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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) has been prepared for Hengyi to accompany a planning permit application to Mornington Peninsula Shire for the proposed redevelopment of the former Mount Eliza Centre, 33 Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza (Figure 1). The proposal for the site includes the retention and adaptation of the three heritage buildings (Figure 2), and construction of a number of buildings associated with the proposed use of the site for a retirement community.

This HIS makes reference to the following documentation:

- Beachleigh Town Planning Supporting Document, prepared by VIA Architects, dated August 2020
- Architectural drawings prepared by VIA Architects, dated 28 August 2020 and numbered (all Revision B):
  - TP00-000
  - TP00-040 – TP00-43 (inclusive)
  - TP00-051 – TP00-052
  - TP00-100
  - TP10-000 – TP10-001
  - TP10-011 – TP10-021
  - TP10-041
  - TP10-101
  - TP10-111
  - TP10-141
  - TP10-200 – TP10-201
  - TP10-211
  - TP10-241
  - TP10-300 – TP10-301
  - TP10-311
  - TP10-341
  - TP10-400 – TP10-401
  - TP10-411
  - TP10-441
  - TP10-500 – TP10-501
  - TP10-511 – TP10-521
  - TP10-541
  - TP40-011 – TP40-012
  - TP40-021 – TP40-022
  - TP40-031 – TP40-041
  - TP40-051 – TP40-052
  - TP40-101 – TP40-106 (inclusive)
  - TP41-001
  - TP41-011 – TP41-015 (inclusive)
  - TP41-020 – TP41-021
  - TP80-001
  - TP80-011 – TP80-021
  - TP80-101
  - TP80-201 – TP80-202
  - TP80-301
  - TP90-001 – TP90-007 (inclusive)
- Beachleigh 3D Render Package
- Beachleigh Landscape Concept Report – Town Planning, prepared by Tract, dated 26 August 2020
Reference has also been made to the *Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan* (CMP), prepared by Peter Barrett in May 2016 and the *Heritage Citation, The Mount Eliza Centre, 33 Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza* prepared by GJM Heritage in May 2017.

**Figure 1** Location plan with the subject site indicated in blue  
Source: VicPlan

**Figure 2** Recent aerial image of the subject site (approximately indicated)  
Source: Nearmap, image date May 2020
2.0 STATUTORY HERITAGE CONTROLS

2.1 Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme

2.1.1 Heritage Overlay

The site at 33 Jacksons Road includes three buildings which are identified as the Mount Eliza Centre, included as HO399 in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay (HO) of the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme. The extent of HO399 does not apply to the site as a whole; the Schedule identifies the heritage place as the ‘Former administrative block (central portion), former treatment ward and former chapel and limited curtilage’ (Figure 3 and Figure 4). No external paint controls, internal alteration controls and tree controls apply.

Figure 3 HO map showing the extent of HO399 (subject site indicated in red)
Source: Morning Peninsula Planning Scheme

Figure 4 Aerial image of the subject site (identified in blue) with the extent of HO399 overlaid
Source: VicPlan
**Background to HO399**

At its meeting on 19 June 2017, the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council’s Planning Services Committee resolved to adopt an officer recommendation to seek authorisation from the Minister for Planning to commence planning scheme amendment C207. Amendment C207 sought to apply a HO to 33-33A Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza. The proposed amendment sought to apply the HO to the whole of the subject site and to include a policy reference document at Clause 22.04-5 of Council’s heritage policy, titled *Heritage Citation, The Mount Eliza Centre, 33 Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza* (GJM Heritage, May 2017). On 6 July 2017, Amendment C208 approved an interim HO to the whole of the site.

Subsequently, the Minister for Planning exercised his powers of intervention to approve Amendment C221 at the request of the Department of Health and Human Services to apply permanent heritage controls to the site. This amendment was subsequently gazetted on 28 June 2018. The gazetted amendment differed from the amendment that was adopted by Council, insofar as the gazetted amendment included the three buildings noted above, rather than the whole of the site. Additionally, the gazetted amendment did not include the proposed reference document *Heritage Citation, The Mount Eliza Centre, 33 Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza* (GJM Heritage, May 2017, noting that this assessment referenced the whole site).

**Statement of significance**

The statement of significance for the site included in the 2016 CMP states that the Mount Eliza Centre is of architectural, aesthetic, historical, scientific/research and social significance to the State of Victoria as follows:

The Mount Eliza Centre is of architectural significance to Victoria. Within the complex are buildings that are the early work of Stephenson & Meldrum/Stephenson & Turner, who became the leading architectural firm in the design of hospitals in Australia in the twentieth century. Built in 1929-30 as the Orthopaedic Branch of the Children’s Hospital, the early buildings of the Mount Eliza Centre are an example of a transitory hospital design bridging the more traditional hospital designs in the early twentieth century and the Functionalist design that emerged in the 1930s (Criteria C, D & H). Of contributory heritage value to this architectural significance is the Administrative Block, the former Ward D containing the swimming pool and sun balcony, and the Chapel/Mortuary.

