

**A REVIEW OF LOCAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES IN THE  
MELBOURNE PLANNING SCHEME**

**A SUBMISSION BY THE HERITAGE COUNCIL OF VICTORIA**

**8 AUGUST 2014**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This submission is made by the Heritage Council of Victoria (Council) in response to the paper, 'A Review of the Local Heritage Planning Policies in the Melbourne Planning Scheme', circulated by the City of Melbourne in July 2014.

The Council congratulates the City on commencing this exercise and shares the view that it is long overdue.

The City of Melbourne has made extensive use of the planning system to identify and conserve its heritage places and has been a long standing leader in the delivery of local heritage conservation. This Review provides it with an opportunity to reassert itself in that role.

## **2.0 THE PROPER ROLE OF THE POLICIES AND ANALYSIS**

Council believes that the Review's analysis of the recent history of the development of heritage planning policies in the various Victorian Planning Schemes is a useful starting point. Council is, however, of the opinion that this review would also benefit from a consideration of the experiences of users of the current system in Melbourne. The City's statutory planners, heritage advisers, VCAT advocates and expert witnesses along with the developers would be able to provide useful reflections on how the current system works and what matters they find difficult to navigate. Council recommends that this consultation occur before options for revision of the policies are finalised.

Council also points out that municipalities adjoining the City of Melbourne have equivalent policies in their schemes. It would have been useful if this Review had also referred to them. Ultimately it would seem appropriate that the policies, particularly outside the Capital City Zone had some similarity. Otherwise the potential for confusion amongst owners and developers located near municipal boundaries is exacerbated.

## **3.0 DEFINING HERITAGE PLACES**

At 3.3 the Review points out that the grading system used by the City is problematic. The difficulties with the use of this system has been compounded by the successive re-grading of places.

Council believes that the current 4 building grades and 3 streetscape grades leads to a formulaic approach to the demolition and redevelopment of heritage places.

Council agrees that the City should take up an approach similar to other municipalities where individual places are designated as Individually Significant, Contributory to a Precinct or not Contributory to a Precinct.

Whilst the translation table presented at p12 of the Review may appear to present a reasonable way of proceeding on an immediate and interim basis, Council is of the belief that undertaking a direct translation as proposed is problematic. Unfortunate, as it may be there will need to be re-assessment of the value of many of the properties currently graded.

Council must also point out that designation of state significance is a statutory responsibility and therefore the prerogative of the Heritage Council and should be left to it. Whilst the City and its various consultants may believe that a building is of state significance (the current Grade A) that doesn't make it so. Once the Council has added a place to the Victorian Heritage Register. The Minister is obliged to amend the relevant planning scheme to identify it

as such. This should be the only process that designates a place as being of state significance.

## **4.0 HERITAGE PLACES IN THE CAPITAL CITY ZONE**

### **4.1 Reliance on the Burra Charter**

Council has adopted the Burra Charter as a guiding document for its own deliberations, but doesn't believe that it is necessarily appropriate to guide deliberations under the Melbourne Planning Scheme. The Burra Charter is a broad set of principles designed to guide the proper conservation of places of heritage significance. It does not set out the sort of detailed considerations that need to be taken into account in determining planning applications under the provisions of the Heritage Overlay (HO).

As a result, the Council believes that the City needs to write its own planning policies to deal with issues that are specific to heritage places in the City. For example, there appears to be a need to address issues surrounding the development of building on roof tops within the Capital City Zone. Equally the City needs to provide policy guidance on facadism in the Capital City Zone.

Council finds the statement that the heritage policy is not intended as a built form control as surprising. It agrees that there are other tools within the Scheme which can determine built form, but so should the considerations under the Heritage Overlay. They should be formulated to protect the heritage values of the place and as a consequence will guide the built form associated with the place and its surrounds.

### **4.2 The Use of Reference Documents**

Council considers that it is important that reference documents are relatively current and useful. Where they are referred to, they should also be publicly available. The list should not be a long catalogue of old and un-relied upon documents. Where multiple documents are referred to, they often present different facts and views on what is important about heritage places. This is confusing to users of the system. Council believes that outdated documents should be removed from any lists of reference documents.

