

**CITY OF BOROONDARA**

**Review of C\* Grade Buildings in  
the Former City of Hawthorn**

Prepared for  
City of Boroondara

September 2006  
Revised June 2007  
Revised November 2009

**VOLUME 1 MAIN REPORT  
& ADDENDA**

**LOVELL CHEN**

ARCHITECTS & HERITAGE CONSULTANTS

25 LITTLE Bourke STREET MELBOURNE 3000 AUSTRALIA  
TEL: 61 (0)3 9662 3344 FAX: 61 (0)3 9562 1037  
enquiry@lovellchen.com.au www.lovellchen.com.au

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### VOLUME 1

<b>Project Team</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Scope and Project Brief	1
1.2 Summary of Recommendations	2
1.3 Background	2
1.4 Existing Grading Systems	4
<b>2.0 Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Principal Tasks	6
2.2 Existing Documentation	6
2.3 Site Inspections	7
2.4 Historical Research	7
2.5 Comparative Analysis	8
2.6 Assessment of Significance	9
2.7 The Issue of Intactness	14
2.8 Individual Data Sheets (Citations)	16
2.9 Conclusion	16
<b>3.0 Findings and Recommendations</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Properties Recommended for a Site-Specific Heritage Overlay	18
3.2 Properties Recommended to be upgraded to B grade Heritage Places	20
3.3 Properties not Recommended for Site-Specific Heritage Overlays	21
3.4 Properties Recommended for Inclusion in Existing Heritage Overlay Precincts	23
3.5 Properties Recommended for Inclusion in New Heritage Overlay Precincts	24
3.6 Conclusion & Summary of Recommendations	27
<b>4.0 Select Bibliography</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Primary sources	29
4.2 Unpublished reports and theses	29
4.3 Secondary sources	29
4.4 Newspapers and journals	30
4.5 Websites, indexes and databases	30
<b>ADDENDUM 1</b>	<b>Overview of Properties not Recommended for Individual Heritage Overlays</b>
<b>ADDENDA 2 and 3</b>	<b>Consultation and Review of Citations, April-June 2007</b>
<b>ADDENDUM 4</b>	<b>Amendment C64 and Final Recommendations</b>

## **Project Team**

This report was prepared by:

Peter Lovell

Anita Brady

Kate Gray

Michael Galimany

Conrad Hamann

Kate Paterson

Katherine White

## 1.0 Introduction

This report (Volume 1) forms part of a Heritage Review of C\* grade properties in the former City of Hawthorn, undertaken by Lovell Chen for the City of Boroondara. The purpose of the document is to set out the background to the review, the approach and methodology adopted, and the conclusions and recommendations.

### 1.1 Scope and Project Brief

A project brief (Heritage Review: C\* Graded Places in the Former City of Hawthorn, Contract No. 06/233) was prepared by the City of Boroondara in November 2005. The project commenced in April 2006. The focus of the review was on residential buildings (albeit in a small number of cases adapted to a different use).

The review involved 116 properties (see 'Number of Properties Reviewed' below) in the former City of Hawthorn which were identified as C\* grade (or 'keynote') heritage places in the *Hawthorn Heritage Study* (Meredith Gould, 1993). Table 1 on pages 4 and 5 of this report includes a definition of C\* grading. The properties all have 'Place Identification Forms', as prepared during the 1993 study. In addition, in 2000, Council undertook a preliminary assessment of the properties, which resulted in the compilation of draft heritage citations for 81 properties. These citations were referred to in this review. Council also photographed all the properties in late 2005.

The places are currently not included in Boroondara's Heritage Overlay, either as site specific inclusions, or within Heritage Overlay precincts. The purpose of this review was to determine which of these places are of sufficient heritage significance to justify inclusion in the Heritage Overlay as individual places (i.e. as site-specific Heritage Overlays), and to prepare and update the property citations to support an amendment to the Boroondara Planning Scheme, for inclusion of the properties. It was also the case that the review could consider and make recommendations, where appropriate, on the inclusion of places in a Heritage Overlay precinct, either by extending an existing precinct or establishing a new precinct.

For those properties originally identified as C\*, and for which it is the conclusion of this review that the application of an individual Heritage Overlay is not warranted, it is recommended that these properties be provisionally downgraded to C grade heritage places. The Addendum to this report also addresses, and provides some clarification on, places not recommended for individual Heritage Overlays. It is also recommended that further work be carried out by Council to confirm these provisional gradings (see also the discussion at Section 3.3 of this report); in some cases further research may change the provisional C grading, resulting in further downgrading of the properties.

The 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study* also identified streetscape gradings for the properties; the streetscape gradings were not reviewed for this project.

#### *Number of Properties Reviewed*

It should be noted that the list of properties which Council provided for review totalled 111 'sites'. These 111 sites included one group of three villas (189, 191A & B and 193 Auburn Road, listed as one site), which were dealt with by the consultant as three individual buildings, and one group of four terrace houses (238, 240, 242 and 244 Barkers Road, also listed as one site), which were dealt with as two pairs of two terraces; thus 'adding' 5

buildings, or 3 datasheets, to the original 111 to result in a total of 116 potential properties (or 114 potential place datasheets, see 'Total' of places in table below).

**1.2 Summary of Recommendations**

- § 51 places (including a number of attached properties) are recommended for site-specific Heritage Overlays; the properties are listed at Table 2 on pages 18-20, and individual property citations are included in Volume 2. A small number of these properties are attached or adjoin, and were built at the same time by the same builder/developer (i.e. they form pairs or a group); in these instances a single Heritage Overlay could be considered for the properties.
- § Two of the above 51 places are recommended to be upgraded to B grade heritage properties; these are listed at Table 3 on page 20.
- § 63 places are not recommended for site-specific Heritage Overlays; these are listed at Table 4 on pages 21-23. [See also the Addendum to this report.]
- § One place is recommended for inclusion in an existing Heritage Overlay precinct; this is listed at Table 5 on page 24; the citation for this property is included in Volume 2.
- § 60 places out of the total are also recommended for inclusion in new Heritage Overlay precincts; these are listed at Table 6 on pages 24-26.

