November, 1977

The Vice-Principal
University of Melbourne
PARKVILLE VICTORIA 3052

Dear Mr. Marginson,

I have pleasure in making the third of my major submissions as the University Master Planner. The first was the 1970 Master Plan Report and the second, the Landscape Elements Report of April 1974.

This Report deals with the area related to University Square – directly south of the Grattan Street gate to the main site. It was mentioned in the 1970 report but not discussed in detail.

While my 1970 Master Plan Report was strongly in favour of University development in this direction, it appeared at the time that it was precluded by earlier University decisions, the then zoning, and financial problems arising from the value of the land.

Subsequent events, particularly the publication of the City of Melbourne Strategy Plan, have enabled the University to consider action in this area and have led to the request for a planning report.

This Report has been seen, in draft form, by the Central Building Planning Committee and its Chairman (Professor L.K. Stevens) and has been the subject of detailed comment by yourself and the Controller (Buildings) – (Mr. M.R. Pawsey).

I believe that the Report will provide a sound basis for detailed planning of future new construction and the renovation of existing buildings. It has also been our joint hope that the Report might be of interest and value to the Melbourne City Council.

Yours sincerely,

Bryce Mortlock
Master Planner
Ancher Mortlock & Woolley Pty Ltd
Architects & Planners
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1. Why a University Square Precinct?

The reasons for the development of a university precinct fronting University Square were explicitly and fully set out in the University of Melbourne Master Plan Report 1970. Subsequent events have merely strengthened the arguments.

The 1970 Report presents a case for expansion generally in these terms:

"The University must expand ... because sites can no longer be found in the existing grounds for buildings required to house the immediate needs of academic departments (even if) all our recommendations concerning intensive use are adopted." (5.1)

Inevitably, some recommendations have not been adopted, and others are in doubt for reasons outside the University's control; the Conservatorium and Grainger sites, for example.

The Report specifically urges the designation of the University Square precinct as an expansion area:

"We strongly recommend that the University press for the establishment of University Square as a forecourt to the main entrance by the removal of the bowling club. At the same time consideration should be given to extending the University's property ownership in the streets fronting the Square. Eventually, with harmonious redevelopment of the surrounding buildings, University Square could become a significant piece of University oriented cityscape, besides providing in its surrounding properties an outlet for expansion to the south which for a number of reasons the University is going to need - not as an alternative, but additional to the expansion area in Carlton." (5.1)

That need is all the greater now that Carlton Area B is no longer regarded as suitable for academic departmental use and the development of Area A has been delayed for the time being by the suspension of capital grants to the University of Melbourne.

The 1970 Report gave other reasons for making the Square a precinct of the University, including: the desirability of shifting the "centre of gravity" (now in the northern precincts, as the parking and traffic survey showed) nearer its true focus on the south lawn by much more building to the south (5.31): increasing the use of the main gate (then and currently the least used of all), and restoring the Square's proper role of forecourt to the main
entrance. (5.1). These reasons still hold as strongly as ever.

When the Report was written there was no doubt about the desirability of expansion south of Grattan Street, but the likelihood of it happening within the review period seemed remote because of the prior commitment to Carlton Areas A and B. It is even more desirable now, and its prospects are no longer remote.

The move by the University into the University Square Precinct is one which produces little conflict externally, and in fact is supported by local agencies and officers of the Melbourne City Council. The Carlton Association, during the many negotiations over the past 5 years, has supported the University in its moves to the south of the site. It is understood that this support has been on the basis that the University would preserve the present scale of development and improve the area by replacement of existing factories.

The Carlton Community Planning Group (the official M.C.C. sponsored Strategy Plan consultative Group) is aware of the proposed move. Although the area is outside the Group's sphere of involvement, it has indicated a desire to receive this report for information.


The principles laid down in the 1970 Report were not limited in their application to the main site, but were intended to apply equally to the expansion areas, of which the University Square precinct was to be one, as we have seen.

No purpose would be served by quoting or even summarizing in this paper all the relevant parts of the 1970 Report, which are readily available in that publication, complete with summaries. It will be more to the point to consider the special problems that arise from the application of the principles to the University Square precinct.

Nevertheless it is useful to begin with a reminder of some of the major objectives of the 1970 Report. They may be stated as follows (relevant sections of the Report in brackets):

Attainment of the maximum building volume consistent with defined standards of amenity and known physical constraints (1.3).

