

# **CITY OF BOROONDARA**

## **Review of B-graded buildings in Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn**

**Prepared for  
City of Boroondara**

**January 2007  
Revised June 2007  
Revised November 2009**

**VOLUME 1 MAIN REPORT  
& ADDENDA**

**LOVELL CHEN**

**ARCHITECTS & HERITAGE CONSULTANTS**

**35 LITTLE BOURKE STREET MELBOURNE 3000 AUSTRALIA  
TEL +61 (0)3 9667 0800 FAX +61 (0)3 9662 1037 [enquiry@lovellchen.com.au](mailto:enquiry@lovellchen.com.au)**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### VOLUME 1 Main Report

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Project Team</b>  | <b>ii</b> |
| <b>1.0 Introduction</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Scope and Project Brief  | 1         |
| 1.2 Background   | 1         |
| <b>2.0 Methodology</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1 Introduction   | 3         |
| 2.2 Existing Documentation   | 3         |
| 2.3 Existing Grading Systems   | 4         |
| 2.4 Site Inspections   | 6         |
| 2.5 Historical Research  | 7         |
| 2.6 Comparative Analysis   | 9         |
| 2.7 Assessment of Significance   | 9         |
| <b>3.0 Findings and Recommendations</b>  | <b>19</b> |
| 3.1 Introduction   | 19        |
| 3.2 Recommendations for Individual Buildings   | 19        |
| 3.3 Kew Precincts Review   | 25        |
| 3.4 Recommendations for Further Work   | 28        |
| 3.5 Conclusions  | 28        |
| <b>4.0 Select Bibliography</b>   | <b>30</b> |
| 4.1 Primary sources  | 30        |
| 4.2 Unpublished reports and theses   | 31        |
| 4.3 Secondary sources  | 31        |
| 4.4 Newspapers and journals  | 32        |
| 4.5 Websites, indexes and databases  | 32        |
| <b>Addendum 1 Consultation and Review of Citations, April-June 2007</b>                                |           |
| <b>Addendum 2 Consultation and Review of Citations, November 2007</b>                                  |           |
| <b>Addendum 3 Amendment C64 and Final Recommendations</b>  |           |
| <b>VOLUME 2 Individual Building Data Sheets – Kew</b>  |           |
| <b>VOLUME 3 Individual Building Data Sheets – Camberwell and Hawthorn</b>                              |           |
| <b>VOLUME 4 Individual Building Data Sheets for buildings not recommended for the Heritage Overlay</b> |           |

## **Project Team**

This report was prepared by:

Peter Lovell

Kate Gray

Michael Galimany

Conrad Hamann

Kate Paterson

Katherine White

## 1.0 Introduction

This report forms part of a Heritage Review of B graded buildings in Camberwell, Kew and Hawthorn undertaken in 2005-6 by Lovell Chen for the City of Boroondara. The purpose of the document is to set out the background to the Heritage Review, the approach and methodology adopted, and the conclusions and recommendations.

### 1.1 Scope and Project Brief

A project brief (Heritage Review: B Graded Buildings in the Former Cities of Kew and Camberwell, Contract No. 05/212) was prepared by the City of Boroondara in January 2005.

In summary, the Project Brief required the consultants to review all those individual residential B-graded buildings identified in earlier urban conservation studies for Camberwell (1991) and Kew (1988) which were not currently affected by Heritage Overlay controls pursuant to the Boroondara Planning Scheme. A list of buildings was provided to the consultants, with a total of 81 B-graded buildings identified in Camberwell and 147 B-graded buildings in Kew. Of the B-graded Kew properties, four had been graded A (in the 1988 study) but had subsequently been downgraded to B. Towards the end of the project, the scope of the project was extended to include eight B-graded buildings in Hawthorn which had not previously been included in the Heritage Overlay.

The focus of the study was on residential buildings (albeit in a small number of cases, adapted to a different use).

The consultants were required to review the significance of each of the buildings identified, making a judgement in each case about whether the application of the heritage overlay was warranted. Following on from this, the Project Brief required the preparation of all the necessary background information (including updated property citations) to support a planning scheme amendment to apply the heritage overlay to each of these properties.

The project commenced in July 2005 with the majority of the work being undertaken over a period of some nine months.

### 1.2 Background

Prior to amalgamation in 1996 of the municipalities of Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn, each of these municipalities had undertaken major heritage or urban conservation studies.

The three studies were as follows:

- Pru Sanderson Design Pty Ltd, Kew Urban Conservation Study, 1988
- Meredith Gould, Conservation Architects, Hawthorn Heritage Study, 1992
- Graeme Butler & Associates, Camberwell Conservation Study, 1991

While the individual methodologies, grading systems and recommendations of the three studies varied considerably, in all three cases, all A and B graded buildings located outside

urban conservation areas or heritage precincts, were recommended for site-specific heritage controls in the planning schemes.

Prior to amalgamation, each of the three municipalities had implemented some of the recommendations of the earlier studies with the introduction of planning scheme controls over recommended precincts (urban conservation areas) and, in some cases, over individual buildings, site or places. Since amalgamation, the City of Boroondara has continued this process through the provisions of the new format Boroondara Planning Scheme.

The current Heritage Review process has been initiated to address an anomaly which arose following amalgamation, whereby the majority of both A and B graded buildings (outside Heritage Overlay precincts or areas) in the former City of Hawthorn were included as individual places in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay, whereas in Camberwell and Kew, only A-graded buildings outside areas were included in the HO schedule. As a result of this anomaly, in cases of development proposals for unprotected B graded sites in Camberwell and Kew, Council has undertaken site-specific heritage assessments and in some cases has sought planning scheme amendments for interim heritage protection for these.

As part of its priority works program Council is currently undertaking a number of heritage reviews, including the subject 'B' grade building review. Additional heritage reviews currently underway include the Auburn Village Heritage Review, Balwyn Road Precinct Review, Hawthorn C\* Review and a review of Council's key heritage policy documents. Council's review of its key heritage policies will incorporate a number of recommendations arising from work undertaken by Lovell Chen as part of this Review (refer to section 2.1 below).

## **2.0 Methodology**

### **2.1 Introduction**

A number of additional tasks were also undertaken preparatory to undertaking the core work of assessing the buildings and reviewing and upgrading the earlier citations. These focused on assisting the development of an appropriate methodology for the review and informing the development of a strategic framework for the amendment.

The additional tasks included a review of key policy documents (including both Council documents and external documents), a review of recent Panel reports dealing with the introduction of the Heritage Overlay, a review of the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) and other criteria for the assessment of cultural heritage significance, and a consideration of the existing grading systems in place at Boroondara.

The review of recent Panel reports and of other key documents, including the VPP Practice Note 'Applying the Heritage Overlay', raised a number of related issues. These included the following:

1. The need for a clearly stated methodology for heritage assessments;
2. The need for rigour in the research, analysis and assessment of places to be included in the Heritage Overlay;
3. The requirement for concise and focused statements of significance.
4. The requirement for the use of recognised heritage criteria for the assessment of significance.

These are variously discussed below.

### **2.2 Existing Documentation**

All relevant building-specific information from the earlier municipal heritage or urban conservation studies was provided to the consultants.

In the case of the B-graded buildings in the former City of Camberwell, the information contained in Graeme Butler's Camberwell Conservation Study (1991) was relatively comprehensive. It comprised a written building citation, including a photograph, detailed history based on rate books and a range of other sources, a physical description, list of comparative examples, notes on external integrity and streetscape and a statement of significance.

By comparison, in the case of the B-graded buildings in the former City of Kew, the information provided in the original study was relatively limited. Building Identification Forms for B-graded buildings from the 1987 Kew Conservation Study were in the format of a single sheet with photograph and a series of boxes whereby the broad period of construction was indicated, and significant elements (walls, roof, joinery, verandah, and/or fence) were identified. Brief handwritten notes also appeared on the sheets. In the case of 87 of the 147 Kew properties some additional information was provided in the form of draft citations prepared for Council by Graeme Butler in 2000. The information contained in these draft documents was essentially in the form of brief histories (including rate book and directory

research). Generally these draft citations did not include physical descriptions or any assessment of significance.

For the 8 Hawthorn properties, Council provided a series of citations prepared for the former City of Hawthorn by Meredith Gould Conservation Architects. In the first instance these included the Place Identification Forms from the 1992 Hawthorn Heritage Study (sometimes dated 1993 and 1994). Additionally, for a number of the buildings more detailed citation material (also prepared by Meredith Gould Conservation Architects in the later 1990s as part of the Hawthorn Heritage Review) was provided. In all cases, a written history, description and assessment of significance were included.

**2.3 Existing Grading Systems**

Alphabetical building grading systems are in place in most documents and studies undertaken for the City of Boroondara and its predecessors (the Cities of Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn). As shown in the attached table, these systems vary in the number of gradings included (compare Kew with 3 levels and Hawthorn with 6 levels) and the definitions of these gradings. The degree of variation between the studies can be illustrated by reference to the definitions of B-graded buildings in Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn:

‘Places that are integral to the cultural significance of the City of Kew as a whole, through their architectural integrity or historical associations.’  
(Kew)

‘Considered highly important compared to examples taken from across the Metropolitan Area.’ (Camberwell)

‘B’ places are of regional or metropolitan significance, and stand as important milestones in the cultural development of the metropolis. Many will be either already included on, or recommended for inclusion on, the Register of the National Estate.’ (Hawthorn)