The above information can be summarised as follows:

Recommended for an individual heritage overlay	51
Not recommended for an individual heritage overlay	63
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>114</b>

**1.3 Background**

Prior to the amalgamation in 1996 of the former 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*, 1993
- § 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. In addition, all C\* grade buildings, and C grade buildings in Level 1 or 2 Streetscapes located outside urban conservation areas in Hawthorn, were recommended for individual protection and planning controls. Similarly, C grade buildings located outside areas in Camberwell were also recommended for planning controls.

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, sites or places. Since amalgamation, the City of Boroondara has continued this process through the provisions of the new format Boroondara Planning Scheme.

Council has also sought to address an anomaly which arose following amalgamation, whereby the majority of both A and B grade 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 grade buildings outside areas were included in the Schedule. As a result of this anomaly, in cases of development proposals for unprotected B grade 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 properties.

As set out in the table below, the inclusion of a C\* level of grading is unique to the former City of Hawthorn. As such, the need for a review of these properties was imperative to investigate their significance relative to those already individually included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and to recognise those which would require planning controls.

#### *Review of B Grade Heritage Properties in Kew and Camberwell*

Lovell Chen recently completed a Heritage Review of B grade properties in the former cities of Kew and Camberwell, for the City of Boroondara (Volumes 1-5, Lovell Chen, June 2006). This project required a review of all individual residential B grade buildings identified in the 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. Towards the end of the project, the scope was extended to include eight B grade buildings in Hawthorn which had not previously been included in the Heritage Overlay.

The methodology and approach taken for this Heritage Review of C\* grade properties in the former City of Hawthorn is substantially the same as that followed for the B grade Heritage Review.

#### *Other Heritage Reviews*

Council is currently undertaking a number of heritage reviews, in addition to the aforementioned B grade review (Lovell Chen, June 2006) and the Hawthorn C\* grade review. These include the Balwyn Road Precinct Review and a review of Council's key heritage policy documents in addition to the recently completed Auburn Village Heritage Review. Council's review of its key heritage policies incorporates a number of recommendations arising from work undertaken by Lovell Chen as part of the reviews of B grade properties in Kew and Camberwell, and C\* grade properties in Hawthorn.

#### *Simplified Grading System*

Council is moving towards adopting a simplified grading system, which will identify only significant and contributory heritage properties. Significant properties will include all A and B grade properties in Boroondara, and C\* grade properties in the former City of Hawthorn. All significant properties will be included in the Heritage Overlay, with site-specific overlays if outside heritage precincts.

## 1.4 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 former Cities of Kew, Camberwell and Hawthorn).

The full range of definitions is shown on the following table (with C\* highlighted):

Grading	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.
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.
<b>C*</b>	<b>Not included in study</b>	<b>Not included in study</b>	<b>'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)</b>
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	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

Grading	Kew Urban Conservation Study, Volume 1, 1988	Camberwell Conservation Study, Volume 4, 1991	Hawthorn Heritage Study, Vol 1A, 1993
	typical building types		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 currently none for streetscape contribution.	E' places have generally been substantially altered 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.

**Table 1 Definitions of current Boroondara heritage property gradings.**

While C\* grade buildings were only identified and defined in the former City of Hawthorn, it was ultimately the objective of this review to determine whether the application of the Heritage Overlay to these properties on an individual basis was warranted. For those properties originally identified as C\*, and for which it is concluded here that the application of an individual Heritage Overlay is not warranted, then it is recommended that these be provisionally downgraded to C grade heritage properties (see Table 4). As noted above, it may also be that in some cases further research may change the provisional C grading, further downgrading the properties.

In some cases, these provisional C grade properties are also located in areas which warrant further investigation as to the merits of being included in a Heritage Overlay precinct, either by extending an existing precinct to incorporate these properties, or by establishing a new precinct (see Table 5 & Table 6).

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 Principal Tasks

The key project stages and tasks undertaken in this Heritage Review were as follows:

#### *Task 1*

This involved a preliminary **desktop review** of all places, including a review of the Place Identification Forms from the *Hawthorn Heritage Study* (Meredith Gould, 1993), recent property photographs (2005) and the 81 draft citations prepared in 2000. The purpose of this stage was to identify the places considered to be potential candidates for the Heritage Overlay, and based on that assessment to commence further investigation and review/updating of the draft heritage citations.

#### *Task 2*

This task involved **additional research**, where required, for those places identified as potential candidates for the Heritage Overlay, with a view to reviewing/updating the draft heritage citations.

#### *Task 3*

This task involved **site visits** to the places identified above, to photograph the places and prepare accurate and up-to-date descriptions. The remainder of the original C\* places (i.e. those considered to not be of sufficient significance to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay), were also visited to verify the 'desktop' decisions made based on the existing citations and photographs. In some cases, as a result of this site visit verification, properties were added to the list of places recommended for individual Heritage Overlay protection, while other properties were removed.

#### *Task 4*

Finalise the **property citations** (see Volume 2) and list of places recommended for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay (see Table 2 in this report). This included documenting or updating each property's history and physical description, a brief comparative analysis with other broadly or specifically similar examples, a review against Heritage Victoria criteria for the assessment of cultural heritage significance, and the drafting of concise and focused statements of significance for each of the properties.

#### *Task 5*

Make any other relevant **recommendations**, such as recommendations relating, in some cases, to inclusion of properties in Heritage Overlay precincts.

### 2.2 Existing Documentation

All relevant building-specific information from the 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study* was provided to the consultants. In the first instance, as noted above, these included the Place Identification Forms from the 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study* (variously dated 1993 and 1994). Additionally, for a small number of the buildings more detailed citation material was provided (also prepared by Meredith Gould Conservation Architects in the later 1990s).

Graeme Butler's citations for 81 properties (draft, 2000) were provided to the consultants. 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 assessments of significance.

Council also provided the consultants with relatively recent (November 2005) photographs of the properties subject to the review.

### 2.3 Site Inspections

As noted above, all properties subject to the review were visited, although generally only those identified in the desktop review as being candidates for inclusion in the Heritage Overlay were inspected in detail and photographed to the extent of fabric visible from the street.