### **4.3 Conservation Management Plans**

Council finds it unusual that a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) should be required for all alterations, works and demolition of individual heritage buildings. It is Council's belief that CMPs should be reserved for instances where significant conservation works are to be carried out as part of a proposal. It is very difficult to understand the point of a CMP in the case of an application for demolition of a building.

### **4.4 Heritage precincts, demolition and infill development**

Currently, Statements of Significance for heritage precincts within the Capital City Zone are included within the local policy at clause 22.04. Council considers that there is nothing inherently wrong with this if the Statements of Significance for the heritage precincts are:

1. Up-to-date: for example, few of the Statements of Significance currently refer to the contribution of interwar or post-war buildings despite the presence of some important buildings from these periods;
2. Relatively concise: - the Statements of Significance should leave no doubt as to the elements which are of importance and should avoid restating the history or description of the precinct; and
3. Provide clear guidance to planners in the exercising of discretion.

As an example, the Heritage Council suggests that an appropriate model to writing a Statement of Significance for a precinct can be found in the approach of the City of Stonnington to the Coonil Estate precinct (see Attachment 1). The series of dot-points under the heading 'what is significant' meet the three tests referred to in the paragraph above. Moreover, this well written and concise analysis could be readily inserted into the local policy and would form a useful guide to exercising discretion.

The benefit of inclusion in the local policy, as opposed to an Incorporated Document, is that the material then becomes a part of the actual planning scheme without the need to go to an external (albeit an Incorporated) document.

However, should Melbourne City Council prefer that this material be included in an Incorporated Document, the Heritage Council would still recommend that the concise and analytical approach of the City of Stonnington to writing Statements of Significance (as exemplified by the Coonil Estate) be adopted.

## **5.0 HERITAGE PLACES OUTSIDE THE CAPITAL CITY ZONE**

### **5.1 Consideration of "concealment" for new additions**

Under this heading the Review has correctly identified the need to better define some precincts. As with many inner urban heritage precincts the Melbourne Scheme identifies some very large heritage precincts and the use of one Statement of Significance for a large precinct provides little in the way of guidance for parts of the precinct which have particular characteristics.

However, simply using a grading (such as a Level 1 Streetscape) doesn't necessarily assist in providing a better understanding of the importance of the particular part of the precinct. Whilst this may be seen as a quick fix it won't provide an adequate description of what is important about the place and whether concealment policies will protect that importance.

### **5.2 Reference Documents**

Council reiterates its comments above about the use of Reference and Incorporated Documents

### **5.3 Statements of Significance for the heritage precincts**

See the comments about supplementary statements above.

Council believes that the City should consider supplementing the Statements of Significance for precincts with statements that highlight the particular significance of elements of the precinct.

Council also believes that there is a real need for greater compliance with the guidance on drafting Statements of Significance as outlined in the Practice Note. It understands that from time to time, Planning Panels Victoria has found reason to comment on the usefulness of Statements of Significance. Council believes that Statements of Significance should be relatively succinct and be designed to assist in gaining a clear understanding of what is important and hence what should be conserved about a place. They are not an opportunity for consultants to write a long dissertation on the history of the place or assemble a collection of facts uncovered in some broad ranging research exercise.

## 6.0 THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a brief commentary on each of the recommendations provided in the review paper. They draw on and summarise the views expressed in the rest of the submission above.

### **1 Clause 22.04 Heritage Places within the Capital City Zone**

**The following changes are recommended for Clause 22.04:**

- 1. Include any additional guidance in the Capital City Zone not adequately addressed in the Burra Charter.**
- 2. Include more guidance for alterations to facades for commercial buildings, signage and restoration of heritage elements.**
- 3. Include guidelines for the preparation and use of Conservation Management Plans (CMP).**
- 4. Include a separate incorporated document for the Statements of Significance.**

As indicated above the Council believes that there is a real need for the City to develop its own policies and not rely on the Burra Charter which is a very general set of principles, often open to broad interpretation. It is not opposed to the requirement for CMPs, but believes that this should be targeted to proposals which are going to involve conservation works. A requirement for a CMP where the application is for demolition makes little sense. Although a permit condition requiring recording of the place should be automatic in such instances.

