



Hawke Street West Melbourne Heritage Gradings

Submission prepared by: Bill Cook
for Panel Hearing Amendment 258
Melbourne Planning Scheme
14th August 2018.

Submission Focus

- Major concern is the consistency of gradings on the South-eastern side of Hawke Street, between King and Spencer Streets.
- In particular, I find it difficult to understand why house 43 is graded as contributory and the three houses on each side of it are graded as significant.
- I acknowledge the enormous change that this review of heritage places has brought to the status of heritage in West Melbourne. The expansion in the number of places listed and some upgraded levels of gradings will make an enormous change to the detail and potential for preservation than that which is available in the current system.
- Despite this acknowledgement I think the system needs to ensure that we are making the right decisions for the right reasons.

The context - only one of this group of seven 2 storey houses is graded as contributory!

House 43 parapet including orbs in poor condition but are intact.



House 37 and 49 are both in very original.
I will focus discussion on the pairs on either side of house 43.



On southern side, house 45 and 47 – built as a pair



- Dated 1876
- Pairs seem to justify a rating boost.
- House 45 relatively intact. Parapet good but minus 5 of 6 orbs.
- New iron lacework on house 45 was installed in 1980s.
- House 47 significantly defaced – parapet, windows, balustrade, friezes, corners and fence.
- Negative affect on RHS of 45

Details on house 43 and 45 are very close to identical. As 45 and 47 are a pair, 47 would once have had the same decoration.



On the northern side, house 39 and 41 Hawke Street, were built as another matching pair.



- Dated 1883
- House 39 is in well-preserved condition, apart from fence and one missing chimney pot.
- House 41 has been altered – verandah balustrade and fence.
- Style is quite different to house 43 and 45.

43 Hawke Street, West Melbourne



- Unique - not built as part of a pair but possibly as a non-identical twin.
- Original chimney has been removed.
- Front fence is not original.
- Façade is fully intact
- Lower verandah lacework original.

The original lacework of house 43 on the ground floor frieze is intact. It's design is unique in that it reads from right to left in each section. This lace pattern has been replicated and re-installed above in the upper verandah.



No Statement of Significance for house 43.

- No statement of Significance for non significant, contributory places.
- This makes any comparison with what should or should not be included as significant very difficult.

What is of significance for house 43?

- In 1870 James Cunningham, owner and occupier, contracted Crawford and Anderson of Elizabeth Street North to build a four roomed house.
- In 1877 Henry Kipling became the owner and occupier. In 1878-9, he contracted Frederick Wittpan of Rathdown Street North, to add two more rooms.
- Both were family men whose families experienced child/infant deaths.
- Kipling ceased to occupy the house in 1887 when he moved to The Avenue in Parkville.
- His ownership of 43 continued until after his death in 1901, when his estate trustee took over.

Contributory elements include;

Acknowledge S of S for house 45 with some exclusion for fence , Corinthian column, pair, face brick side and rear, chimneys, three lights at ground floor. Additions applicable to house 43 are in red.

- Two story stuccoed house.
- Cemented dentilated cornice moulds, rosettes and brackets with a raised arched entablature and guilloche pattern balustrading either side.
- Pitched roof behind parapet.
- Two storey cast (iron) verandah, panelled cast (iron) frieze and brackets.
- 4 out of 6 orbs still in place.
- Original cast iron frieze in place on lower verandah.
- The siting of house 43 on the crest and in a forward position from house 45, allows the high parapet to crown this Victorian streetscape.
- Double hung sash windows.
- Four panel entry door and toplight.
- Contribution to valuable Victorian era streetscape.

(replacements on 43 are cast aluminium)



Note the crowning effect of house 43 on the streetscape from the distance.



Further S of S points and Key issues for house 43

How is it significant?

- Cunningham and Kipling's house is significant historically and aesthetically to West Melbourne.

Why is it significant?

- Historically representative of a major growth period in West Melbourne.
- Aesthetically for the ornate façade detailing, its siting within the streetscape, and as contributory to a significant Victorian –era streetscape.

When did house 43 achieve its detailed façade and verandah treatment?

- Was the original four roomed house two storey?
- Was it four on the ground?
- When was the verandah/facade completed?
- Was it done before the erection of house 45-47 in 1876 or was it done with the additions to house 43 in 1878 or at some other time?
- Unfortunately, the details in the 'Notice of Intent' documents and any other available evidence do not throw any light on the answer to this question.
- There must have been some collaboration between the principals to have achieved such identical detail.