The 1929-30 Orthopaedic Branch buildings of the Mount Eliza Centre are of aesthetic significance as an example of a restrained Mediterranean style applied to institutional buildings, and a style that responds well to its elevated siting overlooking Port Phillip Bay (Criterion E). In terms of aesthetic significance it is the Administrative Block, former Ward D containing the swimming pool and sun balcony, and the Chapel/Mortuary, which are of contributory value as fine examples of this style.

The Mount Eliza Centre is of historical significance as the largest campus of the (Royal) Children’s Hospital outside of the main Carlton and Parkville campuses. It is of historical significance for its ground-breaking work in Australia for the treatment of infantile paralysis. Later the hospital treated a broader range of paediatric conditions, and in more recent years the site served the community as an aged care facility (Criteria A, D & G). It is also of historical significance for its association with Victorian individuals and organisations that donated funds, or worked to provide better facilities, for this hospital and its patients (Criteria G & H).

The Mount Eliza Centre is of research potential in understanding the treatment of infantile paralysis in the early to mid-twentieth century in Victoria, particularly in its use of therapies including heliotherapy and hydrotherapy (Criteria B & C). Of contributory heritage value to this research potential is the former Ward D
containing the swimming pool and sun balcony that has interpretative value in these treatments.

The Mount Eliza Centre is of social significance as a medical facility that is known, used and valued by Victorians since 1930 (Criterion G).¹

The 2017 GJM statement of significance for the site differed from that included in the CMP insofar as it identified the site as being of local historical, architectural and aesthetic significance, and recommended that each of the twelve early buildings on the site be subject to a HO. As noted above, the 2016 CMP identified only three of the twelve early buildings as having heritage significance (it is these three early buildings that are subject to the existing HO399).

2.1.2 Additional overlays

The property is also subject to Schedule 4 to the Design and Development Overlay (DDO4), Environmental Design, and Schedule 1 to the Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO1), Township Vegetation.

3.0 HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION

3.1 Summary history

The subject site is located on the south side of Jacksons Road. It is irregular in shape with a frontage to Jacksons Road. The west boundary of the site abuts Port Phillip Bay foreshore reserve with residential development to the north, east and south. The site falls approximately 15m from east to west, toward Port Phillip Bay, and comprises an overall area of 3.4 hectares.

Originally the site of architect Thomas Watt’s 1878 holiday residence, Beachleigh (now demolished), the orthopaedic section of the Children’s Hospital was constructed on the subject site between 1929 and 1930 ‘in response to what was described as an ‘epidemic’ in infantile paralysis in the interwar years.’² Increased patient numbers and space limitations at the Children’s Hospital campus in Carlton, in addition to the perceived benefits of fresh air and sunshine, led to the establishment of a separate facility in Mount Eliza. The foundation stone was laid by the then Governor, Lord Somers, in March 1929.³ The hospital complex was designed by the prominent architectural firm of Stephenson and Meldrum (later Stephenson and Turner) and was reputedly the first completely new hospital complex that the firm had designed.⁴ The construction phase of the complex was fraught with financial difficulty, but a government grant enabled the completion of the hospital buildings.⁵ A donation of £250 was provided by Mr Roy A White for the laying out of the grounds at the hospital, and various working bees were held to assist.⁶ The hospital was finally opened in early March 1930, with the first transfer of 20 patients from the special ward at the convalescent home in Hampton.⁷ The children admitted to the Orthopaedic are described as suffering from ‘bone tuberculosis and infantile paralysis’, as well as

---

1 Peter Barrett, Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan, 2016, pp. 34-35.
3 The Argus, Friday 22 March 1929, p. 6.
5 The Argus, Friday 28 February 1930, p. 11.
6 The Argus, Saturday 29 June 1929, p. 24; The Argus, Friday 28 February 1930, p. 11.
7 The Argus, Friday 28 February 1930, p. 11.
poliomyelitis and osteomyelitis. The hospital originally provided accommodation for 100 patients, and the duration of their stay was typically one year.

The original design of the complex incorporated a group of one and two-storey brick and overpainted render buildings constructed in the Spanish Mission style with variously hipped and gable roof forms clad with terracotta tiles. The buildings were originally arranged around a large lawn area with a west orientation to Port Phillip Bay. The main administration building was located to the east of the site, with the interconnected ward buildings angled away from the central single-storey ward block to enable the greatest exposure to the bay (Figure 5).

