelter in Powlett Reserve (1938) was constructed to provide support for elderly men living in the suburb's boarding houses.⁵⁵

Other allotments, including those associated with a former foundry site east of Simpson Street, between George Street and Wellington Parade,⁵⁶ were redeveloped with small to medium scale residential flats and apartments of various styles. Many of these, particularly those built in the interwar period, were of relatively high quality design. In this period, two major hospitals were also established in East Melbourne, with the Mercy Hospital (1934-35) and Freemasons Hospital (1937) in Clarendon Street.

In the post-war period, the suburbs' proximity to the city saw many large properties along Wellington and Victoria parades redeveloped for commercial and governmental use, including construction of large-scale office buildings.⁵⁷ Cliveden mansion was demolished in 1968 to make way for the Hilton Hotel. Ironically, East Melbourne's status as an attractive place of residence also began to return in this period. This effectively ended the boarding house era, with many large houses and mansions returned to single dwellings, and a wave of restoration work commencing. Apartment towers were also constructed in the precinct, in Clarendon Street and on Wellington and Victoria parades. Jolimont has also been subject to redevelopment on its southern and western edges, with construction of small to medium sized office and apartment buildings.

2.2 Description

The extent of the East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is identified as HO2 in the planning scheme maps.

Fitzroy Gardens, Yarra Park, Melbourne Cricket Ground, Richmond Cricket Ground and Jolimont Railway Station, are largely within or immediately adjoin the precinct.

Significant and contributory development dates from the 1850s through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range.

East Melbourne and Jolimont precinct is predominantly residential in character, and renowned for its high quality historic dwellings. Some of Melbourne's finest and earliest large houses of the 1850s and 1860s are in the precinct, complemented by later development including grand terraces in pairs and rows and substantial free-standing villas from the 1870s and after. There are also Edwardian dwellings and interwar duplexes and flat blocks. Front garden setbacks are common, as is rear lane access. The height of residences varies, with buildings of one, two and sometimes three storeys. More modest, often single-storey cottages and terrace rows are located in the east of the precinct. Large and prominent dwellings are often located to corners.

Residential buildings are typically well resolved in terms of their design and detailing. Brick is the predominant construction material, with rendered masonry, face brick and examples of stone buildings. Decorative and often ornate cast iron work to verandahs is evident in the later Victorian houses, with the iron work displaying a rich variety of patterns; while earlier dwellings are more simply detailed. Slate roofing is common, as are hipped roof forms, and prominent and visible chimneys. Eaves lines and parapets are detailed and ornamented, including with urns and finials; side or party walls extend from the fronts of terraces, as per the nineteenth century fire regulations, and are often decorated. A high number of original iron palisade fences with stone plinths survive. Smaller scale rear wings are typical for two-storey terraces and dwellings, although rear additions are common, some of which are large and visible to rear lanes and ROWs. Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

Within the precinct there are an unusually high number of properties of individual historical and architectural significance, including many on the Victorian Heritage Register.

Principal roads in the precinct include Victoria Parade on the north, which is a grand historic boulevard, albeit with later twentieth century office towers and hospital development at the west end, much of which replaced substantial historic residences. However, some substantial dwellings remain west of Lansdowne Street, and further east towards the redeveloped Victoria Brewery site (Tribeca). Finer grained and more modest residential development, including single and two-storey terraces, is located in the lower eastern part of the parade.

Wellington Parade separates East Melbourne from Jolimont. The north side of the road was redeveloped in the second half of the twentieth century, predominantly with office and apartment towers, and also the Hilton Hotel on the site of the historic Cliveden mansion. Some substantial historic residences survive, and at the east end, a concentration of interwar flat blocks associated with the Garden Avenue development on the former foundry site.

Hoddle Street within the precinct has predominantly Victorian residential development, together with St John's Church and primary school at the north-east corner of the precinct; the former Yarra Park Primary School; east boundary of Yarra Park; and the Punt Road Oval at the south-east corner of the precinct.

Clarendon Street was historically a prestigious street, beginning with the construction of Bishopscourt in the early 1850s, and now regarded as one of Melbourne's most significant early houses. Noted other residences include 206 Clarendon Street (1856, later Redmond Barry's house); Clarendon Terrace (1856); Mosspenoch (1881); and St Hilda's House (1907). Clarendon Street has also been subject to some substantial twentieth century developments, including tall apartment buildings, hospital complexes, and the aforementioned Hilton Hotel at the south end of the street. Albert Street, bordering the north side of Fitzroy Gardens, has similarly attracted higher quality residences as well institutional development.

The main residential streets in East Melbourne are typically highly intact, but also diverse, incorporating the range of historic dwelling types described above. They include George, Hotham, Gipps, Grey, Powlett and Simpson streets. The significant Queen Bess Row (1886) is prominent in Hotham Street, and was one of the earliest apartment buildings in Melbourne.

Jolimont has Wellington Parade South to its north boundary, and is distinguished by the historic Jolimont Square estate of the mid-nineteenth century, with the Square itself variously retaining historic and later buildings, including those associated with the former Adult Deaf Society use of the site. Jolimont Terrace, facing east to Yarra Park, complements Vale Street across the park with its grand historic residences. Elsewhere, Jolimont is highly varied, with modest historic cottages, early twentieth century warehouses, and later twentieth century office and residential developments. Across Yarra Park is the south-eastern component of East Melbourne. It incorporates Vale and Berry streets, and Webb lane, with historic residences interspersed with later development. Vale Street, facing west to Yarra Park, includes grander residences.

In lanes throughout the precinct rear boundary walls vary, with many original walls removed or modified to accommodate vehicle access. Some historic outbuildings remain, but contemporary rear additions to houses are common, some of which are large and visible to the rear lanes and ROWs.

The Catholic Church has historically been a major landowner in the area, expanding out from St Patrick's Cathedral and the archdiocesan administration complex on the west side of Fitzroy Gardens, to historic properties in the west end of Albert Street and the former Mercy Hospital complex in Clarendon Street.

Commercial, manufacturing and industrial development has historically been limited. Exceptions include Victoria Brewery on Victoria Parade, which was historically a dominant complex on the Parade, and was adapted and redeveloped as an apartment complex (Tribeca) in the early 2000s. The historic buildings on the site substantially date from the 1880s and later. Some limited historic commercial development is also located on Wellington Parade.

Commercial, manufacturing and industrial development has historically been limited. Exceptions include Victoria Brewery on Victoria Parade, established in the 1880s, and historically a dominant complex on the parade; this was adapted and redeveloped as an apartment complex (Tribeca) in the early 2000s. Some limited historic commercial development is also located on Wellington Parade.

2.2.1 Pattern of development

In East Melbourne, the highly regular grid of the late 1840s government subdivision resulted in both north-south and east-west running streets, and very consistent rectilinear blocks of development. The mostly

wide streets are interspersed with parks and squares. Powlett Reserve occupies a full block between Powlett and Simpson streets, while Darling Square occupies a half block between Simpson and Darlings streets. Minor streets and lanes cross, or partly extend into the main blocks of development. The pattern is broadly one of larger allotments in the west of the subdivision, with smaller allotments in the east.

Jolimont Square is associated with the subdivision of Charles La Trobe's Jolimont Estate in the late 1850s. As noted, Agnes, Palmer and Charles streets are associated with this historic subdivision.⁵⁸ The Square also retains an axially arranged central garden now planted as a lawn, running north-south for most of the depth of the Square. The garden is surrounded by a circulating driveway which reflects the layout of the original plan.

The south-eastern component of East Melbourne, to the corner of Wellington Parade and Punt Road, also follows a regular pattern of north-south running streets, being Vale and Berry streets, and Webb Lane. This subdivision occurred in the early 1880s, following alienation of part of the old Police Paddock.

Garden Avenue, off the east end of Wellington Parade and adjoining the railway cutting, is associated with an interwar subdivision of a former foundry site.

Major roads and boulevards border or traverse the precinct. Several of these were historically major thoroughfares east of the city, including Victoria and Wellington parades, and Albert Street. Hoddle Street, merging into Punt Road, borders the east side of the precinct. The *Roads Act* of 1853 provided for a number of wide (3 or 4 chains) routes out of Melbourne, indicating the then Surveyor-General, Robert Hoddle planned for the growing city. These routes included Wellington Parade, Hoddle Street and Victoria Parade. The latter is elevated at its western end in the area of Eastern Hill, then steps down to the east to Hoddle Street. Wellington Parade runs east-west through the precinct.

In terms of infrastructure, streets in the precinct variously retain bluestone kerbs and channels, while lanes generally retain original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.

2.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings

The precinct is notable for its historic parks and gardens, including Fitzroy Gardens, the smaller squares in Powlett and Simpson reserves, and the extensive Yarra Park. There are views into and out from the parks and gardens to the bordering residential areas. Yarra Park, in turn, is dominated by the Melbourne Cricket Ground and also hosts Richmond Cricket Ground, home of the Richmond Football Club.

The parks and squares variously retain elements of their original or early landscape design, mature tree plantings including specimen trees, mature tree avenues, perimeter borders and garden bed borders. There is also some remnant indigenous vegetation, including to Yarra Park.

Fitzroy Gardens has an outstanding collection of plants, including conifers, palms and deciduous trees; Dutch and English elm rows and avenues; a cedar avenue; and a collection of nineteenth century pines and araucarias. The gardens also contain significant buildings and structures including the Band Pavilion (1864), Rotunda (1873), Sinclair's Cottage (an early gardener's cottage, 1866), the Spanish Revival-styled Conservatory (1930) and the electricity substation (1940).⁵⁹

Tree plantings, including planes and elms, are common to centre medians and sides of streets in the precinct. Streets with tree plantings include Albert, George, Powlett, Simpson and Clarendon streets. Victoria Parade has a double row of elms down its centre, as befits its historic role as a grand boulevard.

Gardens and deep front setbacks are common in precinct, especially in the western area of East Melbourne where the allotments are large. Outstanding in this context is the garden of Bishopscourt, a renowned inner Melbourne private garden of generous proportions with a sweeping drive and lawn, and both evergreen and deciduous tree species.

Jolimont Terrace, facing Yarra Park, has grand houses on large allotments and a generally consistent pattern of deep setbacks and front gardens.

2.3 Statement of Significance

East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct (HO2) is of state significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).
- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is associated with some of Melbourne's earliest surveys and subdivisions, beginning in the late 1830s. It is predominantly residential in character, and renowned for its high quality historic dwellings, and proximity to some of Melbourne's most significant public institutions, sporting facilities, and parks and gardens. Significant and contributory development dates from the 1850s through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical nineteenth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of face brick, rendered masonry and bluestone building materials.
 - Hipped roof forms with often visible and prominent chimneys, and slate cladding; eaves lines and parapets with detailing and ornamentation, including urns and finials; side or party walls extending from the fronts of terraces, and often decorated; verandahs with decorative and often ornate cast iron work, and tiled floors; iron palisade fences on stone plinths; and limited or no side setbacks.
- Presence of some of Melbourne's earliest and finest large houses.
- Simply detailed earlier Victorian dwellings which contrast with later more ornate including 'Boom' style residences.
- Other later development as evidenced in Edwardian and interwar buildings.
- Very high proportion of surviving first or original dwellings.
- Unusually high number of properties of individual historical and architectural significance, including many on the Victorian Heritage Register.
- Typically low scale character, of one and two-storeys, with some larger three-storey buildings.
- Larger scale development including multi-storey modern buildings mostly confined to the borders of East Melbourne, with low scale historical development and minimal infill to the suburb's centre.
- In East Melbourne, the late 1840s planning and government subdivision as evidenced in:

- Highly regular grid of streets and consistent rectilinear blocks of development, interspersed with parks and squares.
- Mostly wide and straight north-south and east-west streets, with minor streets and lanes which cross, or partly extend into the main blocks of development.
- Larger allotments in the west and smaller allotments in the east.
- Lanes and ROWs which provide access to rears of properties.
- Fitzroy Gardens as planned for the west side of the residential grid.
- In the east of the suburb, subdivision from the early 1880s of part of the old Police Paddock.
- In Jolimont, nineteenth century planning and subdivision as evidenced in:
 - Jolimont Square in the west of the suburb, being the historic subdivision of Charles La Trobe's Jolimont Estate in the late 1850s.
 - In the east of the suburb, subdivision from the early 1880s of part of the old Police Paddock.
- Importance of major roads and thoroughfares which border or traverse the precinct, with their historical status demonstrated in surviving significant development, including Victoria and Wellington parades, and Albert, Clarendon and Hoddle streets.
- Historic parks and gardens which distinguish the precinct and have historically enhanced its prestige, including Fitzroy Gardens and Yarra Park.
- Views into and out from the parks and gardens to the bordering residential areas.
- Dominance of the Melbourne Cricket Ground in Yarra Park.
- Importance of gardens and front setbacks to dwellings; and street plantings including planes and elms, to centre medians and sides of streets.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels, and lanes with original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.
- Vehicle accommodation which is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

How is it significant?

East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is of historical, aesthetic/architectural and social significance to the State of Victoria.

Why is it significant?

East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is of **historical significance**. East Melbourne was one of the earliest Melbourne suburbs surveyed by Robert Hoddle in 1837. His plan included the Government and Police Magistrates paddocks, in the future Yarra Park, where two significant early public figures, Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, Charles La Trobe and Police Magistrate Captain, William Lonsdale, took up residence in the late 1830s. The presence of these early administrators, coupled with the substantial Mounted Police Barracks in Yarra Park, emphasises the importance of East Melbourne in terms of nascent colonial administration and law enforcement in Port Phillip. Aboriginal scar trees also survive in the park, reminders of its importance as an Aboriginal ceremonial gathering and camping place, and the source of rich natural resources. Hoddle also prepared a grid plan for residential subdivision of East Melbourne in 1842, which was

revised in 1848 to accommodate the future Fitzroy Gardens. Bishops court, the Episcopal residence of Anglican Bishop Perry, was the first dwelling in the subdivision, constructed in 1853. It helped to establish East Melbourne as a highly prestigious residential area which subsequently attracted the professional and business classes, and many prominent figures in government, politics, law, medicine, architecture and the arts. The suburb was associated with Eastern Hill, the focus of civic, ecclesiastical, educational and institutional development from the 1840s, and the future site of St Patrick's Cathedral. It was also on the fringe of the developing Parliamentary and Treasury precincts, the seat of government in Victoria. Jolimont was mostly developed later, but notably included the 1850s subdivision of La Trobe's earlier Jolimont Estate (in the former Government Paddock). Major roads and boulevards border or traverse the precinct, several of which were historically important thoroughfares heading east out of the city. Wellington Parade, Hoddle Street and Victoria Parade were envisioned by Robert Hoddle as major routes out of Melbourne, their status confirmed in the *Roads Act* of 1853. The precinct is also significant for its historic parks and gardens, with Yarra Park and Fitzroy Gardens two of the ring of parks reserved by La Trobe, in a visionary action which resulted in a series of much valued open spaces surrounding inner Melbourne. The first game of Australian Rules football was played in Yarra Park in 1858; Melbourne Cricket Club also established a cricket ground in the park, which evolved into the internationally renowned stadium, the Melbourne Cricket Ground (MCG). The MCG was also home to the Melbourne Football Club which was established in 1859 and is one of the oldest football clubs, of any code, in the world. The stadium hosted the 1956 Olympic Games. Richmond Cricket Club also developed its own ground in Yarra Park, the Punt Road Oval, which in turn was home to the Richmond Football Club established in 1885.

East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct is of **social significance**, and highly regarded in Melbourne for its historic streetscapes and buildings. Both Fitzroy Gardens and Yarra Park are also highly valued, with the former a popular place for passive recreation in proximity to Melbourne's CBD. The latter gains significance from being the setting for the MCG; the association of Yarra Park with the development of Australian Rules football is also of social significance.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the East Melbourne and Jolimont Precinct largely rests in its Victorian-era development. The precinct is renowned for its high quality historic dwellings, including some of Melbourne's finest and earliest large houses of the 1850s and 1860s, complemented by later development including grand terraces in pairs and rows and substantial free-standing villas from the 1870s and after. There are also Edwardian dwellings and interwar duplexes and flat blocks. Within the precinct there are an unusually high number of individual properties included in the Victorian Heritage Register; and little replacement of first or original dwellings has occurred. East Melbourne's streets are mostly wide, straight and tree-lined, interspersed with parks and squares, following the highly regular gridded pattern of the 1840s subdivision. The major roads and boulevards historically attracted grander development. Clarendon Street was an early prestigious residential street, with several of Melbourne's most significant early residences constructed there, beginning with Bishops court in 1853. Jolimont also has significant historic residences. Lanes throughout the precinct are demonstrably of nineteenth century origin and function. Historic parks and gardens further enhance the aesthetic significance, including Fitzroy Gardens, the smaller squares of Powlett and Simpson reserves, and the extensive Yarra Park. These variously retain elements of their original or early landscape design, including specimen trees, mature tree avenues, perimeter and garden bed borders; and some remnant indigenous vegetation, including in Yarra Park. There are views into and out from the parks and gardens to the bordering residential areas. Yarra Park is dominated by the MCG and also hosts the Punt Road Oval. Fitzroy Gardens is an outstanding early public park in Melbourne, with an important collection of plants, some of which date to the nineteenth century. It also retains significant historic buildings and structures.