The full range of definitions is shown on the following table:

| Study | Kew Urban Conservation Study, Volume 1, 1988  | Camberwell Conservation Study, Volume 4, 1991  | Hawthorn Heritage Study, Vol 1A, 1993   |
|-------|---|--|---|
| A     | Places that are of individual cultural significance within the locality, the State of Victoria, or Australia as a whole. These are on, or recommended for inclusion on, at least one of the Historic Buildings Register, the Government Buildings Register, or the Register of the National Estate. | Considered culturally valuable when compared to a similar type or style of site taken from across the State. | ‘A’ places are of national or state importance, irreplaceable parts of Australia’s heritage. Many will be either already included on, or recommended for inclusion on, the Historic Buildings Register or Government Buildings Register, and the Register of the National Estate. |



| Study | Kew Urban Conservation Study, Volume 1, 1988  | Camberwell Conservation Study, Volume 4, 1991   | Hawthorn Heritage Study, Vol 1A, 1993  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| B     | Places that are integral to the cultural significance of the City of Kew as a whole, through their architectural integrity or historical associations.  | Considered highly important compared to examples taken from across the Metropolitan Area.   | 'B' places are of regional or metropolitan significance, and stand as important milestones in the cultural development of the metropolis. Many will be either already included on, or recommended for inclusion on, the Register of the National Estate.                             |
| C*    | Not included in study   | Not included in study   | 'C*' "keynote buildings" are 'C' graded buildings of local significance which also play a key role in formulating the visual impression of the historic character of an area. (They often appear in the absence of nearby A or B graded buildings)                                   |
| C     | Places that contribute to the architectural or historical character and cohesiveness of the City of Kew. Grade C structures are, in the main, severely altered examples of typical building types | Considered important compared to examples taken from across the Metropolitan Area.  | 'C' places make an architectural, historic, scientific or social contribution that is important within the local area. This includes well preserved examples of particular themes of development, as well as some individually significant places that have been altered or defaced. |
| D     | Not included in study   | Considered valuable only as good examples of common site types within the municipality with potential to form streetscapes or precincts or stand alone as faithfully preserved examples of a common type. | 'D' places are representatives of particular themes of development which have been significantly altered but which stand in an area where that development theme is particularly well illustrated.   |
| E     | Not included in study   | As for D but altered with potential for restoration but   | E' places have generally been substantially altered  |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  | currently none for streetscape contribution. | and no longer provide a clear illustration of the theme of development of an area. Because of this they are not considered to make an essential contribution to the historic character of the area, although retention and restoration may still be beneficial. |
|--|--|--|---|

The variation between these definitions was reviewed at the outset of the study, and the question of whether such inconsistencies would have significant implications for the methodology or outcome of the Review was considered. Based on the definitions alone, it was thought possible that some of the B-graded buildings in Kew might prove to be of a lower level of significance when compared with the B-graded buildings in Camberwell, where buildings were described as being 'highly important' when compared with examples taken from across the metropolitan area. Though only a small group of buildings added to the study in its latter stages, the Hawthorn definition of B-graded buildings was broadly comparable with that of Camberwell. At the end of the study, while it was not clear that there was a substantial qualitative difference between B-graded buildings in Camberwell and those in Kew, it is interesting to note that a somewhat higher proportion of B-graded buildings in Kew have not been recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay as compared with Camberwell (refer Section 3.2, Recommendations).

Ultimately, while the variation between the grading systems does introduce a level of inconsistency into the process, the critical issue is that regardless of the grading definition, in each of the three studies, the recommendation for B-graded buildings was essentially the same: that B-graded buildings outside heritage areas or precincts be identified as warranting protection under the planning scheme. The purpose of this Review has been to test this recommendation for each of these B-graded buildings.

## 2.4 Site Inspections

All sites in the study group were visited and the buildings were inspected and photographed to the extent of fabric visible from the street. Though in the overwhelming majority of cases, significant change has occurred at the rear of the houses, alterations and additions were generally only noted where these were visible from the main frontage of the property or the side street/s if on a corner.

The approach in this study has been to document changes to fabric as accurately as possible within the constraints posed by the study methodology. Even where the buildings are visible, the view from the street does not necessarily reveal all relevant details and materials and there are cases where loss of integrity is only apparent on closer inspection. It has been possible to compensate for limited access/visibility in part through a review Council's building and planning records which identify where works have taken place. Notwithstanding this, there are examples where new fabric may not be easily identified. This is particularly true in the case of elements such as verandahs which have been replaced/renewed, in some cases on the basis of factual records, enabling the accurate reconstruction of the original, but more

typically in a standard 'period' form. Occasionally, there may also be doubt about more substantial changes such as dormer roof forms, where the origins of such features are unclear other than on close inspection.

In some cases, when site inspections were carried out, it was evident that the buildings were obscured either fully or in part, most commonly by vegetation or fences or a combination of the two, or by later buildings. In a small number of cases, while the buildings were generally visible from the street, it was considered that the assessment process would be assisted by a more detailed inspection. In all these cases, Council wrote to the owners requesting site access for the purpose of this Review.

In many cases it was possible during the course of the project to arrange site inspections, while in others access was not available. Regardless of whether individual properties could be inspected in more detail, however, in all cases a judgement has been made on whether there was sufficient information about the fabric of the building to allow an assessment for the purposes of considering significance and the application of the Heritage Overlay. In all but one case, the judgement has been made that there is, on balance, sufficient information (both visual and documentary) to underpin an assessment, and to justify making a provisional recommendation in relation to the Overlay. It is recognised that this is an imperfect methodology; the principal concern being the possibility that obscured buildings may have been altered and their significance compromised as a result. Accordingly, in such cases, the assessment of significance is provisional only and this is noted on the data sheet. The citations could be modified in the event that the opportunity arises to undertake more detailed site inspections.

In one case, it was considered that in the absence of a site inspection, there was not sufficient visual material to allow for a proper assessment as part of this Review. In this case, the approach taken was to recommend the application of the Heritage Overlay based directly on an earlier assessment prepared by another heritage consultant for the City of Hawthorn with this assessment to form part of the amendment documentation.

## 2.5 Historical Research

### *Owners and Occupants*

The approach taken in this review has been to incorporate the historical research and individual building histories from the earlier municipal studies. Written histories were existing for all of Camberwell and Hawthorn buildings and draft histories had also been prepared for 87 of the 147 Kew buildings. It has been beyond the scope of this project to review or verify in any substantial manner the research underpinning the existing individual building histories, and these have generally been accepted as accurate and correct in a factual sense. The exception to this is where additional historical research undertaken as part of this Review has revealed errors or inconsistencies in the existing histories and in such cases these have been corrected as far as is possible.

Work was undertaken to bring the previously un-researched buildings in Kew (ie, the buildings for which no draft citations were prepared by Graeme Butler in 2000) up to a broadly comparable level of documentation as the buildings in Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn for which histories had previously been prepared. Basic historical research, including ratebook and directory searches sufficient to establish the date of construction, original owners and/or occupants and subsequent basic pattern of occupation, were

undertaken for these properties. In addition, a review of Sands & McDougall Directories was undertaken for all buildings in Kew through until the late twentieth century.

In considering the scope and nature of additional historical research undertaken as part of the Review, the approach is one which has attempted to be as rigorous and focused as possible within the budgetary constraints common to all such heritage studies. Accordingly, the approach adopted has been informed by a consideration of the assessment methodology and of the criteria which might be adopted (refer to discussion below at 2.7).

In considering the history of individual properties, the vast majority of residences in Boroondara and elsewhere have a broadly similar pattern of ownership and occupation, their residents are either owner-occupiers or tenants, with the properties changing hands as inherited property or as a result of sale. While the historical details of the various occupants and owners are of interest, in most cases the buildings are not considered to derive significance from their historical association with particular individuals or families. On this basis, while it may add interest, it was not considered necessary to undertake detailed research on all individual owners or occupiers. Similarly, the historical material included in some of the existing citations was amended, in many cases to remove biographical and other historical detail where the veracity or relevance of the material was considered to be questionable.

#### *History of Alterations*

The approach to historical research in this review has been one which seeks to assist in the assessment process. On this basis, and considering the importance of the issue of physical intactness, a review of Council's building and planning indexes and files was undertaken for all properties (refer to Select Bibliography for a list of these). The purpose of this review was to identify the nature of any alterations, additions and/or subdivision works which may have occurred for each property. This research was particularly useful in confirming altered fabric and in some cases identifying reconstructed elements such as verandahs.

Similarly, general searches were undertaken for historic photographs and other images, and Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works (MMBW) plans generally dating from the early twentieth century (both the 160':1" scale series and the 40':1" scale series) were consulted. In selected cases, the MMBW Plans of Drainage for individual properties were also obtained from the current water authority for the area, Yarra Valley Water. The primary purpose in pursuing these avenues of historical research was to assist in understanding the physical fabric of the buildings and in some cases, their original date of construction.

No architect has been linked with the design of most buildings in this Review. To a degree this reflects the fact that many – if not the majority – were not architect-designed, but rather, were good quality builder designs. Notwithstanding this, there are a number of buildings in the Review which have characteristics which suggest that they were commissioned architect designs. In some of these cases, the architect is known, either on the basis of historical research undertaken in the previous studies, or as a result of research undertaken in this Review. In other cases, however, the original architect remains unknown. The approach to this issue has been not to attribute the design of a building to a particular architect unless there is some documented link.

## 2.6 Comparative Analysis

The issue of the importance of comparative analysis was one which emerged from a review of recent Panel Reports. The process by which individual buildings or places can be compared with other broadly similar examples in order to reach a conclusion about relative significance is one which is a key aspect of conservation practice in the general sense. Accepting this, equally, at the level of a municipal heritage study, it is a process which if undertaken in any detail, is extremely time-consuming and costly. Accordingly, the issue of comparative analysis is one which has been addressed in this Review, albeit in a manner which necessarily has been subject to some constraints.

The obvious context from which comparisons have been drawn for individual buildings is from within the Review group itself (comprising more than 230 buildings). Grouping buildings of similar age, form, and architectural style and then comparing these has assisted greatly in distinguishing the more assured and architecturally distinctive examples from the more typical, and has been an important aspect of the assessment methodology.

In addition, a brief desktop review of the Camberwell and Kew studies in some cases proved to be useful in providing a comparative context for the assessment, although the desktop nature of this part of the comparative work poses significant limitations. Buildings below a B-grading were not illustrated in the Kew study, for example, while the Hawthorn Heritage Study was not consulted, as individual building citations were not included in the published version of the study. In most cases it was outside the scope of the study to inspect the possible comparisons to confirm that they had not been altered or even demolished and this was a major limitation.

Beyond this, relevant comparisons were drawn from the consultants' knowledge of buildings in the area.

Within the constraints identified, an effort has been made to draw meaningful conclusions from the comparative analysis work, rather than simply providing a list of buildings (as was the approach in the Camberwell Conservation Study).

## 2.7 Assessment of Significance

The primary and overriding consideration in assessing the buildings in this Review has been that of whether the particular building or place warrants the application of a site-specific Heritage Overlay. In this regard, while the assessment methodology for this Review has been informed in the first instance by accepted heritage conservation practices and methodologies and by the existing gradings, it is also informed by an awareness of a series of issues which have been raised and discussed in some detail by Panels considering recent Heritage Overlay amendments.

### **The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 1999)**

The Burra Charter establishes the concept of Cultural Significance and sets out a series of values which contribute to Cultural Significance:

*Cultural significance* means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations (Article 1.2)

Acceptance of these Burra Charter values underpins the assessment process and use of the assessment criteria, and the criteria themselves are drawn from and make reference to these values.