In some cases, the buildings were obscured either fully or in part from the street, most commonly by vegetation or fences or a combination of the two, or by later buildings or structures. In a small number of other 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 (buildings being obscured or more detailed inspection warranted), Council wrote to the owners requesting site access for the purpose of this review, and access was generally made available to the consultants.

### 2.4 Historical Research

#### *Owners, Occupants & Architects*

The approach taken in this review, in revising and updating the property citations, has been to incorporate the historical research and individual building histories from the *Hawthorn Heritage Study* (1993) and draft (2000) citations as provided by Council. It has generally 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. In some instances, however, 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 also undertaken on a limited number of properties for which only meagre historical information existed, to bring the level of information up to a broadly comparable level of documentation with the other C\* grade properties.

The historical background information (historical research) utilised rate books and Sands & McDougall Municipal Directories searches to establish the date of construction, original owners and/or occupants and subsequent basic pattern of occupation. In addition, Melbourne & Metropolitan Board of Works detailed plans (both the 160':1" scale series and the 40':1" scale series) from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were utilised, and 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. Similarly, general searches were undertaken for historic photographs and other images. 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. Council building and planning records were also used in some cases, to assist with determining previous works to properties.

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, with their residents being either owner-occupiers or tenants, and 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 generally not considered to derive significance from their historical association with particular individuals or families. On this basis, it was not considered necessary to undertake detailed research on all individual owners or occupiers, although this did occur to a limited extent in a small number of instances. Similarly, the historical material included in some of the existing citations was amended, in some cases to remove biographical and other historical detail where the veracity or relevance of the material was considered to be questionable.

Only in a few cases has it been possible to link the design of dwellings to a specific architect or builder. 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, the original architect remains unknown. The approach to this issue has generally been not to attribute the design of a building to a particular architect unless there is some documented link.

#### *History of Alterations*

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 alterations are only apparent on closer inspection. It has been possible to compensate for limited access/visibility in part through a review of Council's building and planning indexes and files, which helped 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. Aerial photographs provided by Council have also been of assistance.

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 or 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.

## **2.5 Comparative Analysis**

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/importance is one which is a key aspect of heritage conservation practice. However, at the level of a municipal heritage study, it is a process which 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 context from which comparisons have been drawn for individual buildings is generally from within Hawthorn, and then more broadly within Boroondara. Occasionally, where it was helpful and enlightening, comparisons were made beyond the municipality. This generally relied on the consultants' knowledge of relevant buildings. In most cases it was outside the scope of the study to provide detailed supporting information on the comparable properties, but they were nevertheless included or referred to, in order to assist the assessment process.

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. 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.

## 2.6 Assessment of Significance

The primary and overriding consideration in assessing the buildings in this review has been whether the particular building or place warrants the application of a site-specific (individual) Heritage Overlay. The assessment methodology has also been informed by accepted heritage conservation practices and methodologies.

### *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, 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 Planning Panels in Victoria 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.

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

---

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

### *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: Hawthorn, 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 criterion addresses the question of *historical value* as set down in the Burra Charter. In considering this criterion, 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) could be considered to be of some 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 criterion. 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>2</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 Hawthorn. Although in some cases these buildings may have been altered to a greater degree than many later buildings, this is balanced by the fact that there are relatively few buildings surviving from the mid-nineteenth century and these surviving examples are therefore important in providing a physical reference to the earlier phases in the history of the area.

Similarly, with regard to historical associations with a particular person or family, Boroondara historically has been an area which has attracted residents of relative affluence, many of which have been prominent in the professions, manufacturing, politics or similar. As noted above, these historical associations are generally of interest, but in most cases the properties do not derive particular significance from the association with individuals or families, although there are some exceptions. Also as noted above, meeting this criterion only is not considered sufficient in itself to justify application of the Heritage Overlay.

*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 residences in the review. Clearly the residential typology in itself is not rare; nor in a general sense is 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.*

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

---

<sup>2</sup> See Bayside Amendment C37 & C38, Panel Report, December 2004.

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 addresses 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, early examples of Federation buildings, interwar attic bungalows, 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 (i.e. they represent a good example of a larger group of buildings). The issue of intactness (refer discussion below) has also 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 are early examples of a type. The buildings may also 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* and *historical values*, and possibly also *aesthetic [architectural] value*, was found to be of limited relevance in this review. The test in considering this criteria 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, 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.

## 2.7 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 grade buildings are distinguished from their less intact C grade counterparts, while in the more complex Camberwell grading system, the D grade buildings are distinguished from E grade examples on the basis of intactness. Alternatively, in Hawthorn, with regard to the definition of C grade properties, a distinction is drawn in the definition between well-preserved representative C grade buildings and C grade buildings that were individually significant but which have been altered (i.e. the C grade definition includes 'well preserved examples of particular themes of development, as well as some individually significant places that have been altered or defaced'; see Table 1 above). Interestingly (with the exception of the Kew definition for B grade buildings which refers to 'architectural integrity'), the definitions for A and B grade 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 determining significance. The critical issue in this regard is whether the change/s has significantly compromised the presentation and/or the significance of the building. Where alterations and additions did not have a negative impact on the graded property overall, then the changes did not result in the property being downgraded from a C\*. This is referred to, and elaborated on, in the relevant property citation.

#### *Non-Visible Alterations*

Alterations to original fabric at the rear of buildings (including part demolition of rear sections of the building) are common and have often 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 on houses 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. Where patterned brickwork was used as a decorative treatment, the overpainting of originally unpainted brickwork, while physically a relatively minor change, 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.

As noted above, all of the changes outlined here can have, to a greater or lesser degree, an impact on the relative significance (and grading) of a place. A number of properties recommended in this review for individual inclusion in the Heritage Overlay (Table 2), have been altered. In considering the issue of reconstructed, reinstated (or missing) verandahs or other features, for instance, 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, where additions are concealed from the street these are generally 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 in a number of such cases, the additions are of a form which could be contemplated under the Heritage Overlay provisions and relevant Council guidelines.

## **2.8 Individual Data Sheets (Citations)**

Individual data sheets have been prepared for each building recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay (see Table 2). These are reproduced in Volume 2 of this review. The format of the data sheets has been designed so 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 (where known). As in the case of the statement of significance, the intention in doing so is to assist future decisions on demolition or alteration works.

