



Landmark Heritage Pty Ltd

PO Box 507

Flemington, VIC 3031

[Natica@landmarkheritage.com.au](mailto:Natica@landmarkheritage.com.au)

# **Moonee Valley City Council**

## **Heritage Gap Study – Review of Additional Properties**

**22 October 2019**

---

## Heritage Gap Study – Review of Additional Properties

### 1. Background

Landmark Heritage Pty Ltd was asked to review a shortlist of potential heritage places identified in the 'Moonee Valley 2017 Heritage Study' (by Context, final version dated Feb. 2019; referred to hereafter as the 2017 Heritage Study) and by a community member. It appeared that these places had not been addressed by the 'Moonee Valley Gap Study, Stage 1' (Context PL, final version dated Oct. 2014; referred to hereafter as the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study). The places investigated can be grouped as follows:

- 33 places identified in the 2017 Heritage Study as being of potential local significance, either as individual places or in groups as a precinct or extension to an existing Heritage Overlay precinct.
- 38 properties (in groups or individually) which had been identified in the field notes of the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, but which were not listed in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report for further investigation and assessment.
- A potential precinct extension, or independent precinct, grouped around three properties recommended for individual assessment in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report.

This list of potential heritage places, particularly those that had been apparently overlooked by the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, raised questions about the thoroughness of this study and its reliability in identifying all places and precincts with a prima facie case for local heritage significance.

### 2. Methodology

In order to carry out a review of these places, the following tasks were carried out:

- Inception meeting with Manager Strategic Planning Jessie Keating, and Coordinator Strategic Planning Christina Collia.
- Desktop review of previous work, including the field notes and field maps from the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, the final report and HERMES database records from this study, as well as the 2017 Heritage Study reports. The author of this report also relied on their experience as the project lead for the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, and their awareness of how work was carried out and shared amongst the Context team.
- Limited historical research using historic aerial photos, MMBW plans, and street directories.
- Examination of photos taken by Council Officers of the places in question, and select site visits where information additional to the photos was required.
- Preparation of a brief discussion of each property (or group, as appropriate) in regard to why it was not identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report. Comment was also made on places that had been identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study field notes, but not in the final report.
- Consideration of the findings of this investigation as to the comprehensiveness of the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study and recommendations for future work in light of these findings.

### 3. Findings

The detailed findings in regard to the all the properties are set out in a table in Appendix A. They are summarised in this section.

Overall, there were:

- One individual place and two groups of properties (37 properties in the groups), which were recorded in the 2014 field notes but not in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report recommendations.
- Nine individual places and four groups of places (24 properties in the groups) comprising a potential precinct or precinct extension. In addition is the potential precinct extension located around three individual places identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study (16 properties in all).

The following results were found:

- Not previously identified by the 2014 Gap Study or the 2017 Heritage Study but *not* recommended for future assessment by this review:
  - Seven individual places and three groups (12 properties in the groups)  
The large majority of these properties were community nominations (six individual places, and the two groups). (Places nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 in Appendix.)
- Noted during the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study fieldwork for future investigation, but not documented in that report:
  - Two individual places and two groups (45 properties in the groups).  
These potential precincts were recorded in field notes and/or photographs, and should have been included in the final list of places to be assessed. Due mostly to clerical errors (i.e., failure to enter all field notes into spreadsheets) these precincts were not recommended for future assessment. In the case of two individual places, street numbering had been recorded incorrectly as well. (Places nos. 1, 5, 6, 12 in Appendix.)  
For one of these two groups (place no. 1), the error had been recognised previously and the group (of 37 properties) was listed in the 'Moonee Valley Heritage Study 2015' (Context PL, final report 11 Jan 2017) as one of a number of 'New potential heritage places'.
- Missed by the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, including the fieldwork:
  - One individual place and two precinct extensions. These are discussed individually, below. (Places nos. 2, 15, 17 in Appendix.)

#### ***Missed by the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study fieldwork:***

- **10 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale**  
This is a substantial Old English style house of the 1930s. It has been hidden by heavy plantings until recently (the front garden has been cleared since Dec. 2017; see Google Streetview image, over). The lack of clear views to the house is the likely reason it was not identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study. The house compares very well against the other interwar houses recommended for the Heritage Overlay by the 2017 Heritage Study.