### Choice of Assessment Criteria

In relation to the application of the Heritage Overlay in general and the assessment process and the use of criteria and thresholds, the VPP Practice Note 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' is a key document. The Practice Note states that places to be included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay should include, *inter alia*

Places identified in a local heritage study provided the significance of the place can be shown to justify the application of the overlay

The Practice Note also requires the use of 'recognised heritage criteria':

Heritage criteria which could be adopted for the assessment of heritage places include those adopted by the Australian Heritage Commission or Heritage Victoria ... [or] those set out in the Department of Infrastructure's 1991 publication, Local Government Heritage Guidelines. These or other criteria may be acceptable. The most important thing is that the assessment of heritage places has been rigorous and that heritage controls are applied judiciously and with justification.

A series of different criteria were considered for use in this Review, including the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) criteria, the Heritage Victoria criteria and those set down in the Local Government Heritage Guidelines document of 1991.

The majority of recent Heritage Studies have used the AHC criteria, and while recent panels have been broadly supportive of this, equally some have recommended these criteria be reviewed and modified to the local context and specific guidelines for their application developed.<sup>1</sup> The interpretation and application of the AHC criteria can be complex, and the only application guidelines which exist date from 1991 and were specifically developed for use in relation to the Register of the National Estate.

The Heritage Victoria criteria were developed from the AHC criteria but are a modified and arguably, a somewhat simplified version. It was considered that the Heritage Victoria criteria could easily be modified to reflect the local context of the City of Boroondara (as opposed to the state context in which candidates for the Victorian Heritage Register are considered).

Accordingly, it was decided to adopt a modified version of Heritage Victoria's assessment criteria for use in this study. The criteria used are as follows:

#### *Amended Heritage Victoria Criteria*

**CRITERION A:** The historical importance, association with or relationship to Boroondara's history of the place or object.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the Bayside Amendment C37 & C38, Panel Report, December 2004, p. 217.

CRITERION B: The importance of a place or object in demonstrating rarity or uniqueness.

CRITERION C: The place or object's potential to educate, illustrate or provide further scientific investigation in relation to Boroondara's cultural heritage.

CRITERION D: The importance of a place or object in exhibiting the principal characteristics or the representative nature of a place or object as a part of a class or type of places or objects.

CRITERION E: The importance of the place or object in exhibiting good design or aesthetic characteristics and/or in exhibiting a richness, diversity or unusual integration of features.

CRITERION F: The importance of the place or object in demonstrating or being associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements.

CRITERION G: The importance of the place or object in demonstrating social or cultural associations

### Thresholds

Integral to a consideration of the use of criteria is the question of establishing a *threshold* of cultural significance which would warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay (whether it be for an area or single building). In other words, in considering the application of any universal value-based system of criteria, the critical issue becomes one of thresholds. In assessing the level of significance of a place, reference needs to be made to the level at which a place could be said to meet any single assessment criterion or value. As established by the VPP Practice Note, the key issue is that places nominated for inclusion in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay need to be of local significance, that is, they must meet one or more criteria at a local level.

On this point, it is noted that the approach taken to the assessment against criteria has not been one of aggregation, that is, the aggregation of heritage values across a number of criteria to reach the threshold of local significance or higher. Rather, the approach has been to assess each place against each criterion separately and independently.

Accordingly, in the current review, the criteria and Burra Charter values have been used in conjunction with reference to the following thresholds:

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| State/National | Places that are considered significant in a state or national context                                    |
| Municipal      | Places that are considered significant in the context of the City of Boroondara as a whole               |
| Local          | Places that are considered significant in the context of a local area (eg: Kew, Camberwell, Balwyn, etc) |

## Application of the Criteria

The amended Heritage Victoria criteria have been applied in a consistent manner generally as described below. It is noted that only three of the criteria (criteria A, D and E) proved to be of particular relevance, with the majority of buildings being considered against Criteria D and/or E. This reflects the nature of the study (generally limited to residential buildings) as well as, to a degree, the fact that the study addressed individual buildings rather than groups of buildings or wider areas.

*CRITERION A: The historical importance, association with or relationship to Boroondara's history of the place or object.*

This criteria addresses the question of *historical value* as set down in the Burra Charter. In considering this criteria it is important to note that all the buildings recommended for the Heritage Overlay as part of this Review (as well as many of the buildings not recommended for the Overlay) are considered to be of historical significance in the local context. Whether they date from the 1870s or the post-World War II period, these buildings all contribute in a general sense to the historical framework of the area and provide reference points to the past for residents and other observers. The same is true for Boroondara's existing Heritage Overlay areas and individual sites, all of which, both singly and collectively, contribute to an understanding of the history of the municipality and its historical development.

Notwithstanding this interpretation of historical significance as something that broadly attaches to all buildings in the Review (as acknowledged in the format of the statements of significance which makes reference to both *historical and architectural significance*), this in itself would clearly not be sufficient to justify the application of the Heritage Overlay.

In considering the use of Criterion A as a basis for the application of the Overlay to individual buildings, the approach was one whereby any such historical associations had to be both specific and of a relatively high level, sufficient to distinguish that individual building from the majority of other Boroondara examples.

It is accepted that most residential buildings in Boroondara are related to one or more broad historical themes in the development of the area, whether it be the proliferation of suburban bungalows in the interwar period in Camberwell or the establishment of substantial Victorian residences on large elevated sites in Kew and Hawthorn in the late nineteenth century. On this basis, an association with a historical theme in the development of a suburb or area was not considered to be sufficient to meet this criteria. This approach is one which is in line with the findings of the Panel for Amendments C37 and C38 to the Bayside Planning Scheme, which questioned whether such historical themes could be represented by individual buildings.<sup>1</sup>

In considering this issue, an exception has been made in a small number of buildings which date from the earlier phases of development of the municipality. Though in some cases these buildings may have been altered to a greater degree than the majority of the B-graded buildings proposed for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay schedule, this is balanced by the fact that there are relatively few buildings surviving from the pre-1870 period and these surviving examples are important in providing a physical reference to the earlier phases in the history of the area.



Similarly, historical associations with a particular person or family were generally not considered to be sufficient to meet this criteria at a local level or higher. Boroondara historically has been an area which has attracted residents of relative affluence, many of which have been prominent, whether it be in the professions, manufacturing, politics or similar. Such associations may be of great interest and are generally noted where known in the histories included on the data sheets for each building. Notwithstanding that there may be a level of *interest* in such details, the public or private activities of these families or individuals and their association with one or more houses is generally not considered to be sufficient significance as to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay to a particular residence.

An exception has been made in a relatively small number of cases, where the historical association is of a higher than usual level of historical importance, and where it can be documented in the historical record (whether or not popularly known). In some cases, the individuals have been particularly prominent in public life in the local context (Mayors of Kew and Camberwell, for example). Exceptions have also been made in cases where the significance of the association transcends the local context. These include the residences of two Australian Prime Ministers (10 Howard Street, home of Robert Menzies and his family from the late 1920s until the 1950s, and 167 Cotham Road, owned by William Hughes between 1915 and 1924). In such cases, while documented, these historical associations are in these cases clearly not literally demonstrated through the physical fabric of the building.<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding this, it is suggested here that there is a level of interest and significance in considering the residences of such individuals in that these buildings provide a particular perspective on their background and way of life. While not claiming that the buildings interpret that individual's life in a direct and tangible way nor that our historical knowledge of the individual necessarily assists in interpreting the physical fabric of the building,<sup>3</sup> such associations between people and particular places do provide a historical context and are of considerable interest.

*CRITERION B: The importance of a place or object in demonstrating rarity or uniqueness.*

This criterion is one which could potentially relate to any one of the Burra Charter values.

It is a criterion which was not particularly relevant to a consideration of the B-graded residences in the Review. Clearly the residential typology in itself is not rare; nor in a general sense, are the majority of variations on this typology. In considering the architecture of the buildings, while a number of buildings were highly distinctive and unusual stylistically or were notable for an unusual combination of features, generally these qualities were assessed under Criterion E.

*CRITERION C: The place or object's potential to educate, illustrate or provide further scientific investigation in relation to Boroondara's cultural heritage.*

---

<sup>2</sup> This is particularly the case in the local planning context, where only the exteriors of the buildings are considered.

<sup>3</sup> As is contemplated in the much-quoted article by Graeme Davison, 'What Makes a Building Historic', in G Davison and C McConville (eds), *A Heritage Handbook*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1991, p. 71. Davison suggests that such connections only become 'more than sentimental if the historic personage and the building somehow interpret each other'.

This criterion is one which relates to the Burra Charter values of *historical, scientific and/or aesthetic value*. It is a criterion which contemplates the potential for research and investigation, and is not generally applicable in the local planning context, other than for archaeological sites.

*CRITERION D: The importance of a place or object in exhibiting the principal characteristics or the representative nature of a place or object as a part of a class or type of places or objects.*

This criterion deals with the issue of 'representativeness', that is the extent to which a building could be considered to demonstrate the characteristics of a particular building typology. It is a criterion which is related to both *historical and aesthetic values* as set down in the Burra Charter.

Many buildings in Boroondara are broadly representative of one typology or another. Accordingly, as with other criteria used in this Review, it is important that in order to meet the criteria at a level which would warrant the Heritage Overlay, the buildings be distinguished from other lesser examples.

This Review includes an array of residential buildings, with particular typologies representing variations on dates of construction, building form, and architectural style. Examples include such types as single-storey Victorian Italianate villas, interwar attic bungalows, post-WWII architect-designed Modernist houses, and many others. The approach in assessing buildings against this criterion has been to require representative examples of particular building typologies to be very good representative examples when compared against others of their type. While the architectural treatment of the building is not always the key issue in considering this criterion, in many cases, representative examples of a particular typology are also well designed examples. Importantly, as the criterion suggests, where buildings have been assessed as representative, they are buildings which are good exemplars of forms and types found more widely in the municipality, that is they represent a good example of a larger group of buildings. The issue of intactness (refer discussion below) below has been considered to be a factor in considering representativeness, in that (with a small number of exceptions) good representative examples of particular types generally have a relatively high level of external intactness.