By the 1940s and 1950s, following the increase in availability of anti-tuberculosis medication and vaccinations, there was a rapid decrease in the number of children suffering from these crippling diseases, and accordingly a reduction in the length of treatment at the hospital. From the mid-1940s children with other long-term medical conditions, such as respiratory, cardiac and abdominal conditions were admitted to the hospital. In 1969, the hospital was converted and adapted for use as a geriatric hospital, and renamed the Mount Eliza Centre. A number of additions had been constructed throughout the site during this time, including covered ways connecting the buildings and additions/alterations to the original buildings. The original mansion Beachleigh which occupied the site was demolished during the late twentieth century, as was the nurses’ accommodation block. Both of these buildings were located in the east of the site, which was subsequently subdivided and sold-off. Most recently, the complex was occupied by Peninsula Health for administrative purposes.

Figure 5 c. 1950s-60s image of the hospital site showing the full extent of the site
Source: State Library of Victoria Pictures Collection

8 The Argus, Friday 28 February 1930, p. 11.
9 The Argus, Friday 22 March 1929, p. 6.
10 Framed History of the Mount Eliza Centre Site, taken from Annual Reports for the Mount Eliza Geriatric Centre (1985); Royal Children’s Hospital (1969 and 1970), in the Boardroom of the Mount Eliza Centre, Lovell Chen 2013.
11 Framed History of the Mount Eliza Centre Site, taken from Annual Reports for the Mount Eliza Geriatric Centre (1985); Royal Children’s Hospital (1969 and 1970), in the Boardroom of the Mount Eliza Centre, Lovell Chen 2013.
The site was recently determined to be surplus to government operational requirements. Following a review of the heritage of the site, approval was granted for demolition of the majority of the complex. The three heritage-listed buildings - the former chapel, administration building and treatment ward - were retained (refer Figure 2).

3.2 Existing buildings

The former chapel is located adjacent to the northeast corner of the site and forms part of the 1929-30 complex of buildings (Figure 6). It is a single-storey rendered brick building with a loggia to its principal south façade (Figure 7), arched windows and an intersecting gable roof form clad in terracotta tiles. The building is generally externally intact to its original design, with a flat roofed addition which extends from the north (rear) elevation of the building.

Figure 6  c. 1930s image of the south and west elevations of the former chapel  
Source: State Library of Victoria Pictures Collection

Figure 7  Recent view to the south elevation of the former chapel
The former administration building is located centrally within the site and also forms part of the 1929-30 complex of buildings (Figure 8). The main central component is a two storey rendered brick building with a tiled roof and column supported entrance porch with balcony above on the principal east elevation (Figure 9). The building previously had a single-storey wing attached to each side – the southern wing was a later addition (Figure 10) – and each side wing was subsequently altered by way of a second floor addition. These adjoining wings have been demolished (Figure 11). The principal east and rear (west) elevations of the main two-storey building are generally intact externally, noting that prior to the second floor additions to each of the wings, the main administration building had a hipped tiled roof rather than a gable ended roof.

Figure 8  c. 1930s image of the principal east elevation of the former administration building
Source: State Library of Victoria Pictures Collection

Figure 9  Recent view to the principal east elevation of the former administration building following demolition of the adjoining wings
Figure 10  c. 1930s view to the rear elevation of the former administration building (indicated) prior to the addition of the southern adjoining wing; the close proximity of the buildings to the rear are visible in this image  
Source: State Library of Victoria Pictures Collection

Figure 11  Recent view to the rear west elevation of the former administration building following demolition of the adjoining wings
The former treatment ward is located adjacent to the midpoint of the western boundary of the subject site. This building is two storeys and comprises rendered brick walls with a gable ended tile roof along the length of the building and hipped roof form at the eastern end. A cantilever staircase and arched windows are located on the ground floor of the north elevation. Originally an open balcony (sun terrace) extended along the upper level of the north elevation (Figure 12 & Figure 13). The building has been altered through the enclosure of the terrace with a flat roof (Figure 14). The expanse of windows which previously enclosed this level, at the rear of the terrace (refer Figure 12) have also been removed (Figure 15). A two-storey building originally abutted the eastern end of this building (refer Figure 13). This building has since been demolished and in the process revealed the original detail of the east elevation of the treatment ward building (Figure 16).

Figure 12  c. 1930s image of the north elevation of the former treatment ward

Figure 13  c. 1930s image of the north and west elevations of the former treatment ward and adjoining buildings; the open form of the balcony/terrace is visible in this image

Source: State Library of Victoria Pictures Collection
Figure 14  Recent view to the north and west elevations of the former treatment ward showing the flat roof enclosure of the former balcony

Figure 15  Recent view from within the (now enclosed) balcony of the north elevation of the former treatment ward
4.0 PROPOSED WORKS

It is proposed to develop the site for a retirement community complex, comprising the adaptive reuse of the retained heritage buildings, construction of new buildings and landscaping works throughout the site. The proposed works to the retained heritage buildings and within the site generally are outlined below, noting that the HO applies only to these buildings and not to the broader site.