3.0 HO3 – North and West Melbourne Precinct

3.1 History

North Melbourne and West Melbourne Precinct is located within the suburbs of the same name. The precinct developed as part of the extension of Melbourne to its north, associated with the mid-nineteenth century growth in population.

In the mid to late 1840s, there were growing calls for the boundaries of the city of Melbourne to be extended, although some allotments in Jeffcott and Batman streets to the north-west of the original Hoddle Grid had by this time been surveyed.⁶⁰ In 1849, a site was chosen for the Benevolent Asylum, on 'the summit of the hill overlooking the junction of the Moonee Ponds with the Salt Water swamp'. It was 'the most magnificent that could be well imagined peculiarly eligible for a public building'.⁶¹ The foundation stone was laid in June 1850, and the asylum opened in 1851.⁶² The location of the asylum at the then western end of Victoria Street interrupted the subsequent route of the thoroughfare.

In 1852, during Robert Hoddle's tenure as Surveyor General, survey plans were prepared by Charles Laing for the first residential allotments north of Victoria Street in what became Carlton and North Melbourne; the extension of the city to its north had effectively been formalised.⁶³ From La Trobe Street, King and Spencer Streets were extended towards Victoria Street on a curved north-west axis past the site of the flagstaff, later Flagstaff Gardens. The latter incorporating the high point of Flagstaff Hill, adjoins the south side of the precinct, and was historically an important viewing place in early Melbourne, and the site of a signal station which communicated with a similar station at Point Gellibrand (Williamstown). Flags flown from the flagstaff indicated the arrival of ships in Hobsons Bay; and drew crowds to this early feature of West Melbourne.

North of Victoria Street, the new streets followed a more rigorous grid, on a north-south and east-west alignment. Flemington Road, on the northern boundary of North Melbourne, was based on an earlier track to Geelong with a crossing at the Saltwater (Maribyrnong) River.⁶⁴ The track was in place as early as 1840, and Flemington Road became a stock route to the Newmarket livestock saleyards, opened by 1859-60.⁶⁵

Allotments east of Curzon Street, between Victoria and Queensberry streets, were auctioned in September 1852, with allotments in Dryburgh and Abbotsford streets sold in March 1853.⁶⁶ A plan of 1852 indicates that 'North Melbourne' referred to the allotments along Spencer and King streets, with an area called 'Parkside' to the north of Victoria Street. Parkside took in parts of what is now Parkville and North Melbourne, with allotments laid out to either side of Flemington Road, and along Queensberry Street West.⁶⁷ In January 1855, North Melbourne was proclaimed as the Hotham ward of the City of Melbourne, after Lieutenant Governor Sir Charles Hotham.⁶⁸ The Kearney plan of 1855 shows the northern part of North Melbourne was intended to address Royal Park, with radial allotments around London-style circuses incorporating small parks and squares. However, the pressures of the population boom following the start of the gold rushes saw this scheme modified by the 1860s, when allotments along Molesworth, Chapman, Erskine and Brougham streets were sold.⁶⁹ This elevated area became known as 'Hotham Hill', and had allotments of more generous proportions than the earlier subdivisions to the south; it was also subsequently developed with some substantial residences.⁷⁰

The 1855 rate books for Hotham ward indicate that the majority of early residences in the precinct were small cottages constructed of wood, with some buildings of brick or stone. A commercial and civic precinct had developed by this time, centred on Queensberry, Errol and Leveson streets. Hotels were prominent, including the bluestone Lalla Rookh in Queensberry Street and the Empire Hotel in Errol Street; bakers, grocers and butchers; and small scale manufacturers including saddle and boot makers were also operating.⁷¹ Development along Victoria Street related to its role as a main thoroughfare out of the city. The presence of saddle and tent makers, farriers and veterinarians,⁷² also demonstrates the importance of these early North and West Melbourne commercial activities in servicing the growing goldfields traffic and migration of people to the gold rush centres north-west of Melbourne.

In March 1858, a reported 1500 residents of Hotham met to agitate for separation from the City of Melbourne, indicating an early level of political engagement by the local residents. In September 1859, the Borough of Hotham was proclaimed.⁷³ The first town hall was constructed on an elevated site at the corner of Queensberry and Errol streets in 1862-63, and was replaced in 1875-76 by the present municipal complex

designed by noted architect George Johnson. In 1887, the name of the Town of Hotham was changed to the Town of North Melbourne.⁷⁴

West Melbourne also developed its own identity in the nineteenth century. It was an early residential suburb with mixed housing types, ranging from small dwellings and cottages through to more substantial villas and double-storey terraces. Substantial housing stock developed along the main thoroughfares of King, William and Dudley Streets, in conjunction with commercial and manufacturing land uses. More modest housing was located towards the West Melbourne Swamp and railyards.⁷⁵

By the latter decades of the nineteenth century, the precinct was predominantly a working class area, accommodating workers and their families associated with many diverse commercial, manufacturing and small and large scale industrial operations. These were located in, or adjoined the current precinct area. By way of example, a row of terraces at 461 to 483 Queensberry Street, owned by prominent local resident John Stedeford, was occupied in 1890 by carpenters, a waiter, labourer, slipper maker, cab proprietor, tinsmith, broom maker, banker and a boarding house operator. Of the twelve properties in Scotia Street in this period, seven were occupied by labourers, with a bootmaker, joiner, saddler and folder also listed in the municipal rate books.⁷⁶ Likewise, residents of the south end of Chetwynd Street included a carrier, engine driver, traveller, barman, lithographer, boilermaker and a blacksmith.⁷⁷

Larger industries and employers were located to the perimeter of the precinct. Queen Victoria Market was developed to the east from the mid-1850s; the Hay, Corn and Horse Market to the north at the intersection of Flemington Road and Royal Parade developed in the same period; while the Metropolitan Meat Market was established in Courtney Street in 1880. Abattoirs were also located outside the precinct area. Railway yards and rail infrastructure were to the south-west of the precinct. The West Melbourne swamp was made over in the late nineteenth century to become Victoria Dock, the main cargo port for the booming city of Melbourne.

A number of agricultural implement manufacturers were located in Hotham; timber milling occurred in the west of the precinct; tanners and soap manufacturers operated from Boundary Road; and the Melbourne Gas Works and Omnibus Company stables were situated on Macaulay Road.⁷⁸ Carriage works, foundries and factories can be seen on the MMBW plans of the 1890s, near the commercial centre of North Melbourne. Many of these were situated on the smaller streets and lanes of the precinct, which had developed off the principal streets.⁷⁹

Religious denominations were well represented in the precinct, with the Catholic Church prominent among them. Within Hotham, reserves were set aside for the Presbyterian, Church of England, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic faiths.⁸⁰ Many large church buildings and schools were constructed throughout the precinct, including St Mary's Star of the Sea (1891-1900) on Victoria Street and the State School (1882) on Queensberry Street. By 1916, the population of North Melbourne was 17,000, of which 50 percent were Catholic, and a number of Catholic schools were established to service the community.⁸¹

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries a number of political associations also formed in the suburb, including the North Melbourne Political Association (1850s); North Melbourne arm of the Liberal Association of Victoria (1880s); and the North Melbourne Political Labor League (1900s). Women's Suffrage League meetings were held at the North Melbourne Town Hall in the 1880s and 1890s, and anti-conscription meetings were held in the suburb in World War I.⁸²

In 1869, the North Melbourne Football Club was formed, being one of the earliest Australian Rules football clubs. Its players were colloquially known as the 'shinboners', believed to be a reference to the local abattoir workers.⁸³ The club's first games were played in Royal Park, and for a time it was known as the Hotham Football Club. Together with the cricket club of the same name, the football club played games at the Arden Street Oval, just outside the precinct boundary, from the 1880s. The historic ground has continued to be the home of the 'Kangaroos', an historic working class football club with its roots in the local community.

In 1905, the Town of North Melbourne was incorporated back into the City of Melbourne as the Hopetoun (North Melbourne) ward.⁸⁴ In 1911, the Melbourne Benevolent Asylum was demolished, opening up Elm and

Miller streets for residential development and Victoria Street for traffic. In the mid-twentieth century, the State Government undertook a program of 'slum clearance' which resulted in the demolition of houses in a number of blocks in the precinct. Aside from Hotham Hill to the north, the precinct's character by this time derived from its residential and industrial uses.⁸⁵

Much of West Melbourne's early housing stock was also demolished with the changing nature of the suburb throughout the twentieth century. Its earlier identity was to a large extent transformed with the growth of industry and manufacturing, and later again with the advance of corporate and office development out of the city.⁸⁶

Although small-scale manufacturing and industrial uses remain, particularly at the fringes of the precinct, North and West Melbourne's proximity to the city has seen it return to a favoured residential locality.

3.2 Description

The extent of the North and West Melbourne Precinct is identified as HO3 in the planning scheme maps.

Significant and contributory development in the precinct dates from the mid nineteenth century through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range.

The precinct is predominantly residential, albeit many streets combine residential and mixed use development where dwellings are seen with commercial, manufacturing and industrial buildings. The precinct varies in terms of its intactness, with streets incorporating both historic and infill development; visible changes and additions to historic buildings; and numerous examples of adaptation of former manufacturing and industrial buildings (such as factories and warehouses) to residential and other uses. In the north-west of the precinct, which has comparatively intact residential streets, there is less commercial, industrial or infill development. Although the principal residential streets in the centre of the precinct are wide, much of the development to these streets is fine grained and modest. There is also variety throughout the precinct in building and allotment sizes, and building heights, styles, materials and setbacks.

The majority of residences are of brick construction, either face brick or rendered masonry, with some earlier buildings of timber and stone. There are a comparatively high number of early buildings in the precinct, including development of the 1850s and 1860s. Victorian terraces and modest cottages predominate, and are typically simply detailed with limited or no setbacks to the street, and on narrow allotments with long backyards giving onto rear lanes and ROWs. In some streets, there are unusually intact rows of modest single-storey dwellings, the survival of which is a significant characteristic of the precinct.

The precinct also has larger Victorian dwellings, including two-storey terrace houses of face brick or rendered masonry. These have verandahs, again generally limited setbacks, and typically lower scale rear wings. Larger terraces and detached houses are more common in the northern part of the precinct. This includes Flemington Road, which has a Victorian boulevard character and some grander residences, but also more modest development at the west end within the precinct.

The site of the former Benevolent Asylum in the south of the precinct, located between Miller, Elm, Curzon and Abbotsford streets, has Edwardian dwellings constructed from the early 1910s. These properties have larger allotments and deeper front setbacks; and dwellings of face red brick, with prominent gabled roofs.

The precinct has secondary or 'little' streets, including named lanes, which accommodate historic workers cottages, warehouses and workshops, and occasionally stables. Small scale early twentieth century industrial development was also typically established in the secondary streets, with a sometimes intricate network of lanes giving access to these operations. Many of these latter developments replaced earlier often very modest dwellings, some of one or two rooms in size, as shown on the MMBW plans. These extremely modest workers cottages were therefore once more extensive.

Development on lanes to the rears of properties includes occasional historic outhouses such as water closets; rear boundary walls vary, with many original walls removed or modified to accommodate vehicle access. The latter is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties.

Large brick warehouses, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, with no street setbacks and dominant building forms are located in the east of the precinct, including in the area concentrated on O'Connell and Cobden streets, north of Victoria Market.

Commercial development is concentrated on Errol, Leveson, Victoria and Queensberry streets. Errol Street is especially notable for its intactness and distinguished buildings, with commercial activity dating from the 1850s, and complemented by the remarkable town hall development of the 1870s. This street, together with this area of Queensberry Street, is the village focus of North Melbourne, and is given emphasis by the town hall tower which has historically dominated the precinct and remains visible from distances. Victoria Street is also a highly intact commercial street, with consistent two-storey Victorian shops to both sides of the street, between Errol and Peel streets.

Historic commercial development throughout the precinct demonstrates many of the characteristics of late nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial/retail streets in inner Melbourne. The majority of buildings are two-storey, with no setbacks; have retail spaces at ground level with the original living quarters above and storage/service spaces to the rear. Ground floor facades vary in intactness, with modified shop frontages but also some surviving original or early shopfronts. These variously retain recessed entries and timber-framed shop windows with timber stall boards or masonry plinths. First floor facades are more intact, with original windows and parapets. There are also original or early iron post-supported verandahs with friezes, including return verandahs to street corners.

The precinct has corner shops and corner hotels, including a concentration of hotels in the area around Victoria Market. The 'corner pub' is very common, with many established in the middle decades of the nineteenth century.⁸⁷ While many have been demolished or adapted to different uses, the ubiquitous corner hotel demonstrates an important aspect of the social life of the precinct's working class community.

Churches and ecclesiastical complexes, which are comparatively larger than those of many other inner Melbourne precincts and suburbs, feature prominently and are often sited to intersections. They include St Marys Anglican Church, the Catholic St Mary's Star of the Sea, and the former Presbyterian Union Memorial Church (now Uniting Church) which has a prominent spire. Their dominant forms have historically contrasted with the surrounding low-scale housing, and the church spires are often visible from distances.

Queensberry Street is a Victorian street, with diverse development along its length including ecclesiastical, civic, institutional, commercial and residential buildings. There is also a concentration of buildings included in the Victorian Heritage Register on or close to Queensberry Street, including St Mary's Anglican Church, the town hall complex, Queensberry Street State School (later the College of Printing and Graphic Arts), the Uniting Church in Curzon Street, and the former Cable Tram Engine House.

Social housing, dating from the latter decades of the twentieth century is also prevalent in North Melbourne~~the precinct, with different examples of this housing type throughout the area, but~~ mostly outside the precinct boundary~~dating from the latter decades of the twentieth century.~~

3.2.1 Pattern of development

Regarding subdivision, the centre of the precinct, between Victoria and Arden streets follows a regular grid pattern, with wide and long north-south and east-west streets. Secondary or 'little' streets connect with the main streets and roads and provide access through large blocks of development. This hierarchy of streets reflects the original mid-nineteenth century road reservations; the wide and long streets also provide areas of the precinct with an open character, and internal views and vistas.

The regular grid changes north of Courtney and Molesworth streets, where the streets angle to the east to Flemington Road in the area of Hotham Hill; and south of Victoria Street where the streets angle to the west to meet those of the CBD grid, including William, King and Spencer streets, which extend out to the southern part of the precinct. The irregular juxtaposition of north-running streets angling east to meet Flemington Road generally reflects the street arrangement shown on the 1855 Kearney map. This pattern also gives rise to several large and irregular intersections in the north which allow for deep views into the precinct from Flemington Road, including along the wide Dryburgh, Abbotsford and Harcourt streets. Allotments associated with the elevated area of Hotham Hill are also more generous than those of the earlier subdivisions to the south.

The precinct also has large and irregular intersections where three or more streets meet at oblique angles; examples include the junctions of Errol, Courtney and Haines streets; Victoria, Curzon and King streets; Capel, William and Walsh streets; and Victoria, Leveson and Roden streets.

Flemington Road was historically important as a route to Geelong, and during the gold rushes as a route to the goldfields to the north-west of Melbourne. The *Roads Act* of 1853 provided for a number of wide (3 or 4 chains) routes out of Melbourne, indicating the then Surveyor-General, Robert Hoddle planned for the growing city. Flemington Road was one of these. Other historically important thoroughfares to the north of Melbourne, in or adjoining the precinct include Victoria, Peel and Elizabeth streets.

In terms of infrastructure, streets in the precinct variously retain bluestone kerbs and channels, while lanes generally retain original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.

3.2.2 Topography

Topography has played an important role in the precinct. Elevated Hotham Hill in the north of the precinct slopes down to the south and west, and historically attracted more prestigious residential development. Historically a creek circled the south side of the hill, and flowed south and west to feed the low-lying West Melbourne Swamp. The latter formed a natural boundary to the area. Larger blocks and residences on Hotham Hill developed after the creek was drained and undergrounded.

The west of the precinct also historically afforded views to Melbourne's docks and wharves, where many of the precinct's residents were employed. The topography has in addition resulted in some buildings having entrances elevated off the ground, and building rows which step up or down, following the grade of streetscapes.

3.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings

The precinct generally has limited open space, but with some triangular pocket parks. Flagstaff Gardens and Royal Park adjoin the precinct, as does the Arden Street Oval. Many of the principal north-south and east-west streets have street trees, including planes, elms and some eucalypts. These include Queensberry, Chetwynd, Leveson and Curzon streets, and most of the streets in the north-west of the precinct. Flemington Road is lined with elms on the precinct side.