The inclusion of a separate Incorporated Document containing Statements of Significance, is, in the Council's view a viable option.

### **2 Clause 22.05 Heritage Places outside of the Capital City Zone**

**The following changes are recommended for Clause 22.05:**

- 5. Investigate the Level 1 streetscapes where concealment measures should be addressed in the policy.**
- 6. Include the full range of building typologies including outbuildings (stables), inter-war, post-war, industrial and commercial buildings.**
- 7. Include further guidance for corner sites (oblique view lines) and development on laneways.**
- 8. Review currency of external reference documents and incorporate the relevant ones into the planning scheme.**

Council believes that simply relying on the designation of Level 1 streetscapes and concealment policies may not be enough to provide adequate guidance and protection to particularly important parts of heritage precincts. It may be necessary to formulate supplementary Statements of Significance, particularly where precincts are very large and diverse in built form. This may also assist in providing guidance for corner sites and development on laneways, etc.

Council has no problem with the use of reference documents in the Scheme, but believes that they should be current and useful. A list of reference documents shouldn't be seen as an opportunity to prepare a bibliography on the subject of heritage protection and conservation in a particular area.

### **3 Review Gradings**

- 9. The current A-D gradings need to be phased out. Adopt a conversion from the current grading into the new system of contributory/significant grading system.**

Council agrees that current grading system needs to be phased out, but care needs to be taken in doing this. A quick permanent fix through the application of a translation table may be too simplistic and result in as many problems as the current grading system creates.

#### ***4 Statements of Significance***

***10. Work with the community to develop Statements of Significance for the seven heritage precincts outside the Capital City Zone that don't have these and introduce these into the Melbourne Planning Scheme.***

The Council agrees that Statements of Significance (and possibly supplementary statements) should be developed for the heritage precincts that currently don't have them.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

The Heritage Council congratulates the City of Melbourne on undertaking this review. It acknowledges that it is not necessarily a simple task, but believes that by being proactive, the City has the opportunity to retain its position as a leader in heritage management.

Aside from the observations and suggestions made in this submission the Council remains open to hold further discussions with the City and comment on further proposals.

HO375

— City of —  
STONNINGTON

## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

<b>Name</b>	Coonil Estate Precinct	<b>File No</b>
<b>Address</b>	MALVERN	<b>Grading</b>
		2007
		Local
<b>Date</b>		
<b>Building Type</b>	Residential Precinct	
<b>Assessment by</b>		<b>Extent of Overlay</b>
		Refer recommendations

**Condition**

**Recommended** VHR No HI No PS Yes  
**Heritage Protection**

**Designer / Architect** No information held **Architectural Style** No information held  
**Maker / Builder** No information held

**Integrity**

No information held

**History and Historical Context**

*The following history has been prepared to illustrate key historical themes as identified in the 'Stonnington Thematic Environmental History' (Context Pty Ltd, 2006, Addendum March 2009).*

## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Prior to the first land sales in 1840, pastoralists had spread to the area that was to become the suburb of Malvern. A network of stock routes meandered through the undulating country and on to Gippsland. When the district was first surveyed, the area was divided into allotments set out within a framework of roads suitable for market gardens, orchards and farms.[1]

The Gardiner Road District (later Malvern Council) was proclaimed in 1856 and market gardens, orchards and a few houses on large allotments were gradually established along two of the main tracks that were later named Glenferrie Road and High Street. Despite the activities of land speculators, the district remained predominately rural. More intense development followed the opening Oakleigh railway line through Malvern, Armadale, Toorak and Hawksburn in 1879. The arrival of the railway coincided with the 1880s land boom that saw huge urban growth in Malvern, Prahran and Melbourne generally.