The ideal city university as an enclave within a public park, providing a visual setting for the university and a recreation area for all (3.2). University Square is specifically quoted in this connection (5.2) as having potentially the scale and character of a London Square.

Development generally in the form of continuously linked low-rise buildings around courts (3.51, 3.53). Courts as "outdoor rooms" for recreation (3.4).

The traditional urban building character of unbroken street frontages, minimal setbacks, predominantly horizontal skylines, colonnades for under-
cover pedestrian movement, and variety of building design within the overall form defined by such conditions (3.53). New buildings to harmonize with the old (3.54).

Parking underground, under buildings, or under podia forming floors of courts, but multi-level structures may be necessary in peripheral areas due to land costs (3.61).

Develop the grounds for optimum use and enjoyment by people on foot (3.6).

Grattan Street, as part of a ring road circulation system around the central area, needs to be bridged for pedestrian access (3.63).

Landscaping should retain existing natural features particularly mature trees (3.73).

Open areas for casual recreation in the form of parks and squares available to all (5.1).

Preserve the strong axis which already exists in the park (University Square) whose northern focus should be the main gates (5.1).

Make University Square the true open-space forecourt to the main gates (5.32).


The Strategy Plan has as yet no statutory force except insofar as its recommendations may have been incorporated in specific planning codes or building regulations. Nevertheless its proposals may be taken as indicative of the planning objectives acceptable to the City authorities at the time of publication, and probably still current in their thinking. Therefore wherever discretionary powers exist in the application of planning controls (which is just about everywhere) there is prima facie reason to suppose that discretion is more likely to be exercised in favour of a project which has paid heed to the Strategy Plan objectives.

Some of the plan's objectives are of general application, others are restricted to specific zones, uses, or building types; for instance the policies of Action Plan A3 apply to "University and Hospital Expansion". The following is a summary of those objectives which might conceivably be applicable to the University Square project:

Page 205 In Mixed Use Zones (of which this is one) the objective is a mixture of high density residential, motels, specialized retail, wholesaling, light industry.

268 Non-residential plot ratio 1.5:1 except for major institutional (e.g. university) uses (no ratio quoted) and hotels/motels (quoted in different places as either 2:1 or 3:1).

268 Residential site density maximum 250 habitable rooms per acre (applies specifically to student housing under Action Plan A3) which may be in addition to the 1.5:1 plot ratio for other uses.

272-3 With particular reference to Melbourne University and RMIT, the Plan calls for the provision of inner city housing for students, and the "multi-use" of education facilities by people who live and work in the city.

The student housing-objective is restated in Action Plan A3 (P285) and again on P159. The multi-use objective is repeated on P207.
In several places "joint planning bodies" are recommended for regulating development proposals by institutions. There is no indication of what the composition of these bodies should be or how they would operate.

Amongst the more generally applicable objectives we find the following:

In residential areas, provide improved pedestrian access to open space and community facilities. Reduce carriageway width in some streets and designate others as pedestrian only, or limited access. Use the space thus gained for landscaped open space or car parking.

Create pedestrian access ways through open space and streets designed so that they do not have traffic crossings.

(Transport policy): "Minimise traffic on local streets by taking appropriate steps such as closing the streets".

"Site Consolidation for Comprehensive Development": favours small scale renewal which includes new housing, assisted in some cases by altering streets or intersections.

It will be seen that there is no serious conflict between the Master Plan principles and the objectives of the City Strategy Plan, and indeed the two plans are in close agreement on the questions of pedestrian movement and provision of open space. There should be little difficulty, therefore, in shaping a precinct plan which conforms to both. If that is so, the precinct plan could well form the basis of the City's Action Plan for the area; a tangible product of the "joint planning body", recommended in the Strategy Plan (see above). This possibility should therefore be kept in view.

4. Existing Character of the Area.

The dominant feature of the precinct is of course the open space of the Square itself with its lawn and mature elms.

To this must be added the open space of two wide streets, Leicester and Barry, carrying light traffic only, but heavily used for parking. (Together they provide about 200 parking places).

The buildings fronting these two streets therefore face one another across a generous expanse of open space with a width between frontages of approximately 130 metres.

The buildings themselves are predominantly one and two storey houses, offices, and factories. Leicester and Barry Streets contain the best of the two-storey terrace houses. Those in Leicester Street belong to the Graduate Union. Of those in Barry Street, some are still used as dwellings, others have been converted to commercial office or showroom use. Some of the conversions have been accompanied by unfortunate alterations to the facades, but most retain their original attractive residential appearance.