*Figure 1. View of 10 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale, in April 2015. Note that this Google Streetview image was taken from an elevated viewpoint, so shows more of the house than would have been visible from the footpath or from across the road in 2013.*

- **HO315 Interwar Duplexes Precinct extension: 1-7 Pattison Street, Moonee Ponds**

This group of interwar semi-detached houses is clearly part of the same 1930s development by the Shaw Brothers builders as HO315 around the corner at 61-79 Ormond Road. They are also of a comparable intactness, and would clearly contribute to HO315.

During the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study there were two assessors for this part of Moonee Ponds; the first surveyed Ormond Road, and the second surveyed Pattison Street northward to Dean Street. For this reason, the relationship between HO315 on Ormond Road and 1-7 Pattison Street may not have been obvious.

- **HO7 Riverview Estate & Trinafour Estate Precinct extension: 1-19 & 4-14 Victoria Street, Moonee Ponds**

The 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study identified Victorian houses at 5, 9 and 11 Victoria Street as of potential architectural significance. These three houses were assessed in the 2017 Heritage Study, and it was found that 5 Victoria Street was of individual significance, only. In contrast, the 2017 Heritage Study recommended that 9 and 11 Victoria Street be assessed as part of an extension to precinct HO7 (note that this precinct was extended by the 2017 Heritage Study, and the precinct citation revised).

The strongest character of Victoria Street is Victorian, with smaller numbers of Edwardian and interwar dwellings. While it does not form a precinct of local significance on its own, it does adjoin precinct HO7 (in its enlarged form as recommended by the 2017 Heritage Study).

While there are some overlaps between the character of Victoria Street and the extended HO7, the housing stock of HO7 is *generally* later than that of Victoria Street, so this was not considered an obvious extension during the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study field survey. Saying that, there is clearly a high number of high-quality Victorian houses, plus one fine interwar house and two fine Edwardian houses, so it would be worth assessing whether this street could contribute to HO7. As the current (and 2017 revised) citation does not mention Victorian housing stock apart from mansions, this will require a full review of the HO7 precinct to redefine what contributes to it.

Considering the reasons for the failure to pick up these places, what is the likelihood that there are more such gaps, and what might be the magnitude of such gaps?

There will always be a small number of buildings that are too concealed from public view for their architectural quality to be understood in a field survey. In some cases, they are identified by initial desktop identification of places or by community nomination (a classic question from heritage consultants in community consultation is: 'Tell us the places of significance that we cannot see or which do not look important unless you know their history.'). It is likely that a small number of such "concealed" places of local heritage significance still exist in Moonee Valley. They may be nominated by community members in the future.

There is also a possibility that there are more potential HO precinct extensions that were not identified as they are located at the junction between the areas surveyed by the two Context consultants who carried out the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study field survey. It is considered unlikely that any *whole* potential precincts have been overlooked for this reason, as heritage consultants tend to "follow" a potential precinct until they have reached its tentative boundaries, even if this boundary goes beyond one's prescribed survey area. And, of course, places of potential individual significance would not have been missed for this reason, as every street was surveyed. Note that there can be some differences between surveyors in which places they identify as potentially significant. This may be due to a surveyor's speciality (e.g., nineteenth century vs. post-war architecture), and on their interpretation of the threshold of local significance.\*

As part of the investigation for this review, all of the streets that formed a boundary between the areas of the two Context surveyors were checked to see if there were any existing HO precincts adjacent (i.e. where potential precinct extensions could have been missed). Two such boundaries were around discrete parts of Moonee Ponds: 1) bound by Ormond Road, Dean Street, and McNae Street /Mt Alexander Road, and 2) bound by Salisbury Street and Pascoe Vale/Fitzgerald Road. There was also an east-west boundary along Woodland Street and Salmon Avenue, then Keilor Road (to Cooper Street). And a north-south boundary along Cooper Street, then east on Buckley Street, then south on Waverley Road to Holmes Road.

---

\* While the Victorian Planning Provisions Practice Note 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (2018), defines local significance as 'those places that are important to a particular community or locality', an increasing number of planning panel decisions have been more conservative in their definition. Their decisions have indicated that places of architectural or aesthetic significance and rarity value, at minimum, should compare well throughout the *entire* municipality, and not just the locality/suburb. See, for example, the panel report for Moonee Valley Amendment C164, pages 20-21.