The expansion of the public transport system, allowed many Victorians to opt for a home in the fresh air and tranquillity of the suburbs away from the noise and dirt of the city. Market gardens and old mansion sites in Malvern were subdivided to create new middle class enclaves, populated by businessmen and their families pursuing the suburban ideal of a *rus en urbe* - country in the city.[2] For most new suburbanites, this took the form of a single-storey detached villa surrounded by its own garden. A far grander expression of *rus en urbe* was found on Arthur Langmore's 'Coonil Estate'. Designed c1885 by architects Reed, Henderson & Smart, Langmore's home was a double-storey Italianate style mansion set on 20 acres of land which now comprises the southern two thirds of the precinct.[3]

In 1885, the Stanhope Estate was subdivided with residential allotments fronting Stanhope, Thanet, Dalny, Dixon, Harvey Streets and parts of Grace, Horace and Jordan Streets. Parkside Street was created in 1888 and by 1891 a row of nine brick villas had been constructed along its southern side.[4]

Malvern had little to offer in the way of employment and the relatively high cost of train travel to the industrial suburbs prevented the suburb from developing large areas of working class accommodation. Nevertheless, a small number of modest timber cottages were built on Parkside and Grace Street, possibly for workers in the Glenferrie Road shops or other service industries catering to the needs of the suburb's more affluent residents.

Stanhope Street appears to have been the favoured location for better quality houses in the precinct. These include the elaborate boom style villas erected by prominent local builder James Wright at 86 and 88 Stanhope Street. Wright also built a substantial Italianate villa as his own home on the corner of Stanhope & Grace Street. Nearby at 76 Stanhope Street, an impressive double-storey brick house with stables was erected in 1889 for box maker Thomas Frame. Known as *Hadleigh*, Frame's house was used as a Ladies' College from 1893.[5]

The severe downturn in the economy during the 1890s left several allotments in the precinct vacant. The 1907 MMBW plan for the area shows the Coonil Mansion standing on its large estate with a long, sweeping driveway off Wattletree Road.[6] A number of vacant lots can be seen interspersed amongst houses on Stanhope, Oxford and Grace streets. Only the southern side of Parkside Street appears fully development with housing. This hiatus in building resulted in the development of the precinct in two distinct eras with Victorian buildings adjacent to Edwardian buildings and no built form to illustrate the transition between the two.

By the early 1900s, the economic situation had improved and several new houses began to appear in the precinct interspersed among the earlier boom era villas. The opening of the electric tramline along Wattletree Road in 1910 further stimulated development in the area. In the same year, the Coonil Estate was subdivided by businessman and MLC, Frederick Hagelthorn, creating Coonil Crescent, Canberra Grove, Derril Avenue and the southern end of Grace Street. Building allotments fronted all these streets, as well as a number in Wattletree Road and Thanet Street. Hagelthorn retained Coonil as his residence, renaming it 'Mangoplah'. It stood on a much-reduced allotment with its entrance from



## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Coonil Crescent. The estate was described in contemporary accounts as follows:

*Every street on the estate is being formed, channelled, metalled ... In all there will be four new streets on the property. ... the land slopes gently from Coonil House, affording picturesque views of the hilly country of East Malvern and Glen Iris. ... The surveyors have departed from the ordinary rectangular form in devising the new streets. Coonil Crescent sweeps in a double curve from Wattle-tree Road along the front of the house. ... The allotments like the streets, break from the dull uniformity which mars much of the older suburban development.[7]*

An unusual feature of the estate was the reservation of land by the vendor for a bowling green. Building restrictions prohibited wooden houses, and the terms of sale stipulated that no building could be erected, less than £600 in value and single dwellings only could be erected on each allotment.[8] Around 1912 Malvern Council had begun to declare brick areas - areas where timber houses were not permitted.[9] These regulations and later minimum requirements for housing allotments were clearly meant to reinforce Malvern's image as a middle class enclave.