*CRITERION E: The importance of the place or object in exhibiting good design or aesthetic characteristics and/or in exhibiting a richness, diversity or unusual integration of features.*

This criterion deals with *aesthetic value* as set down in the Burra Charter and in the context of this Review, addresses the architectural design of the buildings. In assessing buildings against this criterion, the approach has been to identify buildings which are either of a relatively high standard of design, or incorporate particularly distinctive features or a combination of features, particularly rich detailing or decoration, or other architectural qualities or features of distinction. It was not considered that such architectural qualities or elements need necessarily be singular or rare to meet this criterion at a local level.

It is noted that there are many examples of buildings which have been assessed as meeting both Criterion D and Criterion E, and that the two are not considered to be mutually exclusive. There are many buildings which are fine representative examples of a particular building typology (including form and architectural style) but which also incorporate elements or characteristics for which they are considered to be of particular aesthetic/architectural distinction and significance. For example, a fine, representative and broadly intact example

of a Victorian Italianate villa may also be of architectural significance for a particularly distinctive display of dichrome brickwork. Similarly, a fine representative example of a Federation attic residence may also be a particularly accomplished and beautiful composition.

*CRITERION F: The importance of the place or object in demonstrating or being associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements.*

This criterion, which could relate variously to the Burra Charter values of scientific value, historical value, and possibly also aesthetic [architectural] value, was found to be of limited relevance in this Review. The test in considering this criterion was that any scientific or technical innovation or achievement would need to be confirmed as being of significance in the local context, but preferably also in the wider context.

*CRITERION G: The importance of the place or object in demonstrating social or cultural associations*

Criterion G could potentially relate generally to *historical* and *social value*, and possibly *spiritual value*, as set down in the Burra Charter.

As compared with buildings such as public buildings, places of assembly, churches, schools and the like, the application of this criterion to a series of residential buildings is more difficult. In considering the application of the criteria in the current Review, the approach taken was that any social or cultural associations would need to be demonstrated through the fabric of the place or building, and also that these associations would need to be both specific and of sufficient interest or importance as to elevate the place or building above the bulk of other Boroondara residences.

It would be arguable, for example, that a substantial 1920s brick bungalow set on a standard generous allotment in Camberwell at a basic level demonstrates - through its physical form, siting and landscaping and other features - a series of cultural associations relating to middle-class suburban life in the interwar period, including aspirations, financial means, fashion and taste and so on. While this may be in some ways a valid approach, it is not particularly useful in considering the level of significance of any one example.

The study also considered one building (*Fairyland Cottage* at 57 Malmsbury Street, Kew) where particular circumstances have given it a prominence (even a somewhat mythical status) in the historical record above others of its kind. The house was owned for a time by the ancestors of local historian, Dorothy Rogers, and in her book *A history of Kew*, Rogers describes the early history of the house, including a story about it being a meeting place or haven for neighbourhood children for a short period in the twentieth century. While not doubting the veracity of the facts set down by Rogers, it is difficult purely on the basis of this account to elevate the house, a typical and heavily modified example of a simple Victorian cottage, above other examples of its type.

### **The Issue of Intactness**

The issue of intactness has traditionally been a key consideration in local heritage studies and has been one of the major factors influencing the ranking or grading of buildings. The grading systems in the Camberwell, Kew and Hawthorn studies all make explicit reference to intactness, albeit in different ways. The Kew study, in particular, uses intactness as a key test and a means by which B-graded buildings are distinguished from their less intact C-graded counterparts, while in the more complex Camberwell grading system, the D-graded buildings are distinguished from E-graded examples on the basis of intactness. Similarly, in

Hawthorn, a distinction is drawn between well-preserved representative C-graded buildings and C-graded buildings that were individually significant but which have been 'altered or defaced'. Interestingly (with the exception of the Kew definition for B-graded buildings which refers to 'architectural integrity'), the definitions for A and B-graded buildings generally do not explicitly refer to or require intactness.

Given the emphasis in the Heritage Overlay on fabric and on the control of change to fabric, the issue of intactness is considered to be an important one, and the approach in this study has been to use intactness as a moderating factor in assessing significance. The critical issue in this regard is whether the change/s have significantly compromised the presentation and/or the significance of the building.

#### *Non-Visible Alterations*

Alterations to original fabric at the rear of buildings (including part demolition of rear sections of the building) are common and often have occurred in association with the construction of rear additions (discussed below). While these are noted where known, rear alterations are generally not visible from the street and in most cases are not considered to impact on significance in the local planning context.

#### *Alteration of Visible Fabric*

Alterations to visible original fabric (ie, fabric that is viewed from the street) vary in their impact. As noted above, the key issue is the degree to which the change removes or alters significant elements or aspects of the presentation of the building. While the concept of intactness is an important one, the reality is that original fabric is replaced as part of normal maintenance and repair works. Where materials have been replaced with the same or similar materials – for example – replacement of roof or verandah cladding, this is generally not considered to detract from significance. Conversely, where a different material has been introduced, such as concrete roof tiles replacing original terracotta, this may have a greater impact on the visual presentation of the buildings. While physically a relatively minor change, where patterned brickwork was used as a decorative treatment, the overpainting of originally unpainted brickwork may have a significant impact on significance. Minor changes to doors and windows may not have a major impact, depending on their form and visibility. Though widely considered to be a sympathetic means of achieving additional accommodation, the introduction of roof dormers which draw directly on the style of the original house and which use matching materials and detailing can result in the distortion of fabric (ie, the original roof form) which is key to understanding the significance of the place. (Some dormer forms are also out of scale and dominate the original roofscape).

One of the more difficult areas in considering intactness is that of verandahs. In Boroondara over the past twenty years there has been an increase in interest and appreciation of heritage in general and in particular of the architecture of the Victorian and Federation periods. Reflecting this, many residences in Boroondara have been renovated and 'restored' during this period, including the repair, renewal or reconstruction of verandahs, and in some cases, the verandah floor. In some cases this work has been undertaken on the basis of a faithful reconstruction (using the term in the Burra Charter sense) of verandahs based on the original design. In the vast majority of cases, however, the new verandah is likely to be of a standard design which may be sympathetic but is not detailed exactly as the original. The effect of this work is difficult to gauge. In most cases, the presentation of a Victorian villa which has lost its verandah will be enhanced by the reinstatement of a verandah of a design

which is typical of the period. Equally, in considering the issue of intactness and its impact on significance, it is no more intact than the same villa left without its verandah. The issue is further complicated by the fact that the new work will not necessarily be identifiable as such other than on close inspection.

In considering the issue of reconstructed, reinstated (or missing) verandahs or other features it has not been possible to apply a hard and fast rule. Rather, the approach taken to reconstructed or 'period' fabric in this Review has been one which seeks to identify reconstructed/reinstated/new fabric wherever possible and to consider in each case what the impact is on significance. In heritage overlay areas, the reinstatement of missing original elements using elements of standard period design is something which has worked to enhance the presentation and understanding of these areas. In the case of individual buildings proposed for the Heritage Overlay, however, the issue needs careful consideration on a case-by-case basis, with a strong preference for surviving original fabric.

### *Additions*

In considering the issue of additions, with a small number of exceptions, where additions are concealed from the street these are not considered to impact adversely on significance. Even in cases where rear additions are visible on a side street, rear laneway, or elsewhere in the public domain, the impact of these on the principal street presentation of the building was considered to be the more critical factor.

In the case of visible additions, either at the rear or elsewhere, the impact of these has been assessed on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, such additions may be visually dominant in relation to the original building or may have involved major intervention into the main roof form/s of the original house. In others however, rear additions are clearly discernible as such and the original street presentation of the building remains legible. It is interesting to note that a number of such cases, the additions are of a form which could be contemplated under the Heritage Overlay provisions and relevant Council guidelines.

### **Individual Data Sheets**

Individual data sheets have been prepared for each building recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay. These are in Volumes 2 and 3 of this Review. Individual data sheets for buildings not recommended for the Heritage Overlay are included in Volume 4. The format of the data sheets has been designed in order that all the relevant physical and historical information is included in a single document, as well as any comparative and stylistic analysis, the assessment against criteria and a concise statement of significance.

The Heritage Overlay decision guidelines at Clause 43.01-5 require consideration of the impacts on the character, appearance and significance of the heritage place. The statement of significance is therefore the key piece of information on a citation, providing the basis for future decisions on demolition or alterations. In preparing the statement of significance, the approach has been to be concise and direct and to use generally consistent terminology.

In addition to the statement of significance, the data sheets describe original fabric and establish the extent and nature of alterations which have occurred. As in the case of the statement of significance, the intention in doing so is to assist future decisions on demolition or alteration works.

Refer to the introduction to each of the accompanying volumes (2, 3 and 4) for additional explanatory notes in relation to the format of the data sheets.

## **Conclusion**

The assessment methodology adopted in this Review has been one which seeks to apply a set of accepted values and criteria with reference to the thresholds of local, municipal and state/national significance. As far as possible, the assessment has been undertaken with some reference to comparative examples. The issue of intactness has been considered as a moderating factor on significance, on a case-by-case basis.

As noted earlier, the criteria of most relevance to the assessment process in this Review have been Criteria D and E, and to a lesser extent, A. While this may suggest an emphasis on building fabric and on issues of aesthetics and architecture, this is to some degree inevitable in a review of individual residences, particularly in the context of the Heritage Overlay control, which itself focuses on external fabric and appearance. Notwithstanding this, social and historical factors clearly contribute to the form and design of all the houses in this Review, and as noted earlier, all are considered to be of significance as reference points within the broader historical framework of the municipality.

### 3.0 Findings and Recommendations

#### 3.1 Introduction

Please note that the findings and recommendations below are those that were included as part of the January 2007 report. These were revised in June 2007 and again in November 2007 and the recommendations of these revisions are included in Addenda 1 and 2 located at the end of this document. Subsequently, the B Grade Review has proceeded through the Planning Scheme amendment process, including a Panel process and the recommendations have been further amended in some cases as a result of these considerations. The final recommendations of the study, which in some cases, incorporate the recommendations of the Panel for Amendment C64, are included in Addendum 3.

In the course of the Review process, the majority of B-graded buildings in Kew and Camberwell were confirmed as being of sufficient significance to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay on an individual basis. In a small number of cases (in both Kew and Camberwell), individual buildings were considered to be of a higher level of significance than their original assessment and grading had suggested. This is reflected on the revised grading on the data sheets and in the statement of significance for these buildings.

Of the buildings not recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay, a number were found to have undergone substantial alterations and additions since the earlier studies were undertaken and some had been demolished. A number were broadly intact and as surveyed in the earlier studies but on review, were not considered to be of sufficient significance as to warrant the application of the overlay. A proportionally larger number of these were B-graded buildings from the Kew study, possibly reflecting the difference in approach and the grading systems used in this study.