It is also noted that it is anticipated that a suite of external conservation works to the heritage buildings will be prepared on the basis of a permit condition.

4.1 Former chapel

4.1.1 Demolition

The former chapel will largely be retained as existing externally, with the exception of two door openings to the rear of the east and west (side) elevations which will be infilled. The offset addition to the rear (north) of the building will be removed, with a section of the rear elevation also proposed to be removed to provide access into the building as part of the proposed adaptive reuse (refer below).

Internally it is proposed to remove the existing partition walls as doors at the northern end of the building.

4.1.2 New works

It is proposed to retain the former chapel as a standalone building and adapt it for use as a Provedore to be open to the public as well as the residents within the site. The infilled doors will be made good to match the render finish of the building, and the existing windows will be repaired where required and repainted. A new entry foyer addition is proposed at the northern end of the building, with glazed doors on the east and west sides of the addition to provide access into and through the building. The addition will sit centrally on the north elevation, set back from the side east and west elevations of the existing building, and will be clad with bronze coloured metal wall cladding with expressed joints. The gable ended form of the addition will finish below the height of the roof of the existing building.

Internally, the chapel will be retained as a single open space.

A paved terraced is proposed surrounding the building, with stairs leading to a landscaped courtyard to the west.
### 4.2 Former administration building

#### 4.2.1 Demolition

The principal elevation of the former administration building will generally be retained as existing externally, with the exception of the existing door opening on the south side of the ground floor which will be modified to a window to match the existing single ground floor windows. The central doors on the ground and first floors are proposed to be removed (to be replaced with new doors).

The existing openings on the side (north and south) elevations will also be removed to provide access into the proposed new adjoining buildings (refer below).

More extensive demolition is proposed on the rear (west) elevation, to the extent of all of the window and doors opening, with the exception of the existing arched windows at first floor level. The rear elevation at ground floor level and sections of the first floor elevation are also proposed to be removed.

While not requiring a permit under the HO, internally, it is proposed to demolish the majority of the partition walls and doors at ground and first floor level, with the exception of the entry lobby and part of the central corridor on the ground floor. A section of the existing floor at first floor level will also be removed to allow for the installation of new lift and stair access as part of the adaptation of the building.

#### 4.2.2 New works

It is proposed to adapt the former administration building to house reception and administrative facilities, with new two-storey wings adjoining the retained heritage building to the north and south.

As noted above, the principal east elevation will generally be retained as existing externally, with new glazed doors installed within the existing central door openings on the ground and first floors. A new window to match the existing will also be installed to the ground floor.

Modifications are proposed to the rear (west) elevation to provide additional outdoor spaces to take advantage of views to Port Phillip Bay to the west. Stackable glazed doors providing access to a terrace will be provided at ground floor level, with a balcony above at first floor level. New sliding doors and windows are also proposed at first floor level. Two sets of stairs with tiered garden beds to the south are proposed at the rear of the building leading to the ground floor terrace.

The original hipped form to the tiled roof of the former administration building will be reinstated, with the existing chimneys on the east and west sides to be retained.

A new internal layout is proposed to adapt the building for communal, office and administrative use on the ground floor and residences at first floor level. A new lift and stair will also be installed at the southern end of the building.

The proposed new buildings adjoining the north and south sides of the retained building will be contemporary in form with flat roofs which will finish below the eaves line of the heritage building between them. A narrow recess will separate the proposed new buildings from the north-east, north-west and south-west corners of the retained building, with the form of the proposed new building set back from the south-east corner.

### 4.3 Former treatment ward

#### 4.3.1 Demolition

The general external form of the north and south elevations and principal roof form of the former treatment ward will be retained, with demolition proposed to a number of existing openings and non-original elements as outlined below.

On the north elevation, the timber boarding will be removed from the arched windows on the ground floor (the form of the openings will be retained); the remainder of the window and door openings on the ground floor will be removed. It is also proposed to remove the non-original fabric enclosing the
balcony and flat roof above at level 1, as well as the easternmost section of the north elevation below the hipped roof form of the building (to allow for new works to attach to the building in this location).

On the south elevation it is proposed to modify the form of some window and door openings to match the existing openings. The whole of the easternmost section of the south elevation beneath the hipped roof form will be removed (to allow for new works to attach to the building in this location).

On the west elevation, the timber boarding will be removed from the arched windows on the ground floor (the form of the openings will be retained), and the existing window opening at first floor level will be modified for new windows to be installed.