Amongst these boundaries, at the time of the survey in 2013 there were several existing HO precincts on or adjacent to the boundary streets. These were HO5 Vida and Knight Streets Precinct, Aberfeldie, near Buckley Street; HO11 Tennyson Street Precinct, Moonee Ponds, near Salisbury Street; HO17 Dickens Street Precinct, Moonee Ponds, near Mt Alexander Road; and HO316 Steele Street Precinct, Moonee Ponds, near McNae Street.

The streetscapes around these precincts were checked – using Google Streetview – to see if there were properties adjacent of the same type as protected in the precinct. In two cases there are similar houses adjacent to an existing precinct. These are:

- A row of three single-fronted Edwardian houses at 26-30 Salisbury Street, which is around the corner from HO11 Tennyson Street Precinct, 19-31 Tennyson Street. The existing HO11 precinct is aesthetically significant as 'a cohesive and visually harmonious group of Victorian and Edwardian houses'. The majority of houses in the precinct are double-fronted timber dwellings, along with two single-fronted Victorian dwellings. While the three houses on Salisbury Street could potentially contribute to the HO11 precinct, there is not a compelling case to assess them as a precinct extension. This is because they are a different type of dwelling to those in the precinct (single-fronted houses with steeply pitched front gables, in comparison to the asymmetrically massed double-fronted Edwardian houses with Italianate massing in HO11).
- A timber Victorian house at 18 McNae Street, which closes the vista at the west end of the Steele Street Precinct (HO316). In this precinct Victorian and Edwardian houses are contributory, so 18 McNae Street could potentially contribute to the HO316 precinct. As the only such house on this part of McNae Street (others are interwar and post-war), again there is not a compelling case for this precinct extension.

In conclusion, this investigation indicates that there are unlikely to be extensive gaps in the identification of potentially significant individual places, precincts and precinct extensions. The most likely type of gaps are places that are largely hidden from view, or those that have historical significance not obvious in field survey. There are, however, some steps that Moonee Valley Council can take to further narrow these gaps, as set out in Section 4.

#### **4. Recommendations**

The following steps should be taken to ensure that as many as possible places of local significance are identified:

##### **1) Prepare a list of all potential heritage places identified since 2013.**

Review all heritage studies and related reports prepared for Council after and including the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study. Many heritage studies, including the 2014 study and following 'Moonee Valley Heritage Study 2015', include lists of potential heritage places. Not all of these places were included in the scope of the 2017 Heritage Study. There may be further recommendations in other heritage studies prepared in the last five or so years.

Note that the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study began with a very comprehensive desktop identification of places, and all of these places were specifically visited during the fieldwork. Heritage studies prepared up to 2012/13 were encompassed in this review, and do not have to be checked again. They are listed in Appendix A of the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report.

Those places recommended for assessment in this report should be included, as well, noting that there are overlaps with other sources, particularly the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study and the 2017 Heritage Study. These places and groups are:

- Roxburgh Estate Precinct, Ascot Vale
- 10 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale
- 22 Braemar Street, Essendon
- HO316 Steele Street Precinct extension, 24-38 Addison Street, Moonee Ponds (along with 35-48 Addison Street)
- HO315 Interwar Duplexes Precinct extension, 1-7 Pattison Street, Moonee Ponds
- HO7 Riverview Estate and Trinacour Estate Precinct extension, 1-19 & 4-14 Victoria Street, Moonee Ponds

## **2) Check the accuracy of the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study documentation.**

Council has already entered data from the notes taken during the field survey into a spreadsheet. All cases where these properties have *not* been listed in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report should be checked to see if they are of potential significance.

The field notes of the second surveyor, who surveyed parts of Moonee Ponds, and all of Aberfeldie, Airport West, Avondale Heights, Essendon North, Keilor East, Niddrie, and Strathmore, have not survived in Context's records. All photos taken by both surveyors, however, are likely to have survived, and they can serve as a stand-in for field notes. Again, it will be important to apply judgement when considering any photographed places that have not made it into the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study report, as there was culling of places following fieldwork, so in some cases their exclusion from future recommendations was purposeful.

## **3) Continue to accept and record community nominations.**

This includes the recent community nominations of post-war places.