Prior to consideration of this review by Council, two properties initially assessed as warranting the application of a Heritage Overlay were granted building approval for demolition. These properties are located at 219 Cotham Road, Kew, and 31 Chaucer Crescent, Canterbury. A third property at 17 Threadneedle Street, Balwyn, was downgraded from a B grading to a C grading following new historical information being provided. Accordingly, it is no longer proposed to recommend these three properties for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.

#### 3.2 Recommendations for Individual Buildings

##### Kew

A total of 147 buildings were assessed in Kew, with the following recommendations:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 94 |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 43 |
| Already included in HO area                        | 1  |
| Demolished   | 9  |

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| TOTAL | 147 |
|-------|-----|

Buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are listed below. Data sheets for these buildings are in Volume 2 of this report.

|         |                       |
|---------|-----------------------|
| 83-85   | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 231     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 311     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 389     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 35-37   | Belford Road, Kew     |
| 5       | Bowen Street, Kew     |
| 7       | Bowen Street, Kew     |
| 1       | Bradford Avenue, Kew  |
| 1199    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1205    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1221    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1223    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1291    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 46      | Clyde Street, Kew     |
| 161     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 167     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 171     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 206-208 | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 221-229 | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 241     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 294     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 340     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 2       | Daniel Place, Kew     |
| 2       | Daracombe Avenue, Kew |
| 1       | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 2       | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 8       | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 24-26   | Edgecombe Street, Kew |



9 Eglinton Street, Kew  
162 Eglinton Street, Kew  
20 Fernhurst Grove, Kew  
10 Findon Crescent, Kew  
48 Foley Street, Kew  
2 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
6 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
25-27 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
29-31 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
77 Gladstone Street, Kew  
12 Grange Road, Kew  
53 Harp Road, Kew  
6 High Street, Kew  
35 High Street, Kew  
73 High Street, Kew  
28 Holroyd Street, Kew  
2 Howard Street, Kew  
10 Howard Street, Kew  
19 Howard Street, Kew  
20 Howard Street, Kew  
2 John Street, Kew  
16 John Street, Kew  
24 Lister Street, Kew  
2 Merrion Grove, Kew  
24 Miller Grove, Kew  
26 Miller Grove, Kew  
28 Miller Grove, Kew  
76 Molesworth Street, Kew  
82 Molesworth Street, Kew  
17 O'Shaughnessy Street, Kew  
57 Pakington Street, Kew  
66-68 Pakington Street, Kew

70 Pakington Street, Kew  
83 Pakington Street, Kew  
98 Pakington Street, Kew  
72 Peel Street, Kew  
33-35 Princess Street, Kew  
16 Queen Street, Kew  
11 Redmond Street, Kew  
21 Redmond Street, Kew  
34 Rowland Street, Kew  
3 Second Avenue, Kew  
12 Stevenson Street, Kew  
34 Stevenson Street, Kew  
13 Studley Ave, Kew  
25 Studley Park Road, Kew  
44 Studley Park Road, Kew  
52 Studley Park Road, Kew  
75 Studley Park Road, Kew  
89 Studley Park Road, Kew  
12 Tara Avenue, Kew  
1 Tennyson Street, Kew  
14 Vista Avenue, Kew  
51 Walpole Street, Kew  
52 Walpole Street, Kew  
63 Walpole Street, Kew  
83 Walpole Street, Kew  
84 Walpole Street, Kew  
96 Walpole Street, Kew  
118 Walpole Street, Kew  
11 Wellington Street, Kew  
23 Wellington Street, Kew  
25 Wellington Street, Kew  
33 Wills Street, Kew

- 47 Wills Street, Kew
- 10 Wimba Avenue, Kew

### Camberwell

A total of 81 buildings were assessed in Camberwell, with the following recommendations:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 60   |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 15   |
| Removed from study                                 | 4 (3 in proposed new HO precinct, 1 included in Amendment C42) |
| Demolished   | 2  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | <b>81</b>  |

Buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are listed below. Data sheets for these buildings are included in Volume 3 of this report.

- 24 Albion Street, Surrey Hills
- 15 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 25 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 33 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 36 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 78 Athelstan Road, Camberwell
- 2 Beatrice Street, Burwood
- 87-87A Bowen Street, Camberwell
- 930 Burke Road, Balwyn
- 458 Camberwell Road, Camberwell
- 29 Canterbury Road, Camberwell
- 136 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 138 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 169 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 2 Carrigal Street, North Balwyn
- 6 Carrigal Street, North Balwyn

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| 24    | Chaucer Crescent, Canterbury              |
| 44    | Currajong Avenue, Camberwell              |
| 33    | Deepdene Road, Balwyn                     |
| 119   | Doncaster Road, North Balwyn              |
| 10    | Fitzgerald Street, Balwyn                 |
| 177   | Glen Iris Road, Glen Iris                 |
| 32    | Hortense Street, Burwood                  |
| 30    | Howard Street, Glen Iris                  |
| 27    | Inglesby Road, Camberwell                 |
| 6     | Kitchener Street, Balwyn (provisional)    |
| 11    | Luena Road, North Balwyn                  |
| 7-9   | Mangarra Road, Canterbury                 |
| 91    | Maud Street, North Balwyn                 |
| 51    | Mont Albert Road, Canterbury              |
| 65    | Mont Albert Road, Canterbury              |
| 137   | Mont Albert Road, Canterbury              |
| 158   | Mont Albert Road, Canterbury              |
| 1     | Montana Street, Glen Iris                 |
| 7     | Muriel Street, Glen Iris                  |
| 14    | Orion Street, North Balwyn                |
| 622   | Riversdale Road, Camberwell               |
| 626-8 | Riversdale Road, Camberwell (provisional) |
| 660   | Riversdale Road, Camberwell               |
| 11    | The Avenue, Surrey Hills (provisional)    |
| 899   | Toorak Road, Camberwell (provisional)     |
| 931   | Toorak Road, Camberwell                   |
| 1292  | Toorak Road, Glen Iris                    |
| 1293  | Toorak Road, Burwood                      |
| 1297  | Toorak Road, Burwood                      |
| 89    | Union Road, Surrey Hills                  |
| 286   | Union Road, Surrey Hills                  |
| 7     | Victoria Avenue, Canterbury               |

|       |                                |
|-------|--------------------------------|
| 13    | Victoria Avenue, Canterbury    |
| 12    | Vincent Street, Surrey Hills   |
| 26A   | Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills  |
| 50    | Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills  |
| 294   | Warrigal Road, Burwood         |
| 452   | Warrigal Road, Ashburton       |
| 125   | Wattle Valley Road, Camberwell |
| 136   | Whitehorse Road, Balwyn        |
| 199   | Whitehorse Road, Balwyn        |
| 127   | Winmalee Road, Balwyn          |
| 150   | Winmalee Road, Balwyn          |
| 41-45 | Yarrbat Avenue, Balwyn         |

### Hawthorn

A total of 8 buildings were assessed in Hawthorn, with the following recommendations:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 6 |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 2 |
| TOTAL  | 8 |

Buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are listed below. Data sheets for these buildings are in Volume 3 of this report.

|     |                                      |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 173 | Auburn Road, Hawthorn                |
| 7   | Elphin Grove, Hawthorn               |
| 26  | Lisson Grove, Hawthorn (provisional) |
| 1   | Neave Street, Hawthorn               |
| 61  | Wattle Road, Hawthorn                |
| 149 | Victoria Road, Hawthorn              |

### 3.3 Kew Precincts Review

While not within the scope of the work, in the course of the Review, a series of areas were identified in Kew where the building stock was of a quality and relative consistency or interest as to warrant the consideration by Council of additional heritage precincts (Heritage Overlay areas).

In some cases, the areas recommended for future review below include buildings recommended for individual Heritage Overlay controls in this study.<sup>4</sup> It is the recommendation of this Review that the Council pursue the individual site controls, notwithstanding that there may be some future review of the area in which a particular building is located. The possibility of a future area study should not impede the application of the Heritage Overlay to individual sites in this Review.

The precinct recommendations are listed below. It is noted that of these, priority should be given to the review of the Yarra Street area and secondly to the review of the Packington Street / Peel Street / Malmsbury Street, area.

#### *Yarra St, Kew*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the area including Yarra and Stawell Streets and the broader area north of Studley Park Road, south of Wills Street and west of Studley Avenue, and depending on the outcome of this review, that consideration be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct. The area contains a series of houses from the 1950s and 1960s period, many of which appear to be broadly intact and to be of a comparable level of architectural interest.

#### *Packington Street / Peel Street / Malmsbury Street, Kew*

It is noted that the broad area bounded by Eglinton Street to the north, High Street to the south, Derby Street to the east and Princess Street to the west, retains a series of mid-Victorian cottages of a similar type and form, complemented by other forms of late Victorian, Federation and interwar era houses, predominantly small in scale. Though most are altered and of limited individual significance, when combined with the subdivision pattern of the area (characterised by modest and relatively narrow allotments), these buildings provide a historical reference to the early development in this area. It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the area and depending on the outcome of this review, consideration should be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct.

#### *Miller Grove, Kew*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the housing stock in Bowen and Henry Streets and Miller Grove for possible inclusion in a broader Heritage Overlay precinct. While only five properties were graded B in the 1988 Kew Conservation Study (5 and 7 Bowen Street and 24, 26 and 28 Miller Grove), the broader area contains substantial numbers of houses from the Federation and interwar periods, many of which appear to be broadly intact and were graded C in the 1988 Study.

#### *Howard Street, Kew*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the housing stock in Howard Street, Kew, including the cohesive group of interwar residences on the west side (at Nos 13, 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25) which exhibit strong, albeit varying, Old English stylistic overtones as

---

<sup>4</sup> There are also a number of cases where buildings assessed in this Review have not been recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay, but would potentially form part of a precinct.

well as the cohesive and similarly scaled and detailed group of Federation houses on the east side of the street. Depending on the outcome of this review, consideration should be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct.

#### *Denmark Street / Foley Street / Barkers Road, Kew*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the housing stock in the broader area including both sides of Denmark Street between Barkers Road and High Street, Foley Street and the section of Barkers Road bounded by High Street and Power Street, and the northern side of Barkers Road between High Street and Denmark Street. Depending on the outcome of this review, consideration should be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct. While only 5 houses were graded B in the 1988 Kew Conservation Study (1, 2 and 8 Denmark Street, 48 Foley Street and 83-85 Barkers Road), the broader area contains three B-graded institutional/retail properties and substantial numbers of C-graded houses from the Victorian and Federation periods, many of which appear to be broadly intact.