## **2.9 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 some significance as reference points within the broader historical framework of the municipality.

### 3.0 Findings and Recommendations

Please note that the findings and recommendations below are those that were included as part of the September 2006 report. These were revised in June 2007 and November 2007 (see Addenda 2 and 3). Subsequently, the C\* 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 4.

As noted above, this review involved places in the former City of Hawthorn which were identified as C\* grade (or 'keynote') heritage places in the *Hawthorn Heritage Study* (Meredith Gould, 1993). The following table summarises the recommendations:

- § 51 places are recommended for site-specific Heritage Overlays; the properties are listed at Table 2, and individual property citations are included in Volume 2. A small number of these properties are attached or adjoin, and were built at the same time by the same builder/developer (i.e. they form pairs or a group); in these instances a single Heritage Overlay could be considered for the properties.
- § Two of the above 51 places are recommended to be upgraded to B grade heritage properties; these are listed at Table 3.
- § 63 places are not recommended for site-specific Heritage Overlays; these are listed at Table 4. The Addendum to this report provides additional clarification on places included in this category.
- § One place is recommended for inclusion in an existing Heritage Overlay precinct; this is listed at Table 5.
- § 60 places out of the total are also recommended for inclusion in new Heritage Overlay precincts; these are listed at Table 6.

The places not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay are provisionally recommended to be downgraded to C grade properties.

#### 3.1 Properties Recommended for a Site-Specific Heritage Overlay

Properties recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay are listed below. 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.

27	Anderson Road	Hawthorn East
4	Ardene Court	Hawthorn
14	Auburn Grove	Hawthorn East

189	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
191A & B	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
193	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
32	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
238 & 240	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
242 & 244	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
254	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
408	Barkers Road	Hawthorn East
2	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
7	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
1	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
9	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
54	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Brook Street	Hawthorn
32	Clive Road	Hawthorn East
5	Glan Avon Road	Hawthorn
7	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
25	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
15	Hastings Road	Hawthorn East
27	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
9	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
16	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Lennox Street	Hawthorn
19	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
75	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
83	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
17	Mason Street	Hawthorn
27	Mason Street	Hawthorn
37	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East

51	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
67	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
7	Muir Street	Hawthorn
19	Oak Street	Hawthorn
25	Oak Street	Hawthorn
184	Power Street	Hawthorn
20	Rae Street	Hawthorn
5	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
23	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
37	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
106 & 108	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
110	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
6	Summerlea Grove	Hawthorn
534	Toorong Road	Hawthorn
23	View Street	Hawthorn
73	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
75	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>

**Table 2 Properties recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay.**

Data sheets for these properties are included at Volume 2 of this report.

### **3.2 Properties Recommended to be upgraded to B grade Heritage Places**

Two of the properties reviewed are recommended to be upgraded to B grade heritage places. These are as follows:

408	Barkers Road	Hawthorn East
9	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn

**Table 3 Properties recommended to be upgraded to B grade places.**

No 408 Barkers Road is considered to be an exemplar of the Californian Bungalow type, which in terms of its architectural boldness and execution compares favourably with other B grade Bungalows in Boroondara. No 9 Berkeley Street is a fine and distinguished example of a substantial Bungalow, which displays an unusual fusion of Bungalow external form and Federation-era planning.

### 3.3 Properties not Recommended for Site-Specific Heritage Overlays

The following properties have been assessed as not being of sufficient heritage significance to warrant an individual Heritage Overlay. The reasons for not recommending these properties for individual Heritage Overlays are generally covered above in the discussion regarding significance (see Section 2.6) and intactness (Section 2.7), but also in some detail in the Addendum to this report. These buildings may more appropriately, in many instances, be considered as provisional C grade properties, or in some cases lower graded properties (due to the apparent extent of alteration and change since they were originally identified as C\* properties in 1993). Generally, they are not as distinguished architecturally as the C\* properties, or do not stand out within their immediate context as the C\* grade buildings. They may also have been altered to a greater degree than the C\* grade buildings, or have alterations which have impacted more significantly on an understanding of the original building form, and detracted from the presentation and appearance of the building.

It is also the case that many of these buildings are recommended for inclusion in existing or new Heritage Overlay precincts (see Table 5 & Table 6).

Due to the scope of this review, it has not been possible to document in detail the degree of alteration and comparative level of intactness of these properties, or to make recommendations on an appropriate grading. Accordingly it is recommended that further work be carried out by Council to confirm these provisional gradings; in some cases further research may also change the provisional C grading, resulting in further downgrading of the properties.

38	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
68	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
334	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
340	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
24	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
29	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
31	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
57	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
32	Bowen Street	Hawthorn
1	Brook Street	Hawthorn
391	Burke Road	Hawthorn East
825	Burwood Road	Hawthorn East
12	Calvin Street	Hawthorn
6	Churchill Grove	Hawthorn
37	Constance Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East
21	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East

2	Fletcher Street	Hawthorn East
15	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
19	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
10	Grandview Grove	Hawthorn
18	Harts Parade	Hawthorn East
36	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
38	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
13	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
8	Kembla Street	Hawthorn
21	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
25	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
5	Lawes Street	Hawthorn
10	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
33	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
35	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
48	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
33 & 35	Lynch Street	Hawthorn
4	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
28	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
43	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
60	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
79	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
23	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
57	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
22	Miami Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
24	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
182	Power Street	Hawthorn
68	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
84	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
149	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn

16	Rix Street	Hawthorn
8	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
23	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
14	Stewart Street	Hawthorn East
839	Toorak Road	Hawthorn
438	Tooronga Road	Hawthorn
474	Tooronga Road	Hawthorn
63	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
82 & 82A	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
151	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
58	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
76	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
86	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
88	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
14	Wellesley Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>63</b>

**Table 4 Properties not recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay.**

Citations for these properties have not been revised or upgraded as part of this review.