3.3 Statement of Significance

North and West Melbourne Precinct (HO3) is of local significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).

- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

North and West Melbourne Precinct was developed from the mid-nineteenth century as part of the extension of Melbourne to its north and west during a period of significant population growth. Significant and contributory development in the precinct dates from the mid nineteenth century through to the interwar period, although Victorian development predominates. Some places of heritage value may also be outside this date range. The precinct is mainly residential, but with historic mixed use development, and several commercial streetscapes.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical nineteenth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of face brick and rendered masonry building materials, with timber and bluestone indicating earlier buildings.
 - Hipped roof forms with chimneys and parapets; verandahs which are simply detailed or have more decorative cast iron work; iron palisade fences on stone plinths; and limited or no front and side setbacks.
- Comparatively high number of buildings of the 1850s and 1860s.
- Modest workers' cottages as the common housing type, often in consistent and repetitive terrace rows, with simple forms and detailing.
- Other development including larger Victorian dwellings and two-storey terrace houses; Edwardian dwellings on the site of the former Benevolent Asylum; and interwar buildings.
- Typically low scale character, of one and two-storeys, with some larger three-storey buildings.
- Streets of consistent scale, or with greater scale diversity and contrasting modest and larger buildings.
- Streets which display historic mixed uses including residential, commercial, manufacturing and industrial uses.
- Nineteenth and twentieth century hotel buildings and shops located on corners and within residential street blocks.
- Secondary or 'little' streets, including named lanes, with workers cottages, warehouses and workshops, occasional stables and small scale early twentieth century commercial and industrial development.
- Importance of Errol, Victoria and Queensberry streets, being some of inner Melbourne's most extensive and intact commercial streetscapes.
- Remarkable 1870s-80s civic development at the corner of Errol and Queensberry streets, with the town hall tower being a local landmark.
- Views from lanes to historic outbuildings and rears of properties, providing evidence of historic property layouts.
- Undulating topography which has allowed for views and vistas of prominent elements such as the town hall tower and church spires.

- Important role of religion as demonstrated in the large and prominent ecclesiastical buildings and complexes.
- Evidence of change and evolution in the precinct, with streets having buildings from different periods, and historic buildings such as former factories and warehouses adapted and converted to new uses.
- Nineteenth century planning and subdivisions as evidenced in:
 - Hierarchy of principal streets and secondary streets and lanes.
 - Regular grid of straight north-south and east-west streets in the centre of the precinct.
 - Contrasting street alignments in the north of the precinct, where streets angle east to meet Flemington Road; and in the south of the precinct, where the CBD streets extend to meet the precinct.
 - Large and irregular street intersections including three or more streets meeting at oblique angles.
 - Lanes which provide access to rears of properties and act as important minor thoroughfares.
- Principal streets characterised by their width and open character, with vistas available along their length; these are sometimes distinguished by street tree plantings including planes, elms and eucalypts.
- Importance of major roads and thoroughfares which border or traverse the precinct including Flemington Road, a grand Victorian boulevard which was historically the route to the goldfields; and Victoria, Peel and Elizabeth streets.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels, and lanes with original or relayed bluestone pitches and central drains.
- Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with lane access.

How is it significant?

North and West Melbourne Precinct is of historical, social and aesthetic/architectural significance to the City of Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

North and West Melbourne Precinct is of **historical significance**, as a predominantly Victorian-era precinct associated with the nineteenth century growth of Melbourne to its north and west. As early as 1852, streets in the centre of the precinct, and north of Victoria Street, were laid down in a rigorous grid. Early development of the 1850s and 1860s also reflects local involvement in servicing the goldfields traffic and migration of people from Melbourne to the gold rush centres to the north-west. Hotham Hill, in the north of the precinct, was a notable development from the 1860s, its elevated position attracting grander residential development. West Melbourne also developed its own identity in the nineteenth century, being an early residential suburb with mixed housing types, which was later largely transformed including through the expansion of industry and manufacturing. Major roads and streets which traverse or border the precinct, including Victoria, Peel and Elizabeth streets, and Flemington Road, were historically important early Melbourne thoroughfares and boulevards. Flemington Road was envisioned by Robert Hoddle as major route out of Melbourne, its status confirmed in the *Roads Act* of 1853. The working class history of the precinct is particularly significant, demonstrated in the characteristically modest dwellings and historic mixed use development, including the proximity of houses to commercial, manufacturing and industrial buildings, historic corner shops and hotels,

and churches and schools. The Catholic Church was a particularly prominent local denomination. Residents of the precinct were employed in some of Melbourne's most important nineteenth and early twentieth century industries, located close to the precinct, including markets, abattoirs, railways and the port at Victoria Dock. Residents were also politically active, forming various associations in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and being prominent in the women's suffrage and World War I anti-conscription movements.

North and West Melbourne Precinct is of **social** significance. Residents value its historic streetscapes, its 'walkability', and its notable commercial development and village character centred on Errol, Victoria and Queensberry streets. Proximity to the nearby Victoria Market, Arden Street Oval and the city, is also highly valued.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the North and West Melbourne Precinct largely rests in its Victorian-era development including workers' cottages, rows of simply detailed modest dwellings, and two-storey terrace houses. These are complemented by larger Victorian dwellings, Edwardian development on the site of the former Benevolent Asylum, and historic mixed use buildings, with the latter often located in residential streets. There is also some variety in building and allotment sizes, and building heights, styles, materials and setbacks. In the Hotham Hill area, residential streets are wide and elevated, and comparatively intact, with larger residences. In the precinct's south, development is finer grained. Large brick warehouses, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, are located in the east of the precinct near Victoria Market. The precinct also has some of inner Melbourne's most extensive and intact commercial streetscapes, including significant concentrations on Errol, Victoria and Queensberry streets. Errol Street is particularly distinguished by the remarkable 1870s civic development, with the town hall tower a significant local landmark. Throughout the precinct, principal streets connect with secondary or 'little' streets, reflecting typical nineteenth century planning. These secondary streets reinforce the 'permeable' character and pedestrian nature of the precinct, enhanced by the network of lanes which are demonstrably of nineteenth century origin and function, and continue to provide access to the rears of properties. The lanes were also historically used to access small scale commercial and industrial operations, concentrated in the secondary streets of the precinct. Aesthetically, the precinct also has an open character, and internal views and vistas, deriving from the long and wide streets and several large and sometimes irregular intersections. Principal streets are also distinguished by street plantings of planes, elms and eucalypts.

4.0 HO4 – Parkville Precinct

4.1 History

Parkville Precinct is located in the suburb of Parkville. The predominantly residential precinct developed in the second half of the nineteenth century in sections around the perimeter of Royal Park.

From the late 1840s, Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, Charles La Trobe, was investigating establishing parklands for the residents of Melbourne. In a letter to the Melbourne Town Council of 1850, La Trobe outlined his policy for reserving land for the 'recreation and amusement' of the people. The policy included 2,560 acres north of the town of Melbourne, which 'the City Council may now, or at any future time judge proper to set apart and conveyed to the Corporation of Melbourne as a park for public use'.⁸⁸ It is unclear when the name Royal Park was formalised, but it was in use by November 1854 and is likely to have been associated with the naming of the adjacent Princes Park.⁸⁹

The establishment of Royal Park can be seen in the context of La Trobe's proposal to surround the city of Melbourne with a ring of parks and gardens, resulting in an inner ring of Fitzroy, Treasury, Parliament, Alexandra and Royal Botanic Gardens and the Domain, and an outer ring including Yarra, Albert, Fawkner and Princes parks. The former were generally more formally designed spaces, intended for passive recreation; while the latter were developed in a less sophisticated manner for both active and passive recreation.⁹⁰

Royal Parade, originally known as Sydney Road, ran between Royal Park and Princes Park, and forms the eastern boundary of the current precinct. It too was formalised by the early 1850s. In 1853, the University of Melbourne was established on the eastern side of the Sydney Road. The growth and success of the university has influenced development in Parkville, with the institution and the suburb historically connected.

A suburb designated as 'Parkside', associated with Flemington Road, formed part of the northern extension of Melbourne as planned by 1852.⁹¹ Parkside took in parts of what is now Parkville and North Melbourne, to either side of Flemington Road and along Queensberry Street West. By 1855, there had been some subdivision on the south and west sides of Royal Park. A reservation for the Church of England was located in a small subdivision which included Church and Manningham streets to the west of the park; and to the south was the reservation for the Hay, Corn and Horse Market.⁹²

In the 1860s, Royal Park was used by the Acclimatisation Society, which had formed in 1861. In 1862, 550 acres of the park was reserved for zoological purposes, the precursor to the present day Melbourne Zoo.⁹³ The failed Burke and Wills expedition departed from Royal Park in 1860, and was the most high profile event in the park's early history. By the late 1850s, cricket matches were also regularly played in the park, with Australian Rules football played there from the 1870s.⁹⁴ The use of the park for sporting activities has continued to the present day, and has included golf and baseball. In the 1880s, a railway line was constructed through Royal Park, with the Royal Park station giving access to the zoo. A cutting was made through the park to accommodate the line, revealing strata rock formations. A branch line from Royal Park to Clifton Hill was formed as part of the Inner Circle railway, which opened in 1888.⁹⁵ The park has also been used for military purposes since the nineteenth century, including being the site of a major training camp during World War I; and again during World War II when it hosted a camp for both Australian and American troops.

In 1868, there was controversy surrounding a proposal to alienate a portion of Royal Park for a narrow and largely linear subdivision abutting the west side of Royal Parade. To ensure an open landscape character was maintained, only one villa residence of stone or brick was permitted per allotment.⁹⁶ By 1872, a residential subdivision of smaller villa allotments had been created to the south of the intersection of what is now Gatehouse Street and Royal Parade. This subdivision created the east-west streets of Morrah, Bayles and Degraives, and the north-south streets of Fitzgibbons and Wimble.⁹⁷ In 1879, further subdivision and sale of land occurred in the suburb between Morrah Street, the newly named Story Street and along Park Street.⁹⁸ Gatehouse Street was also formed by 1879, with a wide median between it and Park Street, now known as Levers Reserve,⁹⁹ allowing for the channelling of the creek bed that ran parallel to the two streets.¹⁰⁰

Laneways were also created with the subdivisions. These for the most part provided access to the rears of properties, including access for services such as 'night carts'; and for horses stabled on properties, although stables were not common in the precinct due to its proximity to the city and early public transport.

The name 'Parkville' appears to have been adopted for the suburb by the mid-1870s, with newspaper reports referring to the Parkville cricket team in 1875.¹⁰¹ By 1887, the *North Melbourne Advertiser* was reporting that 'the pretty suburb has advanced with giant strides.'¹⁰² The newspaper also commented that 'the suburb is strictly a residential one, being marred with only one public house, and benefitted by a couple of grocers' shops and one butchering establishment.'¹⁰³

However, Morrah Street developed as a small service area, with the 1890 *Sands & McDougall* directory listing a baker, bookmakers, chemist, grocer and painter operating on the north side of the street.¹⁰⁴ There were also a small number of shops along Royal Parade by this time, and a police station which had been established in the late 1870s.¹⁰⁵ The two-storey Parkville Post Office was constructed in 1889 in Bayliss Street, after residents lobbied for its location to be in the residential suburb rather than at the university as first proposed.¹⁰⁶

It has been noted that the majority of dwellings in Parkville were erected between the early 1870s and early 1890s.¹⁰⁷ Certainly, MMBW plans of the 1890s show that by this time the three residential subdivisions of Parkville to the west, south and east of Royal Park were substantially developed, although some vacant allotments remained along Park Street. The vast majority of buildings in the suburb were constructed of brick,

with more limited use of stone. While substantial detached villas set back from the street had been constructed on The Avenue (then Park Road), rows of single and double-storey terraces had been constructed in the southern part of the precinct.¹⁰⁸ The mostly two-storey houses along The Avenue and Gatehouse Street faced west to Royal Park, which by the late nineteenth century had assumed a more organised character, with roads and pathways providing access to different sections of the park.¹⁰⁹

Development of the suburb continued into the twentieth century, with construction of residences on previously vacant allotments. An electric tramline was established through Royal Park in the 1920s.¹¹⁰ University High School was constructed on the south side of Story Street in 1929, on the former horse market site, adjoining the present precinct boundary. In the mid-1930s, the former church site on Manningham Street was subdivided around the new street of St George's Grove.¹¹¹ Blocks of flats were also constructed along Morrah Street in the interwar period. In the mid-twentieth century, the Royal Children's Hospital moved from Carlton to the south side of Royal Park.

Parkville has retained its predominantly residential character, and relatively limited development has occurred in the suburb since the mid-twentieth century, particularly in the south of the precinct. Along The Avenue through to Royal Parade, there has been some infill development with the construction of modern apartment and office blocks.

Many of the suburb's residents have historically been professionals and academics, choosing to live in Parkville because of its proximity to the university, its colleges, and the city. Medical professionals have also been attracted to the suburb, associated with prominent local institutions such as the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute, and hospitals including the Royal Melbourne and Royal Children's.

4.2 Description

The extent of the Parkville Precinct is identified as HO4 in the planning scheme maps.

Royal Park, incorporating the Melbourne Zoological Gardens, is partly surrounded by, and also adjoins the precinct.

Significant and contributory development in the Parkville Precinct dates from the second half of the nineteenth century, with some limited development through to the interwar period.

Parkville Precinct is predominantly residential and a remarkably intact Victorian precinct, with very little replacement of the first or original dwellings. Residences include one and two-storey Victorian terraces, in pairs and rows; and some Edwardian and interwar buildings. Larger more substantial villas are in the north of the precinct, and throughout to prominent corners. Double-storey terraces are the dominant building form. Modest single-storey and single-fronted cottages have more limited representation.

Historic residential development is typically of high quality, with dwellings that are richly detailed and of high integrity. There are few modern buildings or visible additions to historic buildings. Most streets retain their original nineteenth century character, and many also have a consistent scale and regularity of dwelling types, form and materials. Rears of buildings have an unusually high level of visibility in parts of the precinct, including views of intact rear first floors.

Brick is the predominant construction material, with rendered masonry, face brick and some very fine examples of bi-chrome and poly-chrome brickwork. Other characteristics of residential buildings include verandahs with decorative cast iron work, the latter displaying a rich variety of patterns; verandahs and paths which retain original tessellated tiling; eaves lines and parapets which are detailed and ornamented, including with urns and finials; and side or party walls which extend from the fronts of terraces, as per the nineteenth century fire regulations, and are often decorated.

A high number of original iron palisade fences on stone plinths survive to front property boundaries. Roofs are mostly hipped, slate cladding is common, and chimneys are prominent and visible. Smaller scale rear wings

are also common to the two-storey terraces, and visible to street corners and lanes. Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

Other characteristics of development in the precinct include residences with lower ground floors or half-basement levels, reflecting the topography. There are dwellings with entrances below ground/street level on the west side of Park Drive.

North Parkville has more substantial historic dwellings, often free-standing, including on The Avenue and in the northern section of Royal Parade. The Avenue is distinguished by its long curving alignment, oriented to Royal Park to the west. It was historically, and remains, a street of some grandeur where large historic residences were constructed, notwithstanding the introduction of several large scale developments in the later twentieth century. Many of the grand residences have also been adapted to non-residential uses, with a consequent negative impact on settings, including the introduction of extensive car parking. The height of buildings on the street also varies, significantly in some instances. The southern area of The Avenue has smaller allotments by comparison, but still generous in size with some substantial nineteenth century terrace rows.

Royal Parade also historically attracted larger and grander residential development, as befits its boulevard status. Auld Reekie and Nocklofty are substantial and significant Edwardian dwellings constructed between 1906 and 1910. Deloraine Terrace, a significant row of Boom style 1880s terraces is also at the northern end of the parade. A concentration of significant non-residential development including the Uniting Church, former College Church, and historic former police station complex are located south of Macarthur Road.

South Parkville was developed with nineteenth century terrace housing, and is remarkably intact and consistent, with streets of high integrity and some of the best examples of historic terrace rows in Victoria. As with The Avenue, development in Gatehouse Street, predominantly two-storey Victorian terraces, also addressed Royal Park. Park Drive has a consistent Victorian character, and is distinguished through its width and central median. On the east side, there are several large and prominent Victorian villas, with substantial if irregular allotments, including to corners.

West Parkville, in the area centred on Manningham, Church and Southgate streets and St George's Crescent, provides some contrast in terms of streetscape character and development. It has a greater diversity of buildings, from nineteenth century dwellings to interwar and post-war residential development.

In the lanes, rear boundary walls to properties retain some original fabric, but the majority have been modified to accommodate vehicle access. Lanes also generally afford an unusually high level of visibility to the rears of properties, many of which retain intact first floor elevations and rear wings. Of note in this context is Levers Reserve, between Gatehouse Street and Park Drive, which is a wide reserve with flanking ROWs and provides both access to, and views of the rears of properties on the latter streets. Interestingly, stables to rear lanes are not typical of the precinct, reflecting its historical proximity to the city and early public transport.