There is one similar terrace house in Berkeley Street (No. 218, University owned).

The university owned houses on Grattan Street between Berkeley and Barry Streets are undistinguished single storey structures.

Between Leicester and Bouverie Nos. 205 and 211 (University owned) are two storey terraces.
There is an hotel - The Prince Alfred - on the Grattan-Bouverie Street corner, and a corner shop on the Pelham-Barry Street corner.

All the other buildings are commercial or industrial. The most notable of these is the Ramsay Group's building in Berkeley Street. It is a substantial modern structure of three storeys at the street frontage plus basement, clad in brick in a style likely to be compatible with new university departmental buildings. There are no other three storey buildings, but half a dozen or so of the two-storey warehouse type buildings appear well-built and should contain useful bulk floor space.

The buildings have been judged from their exteriors only and no attempt has been made at this stage to survey them in detail.

5. Criteria for Building Character and Form.

In the two city blocks under consideration, new building should be subject to two important sets of visual criteria; those relating buildings to open space, and those relating new building to existing.

5.1 Buildings Related to Open Space.

The major open spaces within the precinct will continue to be those which already exist; University Square and Leicester and Barry Streets. Externally the precinct faces Grattan, Bouverie and Pelham Streets, each over 30 metres wide between frontages, and Berkeley Street (20 metres). Across Bouverie Street from the south-east corner of the precinct lies Lincoln Square, another large parklike public space.

As passive recreation areas, neither University Square nor Lincoln Square is over-used at present, so that the precinct is evidently well endowed already with this type of open space. Indeed, more intensive use of University Square is one of the benefits to be expected from university development in the precinct. There should be no need, therefore, to create further large recreational spaces within the building blocks. Any future courts or open spaces to be formed within the blocks will be there primarily to serve the buildings, by providing daylight, natural ventilation, access and outlook.

As noted in the previous section, the width between frontages across University Square is around 130 metres. The elms in the square are themselves close to 20 metres high, equal in height to a five or six storey building. Buildings of that height fronting the Square would not be out of scale with it. Nor would they be out of scale with the surrounding streets. Continuous buildings of up to six storeys have formed the facades of many great traditional thoroughfares. (1970 Report, pp 21-22).

However, scale of building to open space is not the only criterion. As noted above, we must also take account of the relationship of new building to existing.

5.2 New Building Related to Existing.

Within the precinct, the existing buildings likely to be retained fall into two categories as shown on Precinct Plan 1; those of architectural or historic value, and those of economic value.

5.2.1 Buildings of Architectural or Historic Value: Terraces.

Those of architectural value are all traditional terrace houses. They are the Graduate Union houses in Leicester Street, 205-213 Grattan Street, 218 Berkeley Street,
and many houses at both ends of Barry Street. Their architectural value as visual assets to the street resides in their characteristic terrace-house elevational detail; cast-iron columns, balustrades and brackets; verandahs and balconies; ornamented parapets and divisions; sash windows, panelled doors, fanlights. Taken together with narrow frontages, party walls and two or more storeys, these characteristics identify the houses as examples of Australia's only true urban residential style; a style that was killed by the suburban trend to wider lots and side setbacks. As such therefore they have an historic as well as an architectural value. They are unique and irreplaceable. The side setback has become sacrosanct with control authorities, and however much those authorities may protest their admiration for terraces, they never permit new subdivisions on which terraces could be built.

Original terraces were mostly confined to the inner city areas. Compared to the detached house their numbers are small in any of our cities. We cannot afford, therefore, to lose any that are in reasonable condition, even when, as here, their scale is rather smaller than one could wish, given the context.

"Reasonable condition" for the purpose of the present assessment may be defined as follows: (i) structurally sound as to walls, floors, and roof of principal building; (ii) characteristic details of street elevation intact or readily repairable.

No attempt has been made to survey condition (i) beyond noting such evidence as it is visible from the street.

Condition (ii) eliminates terraces, of which there are several in the precinct, whose facades have been completely remodelled in a debased later style. The complete restoration of long-vanished fronts is not reasonable, nor for that matter possible. The lost details are not recorded, and they cannot be assumed to match nearby or adjoining work since adjoining houses vary quite considerably. Apart from the Graduate Union's row of seven, the groups are all ones, twos, threes and fours. The differences in detail are quite striking, yet the houses consort very well together because of their common scale, their general form, and their continuous massing; thus illustrating the point that, where these qualities are present, absolute uniformity of detail is unnecessary for good street architecture, unless a highly formal effect is the objective.

