

## REVIEW OF HERITAGE OVERLAY LISTINGS IN THE CBD

The heritage overlay to the new format planning scheme lists places for the CBD and Southbank, the area generally identified as the Central City. Many of the individual places listed under the heritage overlay were 'Notable' under the old planning scheme. Some other buildings have individual listings by virtue of their status as registered historic places. There are also a number of heritage places that are precincts.

In addition to these, there are a substantial number of graded places within the CBD that are not at present subject to a heritage overlay. Some of these have come, in recent years, to be seen to be highly significant, and thus warrant consideration under an amendment for inclusion within the heritage overlay. The 1993 *Central City Heritage Study Review* identified 43 proposed new Notable buildings as a priority for such an amendment. Some of these have since been registered as historic buildings and are now protected. Given that almost a decade has passed since that review was undertaken, there may be additional buildings to be considered for individual listing as heritage buildings.

The present study has reviewed graded buildings within the CBD that are not currently protected under a heritage overlay, and has identified those buildings that best warrant such a control on the basis of local or greater individual significance, through demonstrating the nature of development in the Central City area either in isolation or as part of a group or sequence of structures.

The brief for this study established a strong link between this project and the recommendations of the 1993 *Central City Heritage Study Review*, and made it clear that the primary objective was to identify, and thus protect, buildings that were prima facie Notable in the sense of the old planning scheme. The 1993 review encouraged the notion that Notable buildings should be buildings of high individual significance, and in particular buildings of state significance. Further to this, it is noted that the range in individual significance of the Notable buildings under the old planning scheme was quite extensive, from A grade buildings to D grade buildings.

A relatively high individual grading was not the sole consideration in the selection of these buildings when first introduced to the planning scheme in the late 1980s. It would seem that some of the original Notables were selected as relatively rare examples within the CBD of buildings quite common in other parts of the metropolitan area. Other comprised groups of representative buildings that told something about the development of the CBD (eg warehouse, factories, houses) but which might have been found too restricted in area to be considered a true heritage precinct.

In the initial stage of the study, the following criteria were taken into account in sifting through the vast number of graded buildings in the CBD and determining which should be included in the proposed list (initially anticipated to be in the order of 50-60 buildings):

- Buildings of state significance not presently covered by a heritage overlay
- Buildings of high local significance (A, B or C grade in the 1985 study) not presently protected by a heritage overlay

- Buildings that contribute to an important precinct or small group that is not presently protected by a heritage overlay
- Buildings that are particularly prominent (eg located on corners, or relatively large and visible) and that remain good and relatively intact examples of the period and type.

The study commenced with a review of the recommendations of the 1993 Review, followed by a desktop analysis of other graded buildings within the CBD using all the data sheets held by council as well as an analysis through maps of the location and grouping of buildings according to significant historical, social and architectural themes within the development of the CBD. Rohan Storey of the National Trust was also very helpful in providing a number of lists of buildings and interiors for consideration, as well as making himself available for several long sessions in which the existing lists and heritage overlay maps were assessed and discussed. As a result of this desktop review, and limited field work, and initial list of buildings for review was prepared.

It is noteworthy that a substantial preliminary list comprising some hundreds of buildings was drafted in the course of reviewing the data sheets at the MCC and the various lists provided by Rohan Storey. This list comprised buildings graded A to D. The original gradings were not the sole determinant in assessing significance – given the gradings are now 15 years old, some warrant reassessment in the face of changing attitudes to heritage and in particular to twentieth century buildings. Compilation of the list therefore involved a degree of connoisseurship and a subjective judgement on the part of the consultant, based on his experience in identifying and gradings buildings.

For the purposes of this review, the system of gradings referred to is the revised system presently found in the planning scheme. The revised gradings are as follows:

A Buildings are of national or state importance, and are irreplaceable parts of Australia's built form heritage. Many will be either already included on or recommended for the Victorian Heritage Register or the Register of the National Estate.

B Buildings are of regional or metropolitan significance, and stand as important milestones in the architectural development of the metropolis. Many will be either already included on or recommended for inclusion on the Register of the National Estate.

C Buildings demonstrate the historical or social development of the local area and/or make an important aesthetic or scientific contribution. These buildings comprise a variety of styles and building types. Architecturally they are substantially intact, but where altered, it is reversible. In some instances, buildings of high individual historic, scientific or social significance may have a greater degree of alteration.

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

While these definitions vary somewhat from those used in the 1985 study and the 1993 review, they still convey the view that C grade buildings, as well as A and B grade buildings, are important at a local level.

The initial list of places was then itself reviewed, and broken into two further lists – a list of buildings warranting an individual overlay, and a list of suggested precincts. Those buildings that did not make this ‘cut’ were predominantly C and D grade buildings.

During the course of the desktop analysis a second objective was also recognised, a desire to ensure and demonstrate that all buildings in the CBD of C grade and above have been reviewed. This seemed appropriate given that C grade is the threshold of local significance on an individual basis, and that all buildings graded A, b or c therefore have a prima facies case for an individual overlay. While this review had, in fact, already been undertaken, a commitment was made to return to the data sheets and review all buildings graded C and higher that were currently without an overlay. This would then serve as a check against the lists previously generated. Sophie Curran of the MCC provided a complete list of all buildings in the CBD graded C and above that were not the subject of an overlay, and the data sheets were revisited and a number of sites inspected as part of this stage of the review.