### **3.4 Properties Recommended for Inclusion in Existing Heritage Overlay Precincts**

No 391 Burke Road, Hawthorn East, adjoins the Lower Burke Road Precinct (HO154) and fits within the significance previously attributed to the precinct. It can be seen as one of the large group of interwar bungalows directly to the north, located at 395-417 Burke Road within the Lower Burke Road Precinct, all of which were graded C1 or C\*1 in the 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study*. As a major boulevard and entrance to the former Municipality of Hawthorn, the area contains a large number of high-quality interwar bungalows in suburban garden settings, most of which retain an exceptionally high level of integrity which contribute to a strong streetscape. It is recommended that Council give consideration to extending the boundary of the precinct to include the subject property. This property is not recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay.

391	Burke Road	Hawthorn East	C
-----	------------	---------------	---

**Table 5 Property recommended for inclusion in Existing Heritage Overlay precinct.**

**3.5 Properties Recommended for Inclusion in New Heritage Overlay Precincts**

It became apparent during the course of this review that many properties were located in areas of Hawthorn with historic building stock which was of a quality and relative consistency, intactness or interest as to warrant the consideration by Council of establishing a new Heritage Overlay precinct. These areas are briefly described below (note that the precinct boundaries are indicative only, and have not been analysed in detail as part of this review) and are recommended for further detailed review. The properties located in these areas, which were subject to this review, are listed in the table below and include properties recommended for site-specific Heritage Overlays, as well as those not recommended. This is identified through the gradings (C\* and C, the latter indicating a provisional grading).

The precinct areas are also understood to contain, to a greater or lesser degree, properties with higher or lower gradings (other than C\* and C-gradings). It is also the recommendation of this review that Council nevertheless pursue the individual site controls for the C\* grade properties first, notwithstanding that there may be some future review of the areas in which particular buildings are located.

<b>Auburn Road precinct</b>			
189	Auburn Road	Hawthorn	C*
191A & B	Auburn Road	Hawthorn	C*
193	Auburn Road	Hawthorn	C*
2	Fletcher Street	Hawthorn	C
<b>Lisson Grove, Manningtree Road &amp; Wattle Road precinct</b>			
10	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C
19	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C*
33	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C
35	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C
48	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C
75	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C*
83	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	C*
4	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	C
28	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	C
43	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	C
60	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	C
79	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	C

5	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn	C*
58	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C
73	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C*
75	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C*
76	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C
86	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C
88	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	C
<b>Berkeley Street &amp; Kooyongkoot Road precinct</b>			
1	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C*
6	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C*
9	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C*
24	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C
29	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C
31	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C
54	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C*
57	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	C
9	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	C*
11	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	C*
16	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	C*
21	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	C
25	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	C
8	Kembla Street	Hawthorn	C
13	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn	C
27	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn	C*
8	Robinson Road	Hawthorn	C
23	Robinson Road	Hawthorn	C
106 & 108	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn	C*
110	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn	C*
<b>Victoria Road precinct</b>			
63	Victoria Road	Hawthorn	C
82 & 82A	Victoria Road	Hawthorn	C
151	Victoria Road	Hawthorn	C

14	Stewart Street	Hawthorn East	C
825	Burwood Road	Hawthorn East	C
10	Grandview Grove	Hawthorn	C
<b>Oak Street precinct</b>			
32	Barkers Road	Hawthorn	C*
38	Barkers Road	Hawthorn	C
68	Barkers Road	Hawthorn	C
7	Muir Street	Hawthorn	C*
19	Oak Street	Hawthorn	C*
25	Oak Street	Hawthorn	C*
17	Mason Street	Hawthorn	C*
27	Mason Street	Hawthorn	C*
12	Calvin Street	Hawthorn	C
1	Brook Street	Hawthorn	C
6	Brook Street	Hawthorn	C*
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>60</b>	

**Table 6 Properties recommended for inclusion in new Heritage Overlay precincts.**

*Recommended Precincts*

It is recommended that Council undertake a detailed review of the following areas, for consideration as Heritage Overlay precincts. As noted above, the precinct boundaries are indicative only and have not been analysed in detail as part of this review.

The **Auburn Road** precinct contains substantial numbers of graded Victorian, Federation and interwar houses of various form and scale. The area would include both sides of Auburn Road between Burwood and Riversdale Roads and the surrounding streets including Fletcher, Rosebery, Munro and Caroline streets.

The **Lisson Grove, Manningtree Road and Wattle Road** precinct is within the area bounded by Burwood, Glenferrie and Riversdale Roads, and Power Street. Manningtree Road, Wattle Road and Lisson Grove in particular contain substantial numbers of graded Victorian and Federation era buildings.

The **Berkeley Street/Kooyongkoot Road** precinct is bounded by Glenferrie, Riversdale and Auburn Roads, and the Monash Freeway to the south. The area also includes Kembla, Illawarra and Robinson Streets, and part of Riversdale Road. The area has a comparatively high number of graded buildings.

The **Victoria Road** precinct is bounded by Auburn, Rathmines and Burke Roads, and the railway line, and includes Victoria Road, Stewart Street, Grandview Grove and part of Burwood Road. This area retains a high proportion of Victorian-era dwellings.

The **Oak Street** precinct is bounded by Barkers Road, Church Street and the Yarra River, and includes Oak, Muir, Mason, Calvin and Brook Streets. The area has a comparatively high number of graded buildings.

Council should also give consideration to undertaking a review of additional possible precincts throughout the former City of Hawthorn. In addition to the five potential precincts identified above, this work would build on, and review, the precincts (or Urban Conservation Areas) originally recommended in the 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study*. This review of C\* grade properties also noted the potential of other areas, or possible precincts, such as that in the broader area bounded by Rix Street, Burke Road, Sinclair and Harris Avenues and Parkin Street. It is noted that the broader area contains substantial numbers of houses from the interwar period, many of which appear to be broadly intact and were graded C in the 1993 study. This could incorporate an extension to the existing Lower Burke Road Heritage Overlay precinct (HO154).

Due to the relatively high integrity and large numbers of graded, yet unprotected buildings within the above potential precincts, it is recommended that Council undertake the necessary research and review of precincts as a matter of importance.

### 3.6 Conclusion & Summary of Recommendations

With regard to the 51 properties recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay, the following recommendations apply:

- § Council should commence consultation with the owners of each property to inform them of the recommendation regarding their property.
- § As a high priority, Council should commence proceedings to undertake a Planning Scheme Amendment to include the 51 properties in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Boroondara Planning Scheme.
- § Nos 408 Barkers Road and 9 Berkeley Street, Hawthorn, are recommended to be upgraded to B grade heritage places.

