From:	Colin Charman
To:	Colin Charman
Subject:	RE: City North Heritage Review - existing HO"s and Statements of Significance
Date:	Thursday, 4 October 2018 10:39:28 AM

Email from 2012 which indicates the study was undertaken with a-c = significant

From: Anthony Hemingway [mailto:Anthony@rbaarchitects.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 18 December 2012 4:05 PM
To: Deborah Payne
Cc: Robyn Hellman
Subject: RE: City North Heritage Review - existing HO's

Hi Debbie and Robyn,

Individual Citations

In response to your queries about the gradings for the 7 properties in the South Carlton area, we considered that these properties were individually significant (that is good, largely intact examples of their type or period) without necessarily reviewing the grading (this was partly to avoid another variation/type to an already complicated project). Citations for all but HO59 had been prepared by Allom Lovell & Associates (ALA) in 1999/2000.
Any issue about the approach to these sites has not previously been raised.

Discussion

On review, a minor quandary is raised by the current gradings of some (those that are graded D). In our other assessments for the project, a position was adopted that sites graded A to C are individually significant. In the Clause 22.05, however the definition of significant is as follows:

> *Significant* means of historic, architectural or social value for past, present or future generations. All graded buildings are significant.

As such, A to D grade buildings are significant. Hence ALA were able to recommend individual overlays for D graded sites on that basis.

We have graded other sites D (not part of a recommended precinct), which were included on the list or which we observed during our surveys. These sites were not considered to be individually significant in keeping with a broader approach to the A-D grading system. These D grade sites are listed in appendix F in the three volumes (2-4) related to each suburb (Carlton, Melb, North and West Melb).
The approach we have taken is consistent with other planning schemes (Boroondara, Stonnington), where grades A to C are significant and D are contributory. Although not explicitly stated, this approach is essentially reflected in the City of Melbourne definition for the D grading (part explanation of the dilemma/basis for our approach, as this definition does not suggest an individually significant building).

> 'D' buildings are representative of the historical, scientific, architectural or social development of the local area. They are often reasonably intact representatives of particular periods, styles or building types. In many instances alterations will be reversible. They may also be altered examples which stand within a group of similar period, style or type or a street which retains much of its original character. Where they stand in a row or street, the collective group will provide a setting which reinforces the value of the individual buildings.

It should be noted that it has become the norm in recent years to dispense with the letter

grading system (Melbourne has already largely removed the former 'E' grade) and switch to a three tiered system (eg, Yarra and Port Phillip):

- significant (usually formerly grades A to C),
- contributory (formerly grade D), and
- non-contributory.

This format is adopted for all new heritage studies [eg, we have used it for 2 regional areas, Strathbogie and Towong shires).

The term 'contributory' is however used in the Clause 22.05 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme but not in the same way it is typically used in other planning schemes. The term 'outstanding' is also used, which adds another layer of complexity. The term 'Outstanding' has some clearly defined policy implications but the former does not (though by inference, it might).

> *Contributory building* means a 'C' grade building anywhere in the municipality, or a 'D' grade building in a Level 1 or Level 2 streetscape.
>
> *Outstanding building* means a grade A or B building anywhere in the municipality.

The City of Melbourne also retains a streetscape grading system, which has also been generally dispensed with. Streetscape levels adds another layer of complexity (and confusion) to the Melbourne grading system – as the streetscape level can change along a street (which is at odds with the notion of streetscape, because a streetscape should have a consistent level but the gradings of the buildings can of course vary).

Comments

Although the ALA citations may be not quite reach the current standard, they were close enough and it was decided that updating/rewriting with some additional information was not greatly necessary.
Maybe this approach should be reconsidered.

We have prepared a table with comment about the 7 sites.
Possibly the following table should be included in vol. 2. as an extra appendix.
Checking all the Carlton sites again, HO802 (97 Berkeley St) is another one which falls into this category (citation prepared by ALA). It could be graded C also.