Complete restoration of remodelled fronts, therefore, while it is not mandatory, is not ruled out, provided the limitations to historic authenticity are accepted; by the same token completely new building which observes the criteria of scale, form and mass would also be admissible in those cases. The decision - remodel or rebuild - would be an economic, not an aesthetic one.

It has to be said that none of the terraces is an outstanding example of the style, and some are quite ordinary. The case for keeping them rests on their historic value and their collective contribution to the urban scene.

It may be questioned, therefore, whether the case applies to a single detached house, like 218 Berkeley Street, which is not a member of any group. It doesn't, is the answer; but this house, as will be shown later, conforms in scale and form to the building envelope proposed for this part of the precinct, and its retention can be justified on that ground.
5.2.2 Relating New Building to Existing Terraces

The disadvantage of all these terraces, as already noted, is their small scale; specifically, the fact that they are only two storeys high. It is a disadvantage that must be accepted.

Contiguous new building will have to conform to this scale at the street elevation. That is not to say it must be limited to two storeys at that alignment, or that it must match the existing heights exactly. The terraces themselves vary a great deal in height, depending on whether they have parapets, gables, and the like, as well as on differing storey heights. No two groups are alike. Picturesque variety is the rule with them, and the decision to preserve them implies the acceptance of the same rule for new infill. (But not necessarily for the whole precinct).

Conforming new infill could conceivably be three storeys at the street, either by having lower storey heights or by having the top storey partly in the roof.

Visible roofs and storeys within roofs are very much part of the terrace house tradition. The roof storey, especially, derives from a long history of European town house design, being a very effective device for reducing the apparent height of buildings seen from the street. The sketches of French streets (Figs. 1 and 2) show the device used repeatedly, almost as a matter of course, to bring buildings of four, five and even more storeys down to human scale. (Note the other devices used in conjunction; string courses, balustrades, varying wall and window treatment from storey to storey). The way the device works is simply by causing the higher parts of the building to recede from the observer. It works for observers in facing buildings as well as observers at ground level, and is also a means of improving sunlight and daylight angles. By adjusting the angle of recession to the width of the street it is, of course, possible to conceal the upper storeys altogether from street level, but this is seldom necessary. The glimpse of roofs, dormers, lanterns and the like on the skyline is one of the delights of picturesque townscape (Clifton, Fig. 3).

As previously noted, buildings of five or six storeys would not be out of scale with the open spaces of the precinct. We have also seen that this building height is not allowable on street frontages in the vicinity of existing terraces. However the above reasoning shows that, even in the vicinity of the terraces, building height may increase within a sloping plane receding up and back from the street alignment. At what angle may the plane slope? This is a subjective judgement, but a way of coming to it may be to rephrase the question "What bulk of building is it acceptable to see behind the parapet (or eaves) of a two storey terrace"? It is quite common for terraces to have visible roofs with a slope of 40 degrees, sometimes with dormers, and these are acceptable; however if their bulk were greater, enclosing two or more storeys, they might be less so, and in such cases the slope should reduce, say to something like 30 degrees.

This suggests that the defining planes may be two, a steeper one for the first roof storey and a shallower thereafter. The mansard roof is composed of two planes in precisely this way. (Fig. 4)
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In principle there is no reason why the existing terrace houses should not acquire extra storeys within the above limits. In other words, their sites can in principle be developed to higher density provided the street character is preserved. Such development would however be subject to the requirement to preserve house interiors of outstanding architectural or historic quality, if there are any. No attempt has been made to assess the quality of house interiors at this stage.

5.2.3 Buildings of Economic Value

As previously noted (Section 4) there are some substantial commercial and industrial buildings in the precinct. With the single exception of the Ramsay Group's building none of them has any claim to architectural distinction, being generally of plain honest appearance unlikely to arouse strong desires for either preservation or abolition. Nor do they develop the site to the full potential which planning codes are likely to permit, since none of the buildings is over two storeys.

It follows that if and when the need arises to develop the site to its full potential, it will no longer be economic to retain these buildings and they will go. Until that time, however, so long as the buildings remain structurally sound, provide useful space, and are economic to maintain, they will continue to exist in the precinct, whether under University ownership or not. There is no economic reason for demolishing a sound building except to redevelop the site, either to a higher density, or for a different purpose; that is, a purpose which the existing building cannot be made to serve, economically or practically.