There are few commercial or institutional buildings in the precinct; a small number are associated with the University of Melbourne. Civic buildings include the post office in the south of precinct.

4.2.1 Pattern of development

Much of the precinct area was subdivided on land released from Royal Park, or originally set aside for markets or other public purposes.

Residential subdivision patterns vary within the precinct, with three distinct areas. North Parkville has larger allotments, with this area mostly developed in the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. South Parkville has a more regular subdivision pattern, with a grid of connected streets and lanes, and a greater consistency of allotment sizes. In the west of the precinct, or West Parkville, the subdivision is more irregular, with smaller and larger allotments.

The precinct is associated with several important Melbourne thoroughfares and boulevards. Royal Parade was historically the main road from Melbourne to Sydney, and has had a major influence on development in the precinct. Flemington Road is another important early boulevard of Melbourne, and a boundary to the southern edge of the precinct. The *Roads Act* of 1853 provided for a number of wide (3 or 4 chains) routes out of Melbourne, indicating the then Surveyor-General, Robert Hoddle planned for the growing city. These routes included Royal Parade and Flemington Road.

More generally, the precinct's streets are typically wide, with deep footpaths and generous medians. Laneways run between and in parallel with the residential streets. Of particular note in this context is Levers Reserve, a distinctively shaped reserve which runs parallel between Gatehouse Street and Park Drive, and is wide at its south end and narrow at its north end. It is crossed by Story, Morrah and Bayles streets, and has a central landscaped median which is flanked by stone-pitched ROWS which are effectively secondary streets, providing access to the rears of properties to Gatehouse Street and Park Drive.

In terms of infrastructure, streets in the precinct variously retain bluestone kerbs and channels, while lanes generally retain original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.

4.2.2 Parks, gardens and street plantings

Royal Park, with its expansive open landform, is a dominant presence in the precinct. It is valued for its remnant indigenous vegetation, including trees, shrubs and grasslands, together with mature tree avenues and specimen trees, including exotics. It is notable, within the context of inner Melbourne parks, for its retention of indigenous vegetation and maintenance of its natural character. Open spaces are used for passive and informal recreation, with more formalised sports played on several ovals and related facilities. The park also affords generous views and vistas out, to the city and to development in Parkville to the east; and internal vistas which enable viewers to experience what is comparatively a vast park landscape within inner Melbourne.

There are also views to Royal Park from within the precinct, including from the east, south and west of the park.

Royal Parade is a leafy and treed boulevard. It is divided into three sections comprising the central full width main carriageway, separated from flanking service roads to either side by grassed medians and road plantations comprising elms planted in the early twentieth century. The service roads are also bordered by elm plantations and grassed medians, which on the west side provide expansive green settings to development on the eastern (Royal Parade) edge of the precinct.

As noted, Levers Reserve is a landscaped [linear area extending from Bayles Street in the north to Flemington Road in the south](#); Gatehouse Street also has street plantings. In parts of the precinct, particularly in the north, deep front setbacks and front gardens to properties additionally contribute to the garden character of the precinct.

4.3 Statement of Significance

Parkville Precinct (HO4) is of state significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).
- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

Parkville Precinct is predominantly residential in character, and was developed in sections around the perimeter of Royal Park. Significant and contributory development dates from the second half of the nineteenth century, with some limited development through to the interwar period. Royal Park has historically comprised the majority of the precinct area, with historic residential subdivisions located to the south, east and west of the park. Within the park are extensive informal parklands, sporting facilities and the Melbourne Zoo.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical nineteenth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of face brick, including bi-chrome and poly-chrome brickwork, and rendered masonry building materials.
 - Hipped roof forms with often visible and prominent chimneys, and slate cladding; eaves lines and parapets with detailing and ornamentation, including urns and finials; side or party walls extending from the fronts of terraces, and often decorated; verandahs with decorative cast iron work, including a rich variety of patterns; verandah floors and paths which retain original tessellated tiling; iron palisade fences on stone plinths; and limited or no side setbacks.
- Streets of consistent heritage character with dwellings of high quality and integrity, and few visible additions to historic buildings.
- Very high proportion of surviving first or original dwellings.
- South Parkville being an example of an area of a particularly intact Victorian residential development area.
- Residential character of the precinct emphasised by historically limited presence of commercial and non-residential development.
- Limited later development as evidenced in Edwardian and interwar buildings.
- Typically low scale character, of mainly two-storeys, with some single-storey and larger two-storey dwellings.
- Rears of properties, including rear wings and first floors, contribute to the heritage character where they are visible and intact.
- Historically important associations with the University of Melbourne and nearby hospitals.
- Larger scale development including multi-storey modern buildings mostly confined to parts of Royal Parade and The Avenue, with low scale historical development and minimal infill to the remainder of the precinct.
- Nineteenth century planning and subdivision as evidenced in:
 - Large allotments in the north of the precinct (North Parkville), on Royal Parade and along the curved alignment of The Avenue.
 - Regular grid and typical hierarchy of principal streets and lanes, with greater consistency of smaller allotment sizes in the south of the precinct (South Parkville).
 - Irregular subdivision, with smaller and larger allotments, in the west of the precinct (West Parkville).
 - Ievers Reserve.

- Importance of major roads and thoroughfares which border the precinct, with their historical status demonstrated in surviving significant development, including Royal Parade with its larger and grander residences. Flemington Road is another important early Melbourne boulevard.
- Dominance of Royal Park beyond the precinct, with its expansive open landform, and relationship with the adjoining The Avenue and Gatehouse Street.
- Views into and out from Royal Park to bordering development and beyond.
- Importance of gardens and treed character, including generous grassed medians, and deep front setbacks and front gardens to properties, particularly in the north.
- Stature of Royal Parade is enhanced by street tree plantings and rows, wide grassed medians and deep footpaths.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels, and lanes with original or relayed bluestone pitches and central drains.
- Vehicle accommodation which is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with rear lane access.

How is it significant?

Parkville Precinct is of historical, social and aesthetic/architectural significance to the State of Victoria.

Why is it significant?

Parkville Precinct is of **historical significance**, as a remarkably intact Victorian-era precinct, with high quality historic residential development, dwellings that are richly detailed and of high integrity, and graceful streets of consistent heritage character. The precinct developed in the second half of the nineteenth century to the perimeter of Royal Park, on land which was alienated from the park or originally set aside for markets or other public purposes. The relationship with the park is reflected in the suburb's name. Royal Park was established in the 1840s as one of the ring of parks and gardens reserved by Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, Charles La Trobe. This was a visionary action which resulted in a series of much valued open spaces surrounding inner Melbourne. An early high profile event in the park was the departure of the failed Burke and Wills expedition in 1860; and in 1862, 550 acres of the park was reserved for zoological purposes, the precursor to the present day Melbourne Zoo. Royal Park is also significant for its long association with sport and recreation, both formal and more passive. Royal Parade on the eastern side of the precinct was formalised by the early 1850s, and is historically significant as the main road from Melbourne to Sydney. The parade, with Flemington Road, was envisioned by Robert Hoddle as a major route out of Melbourne, the status confirmed in the *Roads Act* of 1853. The establishment of Royal Parade also had a major influence on development in the precinct, including attracting larger and grander residences to the west side of the road, as befits its boulevard status. The University of Melbourne was established on the eastern side of the road in 1853, and has historically been strongly linked to the precinct, with many academics taking up residence as did professionals attracted by proximity to the city. Medical professionals have also been attracted to the suburb, associated with prominent local institutions such as the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute, and hospitals including the Royal Melbourne and Royal Children's. The majority of residences were constructed between the early 1870s and early 1890s, with the precinct rapidly established as a prestigious residential area. Little in the way of commerce or other non-residential land uses were established in the precinct.

Parkville Precinct is of **social significance**. It is highly regarded in Melbourne for its intact Victorian streetscapes and buildings. Residents of the precinct also value the heritage character of the suburb, and demonstrate a strong sense of community and ongoing association with Parkville. Royal Park is also highly valued, both locally and more widely. For residents of the precinct, a highly regarded attribute of living in the

suburb is the proximity to the park and the opportunity it presents for formal and informal recreation and the appreciation of its landscape character and qualities.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the Parkville Precinct largely rests in its Victorian-era development. It is one of Melbourne's most intact Victorian precincts, with comparatively few modern buildings or visible additions to historic buildings, and very little replacement of original dwellings. Two-storey terraces are the dominant building form, complemented by single-storey dwellings and more substantial villas and large houses, some of which are highly ornate and sited at prominent corners. South Parkville in particular is remarkably intact and consistent, with some of Victoria's best examples of historic terrace rows. Different subdivision and development patterns are also evident in the northern, southern and western areas of Parkville. The nNorth Parkville is distinguished by large allotments and substantial often free-standing historic dwellings; the sSouth Parkville has a more regular grid of streets and lanes, and greater consistency of allotment sizes and building forms; and the wWest Parkville has a more irregular pattern with smaller and larger allotments, and greater building diversity. Lanes are a significant feature of the precinct, and demonstrably of nineteenth century origin and function. Royal Park is of aesthetic significance, as a vast park landscape within inner Melbourne and a dominant presence adjacent to ~~in~~ the precinct. It has remnant indigenous vegetation and tree avenues and specimen trees. The park affords views and vistas out, to the city and development in Parkville; complemented by generous internal vistas. The historic relationship between Royal Park and the precinct is ~~also~~ reflected in development on the adjoining frontage of The Avenue and Gatehouse Street, where often substantial dwellings address the park. The precinct is additionally significant for its treed and garden character, reflected again in the parks and open spaces, including Hevers Reserve; wide streets with deep footpaths and generous grassed medians; and deep front setbacks and front gardens to properties, particularly in the north of the precinct.

5.0 HO6 – South Yarra Precinct

5.1 History

South Yarra Precinct is located within the suburb of South Yarra. The suburb was developed from the 1840s, on mostly elevated land on the south side of the Yarra River.

Residential development in the precinct area began in the 1840s, after closure of an Aboriginal mission located on the south bank of the Yarra River between 1837 and 1839. In 1840, a survey plan was prepared by T H Nutt for 21 large 'cultivation' allotments on the south of the river.¹¹² Although this plan was subsequently amended by Charles La Trobe, Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, to provide for extensive parkland and government reserves, thirteen remaining allotments north of the future Toorak Road (then the road to Gardiner's Creek) were sold in 1845-1849. These large rectangular allotments influenced the later layout of streets in South Yarra, including in the centre and east of the precinct.¹¹³

Early land owners included J Anderson and H W Mason, both of whom had streets named after them. The elevated land, with the high point of Punt Hill close to the intersection of today's Punt and Domain roads, was especially attractive to new residents, including wealthy graziers (as their town base), city merchants and professionals, and members of the legal profession.¹¹⁴

The establishment of public parks and gardens in and adjoining the precinct was highly influential in its subsequent development. They can also be understood in the context of a proposal, largely credited to La Trobe, to surround the city of Melbourne with a ring of parks and gardens, including land set aside for public purposes. The result was an inner ring of gardens, including the Fitzroy, Treasury, Parliament, Alexandra and Royal Botanic Gardens and the Domain; and an outer ring including Yarra, Albert, Fawkner, Royal and Princes Parks. The former were generally more formally designed spaces, intended for passive recreation; while the latter were developed in a less sophisticated manner for both active and passive recreation.¹¹⁵

When La Trobe amended Nutt's earlier subdivision plan in the early 1840s, he provided for the site of the future Government House. The Royal Botanic Gardens (RBG) reserve was also identified to the east of the Government House Reserve in 1846.¹¹⁶ Within the larger Crown land area, other designations and reserves eventually included Kings Domain, Queen Victoria Gardens and Alexandra Gardens, the latter adjoining the Yarra River. Later development associated with the reserves included the establishment of the National Herbarium, with the collection started in the early 1850s by Ferdinand von Mueller, the first Government Botanist of Victoria; the Melbourne Observatory to the south-west of the Government House Reserve, started in 1861; and the relocation of La Trobe's cottage from Jolimont to the Domain in 1963, on a site off Birdwood Avenue. The latter is a conjectural reconstruction of the cottage, as originally built for La Trobe and his family in the late 1830s.¹¹⁷

Von Mueller was appointed Director of the RBG in 1857, and introduced exotic plants from overseas and elsewhere in Australia. He also oversaw the establishment of a systems garden, treed walks, and the lagoon with islands; and added structures such as glasshouses, a palm house, iron arbours, gates, fences and animal enclosures. However, it is the later layout of the gardens, as overseen by William Guilfoyle between 1873 and 1909, which has largely been retained.¹¹⁸

Government House was constructed between 1872 and 1876, and consists of a complex of buildings, including the vice-regal apartments and State Ballroom, in substantial grounds. The dominant tower, rising some 45 metres, is a landmark, and visible from distances around, including from the Botanic Gardens. Government House is one of Australia's grandest historic residences, and regarded as one of the finest examples of nineteenth century residential architecture in Australia.¹¹⁹

The Melbourne Observatory comprises buildings and elements constructed between 1861 and 1945, including the main Observatory Building, Great Melbourne Telescope Building, Equatorial Building, Magnet House, Astronomer's residence and obelisk. The complex was the focus of astronomical, magnetic and meteorological scientific investigation in nineteenth century Melbourne, and was instrumental in providing Victoria with accurate time, as well as meteorological statistics.¹²⁰

The National Herbarium is the oldest scientific institution in the state. While the current building was constructed in the 1930s, and later extended, it houses a collection of approximately 1.5 million dried plant, algae and fungi specimens, the majority of which are Australian, and about half of which were collected before 1900.¹²¹

St Kilda Road, which borders the west of the precinct, was an early track to St Kilda and Brighton. With construction of the bridge over the Yarra River in 1845, and early land sales in St Kilda and Brighton, use of the road increased, as did its status.¹²² Within the general precinct area, St Kilda Road evolved into a favoured address for a range of institutions. Over a relatively brief period in the 1850s and 1860s, these included Melbourne Grammar School (1855); Royal Victorian Institute for the Blind (1866); Victorian Deaf and Dumb Institution (1866); Alfred Hospital (1869); Royal Freemasons Homes (c. 1864); Wesley College (1864); and the Immigrants' Home (1853) near Princes Bridge, since demolished.

In 1862, the name 'Fawkner Park' was applied to the reserve in the south of the current precinct, as a tribute to John Pascoe Fawkner, one of Melbourne's founders.¹²³ In October that year, a series of large villa allotments were subdivided from the western edge of the park along St Kilda Road.¹²⁴ The South Yarra State School was established on the east side of the park by the late 1870s.¹²⁵

The Kearney map of 1855 shows development in South Yarra to be a mix of large residences on substantial allotments, and scattered small buildings along the main thoroughfares and lanes which had developed after the initial land sales.¹²⁶ Large estates in or adjoining the precinct area included Airlie, St Leonards, Fairley House, Ravensburgh House and Maritimo. The 1855 map also shows that that the Botanic and South Yarra Club hotels had been established on the south side of Domain Road; with the South Melbourne and Homerton hotels at the west end of Gardiner's Creek Road, now Toorak Road. The *Sands & McDougall* directory of 1862 records few commercial buildings in the precinct; a grocers and butcher were located in Millswyn Street. [This early commercial development on Millswyn Street, which grew to include greengrocers, a milk bar, laundry](#)

and hotel, has been described as 'the commercial hub' of this part of South Yarra, and a more important shopping area than Domain Road.¹⁴² while a A retail centre also later developed on Toorak Road, to the east of Punt Road, outside the precinct boundary.¹²⁷

In 1862, the name 'Fawkner Park' was applied to the reserve in the south of the current precinct, as a tribute to John Pascoe Fawkner, one of Melbourne's founders. In October that year, a series of large villa allotments were subdivided from the western edge of the Park along St Kilda Road. Pasley Street, and the adjoining Park Place, were also created out of a subdivision of the eastern area of Fawkner Park, with the earliest houses built in the 1860s. The South Yarra State School was established on the east side of the Park by the late 1870s.