The Coonil Estate was almost fully developed within 10 years of the original 1910 subdivision.[10] New houses in the estate were generally good quality freestanding brick villas, some designed by important architects of the day. These include the relatively early c1911 bungalow at 4 Coonil Crescent by Arthur Peck and the large villa at 12 Coonil Crescent which was designed by Augustus A Fritsch, architect to the Catholic Church.[11]

In 1919, Frederick Hagelthorn's defeat in politics combined with his dwindling finances, prompted the sale of his Coonil Crescent home. Prior to the proposed auction in November 1919, Hagelthorn accepted an offer to purchase the property by the Mercy Order. A number of allotments facing Coonil Crescent had been subdivided and these were re-sold by the Order. The remaining grounds covered more than two acres and the house, intended for conversion to a private hospital by the Mercy sisters. The mansion became St Benedict's Hospital, the forerunner of Cabrini hospital.[12]

[1] G. Whitehead, Laceworks Landscape Collaborative, *Malvern A physical history. Malvern urban character study*, 1989

[2] Context Pty Ltd, *Stonnington Thematic Environmental History*, pp.125-7.

[3] Stonnington Local History Catalogue. Reg no.10462.

[4] Sands and McDougall Directories.

[5] S. Stefanopoulos, *Walk Into History 4: Six more Great Walks in Stonnington*. p. 24.

[6] MMBW Detail plan no.1475. State Library of Victoria Map Collection.

[7] Stonnington Local History Catalogue. Reg no.10462.

[8] Stonnington Local History Catalogue. Reg no.10462.

[9] Context Pty Ltd, *Stonnington Thematic Environmental History*, p. 128.

[10] Sands and McDougall Directories.

[11] MMBW Plan of Drainage, 76050 & 77042. PROV VPRS 11570.

## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

---

[12] Stonnington Local History Catalogue. Reg no.10462.

### Relevant Historical Australian Themes

The following themes are drawn from the *Stonnington Thematic Environmental History* (Context Pty Ltd, 2006, Addendum March 2009).

3.3.3 Speculators and land boomers - subdivision from 1880 onwards.

3.3.5 Recovery and infill 1900-1940.

8.1.3 The end of an era - mansion estate subdivisions in the twentieth century.

8.2.2 'Country in the city' - suburban development in Malvern before 1920.

## Description

### Physical Description 1

The precinct is a residential area located to the east of the Cabrini Hospital, between Stanhope Street and Wattleree Road. It can be divided into two distinct areas corresponding to the two main periods of development in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century. The northern third of the precinct, comprising Stanhope and Parkside streets and part of Grace Street, is largely a product of the 1880s land boom and is predominately characterised by Victorian housing stock. This generally takes the form of detached villas with hipped slate or corrugated iron roofs and asymmetrical double-fronted facades trimmed with cast iron. A number have fine polychrome brick walls.

The larger and more elaborate Victorian villas in the precinct are typically found on Stanhope Street. They include James Wright's flamboyant late boom period houses at 92, 88 and 86 Stanhope Street and 'Hadleigh', the double storey 1889 villa at 76 Stanhope Street. A largely intact row of somewhat more modest brick villas survives on the southern side of Parkside Street. There are also a smaller number of modest timber cottages in the precinct that demonstrate the mixed character typical of land subdivided during the boom of the 1880s. Examples of Edwardian and interwar dwellings can also be found interspersed amongst the earlier Victorian building stock.

The southern two thirds of precinct - comprising Coonil Crescent, Canberra grove, Derril Avenue, Thanet Street and part of Grace Street - was almost entirely developed with middle class villas in the decade following the 1910 subdivision of the Coonil estate. Consequently, much of the housing stock in this part of the precinct is built in an architectural expression known popularly as the Queen Anne revival. The villas designed in this idiom are characterised by red-brick construction, terracotta tiled roofs, half-timbered gable ends, timber fretted verandahs supported on turned timber posts, casement windows and redbrick chimneys with terracotta pots. The villa at 6 Coonil Crescent is one of the largest dwellings in the estate and is of particular note for its copper domed entry porch. A few houses in the precinct, such 4 and 8 Coonil Crescent, display late-Edwardian or bungalow stylistic elements and are characterised by broad, less steeply pitched gable roofs and simpler massing. As a result of the original 1910 building restrictions which prohibited timber construction and set a minimum house value, the Edwardian dwellings in the Coonil Estate are uniformly of brick construction and display a consistent scale and architectural character.