Once a list of further places and precincts to be assessed is compiled in accordance with the steps above, Council should be confident that heritage identification has been very thorough across the entire municipality.

As discussed above, it is still likely that small numbers of potential heritage places will continued to be identified. This might be due to a perceived threat that causes knowledgeable community members to nominate a place that is not otherwise readily identifiable (e.g. not visible, or significant due for historical reasons). It might be due to changes at the potential heritage place (e.g. heavy vegetation removed, or aluminium siding removed revealing original details). It might be due to changing appreciation of a certain type of building as time passes. This can be both an increased appreciation of later eras as well as greater appreciation for a "common" type of house that is becoming rarer with attrition. There are also always differences between heritage consultants. They all tend to agree on the heritage values of most buildings, but due to their specialities they may identify different additional places.

For all of these reasons, it is considered good practice to regularly carry out gap studies to deal with newly identified places, as well as to investigate typological gaps that have been identified. While it

will depend on the built environment of the given municipality, as well as on the breadth of previous heritage work that has been carried out, it is generally appropriate to carry out a gap study every five or 10 years.

Kind regards,

Natica Schmeder

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Natica Schmeder', written in a cursive style.

Landmark Heritage Pty Ltd



## Appendix A – Detailed Findings

The following table sets out information about places and groups of properties (potential precincts or precinct extensions) that were identified as additional places and precinct by the 'Moonee Valley 2017 Heritage Study' and in recent community nominations. If they were not documented in the 'Moonee Valley Gap Study, Stage 1' report of 2014, the reasons for this are investigated, and any further work required is recommended.

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
1.	Roxburgh Estate Precinct	1-7 & 2-8 Brunton Street, 1-9 & 2-8 Kelvin Street, 2-16 Rothwell Street, 2-22 Roxburgh Street, 11A-27 St Leonards Road, Ascot Vale	2017 Heritage Study	This is a very high quality interwar era precinct. It was identified during the desktop preparation for the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Survey (identified in the 2012 Planisphere 'Neighbourhood Character Study'). Its significance was confirmed in the 2014 fieldwork, but the data was not entered in error. This error was first brought to light during consultation during implementation of the 'Moonee Valley Heritage Study 2015' (Context PL, final report 11 Jan 2017). It is included in that report as one of a number of 'New potential heritage places' (section 3.4), with a brief history provided.	Documentation error	<u>Assess</u> precinct
2.	Italianate house	10 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale	Community member	10 Ormond Road is a substantial Old English style house of the 1930s. It has been hidden by heavy plantings until recently (the front garden has been cleared since Dec. 2017). The lack of clear views to the house is a likely reason it was not identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study. The house compares very well against the other interwar houses recommended for the Heritage Overlay by the 2017 Heritage Study. This house warrants assessment as well.	Hidden	<u>Assess</u>

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
3.	Federation house	14 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale	Community member	14 Ormond Road is a Federation brick villa, constructed after 1905. It is substantial in size and made more prominent by its high-set situation. The garden retains two mature palm trees. In the Ascot Vale context, it is notable for its large size, though there are others like this in Moonee Ponds and Essendon and compared to them it has very simple ornament. More importantly, there is large dormer extension to the east side of the roof, set just one room back from the front facade. As a house that is a representative example of its type, and not distinguished by superior detailing or massing, this alteration puts it below the threshold of local significance.	Below threshold	No action
4.	Interwar house	16 Ormond Road, Ascot Vale	Community member	16 Ormond Road is a typical timber Italianate dwelling, built sometime after 1905 (as it is not shown on MMBW Detail Plan 1097). It is intact as viewed from the street, apart from the loss of its verandah frieze. While distinguished by its elevated situation, architecturally this would not meet the threshold of local significance.	Below threshold	No action

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
5.	Federation house	22 Braemar Street, Essendon	2017 Heritage Study	It appears that this house was noted in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study fieldwork, but not recorded in error. In addition, it is clear that the address was noted incorrectly during field survey. In the field notes is the following: '32-36 Braemar - large Edwardian villas (also 20 & 24)'. As No. 20 has been a modern house since at least 2007 (Google Streetview) and the Edwardian house at No. 22 has had a large upper storey addition, Nos. 22 and 26 were meant to be recorded for future assessment. (Note that No. 26 is quite altered, as discussed below). 22 Braemar Street is still a high quality Federation villa, worthy of assessment.	Documentation error	<u>Assess</u>