#### *Edgcombe Street, Kew*

The western side of Edgcombe Street was developed in the early 1940s, with a series of duplexes (flats) constructed between c.1941 and c.1943. While not confirmed, it appears likely that all were developed by builder Alex M Younger, who acquired the land in 1940. Of the properties on the western side of the street, three (1-3, 5-7, and 21-23) were graded B in the 1988 Kew Urban Conservation Study, with another three (19, 25-27, 29) graded C. While not identical, all these buildings are all similar in overall form, design, materials and detailing, and on face value, it would be difficult to distinguish the C-graded buildings within this group from those graded B. While perhaps not of great individual distinction, when considered together, the duplexes form an interesting interwar grouping that is potentially of some significance in the local context. It is recommended that the properties on the west side of Edgcombe Street be further investigated and assessed with a view to considering the introduction of a single precinct-based Heritage Overlay over the group.

#### *Fernhurst Grove, Kew*

The house at 37 Fernhurst Grove was assessed in this Review not to warrant a site-specific Heritage Overlay. The significance and architectural presentation of the building, however, are reinforced by the two pairs of flanking single-fronted residences, which were all graded C in the 1988 study. On this basis, it is recommended that Council review and assess the group (33-41 Fernhurst Grove) with a view to identifying a small Heritage Overlay precinct.

#### *High Street, Kew*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the housing stock in the broader area including both sides of High Street from Barkers Road to the Junction where there is a series of Federation era houses graded B and C in the 1988 Kew Conservation Study. This section of High Street also contains a substantial number of Victorian and interwar properties. Depending on the outcome of this review, consideration should be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct.

### *Queen Street / Wellington Street / Gellibrand Street*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the area bounded by Cotham Road, Gellibrand Street, Fenton and Stratford Avenues and Xavier College's northern boundary. This area contains substantial numbers of C-graded Victorian, Federation and interwar houses of various form and scale. Depending on the outcome of this review, consideration should be given to identifying a Heritage Overlay precinct.

## **3.4 Recommendations for Further Work**

### **Post-World War II Buildings**

In the immediate post-war period and into the 1960s, Boroondara was an area where large numbers of architect-designed residences were constructed. The Studley Park section of Kew in particular contains one of Melbourne's best and most highly concentrated collections of 1950s architect-designed postwar houses in the Melbourne regional style. This concentration reflects a shift whereby Victorian and Edwardian mansion allotments located in the area shifted from private to institutional use, providing the many awkward steeply sloping sites so revered by young architects in the post-WWII period

The Kew Conservation Study was one of few of the municipal studies of the 1980s and 1990s to consider buildings of the post-WWII period, and a number were also identified in the Camberwell Conservation Study. Notwithstanding this, a number of the key examples within the municipality of residential design of the 1950s and 1960s period in particular are known to have been significantly altered or demolished.

It is recommended that Council undertake a review of post-World War II residential architecture in the municipality with a view to identifying individually significant examples.

Note also the recommendation (see above, under 3.3) for the consideration of the area including Yarra and Stawell Streets and the broader area north of Studley Park Road, south of Wills Street and west of Studley Avenue for possible inclusion as a Heritage Overlay precinct in the Planning Scheme.

## **3.5 Conclusions**

Within the City of Boroondara, 236 B-graded residential properties are not currently affected by Heritage Overlay controls pursuant to the Boroondara Planning Scheme. An assessment of all 236 properties has been undertaken to review the heritage significance of each building and to consider in each case whether the application of the Heritage Overlay control is warranted. Of the 236 properties, 160 have been assessed as being of sufficient cultural heritage significance to warrant the application of an individual Heritage Overlay. Of these, 5 are provisional recommendations.

It is recommended Council commence consultation with the owners of each property to inform them of this recommendation. Council should also commence proceedings to undertake a Planning Scheme Amendment to include the properties in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Boroondara Planning Scheme.

60 properties have been assessed as not being of sufficient heritage significance to warrant an individual Heritage Overlay. The reasons for this assessment are detailed in the individual place data sheets in Volume 4.



16 properties have been removed from the study for various reasons including demolition, inclusion within a precinct-based review and inclusion within a site specific heritage amendment.

The review has also identified a number of areas in Kew that are of sufficient interest to warrant further consideration by Council. It is recommended Council undertake further investigation of the areas to determine whether a precinct based Heritage Overlay is warranted. The immediate priorities for further investigation are the Yarra Street area and the Packington Street / Peel Street / Malmsbury Street, area.

This review also recommends that Council undertake a review of post-World War II residential architecture in the municipality with a view to identifying individually significant examples.

## 4.0 Select Bibliography

A wide range of primary and secondary sources was consulted in the course of the preparation of this review. These included the City of Boroondara's Planning and Building files and those of their predecessors, the City of Camberwell, the City of Hawthorn and the City of Kew. In addition, the individual Council's card indexes to building permits and their associated microfiched permit drawings were also consulted. The computer generated printout to building permits for the City of Kew (approx. 1990-1994) was also consulted. The combined Boroondara building permits database (c. 1995 onwards) was also consulted where necessary for permit information, albeit on a selective basis only. The City of Camberwell Building Approvals Index, for properties constructed prior to 1938, was not consulted as it had been reviewed by Graeme Butler in 1991.

Rate Books in hard copy format for the Cities of Camberwell and Kew were also consulted at the Public Record Office Victoria and in microfilm format at the Kew Library and at the Public Record Office.

The review also builds upon the work of earlier consultants; Pru Sanderson Design Pty Ltd, *Kew Urban Conservation Study*, 1988; G Butler & Associates, *Kew B-graded places study (draft)*, 2001; Graeme Butler *Camberwell Conservation Study*, 1991 and Meredith Gould, Conservation Architects, *Hawthorn Heritage Study*, 1992.

The bibliography includes the most commonly consulted items cited during the compilation of the individual datasheets. All datasheets have citations for the particular sources consulted in each case. The key sources consulted are listed below.

### 4.1 Primary sources

F G A Barnard. *The jubilee history of Kew, Victoria: its origin and progress*, 'Mercury' office, Kew, 1910.

Borough of Hawthorn Rate Books

Borough of Kew Rate Books

City of Boroondara Planning and Building Files

City of Camberwell Building Index and plan records

City of Camberwell Rate Books

City of Hawthorn Building Index and plan records

City of Hawthorn Rate Books

City of Kew Building Index and plan records

City of Kew Rate Books

Kew Municipal Library. *The History of Kew: an annotated bibliography*, 1981.

Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works plans – 160':1" and 40':1" detail plans

*Sands & McDougall's Melbourne and Suburban Directory*, 1863-1901.

*Sands & McDougall's Directory of Victoria*, 1901-1974.

Shire of Boroondara Rate Books

J Smith. *Cyclopedia of Victoria*, Cyclopedia Company, Melbourne, 1903-5.

*Wise's Post Office Directory of Victoria, 1889-1900.*

#### 4.2 Unpublished reports and theses

Fraser Brown. *A study of the subdivision of south-eastern Kew, Victoria*, c. 1983.

John Clare. *The post-Federation house in Melbourne*, Research report, Faculty of Architecture and Planning, University of Melbourne, 1984.

Anne Gartner. *Merchant Builders*, Ph D Thesis, Visual Arts Department, Monash University, 1992.

Bryce Raworth. *A question of style: inter-war domestic architecture in Melbourne*, M Arch. Thesis, Department of Architecture and Building, University of Melbourne, 1993.

Judith Trimble. *Graeme C Gunn: a critical art history*, Doctoral Thesis, Visual Arts Department, Monash University.

#### 4.3 Secondary sources

Richard Apperly, Robert Irving & Peter Reynolds. *A pictorial guide to identifying Australian architecture : styles and terms from 1788 to the present*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1989.

Geoffrey Blainey. *A History of Camberwell*, Lothian Books, Melbourne, 1980.

Robin Boyd. *Victorian Modern: 111 years of modern architecture in the state of Victoria*, RVIA Students' Society, Melbourne, 1947.

Karen Burns, Harriet Edquist & Philip Goad. *Robin Boyd, the architect as critic*, RMIT, Melbourne, 1989.

Graeme Butler. *The Californian bungalow in Australia*, Lothian, Melbourne, 1992.

Winsome Callister & Ian McDougall. *Melbourne optimism*, Judith Pugh Gallery, 1986.

Neil Clerehan ed. *Best Australian houses: recent houses built by members of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1961.

Peter Cuffley. *Australian houses of the forties & fifties*, Five Mile Press, Knoxfield, Vic., 1993.

Peter Cuffley. *Australian houses of the 20's & 30's*, Five Mile Press, Fitzroy, Vic., 1989.

Norman Day. *Heroic Melbourne: architecture of the 1950s*, RMIT, Melbourne, 1995.

Harriet Edquist. *Harold Desbrowe-Annear a life in architecture*, Miegunyah Press, Melbourne, 2004.

Kenneth Frampton. *Modern architecture a critical history*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1980.

Kenneth Frampton & Philip Drew. *Harry Seidler: four decades of architecture*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1992.

J M Freeland. *Architecture in Australia: a history*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1968.

Philip Goad. *Melbourne architecture*, Watermark Press, Balmain, NSW, 1998.

Philip Goad. *Bates Smart: 150 years of Australian architecture*, Thames & Hudson, Melbourne, 2004.

Philip Goad ed. *Judging architecture: issues divisions triumphs Victorian architecture awards 1929-2003*, RVIA, Melbourne, 2003.

Trevor Howells. *Towards the dawn: federation architecture in Australia, 1890-1915*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1989.

Miles Lewis. *200 years of concrete construction in Australia*, Concrete Council of Australia, Sydney, 1988.

Miles Lewis. *Victorian churches*, National Trust of Australia (Victoria), Melbourne, 1991.

Gwen McWilliam. *Hawthorn Peppercorns*, Brian Atkins, Melbourne, 1978.

Val Morgan & Sons. *Morgan's official street directory. Melbourne & suburbs*, V Morgan, Melbourne, 1951.

Victoria Peel, Jane Yule & Deborah Zion. *A History of Hawthorn*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1993.

Douglas Pike & John Ritchie ed. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Melbourne University Press, Parkville, Vic., 1966-

Dorothy Rogers. *A history of Kew*, Lowden publishing, Kilmore, 1973.