The precinct also contains a smaller number of interwar dwellings. These were constructed after the key Edwardian and Victorian periods of development but nevertheless exhibit a scale, form and architectural character compatible with the

## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

---

earlier building stock. Examples include the neo-Georgian villa at 8 Derril Avenue and the bungalow at 94 Stanhope Street.

There are some modern carport and garages additions in the precinct as well as high solid fences, although these have not overwritten the early streetscape character. Modern additions are typically located at the rear of properties where they have minimal impact on the early character. Some first floor additions are visible from the streetscape but have typically been designed as attic storey additions sympathetic to their original roofscape.

### Comparative Analysis

The Claremont Avenue Heritage Overlay (HO156) is located nearby the Coonil Estate and followed a similar pattern of Victorian and Edwardian development. The Edwardian component of the Coonil Estate displays much a higher degree of uniformity in terms of its architectural character and red-brick construction - due in large part to the 1910 building regulations. The curvilinear layout of Coonil Crescent and Grace Street also gives the precinct a character distinct from other early housing estates in Malvern which were typically laid out with streets on a grid pattern.

### Statement of Significance

#### *What is significant?*

The Coonil Estate Precinct is a residential area developed in stages during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Victorian-era houses in the precinct are predominantly detached brick villas dating from the 1880s coexisting with a smaller number of more modest timber cottages. Most of the Edwardian houses in the precinct were developed through the subdivision of the Coonil Mansion Estate as part of a wave of suburban development that occurred in the Malvern area through the early twentieth century.

Elements which contribute to the significance of the precinct include (but are not limited to):

- the Victorian-era houses including the predominantly detached brick villas dating from the 1880s coexisting with a smaller number of modest timber cottages;
- the Edwardian houses and streetscapes developed through the early twentieth century and including fine examples of the 'Queen Anne' revival style and relatively early examples of the bungalow idiom;
- a selection of dwellings from the 1920s and 1930s which are generally sympathetic in terms of their architectural form, scale, and siting, and as such make useful contributions to the early character of the area;
- the predominantly single-storey nature of the precinct. The two-storey scale of the villa, Hadleigh, provides an atypical, but historically important, variation from the scale of the precinct more generally;
- the detached form of the early dwellings with substantial and generally uniform (within each streetscape) front setbacks and side setbacks;
- generous allotments providing landscaped settings for dwellings. A group of modest Victorian cottages in Park Street and semi-detached dwellings in Grace Street form notable but valued variations to the more typical arrangement;
- intactness of built form across all of the periods. Dwellings survive largely unaltered and the area is notable for the absence of prominent additions and alterations. Visible upper level additions to Edwardian buildings are uncommon but typically adopt a discrete dormer form;
- hipped or gabled roofscapes with chimneys and terracotta or slate tiles or plain corrugated galvanised steel cladding;
- the extent to which original detailing survives. Nineteenth century buildings typically retain verandahs, polychrome brickwork and ornamental detailing. Edwardian buildings are generally of note for their ornate timber detailing but in Coonil Crescent, Canberra Grove and Thanet Streets this expression is particularly well-preserved;
- low incidence of modern interventions such as parking provisions in front setbacks (particularly in areas such as Park

## HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

---

- Street where few crossovers exist at all); and,
- the retention of sympathetic low front fences in some sections of the precinct (most notably in sections of Grace Street);
  - street layout and subdivision patterns, in particular, the picturesque curvilinear street layouts of Coonil Crescent and Grace Street;
  - mature street trees; and,
  - bluestone kerbs, channels and laneways (to the extent that they survive).

### *How is it significant?*

The Coonil Estate Precinct is of local historical and aesthetic significance.