Although the suburb remained predominantly residential, in the 1880s and 1890s additional commercial operations opened on Domain Road and Millswyn Street.¹²⁸ The Wimmera Bakery building in Millswyn Street, for example, was constructed next to Morton's Family Hotel, with three grocers and two butchers amongst other shops located on the street by the 1890s.¹²⁹ Few industrial or large commercial buildings were located within the precinct, an exception being the Mutual Store Company's property off St Martins Lane, where the company replaced their c. 1880s livery stables with a new warehouse in c. 1924.¹³⁰

Through the late nineteenth century, many of the earlier large estates were subdivided into smaller allotments, including the South Yarra Hill estate between Park and Leopold streets, and the creation of Mason Street in the late 1880s. The east side of Park Street was originally part of HW Mason's earlier landholding. The majority of allotments on the east side of the street were not released for sale until the 1880s, resulting in what has been described as 'a more cohesive housing type with many elaborate and imposing terraces'. In contrast, the west side of the street was developed in stages, with a more 'eclectic range of housing types'.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the suburb of South Yarra, west of Punt Road, was substantially developed with a mix of substantial and modest residences. The centre of the precinct, in the block between Millswyn and Leopold streets, comprised relatively high density development of terrace pairs and detached villas. There also remained a number of larger residences to the east and west of the precinct and towards the river, including Moullrassie, Goodrest and Maritimo on Toorak Road, and Fairlie House on Anderson Street.¹³¹

By the interwar period, the urban character of South Yarra was changing. The *Argus* noted that development of residential flats was 'one of the features of architectural work in Melbourne' in this period, and South Yarra came to be regarded as 'one of the best [suburbs] in Melbourne' for this type of development.¹³² New streets also continued to be formed from the subdivision of the earlier estates, and demolition of nineteenth century mansions. Marne Street was created following subdivision of the extensive grounds of Maritimo in the early 1920s. The mansion itself was demolished in 1928, after the death of its owner J F W Payne.¹³³ Fairlie Court was created on the site of Fairlie House; and St Leonards Court was formed following demolition of the substantial residence, St Leonards.¹³⁴

Marne Street was created following subdivision of the extensive grounds of Maritimo. The mansion was demolished in 1928, after the death of its owner JFW Payne; and the street was developed in two main stages between 1919 and 1928.¹⁵⁵ By 1940, ~~the Marne s~~Street was extensively developed with flat blocks such as Marne Court, Moore Abbey, Balmoral flats, Maritimo flats and Garden Court;¹³⁵ and noted architects involved in the design of the developments included Joseph Plattell, Edward Bilson, Arthur Plaistead and Robert Hamilton.¹⁵⁷

The replacement of earlier buildings with flat blocks was met with some opposition, with concerns that the area was being 'exploited for commercialism'.¹³⁶ Other developments attracted media attention for their modernity, including St Leonards (1939) in St Leonards Court, in which the owner installed 'modern household appliances and equipment'.¹³⁷ The popularity of flat block developments continued into the post-war period, with the *Argus* noting that 'many small attractive blocks of flats ... are regarded as good investments'.¹³⁸

Development also continued in the parks and gardens in and adjoining the precinct. Between 1927 and 1934, the Shrine of Remembrance was constructed in Kings Domain. It is Victoria's principal war memorial, conceived following World War I, and built on an elevated and formally landscaped site adjacent to St Kilda Road. The design was classically derived, drew on symbolic Greek sources and incorporated a variety of Australian materials.¹³⁹ Another significant development was the Sidney Myer Music Bowl, also constructed in Kings Domain, off Alexandra Avenue. The Bowl was gifted to the people of Melbourne by the Myer family, and named after the founder of the Myer department store empire. Design and construction of the 1958 Bowl involved some of Melbourne's most innovative architects and engineers, and its tensile construction system is regarded as a technical tour de force.¹⁴⁰

South Yarra has remained a popular and prestigious residential suburb characterised by its proximity to parks and gardens and the Yarra River.

5.2 Description

The extent of the South Yarra Precinct is identified as HO6 in the planning scheme maps.

The Royal Botanic Gardens and National Herbarium, Government House and Government House Reserve, Melbourne Observatory, La Trobe's Cottage, Shrine of Remembrance, Sidney Myer Music Bowl, Kings Domain, Queen Victoria Gardens, Alexandra Gardens and Fawkner Park are largely within or immediately adjoin the precinct.

Significant and contributory development in the precinct dates from the 1850s to the mid-twentieth century, including the post-World War II period.

Residential development includes modest nineteenth century cottages; two-storey terraces in pairs and rows; Victorian and Edwardian free-standing villas and large houses; and interwar and mid-twentieth century development including flat blocks. The precinct is noted for its high quality buildings, many of which were designed by prominent architects. While nineteenth century development is well represented, the twentieth century is also an important period in the evolution of the precinct.

Houses are single or double storey, although there is some variety in historic two-storey heights; and also flat blocks of two-three storeys, with some taller examples. Two-storey dwellings typically have lower scale rear wings. Some very fine large historic houses are located in the precinct, on generous allotments and in garden settings.

Most buildings are of masonry construction, including face brick and rendered exteriors; weatherboard is uncommon; and the early institutions to St Kilda Road include stone buildings. Of the Victorian and early twentieth century development, decorative and often ornate cast iron work is a feature, with the smaller cottages more simply detailed. Parapets are prominent, and often detailed and ornamented, including with urns and finials; and side or party walls extend from the fronts of terraces, as per the nineteenth century fire regulations. Slate roofing is common, and chimneys are prominent. Roofs can be hipped and gabled and can vary in their visibility, being prominent elements of building design, or less visible and concealed by parapets. A high number of original iron palisade fences with stone plinths survive.

Pockets of more modest Victorian development, including cottages are typically found away from the main streets and thoroughfares, including on Mason, Hope, Leopold and Little Park streets, and St Martin's Lane. Larger and grander residences front the principal streets and roads in the precinct, including Domain Road, Toorak Road West, Park Street, Anderson Street and also Pasley Street on the east side of Fawkner Park. A consistent pattern is one of larger residences facing the parks, including Fawkner Park and the Royal Botanic Gardens. Park Street is a particularly wide street, carrying the tramline, with a collection of imposing Victorian and early twentieth century residences, with elevated entrances; and interwar flat blocks.

Interwar development, including flat blocks, display many features of the period. These include face brickwork which is often patterned and finely executed, or rendered surfaces, or combinations of face brick and render;

curved window and corner bays; slim and simply detailed awnings or canopies; externally expressed stair bays; art deco detailing to iron work; large windows, often steel-framed; balconies with brick or iron balustrades; and hipped or flat roofs, with plain but sometimes prominent parapets. The earlier blocks have Tudor Revival detailing, including half-timbered gable ends. The later blocks, of the 1940s and post-World War II period are stripped of ornamentation, with plain walls and strongly expressed forms. Many of the flat blocks are built close to the street, with limited setbacks. Marne Street, St Leonards Court, Fairlie Court and Alexandra Avenue are noted for early twentieth century and interwar development, and incorporate a variety of architectural styles in houses and flat blocks. Marne Street in particular has been described as having a 'much higher architectural standard' than other concentrations of interwar flat block development. Domain Park Towers, on Domain Road, is a noted early high rise apartment development, designed by Robin Boyd and completed in 1962.

The precinct generally has limited commercial development, albeit with a small concentration on Domain Road turning into Park Street, where the junction is marked by a double-storey commercial corner building on a curved plan. On Domain Road, the commercial buildings are of mixed character, between one and three storeys, with typically modified ground floor shopfronts and mostly intact upper level facades, including prominent parapets. They include buildings of early twentieth century origin. A small group of former commercial buildings are also located on Millswyn Street, mostly adapted to residential use, including several shops, Morton's Family Hotel and the Wimmera Bakery.¹⁴¹ Historically, there was limited industrial or manufacturing development in the precinct.

Institutional development is a strong feature, as outlined in the historical overview, with notable institutions in and adjoining the precinct boundary, including to St Kilda Road. Melbourne Girls Grammar School is also prominent in the elevated area of Anderson Street; and Christ Church dominates the intersection of Toorak and Punt roads.

Other significant public and institutional development is associated with the various parks and gardens within or immediately adjoining the precinct, including Government House, the Melbourne Observatory, National Herbarium, Shrine of Remembrance, Sidney Myer Music Bowl and La Trobe's Cottage.

5.2.1 Pattern of development

Subdivision in the precinct did not necessarily proceed in an orderly manner, and it has been noted that residential areas were 'not planned, developing from the 1840s to the end of the nineteenth century through small private subdivision of the very early government land sales'.¹⁴² However, the early large allotments north of the future Toorak Road, as sold in the second half of the 1840s, still influenced the planning and layout of future streets, particularly in the centre and east of the precinct.

The ongoing re-subdivision and reduction in size of the large nineteenth century estates is a distinctive characteristic of the precinct, and generally occurred from the latter decades of the nineteenth century through to the interwar period. Some of the early estates were broken up into quite small allotments, an example being the fine-grained subdivision between Park and Leopold streets; Mason Street was also created and subdivided in a similar way in the late 1880s. In the interwar period, many of the flat blocks were built on allotments created from the historic nineteenth century estates. Some were also built on the sites of demolished early mansions.

The precinct is noted for its principal roads and boulevards, and network of mainly north-south running residential streets, on a regular grid. This is particularly noticeable in the central part of the precinct, between Toorak and Domain roads, with the latter on east-west alignments. Generally, allotment sizes tend to be larger in the east and west of the precinct, and more finely grained in the centre. Principal roads and boulevards include St Kilda, Toorak, Domain, and Punt roads; Alexandra Avenue; and Park and Anderson streets.

Several of the principal roads were historically major thoroughfares south of the city, including as noted St Kilda Road. The development of this road, after its humble beginnings as a track to St Kilda and Brighton,

came after the *Roads Act* of 1853, which provided for a number of wide (3 or 4 chains) routes out of Melbourne. The roads were indicative of the foresight of Surveyor-General, Robert Hoddle in his planning for the growing city.

Punt Road, on the eastern boundary of the precinct, was a relatively quiet thoroughfare leading to the punt crossing and pedestrian bridge over the Yarra River. However, traffic increased throughout the twentieth century with the improved river crossing, and the connection with Hoddle Street to the north created one of Melbourne's most direct and busiest north-south thoroughfares.¹⁴³

5.2.2 Topography

Much of the precinct occupies elevated land on the south side of the Yarra River. The high point of the area is Punt Hill, near the intersection of today's Punt and Domain roads. From here the land slopes steeply to the north to the Yarra River, and more gently down to the west and south. On the west side of Punt Road, in the precinct, the steep slope up the hill is evident in the building forms, constructed to step up the grade.

Elsewhere in the precinct, the topography has influenced building forms, including towers to grander residences, and dwellings with generous verandahs which take advantage of available views to the river or to the parks and gardens which abut many of the streets. Entrances are also sometimes elevated off the street. When approaching from the north on Punt Road, development on the hill in the precinct is clearly evident.

5.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings

There is an abundance of historic parks and gardens largely within or immediately adjoining the precinct. These include the Royal Botanic Gardens, Government House Reserve, Kings Domain, Queen Victoria Gardens and Alexandra Gardens. The parks often retain their original or early landscape design, internal road layout, individually significant plants, perimeter and garden bed borders, and mature tree plantings including specimen trees, and mature tree rows and avenues. Some remnant indigenous vegetation also remains.

Within the parks and gardens are significant historic developments including Government House, the Melbourne Observatory, National Herbarium, Sidney Myer Music Bowl and La Trobe's Cottage. The Shrine of Remembrance has its own highly formal axial landscape. The extensive grounds of Melbourne Grammar School, and Wesley College in the south of the precinct, also contribute to the landscape character of the precinct.

Development facing the parks and gardens typically has views into the landscapes; with views also available out from the parks. From the west side of Punt Road, Fawkner Park can be glimpsed along the streets running west off the road, including Pasley Street south and north.

Gardens are a characteristic of residences in parts of the precinct, particularly with the larger residences many of which have generous front gardens and setbacks.

There are also treed streets, including most located between Punt Road and Anderson Street; Anderson Street itself which has elms on the west (Botanic Gardens) side; and Alexandra Avenue, bordering the Yarra River. Toorak Road West is very treed, as is Marne, Millswyn, Pasley, Arnold and Bromby streets. St Kilda Road stands out in this context, with its mature street plantings and wide grassed medians emphasising its historic grand boulevard character.

5.3 Statement of Significance

South Yarra Precinct (HO6) is of state significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).
- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

South Yarra Precinct is predominantly residential, where significant and contributory development dates from the 1850s through to the mid-twentieth century, including the post-World War II period. While nineteenth century development is well represented, the twentieth century is also an important period. The precinct is renowned for its high quality historic dwellings, and proximity to some of Melbourne's most significant public parks and gardens, and public institutions, including the Royal Botanic Gardens and National Herbarium; Government House and Government House Reserve; Melbourne Observatory; Shrine of Remembrance and Sidney Myer Music Bowl. Kings Domain, Queen Victoria Gardens, Alexandra Gardens and Fawkner Park are also largely within or immediately adjoining the precinct. The precinct is generally bounded by Alexandra Avenue to the north; Punt Road to the east; Commercial Road to the south; and St Kilda Road to the west. A separate precinct area is located to the south of Commercial Road.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical nineteenth and early twentieth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of face brick, rendered masonry and bluestone building materials, the latter typical of the early institutional buildings.
 - Hipped and gable ended roof forms with often visible and prominent chimneys, slate or tile cladding; prominent parapets, with urns and finials; side or party walls extending from the fronts of terraces; verandahs with decorative and often ornate cast iron work and tiled verandah floors, and timber verandahs and friezes in the Edwardian dwellings; iron palisade fences on stone plinths.
- Typical interwar building characteristics including for flat blocks:
 - Use of face brickwork, often patterned, or rendered surfaces, or combinations of face brick and render building materials.
 - Hipped or flat roof forms, with plain but sometimes prominent parapets, and plainly detailed chimneys; curved window and corner bays; externally expressed stair bays; art deco iron work; large windows, including steel-framed; and balconies with brick or iron balustrades.
- Later development, of the 1940s and after, is generally stripped of ornamentation, with plain walls and limited detailing.
- Substantial villas and large houses are typically located on principal streets and roads, or address the parks and gardens.
- High proportion of buildings designed by prominent architects.
- Typically low scale character, of one and two-storeys, with some variety in historic two-storey heights; and flat blocks of two-three storeys, with some taller examples.
- Significant nineteenth century institutional development on St Kilda Road.

- Significant nineteenth century scientific and vice-regal development associated with the Royal Botanic Gardens and Government House Reserve.
- Public places of social significance in the Kings Domain including the Shrine of Remembrance and Sidney Myer Music Bowl.
- Nineteenth and early twentieth century planning and subdivision as evidenced in:
 - Hierarchy of principal streets and secondary streets and lanes.
 - Layout and planning of some streets in the centre and east of the precinct reflects the boundaries of the large 1840s estates.
 - Later and ongoing reduction of the early landholdings seen in varied subdivision patterns and allotment sizes.
 - General pattern of large allotments in the east and west of the precinct, and more finely grained allotments in the centre.
- Importance of major roads and thoroughfares which border or traverse the precinct, with their historical status demonstrated in surviving significant development, including St Kilda, Toorak, Domain and Punt roads; Alexandra Avenue; and Park and Anderson streets.
- Historic parks and gardens which distinguish the precinct and have historically enhanced its prestigious status.
- Views into and out from the parks and gardens to the bordering residential areas.
- Importance of gardens and front setbacks to dwellings, particularly the larger residences; and street tree plantings to streets.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels, and lanes with original or relayed bluestone pitches and central drains.

How is it significant?

South Yarra Precinct is of historical, social and aesthetic/architectural significance to the State of Victoria.

Why is it significant?

South Yarra Precinct is of **historical significance**. Development commenced in the precinct in the 1840s, when large 'cultivation' allotments were sold north of the future Toorak Road, and substantial estates were established. The elevated land, including the high point of Punt Hill, attracted wealthy graziers and city merchants and professionals, including members of the legal profession. The subsequent re-subdivision and ongoing reduction in the size of the early estates is a precinct characteristic, with diverse subdivision patterns and small and large allotments resulting. In the later nineteenth century, modest dwellings were generally constructed on the small allotments; while in the interwar and later periods, flat blocks were built on the large allotments, in some instances on the sites of demolished early mansions. South Yarra also became a focus for this new form of residential development in Melbourne, the popularity of which continued into the post-war period. Significant public and institutional development is located within or abutting the precinct, and includes schools, churches and public welfare institutions. The Melbourne Observatory and National Herbarium are significant nineteenth century scientific developments; while Government House reflects the status of the vice-regal presence in nineteenth century Melbourne. The Shrine of Remembrance and Sidney Myer Music Bowl are significant twentieth century developments. The establishment of public parks and gardens in and adjoining the precinct was also highly influential in the precinct's development. These include the Royal Botanic Gardens, Government House Reserve, Kings Domain, Queen Victoria Gardens, Alexandra Gardens

and Fawkner Park. Several of these were included in the ring of parks reserved in the 1840s by the Superintendent of the Port Phillip District, Charles La Trobe, in a visionary action which resulted in a series of much valued open spaces surrounding inner Melbourne. Important historic roads in the precinct include St Kilda and Punt roads. St Kilda Road was envisioned by Robert Hoddle as a major route out of Melbourne, its status confirmed in the *Roads Act* of 1853. In a relatively brief period in the 1850s and 1860s, several significant public institutions were also established along the road.