Therefore many of these "buildings of economic value" are likely to remain in the precinct for a long time.

It is necessary, in that case, to consider what aesthetic criteria should govern their relations with new and existing buildings in the area.

Obviously new building cannot be expected to make detrimental aesthetic concessions to "buildings of economic value". Fortunately the latter are, aesthetically, fairly neutral and therefore not especially demanding of their neighbours. When they acquire new neighbours they can be made even more neutral by a coat of paint in a congenial colour, and similar means of self-effacement. The concessions, in other words, should be made as far as possible by the existing buildings. Variations in height between new and old, and the inevitable differences in facade treatment, can be accepted on the same ground and for the same reason as the differences, previously mentioned (5.2.2), between existing terraces; namely that since picturesque variety, not uniformity, is the guiding aesthetic for the existing buildings to be preserved, so must it also be the prescription for the mixture of old and new.

There are of course limits to the degree of variation which is acceptable; for instance the brutal disparities of scale and treatment in Fig. 5 are quite beyond any sensible limits, whereas the considerable variety of Fig. 6 is at least part of a coherent overall pattern. This is an area where it is hardly possible to define objective limits in advance, since the criteria
vary with the context. Less strict criteria would apply to the relation between a new building and an adjoining "building of economic value" than to the relation between two new buildings close to each other, or between new and historic buildings; the point being that the "economic" building may eventually go, but the others will not. The merits of each case must be left to judgement of the designer at the appropriate time.

The distinction between what might be called "permanent" and "impermanent" buildings, with the implication that the latter wield a lesser influence, has the following consequence: since the "permanent" existing buildings - the terraces - cluster mainly in the northern part of the precinct, the control they exert on the visible character of new building diminishes as one moves south. Building facade height, for example, may increase with the natural fall of the site, to as much as four or five storeys in Pelham Street.

The terraces 95 - 109 Barry Street close to the Pelham Street corner impose a scale limitation at that point, but there are several ways to deal with it. The terraces themselves can be increased in height by an attic storey. They are a heterogeneous collection, probably the least attractive of the "permanent" buildings, and the addition would improve rather than impair their appearance. The corner property, currently a shop and commercial premises, could be rebuilt to four storeys; a taller building at the end is a traditional way of terminating a row of terraces.

Bouverie Street, it will be noted, is free of restrictions derived from "permanent" buildings except for the need to reduce facade height at the northern end to the scale of the terraces in Grattan Street.

In Berkeley Street the Ramsay building is "permanent" but, as previously noted, its presence is unlikely to impose onerous aesthetic restrictions on new building.

In Grattan Street between Leicester and Bouverie the "permanent" terraces dictate the scale of building at the street frontage. The Eggleston MacDonald and Secomb building (No. 215) is a good example of new building conforming to this scale, and its permanence is thereby reasonably assured, although it is designated on Plan 1 as of "economic" value only. (Its ownership is irrelevant to these observations.)

Grattan Street between Barry and Berkeley Streets contains nothing worth preserving, but its frontages will need to retain the terrace-house scale in keeping with the Leicester-Bouverie block, and for continuity with the end terrace in Barry Street, No. 163. This continuity can extend to the single house, 218 Berkeley Street, thus justifying its retention as foreshadowed earlier (5.2.1).

The University Maintenance Depot in Leicester Street (leased on a five year basis from the Graduate Union) appears to pose a special problem. An "economic" building, with potentially a long life, it is interposed between the two groups of Graduate Union terraces, and while it matches one of the groups in facade height, in most other respects it is singularly unlike its neighbours.
On the other hand, the two groups of Graduate Union terraces are unlike each other in a number of respects, being of different heights, with different roofs and parapet treatments, and set back different distances from the street frontages. Under the circumstances their separation by an intermediate building of the same scale is one of a number of possible ways of making the necessary transition. The Maintenance Depot's least harmonious feature is its red brick front; it this were rendered and painted to match the terraces the building should be aesthetically acceptable in its context.

The Graduate Union, which owns the building, is, of course, only affiliated with the University, and makes its own independent decisions. It is not known what its plans are for the building's long term use.