HO	Address	Current grading	Proposed grading	Comment/Notes
HO803	21-25 Bouverie Street, Carlton	D3	C3	A distinctive factory/warehouse unusually with some Georgian Revival style detailing (a style usually associated with residential buildings).
HO804	145-147 Bouverie Street, Carlton	C3	C3	A fine Moderne style building.
HO59	62 Leicester Street (60L Building)	C2	C2	Although altered, it remains as one of the few th

				reminders of the 19 century industrial phase in this area. This one probably had slipped through the net. A citation had not been prepared for this site but a large report was prepared by A Willingham and there is a SOS of sorts on p3. It would be appropriate to prepare a citation for this site.
HO806	120 Leicester Street, Carlton	D3	C/D	A bit borderline but at least a high 'D'. Although the façade windows have been altered to single pane aluminium (timber-framed windows however remain to the north side), the scale is impressive.
HO84	157-163 Pelham Street, Carlton	D-	C	The distinctive features remain largely intact, though the third storey is an addition and 2 doorways have been introduced, but sympathetically.
HO810	599 Swanston Street, Carlton	D3	Probably C3	Although a Victorian period building, it was sympathetically altered during the Interwar period and the result is an interesting hybrid, the value of which is not often recognised.
HO110	625-629 Swanston Street, Carlton	D3	C/D	We had contemplated including this site in the Lincoln Sq precinct, for although it does not face that square it was constructed by Davies Coop, for whom some of the other buildings were erected. Unusually the original upper storeys have been removed however in its truncated form, it remains distinctive. The architects were Adler & Lacey, who designed other buildings recommended in this study.

Ways forward:

1. Prepare a citation for HO59 and include the above table as a separate appendix in the Carlton volume
2. Also update the other 6 citations.

Precinct Citations

Robyn in regards to your query yesterday about citations for HO1 (Carlton) and HO3 (North and West Melbourne), we indicated from the outset that we would not prepare the citations for these precinct as it would not be practical/appropriate to do so as part of this project as only a small part of each were being reviewed. The only realistic way that these precincts can be fully assessed/understood if the whole precinct is being reviewed.

Recommended way forward:

- Leave as is, with a future project for a full review and preparation of citations for HO1 and HO3 (outline this in the amendment documents).

Regards

Anthony Hemingway

Architectural Historian/Heritage Consultant

RBA ARCHITECTS + CONSERVATION CONSULTANTS
Suite 4C / 171 Fitzroy Street, St Kilda, 3182 Victoria
Ph +613 9525 5666 Fx +613 9525 4906
www.rbaarchitects.com.au

From: Deborah Payne [mailto:Deborah.Payne@melbourne.vic.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 17 December 2012 4:39 PM
To: Anthony Hemingway
Subject: RE: City North Heritage Review - existing HO's

…sorry, my final email, on closer inspection we will delete HO86 regardless as there is an approved demolition permit for this site.

Thanks, Debbie

From: Deborah Payne
Sent: Monday, 17 December 2012 4:28 PM
To: 'Anthony Hemingway'
Subject: RE: City North Heritage Review - existing HO's

And HO59 62 Leicester Street (60L Building) C2
I cannot find a current citation for this building either

HO86 (233 Pelham Street) mentioned below currently has a D3 grading and will also

need to be deleted .

Thanks, Debbie

From: Deborah Payne
Sent: Monday, 17 December 2012 4:19 PM
To: 'Anthony Hemingway'
Cc: Robyn Hellman
Subject: City North Heritage Review - existing HO's

Hi Anthony,

Here are the existing HO's which have not been provided with new citations. We will have to delete the D's if you do not believe they should be upgraded.

HO803	21-25 Bouverie Street, Carlton	D3
HO804	145-147 Bouverie Street, Carlton	C3 (are you happy to defend this statement at Panel?)
HO806	120 Leicester Street, Carlton	D3
HO84	157-163 Pelham Street, Carlton	D-
HO810	599 Swanston Street, Carlton	D3
HO110	625-629 Swanston Street, Carlton	D3

Also, there was no Citation prepared for HO1- Carlton Precinct and I am not aware of any existing Statement.

HO86 (233 Pelham Street) 690-694 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne. Part of this property is being included in the new Elizabeth Street North Precinct, but there is no mention of the existing HO.

I am currently going over the North and West Melbourne section, but I am confident all existing HO's have been looked at.

Debbie Payne | Strategic Planner – Local Policy | City Planning and Infrastructure

City of Melbourne | Council House 2, 240 Little Collins Street Melbourne 3000 | GPO Box 1603 Melbourne 3001
T: 03 9658 8404 | F: 03 9654 1054 | E: deborah.payne@melbourne.vic.gov.au
www.melbourne.vic.gov.au | www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/whatson