With regard to the 63 properties not recommended for a site-specific Heritage Overlay, the following recommendations apply:

- § These properties should be given a provisional C grading.
- § Council should undertake further work to confirm these provisional gradings; this may result in some properties being further downgraded.
- § No 391 Burke Road, Hawthorn East is recommended to be included in the Lower Burke Road Precinct (HO154), which should be extended to include this property.

With regard to potential new Heritage Overlay precincts, the following recommendations apply:

- § 60 properties reviewed in this study are recommended for inclusion in five new precincts:
  - Auburn Road

- Lisson Grove, Manningtree Road and Wattle Road
  - Berkeley Street/Kooyongkoot Road
  - Victoria Road
  - Oak Street
- § Council should, as a high priority, undertake a detailed review of the five proposed precincts, to determine appropriate boundaries.
- § Council should review the precincts (or Urban Conservation Areas) originally recommended in the 1993 *Hawthorn Heritage Study*, to ensure these areas are currently adequately, or accurately, represented in the Heritage Overlay.
- § Council should undertake a broader review of additional possible precincts throughout the former City of Hawthorn. This should include an additional area noted during this review, being the broader area bounded by Rix Street, Burke Road, Sinclair and Harris Avenues and Parkin Street.

## 4.0 Select Bibliography

A 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 the preceding municipality, the City of Hawthorn. In addition, the Council's individual card indexes to building permits and their associated microfiched permit drawings were also consulted. However, some records were incomplete for the former City of Hawthorn as opposed to the more detailed records consulted as part of the 'B' review for the former cities of Camberwell and Kew. Thus, only microfiched plans and drawings accompanying relatively recent permits were located.

The review builds upon the work of earlier consultants; Meredith Gould, Conservation Architects, *Hawthorn Heritage Study*, 1993 as well as G Butler & Associates, *Hawthorn Keynote Places (draft)*, 2000.

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

City of Boroondara Planning and Building Files

City of Hawthorn Building Index and plan records.

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.

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

### 4.2 Unpublished reports and theses

Lovell Chen. *Boroondara B Graded Buildings Study*, 2006.

Graeme Butler. *Camberwell Conservation Study*, 1991.

G Butler & Associates, *Hawthorn Keynote Places (draft)*, 2000.

Meredith Gould, Conservation Architects, *Hawthorn Heritage Study*, 1993.

Meredith Gould, Conservation Architects, *Wattle Road*, 1997.

Pru Sanderson Design P/L. *Kew Urban Conservation Study*, 1989.

Allan Willingham. *Wattle Road. Review of Heritage Status*, 1996.

### 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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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-

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

Gustav Stickley. *Craftsman Homes: Architecture and Furnishings of the American Arts and Crafts Movement*, Dover, New York, 1979.

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

#### 4.4 Newspapers and journals

*Australasian Real Property Annual*

*Australian Home Beautiful*

*Australian Home Builder*

#### 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

[www.domain.com.au](http://www.domain.com.au)

**ADDENDUM 1**

## **1.0 Addendum 1**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This addendum forms part of the Main Report (Volume 1) prepared by Lovell Chen for the City of Boroondara as part of the Heritage Review of C\* grade properties in the former City of Hawthorn. It has been prepared in response to Council's request for further information as part of the review; the purpose of the document is to set out the reasons behind the recommendations for not including the following 63 places for individual heritage overlay protection.

As set out in Volume 1, accepted criterion and thresholds were referenced in order to assess every place with a C\* grading. An initial desktop survey was undertaken in order to 'shortlist' those properties which were deemed likely to warrant a C\* or higher grading with the remaining properties likely to be graded 'provisional C' (and recommended for further, more detailed assessment which may in some cases result in further downgrading). Regardless of this initial desktop survey, every place was visited and assessed and, in the case of those properties which did not meet the criteria, the following list of 63 places was prepared. This list includes some which on first impressions appeared to warrant an individual overlay, but on closer on-site inspection or as a result of documentary research, failed to meet the threshold.

It should also be 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.

Individual detailed datasheets were not prepared for the following 63 places.

### **1.2 Discussion**

The reasons behind the decision to not include a property may comprise one or many, but generally can be categorised into two major groupings; the place is too altered, or the place is not of sufficient individual architectural significance. Sometimes it is both.

#### **1.2.1 *Integrity and Alterations***

In Hawthorn, with regard to the definition of C grade properties, a distinction is drawn in the definition between well-preserved representative C grade buildings and C grade buildings that were individually significant but which have been altered (i.e. the C grade definition includes 'well preserved examples of particular themes of development, as well as some individually significant places that have been altered or defaced'). 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 determining significance. The critical issue in this regard is whether the change/s has significantly compromised the presentation and/or the significance of the building. Reference should be made to the discussion of intactness in the Main Report (Volume 1).

With regard to alterations and the level of integrity, it should be noted that a number of the buildings, whether the original building was considered to be of high individual architectural merit, a good representative building or not, had undergone substantial levels of visible

alteration. These alterations generally took the form of conspicuous second storey or rear additions or dormer windows. Examples of this type, amongst others, include 57 Berkeley Street, 21 Fairmount Road, 18 Harts Parade, 38 Havelock Road, 21 Kooyongkoot Road, 5 Lawes Street, 60 Manningtree Road, 57 Mayston Street, 23 Robinson Road and 474 Tooronga Road. In these and other cases substantial loss of architectural features, detail and embellishment such as polychrome brickwork, cast iron, chimneys, roofing, windows, or doors had also occurred. This category includes 10 Grandview Grove, 10 Lisson Grove, 33 Lisson Grove, and 86 Wattle Road and 14 Wellesley Road.

The issue of intactness has also been a factor in considering representativeness, in that (with a small number of exceptions) good representative examples of particular types which generally have a relatively high level of external intactness, have retained the C\* grading. Conversely, good representative examples which have been altered, such as 24 Berkeley Street and 33 Lisson Grove, have been downgraded.