Internally, it is proposed to remove the swimming pool at ground floor level, all of the existing partition walls and doors at ground and first floor levels, as well as a section of the existing floor at first floor level to allow for the installation of new lift and stair access as part of the adaptation of the building (refer below).

4.3.2 New works

It is proposed to adapt the former treatment ward for communal amenities including dining facilities. The form and detail of much of the north and south elevations of the former treatment ward will be retained, reinstated or interpreted, with new elements proposed to support the proposed new use.

On the north elevation at ground floor level, new bifold doors with fanlights above will be installed within the existing arched openings. A new handrail will be installed to the original cantilever stairs on the western side of the building, and external stairs will also be added on the opposite side of the arched openings. At first floor level, a section of the open form of the balcony will be reinstated at the western end of the building, with glazed bifold doors installed to create an (operable) internal wall at this level with the later canopy roof to be rebuilt. The eastern section of the former balcony will be enclosed by a new rendered wall with windows throughout.

On the south elevation, new windows will be installed within the modified openings at ground and first floor levels to match the existing windows, with a glazed door and fanlight above installed within the existing arched opening.

As with the north and south elevations, new glazed doors with fanlights above will be installed within the existing arched openings on the ground floor, with new windows installed within the modified openings at first floor level.

Internally, the ground floor will be retained as an open space, with a new internal layout at first floor level and a lift and stair installed at the eastern end of the building.

Two new additions are proposed on the north-east and south-east elevations of the retained building which will enclose the eastern portion of the building within the proposed new works. A glazed link to the roof of the proposed addition, which will finish below the eaves line of the former treatment ward, will separate the proposed new built form to the north-east of the retained heritage building.

4.4 New development

The proposed new development will incorporate residential units, communal amenities and communal open spaces throughout, most of which will be situated outside of the extent of HO399. The new development will be of one and two-storeys, stepped in form where required due to the slope of the land within the site to the west. The buildings will be contemporary in form utilising various materials including concrete, metal and timber cladding.

Vehicular entry into the site will be provided from three proposed new crossovers on Jacksons Road, with an internal roadway providing vehicular access to the buildings in the southern end of the site. Basement level carparking will be provided beneath a number of the new buildings.
A number of trees are proposed to be removed, however large groups of trees generally located in groups along the property and existing car park boundaries will be retained. New landscaping is proposed throughout the site, in addition to a number of green roofs to new buildings in the south and west sections of the site.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACTS

5.1 Conservation Management Plan

The Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan identifies elements of significance within the site and sets out conservation policies for the place. The retained heritage buildings which make up HO399 were identified as elements of contributory significance in the CMP as follows:

- The central portion of the former Administrative Block, excluding its wings;
- Former Ward D [former treatment ward] including its swimming pool used for hydrotherapy, and its former balcony used for heliotherapy;
- Chapel/Mortuary.

The policy for elements of contributory significance included in the CMP as follows:

Elements that are of contributory value should be retained and conserved. Change or removal of contributory fabric can be made if it can be demonstrated that it will not adversely affect the heritage significance of the broader complex.12

The following policies included in the CMP are relevant for consideration of the proposed development. An assessment of the proposal against these policies is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy consideration</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>... Any new fabric introduced to a contributory element should on close investigation be identifiable as such (new fabric).13</td>
<td>The proposal generally complies with this policy through the use of materials for additions or new works which complement, but differ from, the original fabric of the heritage buildings and through reinstatement works which reflect the original details of the heritage buildings with contemporary treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>A key characteristic of the Mount Eliza Centre is its elevated setting overlooking Port Phillip Bay... This setting, with its physical and visual connection to Port Phillip Bay, should be retained in some capacity. This relationship between the site and the bay is best demonstrated by [the former treatment ward]... Views of the bay from [the former treatment ward] should be maintained in</td>
<td>With regard to the setting of the former treatment ward, the CMP notes that the siting of this building and key visual relationship with Port Phillip Bay is critical to the significance and understanding of the former use of this building. This connection is maintained in the proposed development by way of the partial reinstatement of the open balcony at level 1 on the north elevation and the retention of open space between the building and the foreshore reserve. No new development is proposed to interrupt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Future development | Further adaptation of contributory fabric is appropriate if the original/earlier use of the place/element can be interpreted, and the change to fabric does not adversely impact upon the aesthetic qualities or historical value of an element. Future development that reinstates lost or removed fabric on contributory elements is to be encouraged.\(^{15}\) | The proposal complies with this policy. The adaptive reuse of the retained heritage buildings forms part of the proposed new development and changes to the existing form and fabric were carefully considered to ensure the original/early use of the buildings remains legible (where this is demonstrated by the original form and details of the retained buildings). This is particularly evident through the retention of the original external form and internal open space within the former chapel, the retention of the main entry and original details of the principal east elevation of the former administration building as well as the reinstatement of the hipped form of the roof, and reinstatement of a section of the | views of the bay from the former treatment ward.  
The settings of the former chapel and administration building were not specifically addressed in the CMP. Notwithstanding, it is noted with regard to the former chapel that historically, there was one building adjacent to this building to the east with an open setting otherwise surrounding the building (refer Figure 6). No new development is proposed abutting or in close proximity to the former chapel which will maintain an open setting surrounding this building.  
In the case of the former administration building, this building is oriented to the east, with adjoining wings formerly located on the north and south sides of the building and additional buildings in close proximity to the rear (refer Figure 5). The original approach to the building from the east is maintained in the proposed development with an open setting established to the rear to take advantage of views to Port Phillip Bay. This issue is considered in greater detail in Section 5.2.2 below. | some capacity to interpret the importance of its siting adjacent to the bay. Given the small area of land between [the former treatment ward] and the foreshore boundary, development opportunities for this portion of this site are limited.\(^{14}\) |