South Yarra Precinct is of **social significance**. It is highly regarded for its extensive parks and gardens and significant public buildings and institutions. The Royal Botanic Gardens are the premier public gardens in the state, and much valued by the Victorian community. The Shrine of Remembrance is also a significant public memorial, and the pre-eminent war memorial in the State. Since 1934, it has been a focus for public commemoration and events, including annually on Anzac Day and Remembrance Day; and also a place for private reflection. The Sidney Myer Music Bowl has been a popular venue for concerts and performances since it opened in 1958.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the South Yarra Precinct derives from Victorian development through to development of the mid-twentieth century and post-World War II period. Residential development includes modest nineteenth century cottages, two-storey terraces in pairs and rows, substantial free-standing villas and large houses, and interwar and later flat blocks of which the precinct has many distinguished examples. The larger houses typically front principal streets and roads, or address the various parks. The precinct is also noted for high quality and architect designed buildings. The large estates of the 1840s, which were subsequently re-subdivided, influenced the planning of later streets including the regular arrangement of north-south streets in the centre and east of the precinct. Generally, allotment sizes tend to be larger in the east and west of the precinct, and more finely grained in the centre. An abundance of public parks and gardens, including the Royal Botanic Gardens and Fawkner Park, further enhance the aesthetic significance. These variously retain their original or early landscape design, internal road layout, individually significant plants, perimeter and garden bed borders, mature tree plantings including specimen trees, and mature tree rows and avenues. Some remnant indigenous vegetation also remains. The Shrine of Remembrance has its own highly formal axial landscape; and the extensive grounds of Melbourne Grammar School and Wesley College also contribute to the landscape character of the precinct. There are views into and out from the parks and gardens to the bordering residential areas. Gardens are also a characteristic of larger residences. The precinct additionally has street tree plantings, with St Kilda Road standing out in this context, where mature plantings and wide grassed medians emphasise its historic grand boulevard status.

6.0 HO9 – Kensington Precinct

6.1 History

Kensington Precinct is located in the suburb of the same name, with the name taken from the Borough of Kensington in London.

Early developments in the area, albeit not in the precinct, included the establishment of Flemington Racecourse in 1840; and the historic track to Geelong on the alignment of the future Flemington Road, was also in place as early as 1840. A bridge was constructed over the Saltwater (Maribyrnong) River in 1851.¹⁴⁴

Crown allotments in Portion 16 of the Parish of Dousta Galla, which is now located to the east of the railway line, were sold from November 1849.¹⁴⁵ By 1853, allotments were being advertised in the 'village of Kensington, adjoining Flemington on the Government Road to the Race Course'.¹⁴⁶ In 1856, a site to the north-west of the Kensington village allotments was reserved for the Melbourne Town Corporation cattle yards. The Newmarket livestock saleyards, which replaced the original yards at the corner of Victoria and Elizabeth streets, were completed in 1858; the first sales were held in 1859 and continued until the 1980s.¹⁴⁷ Abattoirs were located to the west of the saleyards along Smithfield Road, towards the Saltwater River, with a bluestone lined stock route connecting the two.¹⁴⁸

Allotments to the west of the railway line were sold from mid-1860, contemporary with the opening of the Melbourne-Essendon railway line in October 1860. Both J McConnell and E B Wight purchased allotments in this section, with subsequently streets named after them.¹⁴⁹ Despite these sales, little development occurred in Kensington until the 1870s.

The suburb, along with Flemington, was originally located within the Municipal District of Essendon. Emphasising the connection between the two localities, Kensington was listed under Flemington in the *Sands & McDougall* directories until the 1880s. The 14 listings under Kensington in 1870 increased to 68 in 1875, and included some commercial premises, such as a store and butcher, and industrial/manufacturing listings including tanners and candle-makers.¹⁵⁰ In 1874, the Kensington Park racecourse was established 'a few yards' from the Kensington railway station by William S Cox, who subsequently established the Moonee Valley Racecourse after the closure of the Kensington course in 1883.¹⁵¹ The Railways Commissioners purchased 30 acres of the racecourse site for the provision of railway sheds.¹⁵²

As Victoria's wheat and wool production grew to international export levels, mills and stores began to be constructed in proximity to Melbourne's port and railway lines, albeit outside the current precinct boundary. The expanding rail network and infrastructure extended from Spencer Street and North Melbourne stations, and later from the new port at Victoria Dock, to areas south of the current precinct. Kensington Roller Flour Mill, owned by James Gillespie, was reportedly the largest mill in the country, and was constructed adjacent to the railway line in 1886-7.¹⁵³ Nearby was Kimpton's Eclipse Hungarian Roller Flour Mills, constructed in 1887 at the corner of Arden and Elizabeth streets. Wool mills were also established along the railway network, and Moonee Ponds Creek.¹⁵⁴ More noxious industries, such as glue works and bone mills were located on the banks of the Maribyrnong River, west of the precinct. Other small-scale industries located in Kensington included wood yards, coach builders and saw mills.¹⁵⁵ As noted, and despite increasing objections in the early twentieth century that they were a 'cause of annoyance', the Newmarket saleyards continued to operate into the 1980s.¹⁵⁶ These nearby industrial and manufacturing operations were important employers of Kensington residents, including those in the precinct, and were within walking distance of their homes.

The suburb experienced significant population growth through the 1880s. This was due to developing local industries, and further subdivision of landholdings. It is also evident in the growth of listings in the municipal directories between 1880 and 1890. In 1880, approximately 80 residents were listed under the Flemington entry, but in 1885 the suburb of Kensington was given its own directory entry. By this time, the suburb comprised thirty streets on both sides of the railway line to the north of Macaulay Road, and to the north of Wolseley Parade. Both McConnell and McCracken streets had over 30 occupied properties, and Macaulay Road was developing as a commercial and service centre near the intersection with Bellair Street.¹⁵⁷ The latter two streets, which meet at the railway crossing associated with Kensington railway station, would form the nucleus of Kensington 'village'. Commercial development was concentrated here, leaving the remainder of the suburb – and the precinct area – to be substantially residential in character. Kensington railway station also opened in 1888, its timing complementary with commercial development in Macaulay Road and Bellair Street.

Allotments in the Kensington Park Estate to the south of Macaulay Road were sold from September 1883, on land which was likely associated with the recently closed racecourse. This subdivision included Bellair Street, Wolseley Parade and Ormond Street to the west of the railway line, and Eastwood and associated streets to its east.¹⁵⁸ Advertising for the auction noted that the estate 'occupies one of the most picturesque, salubrious and delightful positions in the neighbourhood' which 'practically formed an extension to Hotham'.¹⁵⁹ The 1890 directory lists 79 vacant houses in Kensington, many of which were likely recently built.¹⁶⁰ E Owen Hughes designed an ornately decorated two-storey shop and residence to house James Wales' estate agency on Bellair Street (Kensington Property Exchange) which was constructed in 1891.¹⁶¹ Hopetoun Street and Gordon Crescent were created from small subdivisions of the early 1890s. The MMBW plan of 1895 also shows residential development to the south of Macaulay Road and east of the railway line, in proximity to the flour mills.¹⁶²

Such was the growth in the area that in 1882, Flemington and Kensington were severed from the Municipal District of Essendon, and the Borough of Flemington and Kensington was created. Kensington State School opened in McCracken Street in 1881, and was extended five years later.¹⁶³ Enrolments initially numbered 228 children and increased to 1000 by 1898.¹⁶⁴ Local community spirit was demonstrated in the annual Flemington and Kensington Borough picnic, for which 3,000 residents travelled by special train to Frankston in February 1905. Established in the 1880s, by 1905 it was reported to be the 'oldest established municipal outing.'¹⁶⁵

Kensington Town Hall was constructed at the northern end of Bellair Street in 1901. It just preceded the merging of the borough with the City of Melbourne in 1905, becoming the Hopetoun (Flemington and Kensington) ward.¹⁶⁶

Houses were still being built in the precinct area in the 1900s and 1910s. Streets such as Bangalore Street and The Ridgeway were formed around this time. Little development occurred in the interwar period, although some houses were constructed in the few remaining vacant allotments around the perimeter of the suburb.

In the post-World War II period, many of the large mills, and rail and river related industries began to cease operations. The former Newmarket saleyards also underwent significant residential redevelopment from the 1980s.

The precinct has retained its predominantly residential status, although characterised less by its relationship to local industries. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, it has undergone some revitalisation and restoration of its many historic buildings. It has also remained a place where residents walk to the railway station, and congregate in the historic commercial 'village'.

6.2 Description

The extent of the Kensington Precinct is identified as HO9 in the planning scheme maps.

Significant and contributory development in the Kensington Precinct predominantly dates from the 1880s to 1910s, with some limited development in the 1870s and interwar period.

The precinct is mainly residential, with commercial development in Macaulay Road and Bellair Street. A small number of civic and institutional buildings are located in the north of the precinct, including the former town hall. It is principally a late nineteenth and early twentieth century suburban area, with a 'village' character focused on Macaulay Road and Bellair Street.

Residential development includes often repetitive rows of Victorian and Edwardian single-fronted single-storey cottages, with generally consistent allotment sizes. It is characteristically a low scale single-storey precinct, but with some variation to height in the form of two-storey Victorian terraces and additions to individual dwellings. There are also double-fronted houses, and limited interwar residences. The predominant construction material is weatherboard, but brick is also used.

Common characteristics of dwellings include timber-posted verandahs, prominent roof forms and chimneys including hipped and gable-ended roofs, front garden setbacks with fences to property boundaries, rear wings to larger dwellings (such as two-storey terraces), and rear gardens, often with access to a lane. Elevated house entrances, with steps up to verandahs, are common. Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with lane access. There are also examples of bluestone lanes.

Another characteristic of the weatherboard dwellings is the space, or sometimes lack of, between houses. The side setbacks can vary, with sometimes a narrower setback (or separation) to the dwelling on the other side. Others have no separation at all, being built with a direct abuttal, and sometimes a brick party wall. In some cases building regulations have required modifications to abutting weatherboard cottages.

Commercial development is concentrated in Macaulay Road and Bellair Street. Macaulay Road slopes up to the west, with commercial buildings stepping up the hill on the north and south sides of the street. On Bellair Street, in the vicinity of the railway station, the historic commercial development is particularly intact, distinguished by the former Kensington Property Exchange at 166-8 Bellair Street. There is also historic painted signage to commercial buildings in Macaulay Road and Bellair streets. The railway station comprises two buildings: the earlier (1888) building on the east side of the line is an elevated red brick building with render detailing; while the 1905 west station building is an open brick structure which replicates the detailing of the 1889 building. Platforms likely date from c. 1860 (east) and 1880s (west).¹⁶⁷

Generally, commercial buildings to both streets demonstrate many of the characteristics of late nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial/retail development in inner Melbourne. The majority of buildings are two-storey, with no setbacks; have retail spaces at ground level with the original living quarters above, and storage/service spaces to the rear. Ground floor facades vary in intactness, with modified shop frontages but also some surviving original or early shopfronts. These variously retain recessed entries and timber-framed shop windows with timber stall boards or masonry plinths. First floor facades are typically more intact, with original windows and parapets. Bellair Street also has some original Victorian iron post-supported verandahs, with ornate friezes; some simpler post-supported verandahs; and Edwardian cantilevered awnings with ornate steel brackets. The verandahs are unusually wide and deep, and in some cases return to corners, including to the prominent precinct corner of Macaulay Road and Bellair Street. Another distinctive characteristic of Macaulay Road are the sharply angled commercial buildings on the south side of the road, to street corners which run at oblique angles to the south-west.

Moving away from Macaulay Road and Bellair Street, there is a smattering of corner shops in residential streets but typically not corner hotels as occurs in other inner Melbourne suburbs. Kensington's relatively later date for most of its development would account for this, with earlier suburbs in the municipality, such as North Melbourne, more commonly having the typical 'pub on each corner' characteristic.

6.2.1 Pattern of development

As noted, there were early subdivisions in the general precinct area, to the east of the railway line in the late 1840s; by 1853, the 'village of Kensington' was being promoted; and from mid-1860 allotments to the west of the railway line were sold. However, this early subdivision activity did not immediately lead to development in the precinct, with building activity starting to pick up in the 1870s. In the 1880s, when development increased significantly, [including in response to the expansion of local industry](#), subdivisions included the 1883 Kensington Park Estate to the south of Macaulay Road. North of the road in this period, subdivision included re-subdivision of the earlier 1860s Crown allotments, with both McConnell and McCracken streets starting to be more fully developed by 1885.

The subdivisions did not always provide for orderly street arrangements, and some streets have kinks or bends to them, with views up and down streets not being direct. This is particularly the case in the northern part of the precinct, and evident in several of the streets running west of Bellair Street, including Wight and McMeickan streets; and streets running west from McCracken Street, such as Hopetoun and Gordon streets.

Macaulay Road runs through the centre of the precinct, terminating to the west at the junction with Kensington and Epsom roads. Historically, Macaulay Road connected Kensington to industrial development to the east and north-east of the precinct, and from there to North Melbourne and the city. The precinct to the north of Macaulay Road has wide residential streets running in a north-south direction, with lesser secondary connecting streets. The former include McConnell and McCracken streets, with McCracken being particularly wide, with dual carriageways separated by a central landscaped median. Bellair Street is an important street in the east of the precinct, historically associated with the railway line, and connecting with Flemington to the north. South of Macaulay Road, the main residential streets run in an east-west direction, and include Tennyson, Ormond and Wolseley streets. Wide streets are also characteristic of the west and east precinct components.

In terms of infrastructure, streets in the precinct variously retain bluestone kerbs and channels.

6.2.2 Topography

Topography has influenced local development, with higher ground in the west of the precinct, and lower ground in the east towards the historic Moonee Ponds Creek. There are high and low sides to streets, with distant views available from elevated parts of some streets. These include The Ridgeway and Bangalore Street in the west of the precinct, with views to the west and south; and McCracken Street, with views to the east from the high side of the street. Topography has also influenced building forms, with many houses, including modest cottages, elevated off ground level, with steps up to the entrances. This is especially common in the precinct, and is a Kensington 'signature'.

6.2.3 Parks, gardens and street plantings

The precinct is not noted for its parks and gardens; however there are street plantings, particularly on the main thoroughfares. Street trees are a characteristic of Bellair Street (elms and planes) and also of Wolseley Parade (plane trees). McCracken Street is treed, as is Ormond Street.

6.3 Statement of Significance

Kensington Precinct (HO9) is of local significance. It satisfies the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic/architectural significance).
- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (social significance).

What is significant?

Kensington Precinct (HO9) was developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Significant and contributory development predominantly dates from the 1880s to 1910s, with some limited development in the 1870s and interwar period. The precinct is mainly residential, with commercial buildings concentrated in Macaulay Road and Bellair Street. A small number of civic and institutional buildings are located in the north of the precinct, including the former town hall.

The following are the identified 'key attributes' of the precinct, which support the assessed significance:

- Typical late nineteenth and early twentieth century building characteristics including:
 - Use of weatherboard, with some brick building materials.
 - Prominent hipped and gable-ended roof forms with chimneys; timber-posted verandahs; and front garden setbacks with fences to property boundaries.
- Streets of consistent late nineteenth or early twentieth century residential character, often with repetitive rows of modest single-storey cottages on regular allotment sizes.
- Scattered larger dwellings and two-storey terrace houses.
- Later development as evidenced in interwar buildings.
- Elevated house entrances, with steps up to verandahs, is a Kensington 'signature'.

- Irregular side setbacks between weatherboard dwellings including semi-detached pairs or single dwellings with a narrow separation; and some with a direct abuttal and brick party wall.
- Typically low scale character, of mostly single-storey buildings, with some two-storey residences and commercial buildings.
- An absence of large scale or multi-storey buildings, including in backdrop views to historic development.
- High and low sides to some streets due to the local topography, with distant views available from high sides of streets.
- Concentration of historic commercial development in Macaulay Road and Bellair Street, with the latter being particularly intact and distinguished by wide and deep iron post-supported verandahs with ornate friezes, and cantilevered awnings with ornate steel brackets.
- ‘Village’ character of the precinct, focused on the prominent intersection of Macaulay Road and Bellair Street.
- Prominence of the 1901 Kensington Town Hall at the northern end of Bellair Street.
- Nineteenth and early twentieth century planning and subdivisions as evidenced in:
 - 1880s subdivisions to the south and north of Macaulay Road.
 - More regular street layout of the south, west and east parts of the precinct, contrasts with the north of the precinct where streets have kinks and bends.
 - High proportion of modest allotment sizes throughout the precinct.
 - Later subdivision in the west of the precinct.
- Street tree plantings in Bellair Street (elms and planes), Wolseley Parade (plane trees), and McCracken and Ormond streets.
- Historic street materials including bluestone kerbs and channels.
- Rear lanes which retain original or relayed bluestone pitchers and central drains.
- Vehicle accommodation is generally not visible from principal streets, but more common to rears of properties, with lane access.

How is it significant?