Small Homes Service of the RVIA & The Age. *Modern houses: a guide to residential architecture in and around Melbourne*, The Age, Melbourne, 1964.

Alistair Service. *Edwardian architecture*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1977.

Jennifer Taylor. *Australian architecture since 1960*, Law Book Co., Sydney, 1986.

Tibbits, William. *Portraits in the landscape: the house paintings of William Tibbits, 1870-1906*, Historic Houses Trust of NSW, Glebe NSW, 1984.

W D Vaughan. *Kew's civic century*, W D Vaughan, Kew, 1960.

*Who's Who in Australia*, various years.

#### 4.4 Newspapers and journals

*Australasian Builder and Contractor's News*

*Australasian Real Property Annual*

*Australian Home Beautiful*

*Australian Home Builder*

*Building & Engineering Journal*

*Building, Engineering & Mining Journal*

*Journal of the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects*

'Robin Boyd special issue' *Transition*, no. 38, 1992.

#### 4.5 Websites, indexes and databases

Miles Lewis. *Australian Architecture Index*, 1976.

*Melbourne Mansions* database, compiled by Professor Miles Lewis, University of Melbourne.

State Library of Victoria Pictures catalogue

Peter Wille collection of architectural slides, State Library of Victoria

John T Collins collection, State Library of Victoria

State Library of Victoria MMBW maps online database

State Library of Victoria Batten & Percy collection

Picture Australia

Register of the National Estate online database

National Trust of Australia (Victoria) online register

Victorian Heritage Register

City of Boroondara Local History photographs database

Index to Births, Deaths & Marriages, Victoria.



## ADDENDUM 1

### Consultation and Review of Citations, April-June 2007

In April 2007 the City of Boroondara embarked on a program of consultation with property owners and occupiers with regard to the document titled 'City of Boroondara Review of B-graded buildings in Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn 2007'. As a result of additional information provided to Lovell Chen during this consultation period a number of building citations were revised. In many cases, owners and occupants provided additional historical detail and/or information relating to the building fabric which could be incorporated into the revised citation. In the majority of these cases, the recommendations remain the same, however, in a relatively small number of cases both the assessment of significance and the recommendation for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay were revised on the basis of the additional information.

#### *Recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

Those properties which were originally recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, where revisions have been made to citations on the basis of additional information provided, are listed below.

Note that in these cases, the original recommendation is unchanged.

The revised citations are included in Volumes 2 (Kew) and 3 (Camberwell and Hawthorn).

|       |                       |
|-------|-----------------------|
| 83-85 | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 231   | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 311   | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 389   | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 1205  | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 171   | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 241   | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 2     | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 8     | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 10    | Findon Crescent, Kew  |
| 24    | Lister Street, Kew    |
| 26    | Miller Grove, Kew     |
| 83    | Pakington Street, Kew |
| 16    | Queen Street, Kew     |
| 34    | Rowland Street, Kew   |
| 63    | Walpole Street, Kew   |
| 47    | Wills Street, Kew     |

- 78 Athelstan Road, Camberwell
- 11 Luena Road, North Balwyn
- 12 Vincent Street, Surrey Hills
- 26A Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills
- 1 Neave Street, Hawthorn

*Not recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations and recommendations revised)*

There are three properties that were previously recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay but where this recommendation has been amended on the basis of additional information provided.

These properties are listed below and their revised citations are now included in Volume 4.

- 2 Carrigal Street, North Balwyn
- 6 Carrigal Street, North Balwyn
- 14 Orion Street, North Balwyn

*Not recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

Three properties which were originally not recommended for inclusion in the Schedule also had their citations revised on the basis of additional information provided. In the case of one of these properties, 3 Madden Street, North Balwyn, the citation was substantially revised and the property reassessed following an error in the survey.

Note that in each of these cases, the original recommendation not to include the properties in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is unchanged.

The revised citations have been included as part of Volume 4.

- 387 Barkers Road, Kew
- 49 Mary Street, Kew
- 3 Madden Street, North Balwyn

**Summary of Recommendation (revised)**

Following the incorporation of these changes, the summary lists of buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are below. Citations for these buildings are in Volume 2 (Kew) and 3 (Camberwell and Hawthorn) of this report.

*Kew*

A total of 147 buildings were assessed in Kew, with the following recommendations:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage | 94 |
|--|----|



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Overlay  |     |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 43  |
| Already included in HO area                        | 1   |
| Demolished   | 9   |
| TOTAL  | 147 |

|         |                       |
|---------|-----------------------|
| 83-85   | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 231     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 311     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 389     | Barkers Road, Kew     |
| 35-37   | Belford Road, Kew     |
| 5       | Bowen Street, Kew     |
| 7       | Bowen Street, Kew     |
| 1       | Bradford Avenue, Kew  |
| 1199    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1205    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1221    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1223    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 1291    | Burke Road, Kew       |
| 46      | Clyde Street, Kew     |
| 161     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 167     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 171     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 206-208 | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 221-229 | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 241     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 294     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 340     | Cotham Road, Kew      |
| 2       | Daniel Place, Kew     |
| 2       | Daracombe Avenue, Kew |
| 1       | Denmark Street, Kew   |
| 2       | Denmark Street, Kew   |

8 Denmark Street, Kew  
24-26 Edgecombe Street, Kew  
9 Eglinton Street, Kew  
162 Eglinton Street, Kew  
20 Fernhurst Grove, Kew  
10 Findon Crescent, Kew  
48 Foley Street, Kew  
2 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
6 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
25-27 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
29-31 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
77 Gladstone Street, Kew  
12 Grange Road, Kew  
53 Harp Road, Kew  
6 High Street, Kew  
35 High Street, Kew  
73 High Street, Kew  
28 Holroyd Street, Kew  
2 Howard Street, Kew  
10 Howard Street, Kew  
19 Howard Street, Kew  
20 Howard Street, Kew  
2 John Street, Kew  
16 John Street, Kew  
24 Lister Street, Kew  
2 Merrion Grove, Kew  
24 Miller Grove, Kew  
26 Miller Grove, Kew  
28 Miller Grove, Kew  
76 Molesworth Street, Kew  
82 Molesworth Street, Kew  
17 O'Shaughnessy Street, Kew

57 Pakington Street, Kew  
66-68 Pakington Street, Kew  
70 Pakington Street, Kew  
83 Pakington Street, Kew  
98 Pakington Street, Kew  
72 Peel Street, Kew  
33-35 Princess Street, Kew  
16 Queen Street, Kew  
11 Redmond Street, Kew  
21 Redmond Street, Kew  
34 Rowland Street, Kew  
3 Second Avenue, Kew  
12 Stevenson Street, Kew  
34 Stevenson Street, Kew  
13 Studley Ave, Kew  
25 Studley Park Road, Kew  
44 Studley Park Road, Kew  
52 Studley Park Road, Kew  
75 Studley Park Road, Kew  
89 Studley Park Road, Kew  
12 Tara Avenue, Kew  
1 Tennyson Street, Kew  
14 Vista Avenue, Kew  
51 Walpole Street, Kew  
52 Walpole Street, Kew  
63 Walpole Street, Kew  
83 Walpole Street, Kew  
84 Walpole Street, Kew  
96 Walpole Street, Kew  
118 Walpole Street, Kew  
11 Wellington Street, Kew  
23 Wellington Street, Kew

- 25 Wellington Street, Kew
- 33 Wills Street, Kew
- 47 Wills Street, Kew
- 10 Wimba Avenue, Kew

*Camberwell*

A total of 81 buildings were assessed in Camberwell, with the following recommendations:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 58   |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 18   |
| Removed from study                                 | 4 (3 in proposed new HO precinct, 1 included in Amendment C42) |
| Demolished   | 1  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | <b>81</b>  |

- 24 Albion Street, Surrey Hills
- 15 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 25 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 33 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 36 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 78 Athelstan Road, Camberwell
- 2 Beatrice Street, Burwood
- 87-87A Bowen Street, Camberwell
- 930 Burke Road, Balwyn
- 458 Camberwell Road, Camberwell
- 29 Canterbury Road, Camberwell
- 136 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 138 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 169 Canterbury Road, Canterbury
- 24 Chaucer Crescent, Canterbury
- 44 Currajong Avenue, Camberwell
- 33 Deepdene Road, Balwyn

119 Doncaster Road, North Balwyn  
10 Fitzgerald Street, Balwyn  
177 Glen Iris Road, Glen Iris  
32 Hortense Street, Burwood  
30 Howard Street, Glen Iris  
27 Inglesby Road, Camberwell  
6 Kitchener Street, Balwyn (provisional)  
11 Luena Road, North Balwyn  
7-9 Mangarra Road, Canterbury  
91 Maud Street, North Balwyn  
51 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
65 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
137 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
158 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
1 Montana Street, Glen Iris  
7 Muriel Street, Glen Iris  
622 Riversdale Road, Camberwell  
626-8 Riversdale Road, Camberwell (provisional)  
660 Riversdale Road, Camberwell  
11 The Avenue, Surrey Hills (provisional)  
899 Toorak Road, Camberwell (provisional)  
931 Toorak Road, Camberwell  
1292 Toorak Road, Glen Iris  
1293 Toorak Road, Burwood  
1297 Toorak Road, Burwood  
89 Union Road, Surrey Hills  
286 Union Road, Surrey Hills  
7 Victoria Avenue, Canterbury  
13 Victoria Avenue, Canterbury  
12 Vincent Street, Surrey Hills  
26A Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills  
50 Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills

|       |                                |
|-------|--------------------------------|
| 294   | Warrigal Road, Burwood         |
| 452   | Warrigal Road, Ashburton       |
| 125   | Wattle Valley Road, Camberwell |
| 136   | Whitehorse Road, Balwyn        |
| 199   | Whitehorse Road, Balwyn        |
| 127   | Winmalee Road, Balwyn          |
| 150   | Winmalee Road, Balwyn          |
| 41-45 | Yarrbat Avenue, Balwyn         |

*Hawthorn*

A total of 8 buildings were assessed in Hawthorn, with the following recommendations:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 6 |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 2 |
| TOTAL  | 8 |

|     |                                      |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 173 | Auburn Road, Hawthorn                |
| 7   | Elphin Grove, Hawthorn               |
| 26  | Lisson Grove, Hawthorn (provisional) |
| 1   | Neave Street, Hawthorn               |
| 61  | Wattle Road, Hawthorn                |
| 149 | Victoria Road, Hawthorn              |

## ADDENDUM 2

### Consultation and Review of Citations, November 2007

In April 2007 the City of Boroondara embarked on a program of consultation with property owners and occupiers with regard to the document titled 'City of Boroondara Review of B-graded buildings in Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn 2007'. Further information was provided to Lovell Chen after the initial April-June 2007 review of citations for five additional properties. As a result, the building citations were revised. In most cases, owners and occupants provided additional historical detail and/or information relating to the building fabric which could be incorporated into the revised citation. In all of these cases, the recommendations remain the same.