---

\(^{14}\) Peter Barrett, Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan, 2016, p. 38.  
\(^{15}\) Peter Barrett, Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan, 2016, p. 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Use</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpretation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Open Balcony at Level 1 of the Former Treatment Ward.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... Future development of this site could include adaptive reuse of existing buildings, combined with new buildings, for residential purposes... Any new use for the site should retain and conserve elements contributory heritage value, and retain a sense of the site’s earlier history as a hospital.</td>
<td>Buildings that demonstrate the original use of this site as a health care facility should be retained and conserved. This includes interior spaces and elements that provide interpretive value. These include the swimming pool and (enclosed) balcony of [the former treatment ward], which provide interpretative value in understanding hydrotherapy and heliotherapy that were integral treatments for children at the Orthopaedic Branch. Other elements include the chapel interior, which should</td>
<td>The recent demolition of all but the three listed buildings within the site has changed the ability to appreciate the former use of the place. The site is no longer legible as a specialised hospital complex and the historical uses and links between the remaining buildings require active interpretation rather than being immediately evident. Two of the retained buildings (the former chapel and the former administration building) convey little about the historical activities and treatments which took place within the former hospital complex. By comparison, the former treatment ward has more potential to inform on an understanding of the specialist nature of the building and the manner in which this was addressed in the architectural form. Standing now as fragments of a once coherent and formally designed campus, the significance of these buildings now largely resides in their history and their external architecture/design. This external presentation of the buildings is predominantly retained as part of the proposed adaptive reuse of these buildings. This is addressed above in relation to the external form of the heritage buildings. Internally, the proposed adaptive reuse of the retained heritage buildings will result in the loss of one interior space (the swimming pool) identified in the CMP as providing interpretive value. Conversely, the reinstatement of part of the open balcony/ sun terrace at level 1 of this building will assist in an understanding of the original use of the building for the provision of health care within the site. The proposed retention of the former chapel interior as a single open space complies with the CMP policy for this building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Peter Barrett, Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan, 2016, p. 41.
5.2 Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme Heritage Policy Framework

In considering the heritage impacts of the proposed development, the relevant heritage provisions included in the Morning Peninsula Planning Scheme have been referenced. These include:

- Clause 43.01 ‘Heritage Overlay’
- Clause 22.04 ‘Heritage Places and Abutting Land’.

5.2.1 Demolition

The heritage policy at Clause 22.04 states in relation to demolition as follows (only the relevant policies are reproduced):

It is policy to:

- Discourage partial demolition of a heritage place unless it can be demonstrated that one of the following apply:
  - It will not adversely affect the significance of the place.
  - It will assist in the long-term conservation of the place.
  - It will support the viability of the existing use or will facilitate a new use that is compatible with ongoing conservation of the place.
  - It will remove non-contributory elements such as alterations or additions.

The relevant decision guidelines at Clause 43.01 is as follows:

- Whether the demolition, removal or external alteration will adversely affect the significance of the heritage place.

As outlined above, the site was recently determined to be surplus to government operational requirements and approval was granted for the demolition of all but the three remaining heritage buildings. This action has inevitably altered the understanding of the former hospital use of the site, with the remaining heritage buildings standing now as isolated remnants of the former hospital complex.

Notwithstanding the above, the retained heritage buildings formed part of the original 1929-30 complex of hospital buildings constructed within the site, and the identified architectural and aesthetic significance of the place is demonstrated in these buildings as examples of a restrained Mediterranean style to a design by Stephenson & Meldrum/Turner. Accordingly, the buildings will be retained to maintain the contribution of these buildings to the significance of the place. The extent of demolition included as part of the proposed redevelopment has been carefully considered and limited as far as possible to ensure the original design and early use of the buildings (where this is demonstrated by the original form and details of the retained buildings) remains legible. The proposed demolition also meets the intent of the heritage policy at Clause 22.04 in that non-contributory elements to the former chapel and former treatment ward will be removed and the works as proposed will facilitate and support the adaptive reuse of the heritage buildings.