The buildings were mostly graded A, B and C with a couple of D graded buildings that were identified by the consultant as appropriate for an individual heritage overlay to be identified in the schedule. A number of buildings were eliminated throughout the research process and documentation of this can be found in files held by Sophie Curran.

Buildings not previously graded under the Central Business District conservation study were not included in this review. No significant interiors were considered.

At the conclusion of this stage of the project a list of c. 110 buildings had been compiled for review, a number substantially in advance of the number originally anticipated in the brief and the consultant’s fee proposal. In addition, buildings of individual significance that were not the subject of an individual overlay, but were part of a precinct overlay, were deleted from the list, removing many of the buildings identified in the 1993 review.

A decision was also made at this point that no potential precincts were to be investigated further as part of this consultancy.

With a final list of buildings completed, research was commenced into each individual place and a site inspection undertaken in order to determine whether each met the threshold for local significance. In many instances initial research had been undertaken by Graeme Butler on behalf of council as part of an earlier study, and where possible this information was drawn upon in the preparation of citations. The vast majority were then documented, with only a small proportion (\*\*\*) buildings) being found to not meet this threshold. In some instances the additional research undertaken helped to determine the decision not to include a subject site.

Assistance was provided in this stage by Sophie Curran of MCC, who took many of the photographs, prepared a standard data sheet for the purposes of the study, called in numerous drawings from the MCC building application archive, and undertook limited directory research to help establish critical dates and periods of occupation for a number of buildings.

The draft data sheets were made available for review by the MCC and the National Trust. After comments had been received and responded to, the data sheets were considered final.

Draft March 2002

It is this final body of data sheets which forms the basis of the proposed amendment.

The following is a list of the properties recommended for a heritage overlay as a result of this study, including their current (1985) grading.

**FINAL LIST TO BE REFINED IN CONSULTATION WITH PHILLIP PRIEST AND JOHN STATHAM.**

<b>Property No.</b>	<b>Street</b>	<b>Grading</b>
47-49	A'Beckett	C
143-151	A'Beckett	B
185-187	A'Beckett	B
104	A'Beckett	C
7	Alfred Place	C
193-199	Bourke	C
219-225	Bourke	B
415-419	Bourke	C
134-144	Bourke	B
152-160	Bourke	C
160-162	Bourke	C/D
164-166	Bourke	B
168-174	Bourke	C
180-182	Bourke	C
194-200	Bourke	B
418-420	Bourke	C
468-470	Bourke	B
615-623	Collins	B/C
404-406	Collins	C
410	Collins	B
430-444	Collins	B
464-466	Collins	C
9-13	Drewery Lane	C
21-33	Elizabeth	B
215-217	Elizabeth	B/C
299	Elizabeth	C
353-357	Elizabeth	C
365-393	Elizabeth	C
441-447	Elizabeth	B/C
453-457	Elizabeth	B
463-471	Elizabeth	C
473-481	Elizabeth	C
489-499	Elizabeth	B
380	Elizabeth	C
384	Elizabeth	B
53-55	Exhibition	B/C
309	Exhibition	C
30-40	Exhibition	C
104-110	Exhibition	C
125-127	Flinders Lane	B
145	Flinders Lane	A/B
360-372	Flinders Street	C
508-510	Flinders Street	C
520-522	Flinders Street	C
562-564	Flinders Street	B
63-67	Franklin Street	C

96-102	Franklin Street	C
4-6	Goldie Place	B
106-112	Hardware Street	B/C
115-129	King Street	C
131-135	King Street	C
12-20	King Street	C
361-363	Little Bourke Street	C
365-367	Little Bourke	C
373-375	Little Bourke	C
362-364	Little Bourke	C
434-436	Little Bourke	B
66-70	Little Collins	A/B
392-396	Little Collins	C
538-542	Little Collins	C
54	Little Latrobe	C
25	Little Lonsdale	C
116-118	Little Lonsdale	C
120-122	Little Lonsdale	C
128-130	Little Lonsdale	B
194-196	Little Lonsdale	C
198-200	Little Lonsdale	B
372-378	Little Lonsdale	C
523-525	Little Lonsdale	B
439-445	Lonsdale	C
541-561	Lonsdale	B
Kelvin Club	Melbourne Place	C
37-41	Queen	B
111-129	Queen	D
217-219	Queen	C
20-26	Queen	C
118-126	Queen	A
320-326	Queen	B
42-44	Russell	C/D
170-190	Russell	B
288-294	Russell	B/C
2-8	Spencer	B
10-22	Spencer	C
66-70	Spencer	C
122-132	Spencer	D
267-271	Spring	C
St.Francis Monastery	St.Francis Street	D
135-137	Swanston	C
163-165	Swanston	C
309-325	Swanston	C
401-403	Swanston	C
407-409	Swanston	C
411-423	Swanston	D
427-433	Swanston	C
49-53	Victoria Street	A
259	William	B
261	William	C
22-32	William	D
114-128	William (Qantas House)	C