#### *Recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

Those properties which were originally recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, where revisions have been made to citations on the basis of additional information provided, are listed below.

Note that in these cases, the original recommendation is unchanged.

The revised citations are included in Volume 3 (Camberwell and Hawthorn).

- 15 Alma Road, Camberwell
- 10 Fitzgerald Street, Balwyn
- 11 Luena Road, North Balwyn
- 137 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury

#### *Not recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

One property which was originally not recommended for inclusion in the Schedule also had its citations revised on the basis of additional information provided.

Note that in this case, the original recommendation not to include the properties in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is unchanged.

The revised citation has been included as part of Volume 4.

- 77 Greythorn Road, North Balwyn

## ADDENDUM 3

### Amendment C64 and Final Recommendations

In October 2007 Amendment C64 to the Boroondara Planning Scheme was gazetted. This gazettal followed a lengthy planning scheme amendment process. This process included a peer review of a number of citations in the B Grade Reviews by an independent heritage consultant (undertaken for Council by RBA Architects), the appointment of an independent Panel to consider submissions on the Amendment, a hearing process conducted by the Panel and the publication of a Panel report, and the consideration of the Panel's recommendations by Council. At the end of this process, Council adopted the amendment and it was forwarded to the Minister for Planning for approval and was subsequently gazetted. For all citations where revisions to citations were recommended by the Panel, these revisions were made and the owners offered the opportunity to review and comment on the final form of the citations where appropriate.

#### *Included in the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

Those properties which were originally recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and are included in the Schedule following the gazettal of Amendment C64, where revisions have been made to citations on the basis of additional information provided on or the recommendation of the Panel for Amendment C64, are listed below.

Note that in these cases, the original recommendation is unchanged.

The revised citations are included in Volumes 2 and 3.

|       |                            |
|-------|----------------------------|
| 78    | Athelstan Road, Camberwell |
| 85    | Barkers Road, Kew          |
| 1     | Bradford Avenue, Kew       |
| 1205  | Burke Road, Camberwell     |
| 73    | High Street, Kew           |
| 28    | Holroyd Street, Kew        |
| 34    | Rowland Street, Kew        |
| 25    | Studley Park Road, Kew     |
| 52    | Studley Park Road, Kew     |
| 10    | Wimba Avenue, Balwyn       |
| 41-45 | Yarrbat Avenue, Balwyn     |

#### *Not recommended for the Heritage Overlay (citations revised)*

A number of properties were removed from Amendment C64 and are now not included in the Heritage Overlay Schedule, whether as the result of a recommendation by the Panel for Amendment C64, or as a result of further review by Lovell Chen. In some cases there may still be a recommendation for consideration of the place as part of a precinct in the future.



Properties recommended to be removed from the Amendment and where the citations have been revised are as follows:

- 171 Cotham Road, Kew
- 2 Daniell Place, Kew
- 10 Findon Crescent, Kew
- 19 Howard Street, Kew
- 286 Union Road, Surrey Hills
- 33 Wills Street, Kew

### Final lists

The final lists which follow reflect the outcome of the study as a whole and including the planning scheme amendment process. The citations in Volumes 2 and 3 are for places which are included in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay in the Boroondara Planning Scheme following the gazettal of Amendment C64.

The citations in Volume 4 are for places where the final recommendation was that no individual site-specific heritage overlay be introduced. As noted above, however in some cases, there are recommendations these be considered in the future as part of a consideration for precinct heritage controls.

### Kew

A total of 147 buildings were assessed in Kew, with the following recommendations:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 89         |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 48         |
| Already included in HO area                        | 1          |
| Demolished   | 9          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | <b>147</b> |

Buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are listed below. Data sheets for these buildings are in Volume 2 of this report.

- 83-85 Barkers Road, Kew
- 231 Barkers Road, Kew
- 311 Barkers Road, Kew
- 389 Barkers Road, Kew
- 35-37 Belford Road, Kew
- 5 Bowen Street, Kew

7 Bowen Street, Kew  
1 Bradford Avenue, Kew  
1199 Burke Road, Kew  
1205 Burke Road, Kew  
1221 Burke Road, Kew  
1223 Burke Road, Kew  
1291 Burke Road, Kew  
46 Clyde Street, Kew  
161 Cotham Road, Kew  
167 Cotham Road, Kew  
206-208 Cotham Road, Kew  
221-229 Cotham Road, Kew  
241 Cotham Road, Kew  
294 Cotham Road, Kew  
340 Cotham Road, Kew  
2 Daracombe Avenue, Kew  
1 Denmark Street, Kew  
2 Denmark Street, Kew  
8 Denmark Street, Kew  
24-26 Edgecombe Street, Kew  
9 Eglinton Street, Kew  
162 Eglinton Street, Kew  
20 Fernhurst Grove, Kew  
48 Foley Street, Kew  
2 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
6 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
25-27 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
29-31 Gellibrand Street, Kew  
77 Gladstone Street, Kew  
12 Grange Road, Kew  
53 Harp Road, Kew  
6 High Street, Kew

35 High Street, Kew  
73 High Street, Kew  
28 Holroyd Street, Kew  
2 Howard Street, Kew  
10 Howard Street, Kew  
20 Howard Street, Kew  
2 John Street, Kew  
16 John Street, Kew  
24 Lister Street, Kew  
2 Merrion Grove, Kew  
24 Miller Grove, Kew  
26 Miller Grove, Kew  
28 Miller Grove, Kew  
76 Molesworth Street, Kew  
82 Molesworth Street, Kew  
17 O'Shaughnessy Street, Kew  
57 Pakington Street, Kew  
66-68 Pakington Street, Kew  
70 Pakington Street, Kew  
83 Pakington Street, Kew  
98 Pakington Street, Kew  
72 Peel Street, Kew  
33-35 Princess Street, Kew  
16 Queen Street, Kew  
11 Redmond Street, Kew  
21 Redmond Street, Kew  
34 Rowland Street, Kew  
3 Second Avenue, Kew  
12 Stevenson Street, Kew  
34 Stevenson Street, Kew  
13 Studley Ave, Kew  
25 Studley Park Road, Kew

|     |                        |
|-----|------------------------|
| 44  | Studley Park Road, Kew |
| 52  | Studley Park Road, Kew |
| 75  | Studley Park Road, Kew |
| 89  | Studley Park Road, Kew |
| 12  | Tara Avenue, Kew       |
| 1   | Tennyson Street, Kew   |
| 14  | Vista Avenue, Kew      |
| 51  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 52  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 63  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 83  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 84  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 96  | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 118 | Walpole Street, Kew    |
| 11  | Wellington Street, Kew |
| 23  | Wellington Street, Kew |
| 25  | Wellington Street, Kew |
| 47  | Wills Street, Kew      |
| 10  | Wimba Avenue, Kew      |

### Camberwell

A total of 81 buildings were assessed in Camberwell, with the following recommendations:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 56   |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 19   |
| Removed from study                                 | 4 (3 in proposed new HO precinct, 1 included in Amendment C42) |
| Demolished   | 2  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | <b>81</b>  |

Buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are listed below. Data sheets for these buildings are included in Volume 3 of this report.

24 Albion Street, Surrey Hills  
15 Alma Road, Camberwell  
25 Alma Road, Camberwell  
33 Alma Road, Camberwell  
36 Alma Road, Camberwell  
78 Athelstan Road, Camberwell  
2 Beatrice Street, Burwood  
87-87A Bowen Street, Camberwell  
930 Burke Road, Balwyn  
458 Camberwell Road, Camberwell  
29 Canterbury Road, Camberwell  
136 Canterbury Road, Canterbury  
138 Canterbury Road, Canterbury  
169 Canterbury Road, Canterbury  
24 Chaucer Crescent, Canterbury  
44 Currajong Avenue, Camberwell  
33 Deepdene Road, Balwyn  
119 Doncaster Road, North Balwyn  
10 Fitzgerald Street, Balwyn  
177 Glen Iris Road, Glen Iris  
32 Hortense Street, Burwood  
30 Howard Street, Glen Iris  
27 Inglesby Road, Camberwell  
6 Kitchener Street, Balwyn (provisional)  
11 Luena Road, North Balwyn  
7-9 Mangarra Road, Canterbury  
91 Maud Street, North Balwyn  
51 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
65 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
137 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
158 Mont Albert Road, Canterbury  
1 Montana Street, Glen Iris

- 7 Muriel Street, Glen Iris
- 622 Riversdale Road, Camberwell
- 626-8 Riversdale Road, Camberwell (provisional)
- 660 Riversdale Road, Camberwell
- 11 The Avenue, Surrey Hills (provisional)
- 899 Toorak Road, Camberwell (provisional)
- 931 Toorak Road, Camberwell
- 1292 Toorak Road, Glen Iris
- 1293 Toorak Road, Burwood
- 1297 Toorak Road, Burwood
- 89 Union Road, Surrey Hills
- 7 Victoria Avenue, Canterbury
- 13 Victoria Avenue, Canterbury
- 12 Vincent Street, Surrey Hills
- 26A Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills
- 50 Wandsworth Road, Surrey Hills
- 294 Warrigal Road, Burwood
- 452 Warrigal Road, Ashburton
- 125 Wattle Valley Road, Camberwell
- 136 Whitehorse Road, Balwyn
- 199 Whitehorse Road, Balwyn
- 127 Winmalee Road, Balwyn
- 150 Winmalee Road, Balwyn
- 41-45 Yarrbat Avenue, Balwyn

*Hawthorn*

A total of 8 buildings were assessed in Hawthorn, with the following recommendations:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay     | 6        |
| Not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay | 2        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | <b>8</b> |

- 173 Auburn Road, Hawthorn

- 7 Elphin Grove, Hawthorn
- 26 Lisson Grove, Hawthorn (provisional)
- 1 Neave Street, Hawthorn
- 61 Wattle Road, Hawthorn
- 149 Victoria Road, Hawthorn