---

17 Peter Barrett, Mount Eliza Centre Conservation Management Plan, 2016, p. 41.
No external demolition is proposed to the original fabric of the former chapel. The original form of the loggia to the principal (south) façade, arched windows and terracotta tiled intersecting gable roof form will be retained, and the proposed demolition of the non-original addition will not adversely impact on the significance of the former chapel.

With regard to the former administration building, very little external demolition is proposed to the principal façade. The column-supported entrance porch with balcony above will be retained, and this elevation will be maintained as the principal approach and entry to the building. More extensive demolition is proposed to the rear of the building as part of the proposed adaptation of the building. While this will result in the loss of the original form and composition of part of the heritage building, this demolition is limited to an elevation of lesser significance and detailing and one which did not historically contribute to the architectural presentation of the building (due to the concealment of this elevation by adjacent buildings to the west in the original hospital complex layout, refer to Figure 10).

With regard to the former treatment ward, the proposed demolition on the north, south and west elevations is predominantly limited to the removal of non-original fabric (enclosing the balcony) and the modification of existing openings. While this will result in a change to the presentation of these openings, the original form and many of the original details of the building will be retained, including the tiled roof and external cantilever stair, and the open balcony/terrace will be partly reinstated. It is also proposed to demolish some existing fabric at the eastern end of the building to allow for new development in this location. This will result in the loss of part of the original building, however the form and fabric of the tiled roof of this section of the building will be retained which will maintain an understanding of the original form of the building. Additionally, this component of the building is more utilitarian in form and the fabric to be removed does not contribute to an understanding of the historical function of the former treatment ward.

With regard to the proposed demolition to the interiors of the buildings, it is noted that internal alteration controls do not apply within HO399. Accordingly, no further comment in relation to internal alterations is provided in this HIS.

5.2.2 New works

The relevant policies in relation to new development included at Clause 22.04 are as follows:

- Support the replacement of non-contributory buildings with new development that responds positively to the historic context provided by any nearby heritage place.

- Require new development, including boundary fences, to retain the significance of a heritage place, such as through:
  - creatively interpreting and respecting identified heritage values and not simply copying or reproducing historic styles or detailing;
  - being visually recessive and compatible in terms of scale, siting, design, form and materials with the historic character and significance of the heritage place, and,
  - responding positively to special features such as views, vistas, mature vegetation and landmarks.

- Assess the impact of a proposed development on the heritage values of abutting land in a Heritage Overlay.

- Support landscaping that will enhance the historic cultural landscape character of a heritage place.
• If there is more than one heritage citation (statement of significance) for a place (such as when there is an individual citation as well as a group or precinct citation), then consider all citations.

The relevant decision guidelines at Clause 43.01 state that the responsible authority must consider:

• The significance of the heritage place and whether the proposal will adversely affect the natural or cultural significance of the place.

• Any applicable statement of significance (whether or not specified in the schedule to this overlay), heritage study and any applicable conservation policy.

• Whether the location, bulk, form and appearance of the proposed building is in keeping with the character and appearance of adjacent buildings and the heritage place.

• Whether the proposed works will adversely affect the significance, character or appearance of the heritage place.

As noted in Section 2.1.1 above, two assessments and statements of significance have been prepared for the site. The 2017 GJM citation and the 2016 CMP differ in terms of why the subject site is considered to be of heritage significance. This difference has occurred by virtue of their respective assessments undertaken against recognised heritage criteria. The 2017 GJM citation concludes that:

The Mount Eliza Centre, 33 Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza, is of local historical, architectural and aesthetic significance to the Shire of Mornington Peninsula.

The 2016 CMP, on the other hand, concludes that:

The Mount Eliza Centre is of architectural, aesthetic, historical, scientific/research and social significance to the State of Victoria.

In the absence of a formal or endorsed statement of significance associated with the place, the impact of the proposal on the significance of the place as demonstrated by the retained heritage buildings has been considered.

The proposal within the site is generally in accordance with the intent of the heritage provisions of the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme to the extent that the identified heritage buildings are to be retained and adapted as part of a responsive redevelopment which acknowledges and responds to the former site context and values of the place. With the exception of the former chapel, the heritage buildings were historically not visible in views to the site from the surrounding area; rather, the buildings originally formed part of a dense complex of buildings laid out across the broader site. In this regard the overall development of the site in the manner proposed does not raise any heritage concerns. Additionally, and as with the historical context of the site, the development as proposed responds to the elevated siting, bay views and mature vegetation within the site, and incorporates these features into the proposed new use.