Kensington Precinct is of historical, social and aesthetic/architectural significance to the City of Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

Kensington Precinct is of **historical significance** as a Victorian and Edwardian era precinct which developed in a concentrated period in the late nineteenth century through to the 1910s. The establishment of Flemington Racecourse and the road to Geelong in the 1840s, the opening of the Newmarket livestock saleyards and abattoirs, and the railway to Essendon in 1859 and 1860, were important early local developments. However, they did not immediately stimulate intensive residential activity in the precinct. Rather, this occurred from the 1880s, associated with developing local industries and the expansion of wheat and wool production and trade in Victoria. The construction of large mills and wool stores just outside the current precinct, in proximity to the river, port and railway lines, generated local employment; as did the extension of the rail network from Spencer Street and North Melbourne stations. Newmarket saleyards were also a significant local employer. As

Kensington developed, with remarkably consistent residential streets, Macaulay Road and Bellair Street in proximity to Kensington railway station became the commercial focus. The two streets meet at the prominent railway crossing on Macaulay Road, and form the nucleus of Kensington 'village'. The opening of Kensington State School in McCracken Street in 1881 was another important local event, as was the establishment of the short-lived Borough of Flemington and Kensington in 1882, followed by construction of the Kensington Town Hall at the north end of Bellair Street in 1901. Kensington has retained its predominantly residential status, with a focus on the 'village', although it is characterised less by its relationship to local industries which, in the post-World War II period, began to decline.

Kensington Precinct is of **social significance**. Residents value its historic streetscapes, and the commercial area centred on the 'village'. The 1905 town hall is an important local building, as is the 1881 State School in McCracken Street which continues to be the focus of primary school education in the precinct.

The **aesthetic/architectural significance** of the Kensington Precinct largely rests in its Victorian and Edwardian development, with the precinct noted for its comparatively concentrated development history and consistent residential streetscapes, with rear lanes. The streets typically include repetitive rows of modest single-fronted single-storey cottages, predominantly of weatherboard construction, but with some brick; complemented by larger dwellings and two-storey terrace houses. Commercial development on Macaulay Road and Bellair Street mostly relates to the 1880s and 1890s activity in the precinct. Bellair Street is particularly intact with some distinguished commercial buildings; it has wide and deep iron post-supported verandahs with ornate friezes, and cantilevered awnings with ornate steel brackets. The precinct is also notably low-scale, with single-storey and some two-storey buildings. Local topography has influenced development, with many houses, including modest cottages, elevated off ground level with steps up to entrances, an arrangement which is a Kensington 'signature'. The topography has also resulted in high and low sides to streets, with distant views available from elevated sides of streets. Street tree plantings enhance the aesthetic significance of the precinct.

¹ This precinct citation refers to individual heritage places, some of which are included in the Victorian Heritage Register or individually listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, which are wholly or partly located within the precinct boundary, or adjoin it. Historical development outside the precinct boundary is also referred to. This recognises that adjoining development, and individual places, contribute to an understanding of the precinct's evolution and in some cases were influential in the history of the precinct. They also demonstrate important historical attributes or characteristics which are shared with the precinct.

² *Argus*, 22 November 1849, p. 2.

³ 'Plan of the City of Melbourne and its extension northwards', Charles Laing, 1852, held at State Library of Victoria and Marjorie J. Tipping, 'Hoddle, Robert (1794–1881)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/hoddle-robert-2190/text2823>, published first in hardcopy 1966, accessed online 29 June 2015.

⁴ 'Plan of the Extension of Melbourne called Carlton', Surveyor-General's Office, 12 November 1853, held at State Library of Victoria.

⁵ *Age*, 17 October 1857, p. 2.

⁶ Peter Yule (ed.), *Carlton: A History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 17.

⁷ Peter Yule (ed.), *Carlton: A History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 21.

⁸ *Argus*, 25 October 1872, supplement, p 1.

⁹ *Sands & Kenny* directory, 1857.

¹⁰ Peter Yule (ed.), *Carlton: A History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 19.

¹¹ G. Whitehead, *Princes Park Cultural Heritage Study*, 1999, p. 2.

¹² See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Yarra Park (VHR 2251).

¹³ G. Whitehead, *Princes Park Cultural Heritage Study*, p. 7, *The Argus*, 4 September, 1890, p. 10.

¹⁴ See <http://www.blueseum.org/tiki-index.php?page=Princes%20Park>, 5 June 2015.

¹⁵ See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens (VHR H1501).

¹⁶ UNESCO World Heritage 'Justification for inscription'.

¹⁷ *Sands & McDougall* directory, 1873

- 18 *Sands & McDougall directory, 1873.*
- 19 *Sands & McDougall directory, 1873, City of Melbourne rate books, Smith Ward, 1874, rate nos 2111-2118 (for example), VPRS 5708/P9, Volume 13, Public Record Office Victoria.*
- 20 *Hotel listings for Carlton, Sands & McDougall directory, 1873.*
- 21 *City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 14.*
- 22 *City of Melbourne rate books, Smith Ward, 1868, rate nos 2501-2510, VPRS 5708/P9, Volume 7, Public Record Office Victoria, and based on extant bluestone houses on Murchison Street.*
- 23 *Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 31*
- 24 *Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: a History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 337.*
- 25 *Peter Yule, The Royal Children's Hospital: a history of faith, science and love, Halstead Press, Rushcutter's Bay, 1999, p. 101.*
- 26 *See for examples, buildings at 8 Palmerston Place, 280-284 Drummond Street and examples on MMBW detail plan no. 1190.*
- 27 *Based on a comparison of residences in Kay Street and Drummond Street: City of Melbourne rate books, Volume 29, 1890, Victoria Ward, rate nos 2721-2756 and Smith Ward, rate nos 1730-1760, VPRS 5708/P9, Public Record Office Victoria.*
- 28 *Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 38.*
- 29 *Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 42.*
- 30 *F Lancaster Jones, 'Italian Population of Carlton: a Demographic and Sociological Survey, PhD thesis, 1962, as referenced in Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 85.*
- 31 *F Lancaster Jones, 'Italian Population of Carlton: a Demographic and Sociological Survey, PhD thesis, 1962, as referenced in Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, p. 85.*
- 32 *Peter Yule (ed.), Carlton: A History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2004, pp. 134, 138.*
- 33 *John Patrick Pty Ltd and Bryce Raworth Pty Ltd, Yarra Park, Melbourne: Conservation Analysis, 2001, p. 4.*
- 34 *Burchett, Winston, East Melbourne, Craftsmen Press, Hawthorn, 1977, p. 7.*
- 35 *City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 20.*
- 36 *'Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital', eMelbourne, University of Melbourne, accessed via <http://www.emelbourne.net.au/biogs/EM01285b.htm>, 27 March 2015.*
- 37 *'Illustrated map of Melbourne and suburbs', Charles F Maxwell, 1872, held at State Library of Victoria.*
- 38 *Plan of City of Melbourne (Sheet 2), Parish of Melbourne North, Central Plan Office, Land Victoria.*
- 39 *Burchett, Winston, East Melbourne, Craftsmen Press, Hawthorn, 1977, p. 37.*
- 40 *Plan of City of Melbourne (Sheet 2), Parish of Melbourne North, Central Plan Office, Land Victoria.*
- 41 *'Melbourne and its suburbs', compiled by James Kearney, 1855, held at State Library of Victoria.*
- 42 *Argus, 6 April 1857, p. 8.*
- 43 *City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 20.*
- 44 *Sands & McDougall directory, 1862.*
- 45 *Sands & McDougall directory, 1862 and 1864, 'H2131 – Residence', Heritage Victoria, Victorian Heritage Register citation, accessed via http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/#detail_places:2972, 27 March 2013..*
- 46 *Sylvia Morrissey, 'Clarke, Janet Marion (1851–1909)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/clarke-janet-marion-3224/text4857>, published first in hardcopy 1969, accessed online 27 March 2015.*
- 47 *Winston Burchett, East Melbourne, 1837-1977: People, places, problems, 1975, pp. 48-49.*
- 48 *MMBW 160':1" plan no. 27, Lovell Chen collection.*
- 49 *See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Yarra Park (VHR 2251).*
- 50 *John Patrick Pty Ltd and Lovell Chen, Fitzroy Gardens Conservation Management Plan, Volume 1: Main Report, Final Draft, October 2008, p. 13.*
- 51 *City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 22.*
- 52 *John Patrick Pty Ltd and Bryce Raworth Pty Ltd, Yarra Park, Melbourne: Conservation Analysis, 2001, p. 6.*
- 53 *Argus, 26 November 1924, p. 12.*
- 54 *Age, 16 May 1925, p. 16.*
- 55 *See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Old Men's Shelter (VHR H0945).*
- 56 *MMBW detail plan no. 1033 & 1034, 1898, held at State Library of Victoria.*
- 57 *City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 21.*
- 58 *'Agnes' and 'Charles' were La Trobe family names.*
- 59 *See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Fitzroy Gardens (VHR H1834).*
- 60 *Plan of North Melbourne, South Melbourne, c. 1846, held at State Library of Victoria.*
- 61 *Argus, 6 September 1849, p. 2.*
- 62 *Mary Kehoe, The Melbourne Benevolent Asylum: Hotham's Premier Building, Hotham History Project, 1998, p. 13.*

- 63 'Plan of the City of Melbourne and its extension northwards', Charles Laing, 1852, held at State Library of Victoria and Marjorie J. Tipping, 'Hoddle, Robert (1794–1881)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/hoddle-robert-2190/text2823>, published first in hardcopy 1966, accessed online 29 June 2015. See also *Pride of Hotham: A tale of North Melbourne and a red-headed architect*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2006, p. 14.
- 64 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 31.
- 65 Guy Murphy, *At Home on Hotham Hill: A portrait of a nineteenth century entrepreneur*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2004, p. 32.
- 66 Parish of Jika Jika, plan no. M314 (3), Central Plan Office, Land Victoria and *Argus*, 8 March 1853, p. 3.
- 67 Map of Melbourne and its extension', compiled by William Green, 1852, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 68 Bill Hannan, *Pride of Hotham: A tale of North Melbourne and a red-headed architect*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2006, p. 17.
- 69 'Melbourne and its suburbs', compiled by James Kearney, 1855, held at State Library of Victoria and Parish of Jika Jika, plan no. M314 (3), Central Plan Office, Land Victoria.
- 70 Winsome Roberts, *Molesworth Street: A North Melbourne neighbourhood, 1840-1905*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2002, p.17.
- 71 *Sands & Kenny* directory, 1857.
- 72 *Sands & Kenny* directory, 1857.
- 73 Bill Hannan, *Pride of Hotham: A tale of North Melbourne and a red-headed architect*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2006, p. 19.
- 74 Agency VA 3153 North Melbourne, agency description, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 75 Overview provided by L Siska, submission, 10 February 2016.
- 76 City of North Melbourne rate books, Middle Ward, rate nos 1976-1988, 1890, VPRS 5707/P3, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 77 City of North Melbourne rate books, Eastern Ward, rate nos 656-673, 1890, VPRS 5707/P3, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 78 Bill Hannan, *Pride of Hotham: A tale of North Melbourne and a red-headed architect*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2006, p. 15, City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 33 and *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1873.
- 79 MMBW detail plans nos 759, 760 and 762, 1896, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 80 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 32.
- 81 *Spectator and Methodist Chronicle*, 11 February 1916, p. 179, City of Melbourne, *Thematic History – A History of the City of Melbourne's Urban Environment*, 2012, p. 78.
- 82 *Argus*, 20 May 1859, p. 5, 10 January 1880, p. 5; *North Melbourne Courier and West Melbourne Advertiser*, 14 July 1905, p.2; *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 23 June 1876, p. 2, 15 December 1888, p. 3; *Age*, 2 October 1916, p. 9.
- 83 'History', North Melbourne Football Club, www.nmfc.com.au, accessed 26 March 2015.
- 84 Agency VA 3153 North Melbourne, agency description, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 85 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 33.
- 86 Overview provided by L Siska, submission, 10 February 2016.
- 87 It has been noted that there were some 80 hotels in North Melbourne, and some 40 in West Melbourne, in the nineteenth century. Information provided by Mary Kehoe.
- 88 Letter from Charles La Trobe, 30 September 1850, as quoted in W A Sanderson, 'The Alienation of Melbourne Parks', *Victorian Historical Magazine*, Volume XIV, December 1932, p. 145.
- 89 W A Sanderson, 'Royal Park', *Victorian Historical Magazine*, Volume XIV, No. 3, May 1932, p. 110, State Library of Victoria, *Argus*, 14 November 1854, p. 2.
- 90 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Yarra Park (VHR 2251).
- 91 'Map of Melbourne and its extension', compiled by William Green, 1852, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 92 'Melbourne and its suburbs', compiled by James Kearney, 1855, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 93 Victoria Government Gazette, Gazette 36, 25 March 1862, p. 562, accessed via <http://gazette.slv.vic.gov.au>.
- 94 *Argus*, 8 March 1859, p. 5, 5 November 1859, p. 4, 19 December 1859, p. 5, 7 August 1871, p. 5, 8 August 1874, p.6..
- 95 'Inner Circle Railway', eMelbourne, University of Melbourne, accessed via <http://www.emelbourne.net.au/biogs/EM00755b.htm>, 17 April 2015.
- 96 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 38.
- 97 'Illustrated map of Melbourne and suburbs', Charles F Maxwell, 1872, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 98 *Argus*, 10 September 1879, p. 5, 6 December 1879, p. 6.
- 99 Named after Councillor levers, an influential local resident who was a member of the Melbourne City Council; see *South Parkville, Walk No 1*, a walking tour guide, produced by the Parkville Association, 2006, author N L Killip.
- 100 *Argus*, 2 September 1879, p. 6 and 15 October 1880, p. 3.
- 101 *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 9 April 1875, p. 2 and *Argus*, 2 September 1879, p. 6.

- 102 *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 26 March 1887, p. 2.
- 103 *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 26 March 1887, p. 2.
- 104 *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1890.
- 105 *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1890, MMBW detail plan no 1148, 1899, State Library of Victoria.
- 106 *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 26 March 1887, p. 4.
- 107 *South Parkville, Walk No 1*, a walking tour guide, produced by the Parkville Association, 2006, author N L Killip.
- 108 MMBW 160':1" plans nos 30, 31 1895
- 109 Allen & Tuxen plan of Melbourne and Suburbs, 1888, National Library of Australia.
- 110 'Portions of Royal Park required for tramway purposes', 1926, M385, Historic Plan Collection, VPRS 15899, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 111 *Argus*, 22 November 1934, p. 11.
- 112 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 43.
- 113 'City of Melbourne, Parish of Melbourne North and part of Parishes Jika Jika, Doutta Galla and Melbourne South, County of Bourke', parish plan, Central Plan Office, Land Victoria.
- 114 L Oscar Slater, *Walking Tour of South Yarra West*, Prendergast Publishers, Melbourne, 1987, p. 5.
- 115 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Yarra Park (VHR 2251).
- 116 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 43.
- 117 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for La Trobe's Cottage (VHR 1076).
- 118 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Royal Botanic Gardens (VHR 1459).
- 119 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Government House Complex (VHR 1620).
- 120 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for Former Observatory Site (VHR 1087).
- 121 National Herbarium of Victoria, see <http://www.rbq.vic.gov.au/science/herbarium-and-resources/national-herbarium-of-victoria>, accessed 7 July 2015.
- 122 Judith Buckrich, *Melbourne's grand boulevard: the story of St Kilda Road*, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, 1996, various pages, pp. 1-13.
- 123 *Argus*, 17 June 1862, p. 5.
- 124 *Argus*, 24 October 1862, p. 6.
- 125 *Telegraph, St Kilda, Prahran and South Yarra Guardian*, 26 July 1879, p. 3.
- 126 'Melbourne and its suburbs', compiled by James Kearney, 1855, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 127 *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1862.
- 128 *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1890.
- 129 L Oscar Slater, *Walking Tour of South Yarra West*, Prendergast Publishers, Melbourne, 1987, p. 42.
- 130 *News*, 23 August 1924, p. 5.
- 131 MMBW detail plans, nos 891, 896-900, 1895, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 132 *Argus*, 15 June 1934, p. 6.
- 133 *Argus*, 10 July 1928, p. 7.
- 134 MMBW detail plans 980 and 981, 1895, held at State Library of Victoria, *Argus*, 18 September 1937, p. 4, 10 November 1939, p. 10.
- 135 *Sands & McDougall directory*, 1940.
- 136 *Argus*, 22 May 1939, p. 4.
- 137 *Argus*, 8 March 1928, p. 15 and 16 November 1939, p. 7.
- 138 *Argus*, 11 May 1956, p. 18.
- 139 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for the Shrine of Remembrance (VHR 848).
- 140 See Victorian Heritage Register citation for the Sidney Myer Music Bowl (VHR 1772).
- 141 Information contained in correspondence by M Butcher, to the Residential Zones Standing Advisory Committee, 29 August 2014; copied provided to Lovell Chen.
- 142 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004.
- 143 'South Yarra', eMelbourne, University of Melbourne, accessed via <http://www.emelbourne.net.au/biogs/EM01404b.htm>, 17 April 2015.
- 144 Guy Murphy, *At Home on Hotham Hill: A portrait of a nineteenth century entrepreneur*, Hotham History Project, North Melbourne, 2004, p. 32.
- 145 Parish plan, Parish of Doutta Galla, Sheet 3, VPRS 16171, held at Public Record Office Victoria.
- 146 *Argus*, 21 March 1853, p. 8.
- 147 Graeme Butler & Associates, *Kensington Heritage Review*, 2013, p. 477, 'H1430 – Former New Market Saleyards and Abattoirs', Heritage Victoria, Victorian Heritage Register citation, accessed via http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/#detail_places:3105, 26 March 2015.