### *Why is it significant?*

Historically, the Coonil Estate Precinct is significant for its capacity to demonstrate important phases of the middle-class suburban development that shaped Malvern during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The earliest parts of the precinct are a product of the 1880s land boom which saw the rapid expansion of suburban Malvern in response to the construction of the railway (*Historic theme: 3.3.3 Speculation and land boomers- subdivision from 1880 onwards*). The area contains important individual examples of boom period design alongside intact areas of more typical ornamented villas and cottages. The dwellings, typically in landscaped settings on generous allotments illustrate the desire for *rus in urbe* - city in the country - and life away from the crowded conditions of the inner city (*Historic Theme: 8.2.2 'Country in the city' - suburban development in Malvern before 1920*). The consolidation of suburban Malvern, assisted by the development of the tramways network through the early years of the twentieth century, is evident as a second wave of development centred on Coonil Crescent. New houses in the Coonil Estate were typically built to a series of strict regulations that prohibited timber construction and set minimum construction costs. As a result, the substantial, but polite, built form underscores the middle class aspirations of Edwardian Malvern. The development of the precinct in two distinct eras, with no built form to illustrate the transition between the two, highlights the impact of the recession of the 1890s on the development of Malvern (*Historic Theme: 3.3.5 Recovery and infill 1900-1940*). The meandering layout of Coonil Crescent formed to accommodate the retention of the Coonil mansion is a modest reminder of the earliest patterns of subdivision and of the large Victorian properties which were sold off and subdivided to allow modern Malvern to come into being (*Historic Theme: 8.1.3 The end of an era - mansion estate subdivisions in the twentieth century*).

The Coonil Estate Precinct is aesthetically significant as a substantially intact collection of streetscapes and more substantial housing from the Victorian and Edwardian eras. The Victorian streetscapes in the precinct include fine Victorian Italianate villas on Stanhope Street and a largely intact row of brick villas on the south side of Parkside Street. The Edwardian streetscapes constructed as part of the 1910 Coonil Estate subdivision are of particular note for the consistency and quality of the housing stock. They include fine examples of the 'Queen Anne' revival style and relatively early examples of the bungalow idiom both of a type found elsewhere. However, a small number of more substantial attic storey and other less generic or architect-designed villas provide a point of difference from these other areas. Although not central to the significance of the precinct, housing stock from the 1920s and 1930s is generally sympathetic in terms of its architectural form, scale, and siting, and as such makes a valuable contribution to the early character of the area. The aesthetic significance of the Coonil Estate is enhanced by mature street trees and the picturesque curvilinear street layout of Coonil Crescent and Grace Street.

### **Assessment Against Criteria**

Assessment of the precinct was undertaken in accordance with the processes and criteria outlined in the Australian ICOMOS (Burra) Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance.

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

---

**Recommendations 2007**

<b>External Paint Controls</b>	No
<b>Internal Alteration Controls</b>	No
<b>Tree Controls</b>	No
<b>Fences &amp; Outbuildings</b>	-
<b>Prohibited Uses May Be Permitted</b>	-
<b>Incorporated Plan</b>	-
<b>Aboriginal Heritage Place</b>	No

**Other Recommendations**

No information held

This information is provided for guidance only and does not supersede official documents, particularly the planning scheme. Planning controls should be verified by checking the relevant municipal planning scheme.

## Coonil Estate Precinct

### Schedule of Buildings

The following schedule is to be read in conjunction with the Heritage Citation Report for the Coonil Estate Precinct. Definitions of the gradings are explained in the Stonnington Heritage Guidelines. Building gradings reflect the intactness of the built form on the site and its streetscape context. Buildings have been graded according to their relationship to the identified significance of the precinct and the ability of the built form to demonstrate key historic themes in the development of the area. It should be noted that a property may have characteristics other than built form (such as subdivision pattern, orientation, location) that also contribute to the historic themes and the significance of the precinct as a whole.