Significant or contributory?

Significant	<p>A significant heritage place is <i>individually</i> important at state or local level, and a heritage place in its own right. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to <i>the municipality</i>. A 'significant' heritage place may be <i>highly</i> valued by the community; is typically externally intact; and/or has <i>notable features</i> associated with the place type, use, period, method of construction, siting or setting. When located in a heritage precinct a 'significant' heritage place can make an important contribution to the precinct.</p>
Contributory	<p>A 'contributory' heritage place is important for its contribution to a <i>precinct</i>. It is of historic, aesthetic, scientific, social or spiritual significance to the <i>precinct</i>. A 'contributory' heritage place may be valued by the community; <i>a representative example</i> of a place type, period or style; and/or <i>combines with other visually or stylistically related places to demonstrate the historic development of a precinct</i>. 'Contributory' places are typically externally intact, but may have visible changes which do not detract from the contribution to the precinct.</p>

Criteria for grading – significant or contributory.

1. Individually important v contribution to precinct.

I believe house 43 is individually important. Its height, position, originality of the façade make its contribution to the streetscape critical.

It is the keystone to this row of terraces.

2. Significant to municipality v contributes to precinct.

If each of the other houses are significant to the municipality, then I see no reason for house 43 not achieving the same status.

Criteria for grading – Significant or contributory

3. Highly valued by community v's valued by community.

- The qualification “may be” applies to both. Regardless, I find no evidence that the community was even consulted about the relative values in these grading decisions. Consultations that I attended were very broad brush and did not get down to the fundamental issue of whether a neglected single house with a relatively intact façade should receive a lesser classification than a defaced structure with almost all its heritage attributes removed, because it happens to be one of a pair.
- When I did make a submission on the matter, I received no direct response. When I rang to request a reason, I was told it might have to do with the chimney or possibly the fence.

Criteria for grading – Significant or contributory

4. **Notable features** – place type, use, period, method of construction, siting, setting, - v's **representative example** of place period style/ combined with other visually or stylistically related places to demonstrate historic development of a precinct.

- I rely on the heritage consultant's advice on whether the notable features are broadly achieved. I fail to see why house 43 fails to achieve significance - while others, in particular, house 41 and 47 do, due to their pairing status, but discounting their defaced condition.
- Siting is not referred to, even though it is included in the definition, whereas pairing, as such, is not.
- Siting in this case of house 43, promotes diversity within this streetscape, acknowledges changes of slope and lot shapes, which adds to its unique and special quality.
- Pairing might be significant when each of the partners are in reasonably consistent condition, and their matching strengths are mutually reinforcing.
- It is my strong contention that this is not the case here. The partnering pairs are so different that it is almost impossible to tell that they are pairs.

Disparate Pairs

House 39 and 41



House 45 and 47



Submission Conclusion

- I ask that 43 Hawke Street, West Melbourne be upgraded to “significant”
- The policy implications of this exercise seems to me to lack a strategy. It is fine to “identify” and “protect” but the “enhancement” of Melbourne’s heritage requires more. Why give defaced places a higher category? How can you establish an incentive structure to encourage restoration when rewards are offered in such questionable circumstances? How can the community respect such practice?
- The top down model of decision-making in implementing this scheme gives too much power to the “experts” and not enough to participation by the community.

Other Hawke Street observations

1. It would be unfortunate if the “Significant” street classification did not extend to cover the three additional contributory houses (51 to 55) to the SW of 49 Hawke Street in order to reinforce the protection of this entire Hawke Street heritage streetscape.
2. The other contributory place in this two storey row is a two storey house at 35 Hawke Street. It is the oldest of all the two storey houses and was built by the same builder who constructed the first stage of 43 Hawke Street - Crawford and Anderson. Original or modified? Samuel Woodham built the house and occupied it for more than 30 years.



Other Hawke Street observations

- 3 I would also like to note that there is highly active concern by many members of the North and West Melbourne community about another submission to this panel for removal of the heritage grading on the Goldsmith's building, on the corner of Hawke and King Streets. The building's heritage retention would be seen as making a positive contribution to our neighbourhood's character and conservation. I ask you to please maintain the heritage grading of this 98 year old building at 611-617 King Street whose contribution to our streetscape is highly valued by our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to present.