In contrast, a small number of places were considered to be of sufficient significance, albeit with some alterations, to warrant a C\* or higher grading. In these cases, the original buildings were generally considered to be of higher architectural distinction than those which were good representative examples, and as such were recommended for individual overlays. In many cases, the alterations were of a relatively minor or reversible nature such as slate roofing replaced with corrugated steel, a removed verandah, or the alterations were largely concealed from views from the street or respectful of the original design.

#### 1.2.2 *Individual Architectural Merit*

With regard to individual architectural significance, it is noted that the C\* graded buildings recommended for individual overlays in this review generally met either assessment Criterion D and/or E, both of which relate predominantly to architectural or aesthetic qualities. The following list of places includes many properties which were not considered to meet the thresholds for these criteria. The places were generally fair examples (albeit often of a relatively high level of integrity) but with little to distinguish them architecturally or aesthetically. Examples, amongst others, include 38, 68, 334 and 340 Barkers Road, 29 and 31 Berkeley Street, 32 Bowen Street, 1 Brook Street, 825 Burwood Road, 2 Fletcher Street, 19 Glenroy Road, 33 and 35 Lynch Street, 43 Manningtree Road, 22 Miami Street, 8 and 8A Parkin Street, 84 Riversdale Road, 16 Rix Street, 14 Stewart Street, 63 and 151 Victoria Road. The group also included some places where the original house may have previously been of sufficient architectural merit but which were considered to be too altered such as 38 Havelock Street (see above).

#### 1.2.3 *Other*

Lastly, one place did not typify either of the above assessments. No 391 Burke Road, Hawthorn East borders the Lower Burke Road Precinct (HO 154) but was not included in the area when it was established. The reasons behind this are unknown, but the property has been assessed as part of this review with a recommendation to include it in the adjoining area overlay. It is a good and highly intact representative example of the interwar bungalow type, but it is not considered to be of a level of significance which would warrant an individual overlay.

### 1.3 Table of Places

No	Street	Suburb	Too Altered	Insufficient Individual Architectural Significance
38	Barkers Road	Hawthorn		X
68	Barkers Road	Hawthorn		X
334	Barkers Road	Hawthorn		X
340	Barkers Road	Hawthorn		X
24	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	X	
29	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn		X
31	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn		X
57	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn	X	
32	Bowen Street	Hawthorn	X	X
1	Brook Street	Hawthorn		X
391	Burke Road	Hawthorn East		X
825	Burwood Road	Hawthorn East		X
12	Calvin Street	Hawthorn	X	
6	Churchill Grove	Hawthorn	X	X
37	Constance Street	Hawthorn East	X	X
8 & 8A	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East		X
21	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East	X	X
2	Fletcher Street	Hawthorn East		X
15	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn	X	X
19	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn		X
10	Grandview Grove	Hawthorn	X	
18	Harts Parade	Hawthorn East	X	X
36	Havelock Road	Hawthorn		X

No	Street	Suburb	Too Altered	Insufficient Individual Architectural Significance
		East		
38	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East	X	
13	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn		X
8	Kembla Street	Hawthorn		X
21	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn	X	
25	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn		X
5	Lawes Street	Hawthorn	X	X
10	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	X	X
33	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	X	
35	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn	X	X
48	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn		X
33 & 35	Lynch Street	Hawthorn		X
4	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn		X
28	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	X	X
43	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	X	X
60	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	X	X
79	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn	X	X
23	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East	X	X
57	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East	X	X
22	Miami Street	Hawthorn East	X	X
8 & 8A	Parkin Street	Glen Iris	X	X
24	Parkin Street	Glen Iris	X	X
182	Power Street	Hawthorn	X	X
68	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn	X	
84	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn		X

No	Street	Suburb	Too Altered	Insufficient Individual Architectural Significance
149	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn	X	X
16	Rix Street	Hawthorn		X
8	Robinson Road	Hawthorn	X	X
23	Robinson Road	Hawthorn	X	X
14	Stewart Street	Hawthorn East		X
839	Toorak Road	Hawthorn	X	X
438	Toorong Road	Hawthorn		X
474	Toorong Road	Hawthorn	X	X
63	Victoria Road	Hawthorn	X	X
82 & 82A	Victoria Road	Hawthorn	X	X
151	Victoria Road	Hawthorn		X
58	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	X	X
76	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	X	X
86	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	X	X
88	Wattle Road	Hawthorn	X	X
14	Wellesley Road	Hawthorn	X	X

## ADDENDUM 2

### 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 C\* Grade buildings in the Former City of Camberwell'. As a result of the consultation, and additional historical detail and/or information relating to the properties which was provided by the owners, Lovell Chen was asked to review three of the building citations. For two of the three properties, the recommendations relating to inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay remain the same, although one of the citations was updated to include more accurate information. For the other property, the citation was also revised to reflect more up to date information, including the assessment of significance; this property was also subsequently recommended to not be included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

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

The following property was originally recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay; a revision has been made to the citation on the basis of additional information provided. Note that in this case, the original recommendation is unchanged.

The revised citation is included in Volume 2.

5                   Glan Avon Road, Hawthorn

The citation for the following property was reviewed, but not revised. The original recommendation to include the property in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay is unchanged. The original citation remains in Volume 2.

37                   Riversdale Road, Hawthorn

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

The following property was originally recommended to be included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, but this recommendation has been amended on the basis of additional information provided. Note that the citation is no longer included in Volume 2.

25                   Glenroy Road, Hawthorn

Table 1.3 of Addendum 1 lists places recommended to not be included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and identifies whether the recommendation is due to alterations to the building or the building having insufficient architectural significance. In the case of 25 Glenroy Road, Hawthorn, the recommendation is due to alterations to the building.

## Summary of Recommendation (revised)

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

Following the incorporation of the above changes, the summary list of buildings recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay is included below. Citations for these buildings are in Volume 2 of this report.