#### CANBERRA GROVE

Street No.	Grading	
North side		
1A	U	c1980 double-storey house
1	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
<i>Grace St</i>		
3	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
5	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
7	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
South Side		
2	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
4	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
6	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
8	Ungraded	Single-storey c1950 brick villa

#### COONIL CRESCENT

Street No.	Grading	
East side		
4	C	Attic-storey Edwardian bungalow
<i>Derril Ave</i>		
6	B	Edwardian single-storey brick villa (attic-storey addition)
6A	Ungraded	Single-storey c2000 house
8	C	Late-Edwardian attic storey bungalow
10	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
<i>Canberra Grove</i>		
12	B	Edwardian single-storey brick villa (attic-storey addition)
14	Ungraded	Malvern Bowls Club – single-storey Moderne style clubhouse
16	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
18	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
20	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa

#### DERRIL AVENUE

Street No.	Grading	
North Side		
1	Ungraded	Single-storey c1960 brick villa
3	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
5	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
South side		
2	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
4	Ungraded	Double-storey c1953 neo-Georgian brick villa
6	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
8	C	Double-storey c1940 Georgian revival brick villa

**GRACE STREET****Street No. Grading****West Side**

1	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
3	Ungraded	Modern single-storey house
5	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
7	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
9/11	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick semi-detached pair
13	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
15	B	Single-storey late-Edwardian villa
17	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
19	Ungraded	Modern double-storey house
21	C	Edwardian single-storey timber cottage

**East side**

2	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
4	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
6	B	Attic-storey Edwardian brick villa
8	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
10/12	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick semi-detached pair
14	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
16/18	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick semi-detached pair
20/22	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick semi-detached pair
24	B	Single-storey Victorian bichrome brick villa
26	Ungraded	c2007 timber cottage
28	B	Single-storey Victorian timber cottage
30	B	Single-storey Edwardian timber cottage
32	Ungraded	Single-storey c1990 house
34	B	Single-storey Victorian timber villa

**PARKSIDE STREET****Street No. Grading****South side**

2	B	Single-storey Victorian rendered masonry villa
4	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
6	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
8	C	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
10	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
12	B	Single-storey Victorian polychrome brick villa
14	B	Single-storey Victorian polychrome brick villa
16	B	Single-storey Victorian polychrome brick villa
18	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa

**North side**

1	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
3	C	Single-storey interwar Mediterranean style villa
5	C	Single-storey Edwardian dwelling
7	C	Single-storey Edwardian dwelling
9	C	Single-storey Victorian cottage
11	C	Single-storey Victorian cottage
13	C	Single-storey Victorian cottage

**OXFORD STREET****Street No. Grading****East side**

2	Ungraded	Substantially rebuilt/remodelled interwar villa.
4	C	Single-storey interwar villa
6	C	Single-storey interwar bungalow
8	Ungraded	Double-storey c2000 house

**STANHOPE STREET**

Street No.	Grading	
North side		
73	B	Single-storey Edwardian red-brick semi-detached pair (Includes 11 Harvey Street)
75	B	Single-storey Victorian timber villa
77	C	Single-storey interwar villa
79	Ungraded	Block of c1940 flats
81	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
83	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
85	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
87	B	Single-storey Victorian bichrome brick villa
89	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
91	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa

**STANHOPE STREET (cont.)**

Street No.	Grading	
South side		
76	B	'Hadleigh' - substantial double storey 1889 brick villa
76A	Ungraded	Late twentieth century double-storey flats
80	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
84-82	B	Single-storey Edwardian red-brick semi-detached pair
86	Existing HO	Single-storey Victorian brick villa (HO281)
88	Existing HO	Single-storey Victorian brick villa (HO282)
90	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
92	Existing HO	Single-storey Victorian brick villa (HO283)
94	C	Single-storey interwar bungalow
96	B	Single-storey Victorian brick villa
98	C	Altered single-storey Victorian brick villa
100	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa

**THANET STREET**

Street No.	Grading	
West side		
16	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
18	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
20	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
22	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
24	Ungraded	c2000 Edwardian style double-storey villa
26	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
28	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
<i>Canberra Grove</i>		
30	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
32	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
34	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
36	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
38	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa
<i>Derril Avenue</i>		
40	B	Single-storey Edwardian brick villa