Alterations and new works to all three of the heritage buildings are proposed to support the adaptive reuse of the buildings and the site more generally, and these works have been carefully designed to ensure the original form of the buildings remains evident. Specific details of the proposed new works (i.e. window/door details) will be provided as these details are confirmed and submitted on the basis of a permit condition.

Very little change is proposed to the former chapel, with the exception of a new addition on the rear (north) elevation. This addition will present as contemporary new addition (replacing an existing non-original structure on this elevation). The addition will reference the roof form of the former chapel but will finish below the height of the existing building and will not dominate or overwhelm the building in views from the north. The construction of the addition provides an appropriate access sequence and
allows the heritage building itself to be retained essentially as is, obviating the need for new openings and the like. As noted above, no other new works are proposed adjoining or in proximity to this building which will maintain the generally open setting which historically surrounded this building.

With regard to the former administration building, new works are proposed on the north, south and rear west elevations of the building. The works to the rear will provide new openings and outdoor spaces (terrace at ground level with balcony at level 1 above) which will present as contemporary insertions to the building. This change is considered acceptable on the basis that the rear elevation of the former administration building is a secondary elevation which historically was visually obscured by other buildings in close proximity to the west (refer Figure 10). The current exposure of the rear elevation does not reflect the historical context of the building, and the change as proposed to the rear of the building will not impact on the presentation or original detailing of the principal east elevation of the building. In considering the proposed new works on the north and south sides of the building, it is noted that the building historically had single-storey side wings which were later altered to include an additional level. The proposed new works adjoining the side elevations of the former administration building will reference the earlier wings but will read as contemporary new works which will finish below the eaves height of the heritage building. Additionally, each corner of the former administration building will remain visible and the hipped roof form will be reinstated which will allow the three-dimensional volume of the building to continue to be understood.

As noted above, the former treatment ward is the only building within the site which is demonstrative of the treatment activities undertaken within the former hospital complex. This former use will continue to be understood and demonstrated through the reinstatement of part of the open terrace at level 1 on the north elevation. The existing details including the arched openings will be retained, and the modified openings will match the existing windows to present as a cohesive (if not originally intact) expanse of windows, particularly on the south elevation. The proposed new development on the eastern side of the former treatment ward will conceal part of the original form of the building, however as noted above, this component of the building is more utilitarian in form and does not demonstrate the historical function of the building. The inclusion of lower height linking elements will also help to mitigate the visual impact of the new works, especially on the principal north side of the building.

In relation to the retained heritage buildings it is additionally noted that an interpretive strategy will also be prepared as part of the development of the site which will outline the significance of the heritage buildings and historical values of the site more broadly. It is anticipated that this will be provided as a condition of the permit.

When considering the proposed development more broadly, the majority of these works will be located outside of the extent of HO399, and the potential impacts of the works adjoining or in close proximity to the buildings which comprise HO399 are considered above. It is noted however that the potential impact of the development generally on the retained heritage buildings must be considered. Recognising that the original layout and function of the former hospital complex has been lost through the demolition of most of the buildings, the physical and visual connection of the site with Port Phillip Bay survives. As such, this setting was a key consideration for the design and layout of the proposed new development which has been designed to take advantage of views to the bay (noting that the visual connection of the former treatment ward with the bay has been maintained as part of the proposal). In terms of the height and form of the proposed new development, the one and two-storey form and contemporary design of the proposed new buildings will ensure that the retained heritage buildings remain legible and continue to be understood as forming part of the original hospital complex. Additionally, the existing mature vegetation along the property boundaries and in sections within the site will be retained, with new landscaping proposed to support the new development and provide communal outdoor spaces for residents. On balance, and recognising the significance of the site has been diminished by the recent demolition works, the proposal represents an appropriate approach to development which respects the remnant heritage buildings within the site and provides them with sustainable new uses.
6.0 CONCLUSION

As listed in the HO, the Mount Eliza Centre comprises three buildings which formed part of the originally far more extensive 1929-30 hospital complex. While the buildings which comprise HO399 present essentially as stand-alone remnant structures, they do retain architectural and aesthetic qualities that reflect on the history of the place and these are demonstrated through their external form and fabric. The proposed adaptation works to these buildings will largely retain or interpret the original form of the buildings which will maintain the significance of the place as demonstrated by their external fabric and presentation. Where the new works will adjoin or impact on the retained heritage buildings, this has been designed to minimally impact on the significant fabric of the buildings and will reference the historical context of the site within which the retained buildings formed part of a dense complex of buildings adjoining or in close proximity.

The proposed development within the remainder of the site (and predominantly outside of HO399) represents a balanced proposal for the site which recognises the historical context and setting of the site generally and the heritage buildings specifically through respectful contemporary design and a carefully considered layout.