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
6.	Edwardian house	26 Braemar Street, Essendon	2017 Heritage Study	This is a timber Arts & Crafts bungalow. As noted above, it appears that this house was noted in the 2014 Stage Gap Survey, but with the wrong address. However, as indicated by 2009 Google Streetview images, it has undergone extensive external works since that time. In part this may have been reinstatement of original details (if the roughcast-rendered walls were covered by aluminium siding), but the original fretwork has been replaced by a far more standard Edwardian design, the single posts replaced with paired, and new casement windows and highlights installed in the bay windows. The rendered front fence, while very appropriate to a c1915 house like this, has also been built since 2009. Overall it is not intact enough to be of local significance.	Documentation error (below threshold)	No action

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
7.	Post-war house	19 Brewster Street, Essendon	2017 Heritage Study	This house was not identified as potentially of local significance in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Survey. The 2017 Heritage Study has recommended it as a Contributory place in an extension to HO3 Peterleigh Grove and Kalimna Street Precinct. However, the statement of significance for this precinct clearly identifies that period of significance as Victorian through interwar (c1880 to c1945), and this house was built in c1950-55. While intact, it would be hard to argue that it contributes to HO3 as currently defined. If desired, the valued period which contributes to the significance of the HO3 precinct could be review. This may lead to the inclusion of post-war houses as contributory.	Below threshold	No action

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
8.	Federation house	29 Lincoln Road, Essendon	Community member	This is an attractive timber Queen Anne house which appears to be externally intact (apart from a rear extension). There are many houses of this type in Moonee Valley, and for this reason they are generally Contributory graded in a precinct. This same approach has been used in the new precinct proposed in the 2017 Heritage Study, where similar timber villas are graded Contributory (see 174-182 Ascot Vale Road in the Queens Avenue and Burton Crescent Precinct). But as there is no potential precinct surrounding it, it does not warrant further assessment.	Below threshold	No action
9.	Interwar house	31 Lincoln Road, Essendon	Community member	This is a modest, though unusual example of a Mediterranean Revival house. It is distinguished by its arcaded front porch and the ledged timber shutters to the front windows. While it is unusual amongst modest interwar houses in Moonee Valley, it is not a particularly well-designed house, so unlikely to be of local significance. It could be Contributory to an interwar precinct. However, as there is no potential precinct surrounding it, it does not warrant further assessment.	Below threshold	No action



No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
10.	Interwar house	41 Lincoln Road, Essendon	Community member	This is a typical timber California Bungalow of the 1920s it is somewhat more substantial than 43 Lincoln Road, with dwarf columns to the porch and a bow window. There is no indication, however, that it is of local significance, instead it would be an excellent Contributory property in an interwar precinct. However, as there is no potential precinct surrounding it, it does not warrant further assessment.	Below threshold	No action
11.	Interwar house	43 Lincoln Road, Essendon	Community member	This is a modest and typical timber California Bungalow of the 1920s which is externally intact. It could be Contributory in an HO precinct, but there is no indication that it is of local significance. However, as there is no potential precinct surrounding it, it does not warrant further assessment.	Below threshold	No action
12.	HO316 Steele Street Precinct extension	24-38 Addison Street, Moonee Ponds	2017 Heritage Study	During the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study, photos were taken of both sides of Addison Street, including Nos. 24-38. In apparent error, these numbers were not inputted in the spreadsheets and HERMES database. Together the two sides of this street have a very consistent Edwardian character.	Documentation error	<b><u>Assess</u></b>

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
13.	Victorian shops	856-858 Mt Alexander Road, Moonee Ponds	Community member	Historical research (street directories) indicates that this pair of semi-detached two-storey rendered brick building was built as shops. The 1905 MMBW plan shows that they still had a shared verandah covering the footpath, as was typical for 19th-century shops. Since that time, they have undergone a good deal of alteration. The verandah is gone, as are the shopfronts. Instead, new brick walls were cessed at ground floor level of create front porches (note that this change may have been early, as only residents are listed in 1905; No. 858 may retain an early residential front door and window). The detail of the parapets has also been lost. While they could be Contributory in a commercial precinct, this pair is not intact enough to be of local significance. But as there is no potential precinct surrounding them, they do not warrant further assessment.	Below threshold	No action