27	Anderson Road	Hawthorn East
4	Ardene Court	Hawthorn
14	Auburn Grove	Hawthorn East
189	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
191A & B	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
193	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
32	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
238 & 240	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
242 & 244	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
254	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
408	Barkers Road	Hawthorn East
2	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
7	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
1	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
9	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
54	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Brook Street	Hawthorn
32	Clive Road	Hawthorn East
5	Glan Avon Road	Hawthorn
7	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
15	Hastings Road	Hawthorn East
27	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
9	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
16	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Lennox Street	Hawthorn

19	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
75	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
83	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
17	Mason Street	Hawthorn
27	Mason Street	Hawthorn
37	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
51	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
67	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
7	Muir Street	Hawthorn
19	Oak Street	Hawthorn
25	Oak Street	Hawthorn
184	Power Street	Hawthorn
20	Rae Street	Hawthorn
5	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
23	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
37	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
106 & 108	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
110	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
6	Summerlea Grove	Hawthorn
534	Toorong Road	Hawthorn
23	View Street	Hawthorn
73	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
75	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50</b>

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

In addition, the summary list of buildings not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay is included below. The citations for these properties have not been included as part of this review.

38	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
68	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
334	Barkers Road	Hawthorn

340	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
24	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
29	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
31	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
57	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
32	Bowen Street	Hawthorn
1	Brook Street	Hawthorn
391	Burke Road	Hawthorn East
825	Burwood Road	Hawthorn East
12	Calvin Street	Hawthorn
6	Churchill Grove	Hawthorn
37	Constance Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East
21	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East
2	Fletcher Street	Hawthorn East
15	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
19	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
25	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
10	Grandview Grove	Hawthorn
18	Harts Parade	Hawthorn East
36	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
38	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
13	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
8	Kembla Street	Hawthorn
21	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
25	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
5	Lawes Street	Hawthorn
10	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
33	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
35	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
48	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn

33 & 35	Lynch Street	Hawthorn
4	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
28	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
43	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
60	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
79	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
23	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
57	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
22	Miami Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
24	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
182	Power Street	Hawthorn
68	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
84	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
149	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
16	Rix Street	Hawthorn
8	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
23	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
14	Stewart Street	Hawthorn East
839	Toorak Road	Hawthorn
438	Tooronga Road	Hawthorn
474	Tooronga Road	Hawthorn
63	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
82 & 82A	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
151	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
58	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
76	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
86	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
88	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
14	Wellesley Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64</b>

## **ADDENDUM 3**

### **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 C\* Grade buildings in the Former City of Camberwell'. Further information was provided to Lovell Chen after the initial April-June 2007 review of citations for an additional property. As a result, the building citation was revised.

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

The following property was originally recommended for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay; a revision has been made to the citation on the basis of additional information provided. Note that in this case, the original recommendation is unchanged.

The revised citation is included in Volume 2.

242 & 244      Barkers Road, Hawthorn

## ADDENDUM 4

### Amendment C64

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 C\*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.

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

Two properties were removed from the Amendment at the end of the process. In one case, the property was removed on the recommendation of the Panel for Amendment C64 and in the other, on further review by Lovell Chen following the peer review by RBA Architects.

The removed properties are

- 32 Clive Road, Hawthorn East
- 5 Glan Avon Road, Hawthorn

### 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 Volume 2 are for C\* places which are included in the schedule to the Heritage Overlay in the Boroondara Planning Scheme following the gazettal of Amendment C64.

#### *Recommended for the Heritage Overlay*

27	Anderson Road	Hawthorn East
4	Ardene Court	Hawthorn
14	Auburn Grove	Hawthorn East
189	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
191A & B	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
193	Auburn Road	Hawthorn
32	Barkers Road	Hawthorn

238 & 240	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
242 & 244	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
254	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
408	Barkers Road	Hawthorn East
2	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
7	Beaconsfield Road	Hawthorn East
1	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
9	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
54	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
6	Brook Street	Hawthorn
7	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
15	Hastings Road	Hawthorn East
27	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
9	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
16	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
11	Lennox Street	Hawthorn
19	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
75	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
83	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
17	Mason Street	Hawthorn
27	Mason Street	Hawthorn
37	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
51	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
67	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
7	Muir Street	Hawthorn
19	Oak Street	Hawthorn
25	Oak Street	Hawthorn
184	Power Street	Hawthorn
20	Rae Street	Hawthorn
5	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn

23	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
37	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
106 & 108	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
110	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
6	Summerlea Grove	Hawthorn
534	Toorong Road	Hawthorn
23	View Street	Hawthorn
73	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
75	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>

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

In addition, the summary list of buildings not recommended for an individual Heritage Overlay is included below. The citations for these properties have not been included as part of this review.

38	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
68	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
334	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
340	Barkers Road	Hawthorn
24	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
29	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
31	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
57	Berkeley Street	Hawthorn
32	Bowen Street	Hawthorn
1	Brook Street	Hawthorn
391	Burke Road	Hawthorn East
825	Burwood Road	Hawthorn East
12	Calvin Street	Hawthorn
6	Churchill Grove	Hawthorn
32	Clive Road	Hawthorn East
37	Constance Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East

21	Fairmount Road	Hawthorn East
2	Fletcher Street	Hawthorn East
5	Glan Avon Road	Hawthorn
15	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
19	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
25	Glenroy Road	Hawthorn
10	Grandview Grove	Hawthorn
18	Harts Parade	Hawthorn East
36	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
38	Havelock Road	Hawthorn East
13	Illawarra Road	Hawthorn
8	Kembla Street	Hawthorn
21	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
25	Kooyongkoot Road	Hawthorn
5	Lawes Street	Hawthorn
10	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
33	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
35	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
48	Lisson Grove	Hawthorn
33 & 35	Lynch Street	Hawthorn
4	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
28	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
43	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
60	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
79	Manningtree Road	Hawthorn
23	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
57	Mayston Street	Hawthorn East
22	Miami Street	Hawthorn East
8 & 8A	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
24	Parkin Street	Glen Iris
182	Power Street	Hawthorn

68	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
84	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
149	Riversdale Road	Hawthorn
16	Rix Street	Hawthorn
8	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
23	Robinson Road	Hawthorn
14	Stewart Street	Hawthorn East
839	Toorak Road	Hawthorn
438	Toorong Road	Hawthorn
474	Toorong Road	Hawthorn
63	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
82 & 82A	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
151	Victoria Road	Hawthorn
58	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
76	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
86	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
88	Wattle Road	Hawthorn
14	Wellesley Road	Hawthorn
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66</b>