-
- 148 'H1430 – Former Newmarket Saleyards and Abattoirs', Victorian Heritage Register, Statement of Significance, accessed via
Victorian Heritage Database, <http://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/3105>, 13 April 2016.
- 149 Parish plan, Parish of Dousta Galla, Sheet 3, VPRS 16171, held at Public Record Office Victoria.
- 150 *Sands & McDougall* directory, 1875.
- 151 *Australasian*, 26 September 1874, p. 9, *Argus* 17 January 1883, p. 9.
- 152 *Argus*, 20 January 1883, p. 9.
- 153 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 27.
- 154 City of Melbourne Heritage Precincts Project (draft), Meredith Gould Architects 2004, p. 28.
- 155 *Sands & McDougall* directory, 1890.
- 156 *Argus*, 22 August 1936, p. 16.
- 157 *Sands & McDougall* directory, 1885.
- 158 'Plan No. 1 of the subdivisions of the Kensington Park Estate', C J & T Ham, c. 1884, held at State Library of Victoria.
- 159 *Argus*, 29 September 1883, p. 3.
- 160 *Sands & McDougall* directory, 1890.
- 161 'H1204 – Former Kensington Property Exchange, Office, Shop and Residences', Heritage Victoria, Victorian Heritage Register,
accessed via http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/vhd/heritagevic?timeout=yes#detail_places:4431.
- 162 MMBW 160':1" plan no. 33, Flemington and Kensington, c. 1895, held by State Library of Victoria.
- 163 *North Melbourne Advertiser*, 18 June 1886, p. 3.
- 164 Graeme Butler & Associates, *Kensington Heritage Review*, 2013, p. 486
- 165 *Mornington Standard*, 25 February 1905, p. 2.
- 166 Flemington and Kensington (Borough 1882-1905), agency description, VA 2969, Public Record Office Victoria.
- 167 'Kensington Railway Station', Flemington and Kensington Conservation Study, citation, accessed via Heritage Victoria's Hermes
database, <http://applications.doi.vic.gov.au/hermesv6/Login.html>, 13 April 2015.



Melbourne Planning Scheme

Incorporated Document

Amendment C258: Heritage Places Inventory 2017

Corrected for re-exhibition, November 2017

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

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
DEFINITIONS	4
CARLTON.....	5
EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT.....	51
FLEMINGTON AND KENSINGTON.....	71
MELBOURNE	108
NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE	130
PARKVILLE	191
SOUTH MELBOURNE, SOUTHBANK, DOCKLANDS & PORT MELBOURNE.....	208
SOUTH YARRA.....	210

CARLTON			
Street (CARLTON)	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Dorrit Street	34	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	36	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	38	-	Significant
Dorrit Street	40-42	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	44	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	46-48	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	50	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	52	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	54	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	56	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	58	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	60	-	Significant
Dorrit Street	62	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	64-66	Contributory	Significant
Dorrit Street	68	Significant	Significant
Dorrit Street	70	Significant	Significant
Drummond Place	14-16	Contributory	-
Drummond Place	18-20	Contributory	-
Drummond Street	2-14	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	16-20	Contributory	Significant
Drummond Street	22	Contributory	Significant
Drummond Street	24	Contributory	Significant
Drummond Street	26	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	28-32	Contributory	Significant
Drummond Street	46-56	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	58	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	60	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	62	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	64-68	Significant	Significant
Drummond Street	70-72	Significant	Significant
<u>Drummond Street</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>Contributory</u>	<u>Significant</u>
<u>Drummond Street</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>Contributory</u>	<u>Significant</u>
Drummond Street	98	Contributory	Significant
Drummond Street	100-108	-	Significant

EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Hotham Street	32-34	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	36-38	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	42-48	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	50	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	52	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	54	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	72-76	Significant	-
Hotham Street	78-82	Contributory	-
Hotham Street	92	Significant	-
Hotham Street	94-96	Significant	-
Hotham Street	98-102	Significant	-
Hotham Street	110-112	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	114	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	116	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	118	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	120	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	146	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	148	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	150	-	Significant
Hotham Street	152-156	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	154-156	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	158	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	160	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	162	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	164	Significant	Significant
Hotham Street	166	-	Significant
Hotham Street	168	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	170	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	172	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	174-188	Contributory	Significant
Hotham Street	29-33	Significant	-
Hotham Street	43	Contributory	-

EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Jolimont Road	124-126	Contributory	-
Jolimont Road	128-13 68	Contributory	-
Jolimont Road	140-142	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	50	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	62	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	64	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	66	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	70	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	76-78	Contributory	-
Jolimont Street	80	Contributory	-
Jolimont Terrace	2-10	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	12	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	16	Contributory	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	18	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	20	Contributory	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	22	Contributory	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	24	Contributory	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	26	Contributory	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	28	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	30	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	32	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	40	Significant	Significant
Jolimont Terrace	42	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	14	Contributory	-
Lansdowne Street	16-30	Contributory	-
Lansdowne Street	7-9	Significant	-
Lansdowne Street	15-17	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	19	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	21	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	23	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	25	Significant	Significant
Lansdowne Street	27	Significant	Significant
Macarthur Street	Gordon Reserve	Significant	Significant
Macarthur Street	Tram Shelter	Significant	Significant

EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
	(cnr with St Andrews Place)		
Morrison Place	2-6	Significant	Significant
Morrison Place	8-10	Significant	Significant
Morrison Place	14-18	Significant	Significant
Morrison Place	20	Significant	Significant
Morrison Place	22	Significant	Significant
Morrison Place	Eye and Ear Hospital	Significant	Significant
Nicholson Street	1-4	Significant	-
Nicholson Street	Cast Iron Urinal	Significant	-
Palmer Street	1	Contributory	-
Palmer Street	3	Contributory	-
Palmer Street	5	Contributory	-
Palmer Street	7	Contributory	-
Parliament Place	2-12	Significant	Significant
Parliament Place	22-36	Significant	Significant
Parliament Place	1-33 (Tram Shelter)	Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	10	Significant	-
Powlett Street	12	Significant	-
Powlett Street	14	Significant	-
Powlett Street	16-24	Significant	-
Powlett Street	50-52	Significant	-
Powlett Street	52	Significant	-
Powlett Street	54	Significant	-
Powlett Street	56-60	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	62-68	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	82-112	Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	118-122	Significant	- Significant
Powlett Street	124	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	126-128	Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	130	Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	132	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	134	Contributory	Significant

EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Powlett Street	136	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	138	Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	140	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	142	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	150-152	Significant	-
Powlett Street	156	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	158	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	160	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	162	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	164	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	166	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	168	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	170	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	172-188	Significant	-
Powlett Street	13-19	Significant	-
Powlett Street	51-57	Significant	-
Powlett Street	59	Significant	-
Powlett Street	61	Significant	-
Powlett Street	63-71	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	85	Significant	-
Powlett Street	87	Significant	-
Powlett Street	89	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	91	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	101	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	121-123	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	125	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	127	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	129	- Significant	Significant
Powlett Street	131	-	Significant
Powlett Street	133	-	Significant
Powlett Street	135	Significant -	Significant
Powlett Street	139-143	Contributory	Significant
Powlett Street	147-163	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	165-169	Contributory	-

EAST MELBOURNE AND JOLIMONT			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Powlett Street	171	Significant	-
Powlett Street	173	Significant	-
Powlett Street	175	Contributory	-
Powlett Street	187-225	Significant	Significant
Simpson Street	12	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	14	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	16	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	18	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	20	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	22	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	24	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	28	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	462-44	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	52	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	54-56	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	58-60	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	62-64	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	72-74	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	76	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	78-80	Significant	-
Simpson Street	100-102	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	104	Significant	Significant
Simpson Street	132-134	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	136	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	138	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	140	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	142	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	144	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	146	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	148	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	150	Contributory	-
Simpson Street	152	Significant	-
Simpson Street	154	Significant	-
Simpson Street	13	Contributory	-

FLEMINGTON AND KENSINGTON			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Belmont Road	6	Contributory	-
Belmont Road	1	Contributory	-
Belmont Road	3	Contributory	-
Belmont Road	7	Significant	-
Bent Street	2	Contributory	-
Bent Street	4	Contributory	-
Bent Street	6	Contributory	-
Bent Street	10	Contributory	-
Bent Street	1	Contributory	-
Bent Street	3	Contributory	-
Bent Street	5	Contributory	-
Bent Street	9	Contributory	-
Bent Street	11	Contributory	-
Bruce Street	6	Contributory	-
Bruce Street	8	Contributory	-
Bruce Street	5-7	Significant	-
Bruce Street	43	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	5-7	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	9	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	11	Significant	-
Chelmsford Street	13	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	15	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	17	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	19	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	21	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	23-25	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	33	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	37	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	39	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	41	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	43	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	45	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	47-51	Contributory	-
Chelmsford Street	53-59	Contributory	-

FLEMINGTON AND KENSINGTON			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Eastwood Street	145	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	147	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	149	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	151	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	153	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	157	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	159	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	161	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	163	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	165	Contributory	-
Eastwood Street	167-169	Contributory	-
Elizabeth Street	2-50	Significant	-
Elizabeth Street	31	Contributory	-
Elizabeth Street	33-35	Contributory	-
Elizabeth Street	52-112	Significant	Significant
Epsom Road	32	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	34	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	36	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	38	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	40	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	42-44	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	46	Significant	-
Epsom Road	56	Significant	-
Epsom Road	58	Significant	-
Epsom Road	60	Significant	-
Epsom Road	64	Significant	-
Epsom Road	66	Significant	-
Epsom Road	300	Significant	Significant
Epsom Road	Flemington Racecourse	Significant	Significant
Epsom Road	1-7	Significant	-
Epsom Road	17	Contributory	-
Epsom Road	19	Contributory	-

MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Little Lonsdale Street	124-126	Contributory	-
Little Lonsdale Street	128-130	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	132	Contributory	-
Little Lonsdale Street	178-190	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	194-196	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	198-200	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	202	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	372-378	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	388-426	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	550	Contributory	-
Little Lonsdale Street	552-578	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	25	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	33-39	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	117-147	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	361-365	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	523-525	Significant	-
Little Lonsdale Street	Common Olive Tree	Significant	-
<u>Liverpool Street</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>Contributory</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Liverpool Street</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>Contributory</u>	<u>-</u>
Lonsdale Street	42-44	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	64-78	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	118-148	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	180-222	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	326	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	352-362	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	436-450	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	472-474	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	556-558	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	612-622	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	103-105	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	107-111	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	113	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	115	Contributory	-

MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Lonsdale Street	117-121	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	145-147	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	185-187	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	189-191	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	193	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	201	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	203-207	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	217-231	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	233-237	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	239	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	241-245	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	269-321	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	275-321	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	377-379	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	439-445	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	455-469	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	459-505	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	573-577	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	579-585	Significant	-
Lonsdale Street	613-649	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	639	Contributory	-
Lonsdale Street	651-669	Contributory	-
Manchester Lane	30-44	Significant	-
Market Lane	14-16	Contributory	-
Market Lane	26-28	Contributory	-
Market Street	64-74	Significant	-
Market Street	29-31	Significant	-
McKillop Street	20-22	Significant	-
McKillop Street	11-15	Significant	-
McKillop Street	17	Significant	-
McKillop Street	19	Significant	-
Melbourne Place	14-30	Significant	-
Meyers Place	20	Contributory	-
Mill Place	2-4	Significant	-

MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Victoria Street	83-129	Significant	Significant
Victoria Street	133-159	Significant	Significant
Waratah Place	7-9	Contributory	-
Waratah Place	11-15	Contributory	-
William Street	22-32	Significant	-
William Street	84-88	Significant	-
William Street	90-96	Significant	-
William Street	98-110	Significant	-
William Street	130-148	Significant	-
William Street	152-162	Significant	-
William Street	192-228	Significant	-
William Street	280-318	Significant	-
William Street	77-89	Significant	-
William Street	259	Significant	-
William Street	261	Significant	-
Wills Street	22-30	Significant	-
Wills Street	17-23	Significant	-
Wills Street	25-29	Significant	-
<u>Windsor Place</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>Contributory</u>	<u>-</u>

NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE (the properties shown in blue text were assessed under Amendment C258 – West Melbourne Heritage Review 2016)

NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Abbotsford Street	36	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	38	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	40-44	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	46	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	48	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	50-54	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	64-66	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	68	Contributory	-
Abbotsford Street	70-72	Contributory	-

NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Flemington Road	355	Contributory	-
Flemington Road	443	Contributory	-
Flemington Road	445	Contributory	-
Flemington Road	447	Contributory	-
Franklin Place	23	Contributory	-
George Street	6	Contributory	-
George Street	8	Contributory	-
George Street	1	Contributory	-
George Street	3	Contributory	-
George Street	5	Contributory	-
George Street	7	Contributory	-
George Street	9	Contributory	-
George Street	11-13	Contributory	-
Gracie Street	2-52 (<u>Administration Building and Residence of 1934-5</u>)	<u>Significant Contributory</u>	-
Haines Place	2	Significant	-
Haines Street	2	Significant	-
Haines Street	4	Contributory	-
Haines Street	6	Contributory	-
Haines Street	8	Significant	-
Haines Street	5	Contributory	-
Haines Street	7	Contributory	-
Harcourt Street	66	Significant	-
Harcourt Street	68	Significant	-
Harker Street	2	Contributory	-
Harker Street	4	Contributory	-
Harker Street	6	Contributory	-
Harker Street	8	Significant	-
Harker Street	10	Contributory	-
Harker Street	12	Contributory	-
Harker Street	18	Contributory	-
Harker Street	1	Contributory	-
Harris Street	2	Contributory	-

NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Harris Street	4	Contributory	-
Harris Street	1	Contributory	-
Harris Street	9	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	2	Significant	-
Hawke Street	2A (Elm Tree at Hawke and Curzon Street Reserve)	Significant	-
Hawke Street	4	Significant	-
Hawke Street	6	Significant	-
Hawke Street	8	Significant	-
Hawke Street	10	Significant	-
Hawke Street	12	Significant	-
Hawke Street	44-46	Significant	-
Hawke Street	48	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	50	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	52	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	54	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	58	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	60	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	68	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	70	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	72	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	74	Significant	-
Hawke Street	76	Significant	-
Hawke Street	78	Significant	-
Hawke Street	80	Significant	-
Hawke Street	82	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	104	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	110	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	112	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	114	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	116	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	118	Contributory	-
Hawke Street	120	Contributory	-

NORTH AND WEST MELBOURNE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
	and Co ironmongers warehouse complex, Roden Street Wing)		
Roden Street	164-184, Briscoe and Co ironmongers warehouse complex	Significant	-
Roden Street	1-37 (Primary School No. 1689)	Significant	Significant
Roden Street	159	Contributory Significant	-
Roden Street	163	Contributory Significant	-
<u>Roden Street</u>	<u>159-163, Thomas Hulse House Row Precinct</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>-</u>
Roden Street	171	Contributory	-
Roden Street	173-175	Contributory	-
Roden Street	171-179 (Wington Cottages)	Significant	-
Roden Street	177	Contributory	-
Roden Street	179	Contributory	-
Roden Street	197	Significant	-
Roden Street	199	Significant	-
Roden Street	201	Significant	-
Roden Street	203	Contributory	-
Roslyn Street	22-40	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	58	Contributory	-
Roslyn Street	62	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	64	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	66	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	68	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	70-74	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	126 (rear 124)	Contributory	-
Roslyn Street	300	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	49-51	Significant	-
Roslyn Street	65	Contributory	-
Roslyn Street	67	Contributory	-
Roslyn Street	69	Contributory	-

PARKVILLE			
Street	Number	Building Grading	Significant Streetscape
Royal Parade	21-23	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	21-27	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	29-31	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	33	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	35-39	-	Significant
Royal Parade	43-49	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	51	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	53	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	55	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	57	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	59	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	61	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	63-65	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	67	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	69	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	71	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	73	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	75	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	77-83	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	87	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	89	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	91	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	93-97	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	99	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	101	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	103	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	105	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	107	Significant	Significant
Royal Parade	113-115	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	117	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	119	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	121-125	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	127	Contributory	Significant
Royal Parade	129-133	-	Significant