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
14.	Victorian shops	862-864 Mt Alexander Road, Moonee Ponds	Community member	Historical research (street directories) indicates that this pair of semi-detached two-storey rendered brick building was built as shops. Since that time, they have undergone a good deal of alteration. The shopfronts are gone and new brick walls were recessed at ground floor level of create front porches. The bichrome brick front walls have been rendered over. There is also evidence that front verandahs have been removed. The first floor retains attractive Italianate details to the windows and cornice, but they are too altered overall to be of local significance.	Below threshold	No action

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
15.	HO315 Interwar Duplexes Precinct extension	1-7 Pattison Street, Moonee Ponds	2017 Heritage Study	The group of interwar semi-detached houses at 1-7 Pattison Street were clearly part of the same 1930s development by Shaw Brothers builders as the adjacent HO315 Interwar Duplexes Precinct at 61-79 Ormond Road. They are also of a comparable intactness, and would clearly contribute to this precinct. During the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study there were two assessors for this part of Moonee Ponds; one surveyed Ormond Road, and the other surveyed Pattison Street northward to Dean Street. For this reason, the relationship between HO315 on Ormond Road and 1-7 Pattison Street may not have been obvious. (This same consultant did identified the second group of Shaw Brothers houses on Dean Street, which were assessed in the 2017 Heritage Study.)	At surveyor boundary	<u>Assess</u> extension

No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
16.	Terraces	1-15 Smith Street, Moonee Ponds	Community member	1-15 Smith Street comprises two small single-storey Victorian (c1880s) terraces that were remodelled c1940. The houses retain simple parapet and Italianate rendered chimneys, as well as some of the original narrow sash windows and four-panelled front doors. The remodelling was restricted to the removal of the original front verandahs and their replacement with parapeted masonry porches inscribed with house names. The terrace at Nos. 1-7 retains brick flashes, as the sole decorative detail apart from the names written on the porches. The group is interesting as an illustration of an attempt to make old houses appeal to residents in a new century. The design of the alterations is not, however, of particularly high design quality. As a comparison, see 57 Vanberg Road, Essendon (assessed in the 2017 Heritage Study). It is a large brick Victorian villa that was given a fine masonry porch and bay window in the 1920s. Both the original house and the later works are of high quality and are well integrated. In contrast, the Smith Street group is of much lower quality. They are considered to be of interest but not of local significance.	Below threshold	No action

17.	HO7 precinct extension	1-19 & 4-14 Victoria Street, Moonee Ponds	2017 Heritage Study	<p>The group of Victorian houses at 5 &amp; 9-11 Victoria Street was identified in the 2014 Stage 1 Gap Study. The 2017 Heritage Study recommended that the entire street be considered as an extension to precinct HO7. Houses in the precinct along the adjacent Park Street are more substantial and the majority date from the Edwardian/Federation and interwar eras. While Victoria Street has several very good examples of Edwardian (Nos. 4 &amp; 19) and interwar houses (No. 14), its dominant character is Victorian, with particularly good examples at Nos. 5 (in HO), 9, 10, 11, and 17. There is also a fair number of reproduction houses (one quarter). Due to this mix-era character and the number of non-contributory properties in this small group, Victoria Street does not form a precinct of local significance on its own. It does, however, adjoin precinct HO7 in its enlarged form recommended by the 2017 Heritage Study.</p> <p>While the current and revised HO7 citations mention only Victorian <i>mansions</i> as well as the predominant Edwardian and interwar houses in the precinct, there are more standard Victorian villas that are somewhat larger but otherwise similar to houses on Victoria Street (compare 68 Park Street in HO7 with 10 Victoria Street, both bichrome brick Italianate houses).</p>	Missed in part	<b><u>Assess</u></b>
-----	------------------------	---	---------------------	---	----------------	----------------------



No.	Place name	Address	Identified by	Comments	Why missed?	Recommendation
				While the Victorian character of HO7 would have to be articulated better in the precinct citation if this extension were added, there is already some overlap between the character of HO7 and this street. More importantly, there are many fine houses on Victoria Street worthy of protection.		