5.3 Structure and Materials.

There is little to add to the recommendations of the 1970 Report (3.54, Page 24), which were: concrete frame or load-bearing brick structure, face brick external cladding in muted shades, visible roofs dark in colour. Absolute uniformity is not sought, but rather a family resemblance in form, structure and materials, and the choice of materials and colours should be conditioned by the well-mannered intention to pay heed to one's neighbours.

In the latter respect there is scope for widening the range of materials and finishes to include render and paint, a traditional finish for terraces of which there are numerous examples in the precinct; the Graduate Union buildings, for example.

An example of a suitable face brick colour for new buildings is given by the Ramsay Group building which is in Clifton greys (or a closely similar brick).

5.4 Building Forms: Summary.

To draw together the conclusions reached in the foregoing discussion:

The objective, as always, is to define the maximum building volume permissible subject to agreed amenity standards. The standards remain those laid down in the 1970 Report and of course include local authority plot ratio limitations.

Open space standards within the precinct should reflect the fact that the major recreational open space is University Square; courts or open spaces within the blocks should be required only to serve the buildings in respect of daylighting, ventilation, access and outlook.

Existing terrace houses in reasonable condition should be retained permanently. Certain other structurally sound buildings should remain as long as they are of economic value.

New buildings should be designed to harmonize with the permanent existing buildings.

"Temporary" existing buildings should be modified where practicable to make whatever aesthetic concessions are necessary towards new or permanent buildings. (Mainly things like protective colouring; the Maintenance Depot being a case in point.)
New building volumes should consist, as in the 1970 Report, of continuously linked low-rise buildings with unbroken street frontages, minimal setbacks, predominantly horizontal skylines, colonnades for under-cover pedestrian circulation.

There should be a variety of detailed design within the overall form. New building should conform to the scale of existing permanent buildings where contiguous (mainly at the northern end of the precinct). The scale should increase with distance. Four or five storeys is in keeping with the scale of the open space and its trees.

Building height can increase within sloping planes receding from the street. This suggests storeys within roofs, visible roofs, roof terraces, and skyline incidents such as dormers, lanterns. These principles apply also to existing terraces subject to certain conditions.

It should be emphasized that recommendations on classification and treatment of existing buildings are independent of, and unaffected by, the ownership of the buildings, now or in the future. In other words, they are recommendations as to what should be the future of these buildings, whether the University owns them or not.


6.1 Principles.

"The overall aim of traffic planning for a pedestrian oriented university ... is to make satisfactory provision for essential vehicle traffic whilst developing the grounds for optimum use and enjoyment by people on foot." (1970 Report, 3.6, page 26).

The university should aim to satisfy the demand for parking generated by its users, but the spaces should be provided on the periphery of the central area and as far as possible out of sight under buildings or podia. (3.61)

To reduce vehicle movement in the central area its internal road system should be a series of spurs and loops off the surrounding public roads (Grattan and Swanston Streets, College Crescent and Royal Parade) which thus constitute its ring road. Because of the heavy traffic they carry, these roads need to be bridged for pedestrian access (3.62).

The City of Melbourne Strategy Plan, as we have seen (section 3 above) also urges improved pedestrian access and the reduction of traffic on local streets, by such measures as reduced carriageway width, pedestrian only or limited access streets, and street closures. The space thus gained can be used for landscaping or parking.

6.2 Vehicle Traffic.

It is not part of this proposal that the University should aim, even in the long term, to own and be responsible for the existing public streets and in and around the University Square precinct. (The lanes within the
blocks are a different matter; see below, 6.3). Therefore the recommenda-
tions in this section should be seen as ideas towards a City Action Plan for the area, pursuant to the objectives of the Strategy Plan.

It is assumed that such an Action Plan would envisage the progressive increase of university-oriented land uses, both academic and residential, within the precinct, and the corresponding decrease in commercial and industrial uses. It would also have to take into account the fact that the timetable for the changeover is likely to be a very protracted one, and to cater indefinitely for a degree of mixed use.

The character of Grattan Street is unlikely to change significantly over this period. At present it is a through street carrying fairly heavy traffic which is fast-moving because the street is seldom overloaded. The east-west freeway, if built, would cause the volume of traffic to drop initially, but in accordance with Parkinson's Law of Traffic (Traffic expands to fill the street capacity available) it would then return to its present level over a few years.

Leicester, Barry and Bouverie Streets carry light local traffic only. Each is wide enough to allow centre as well as kerbside parking.

Berkeley Street is narrower, has no centre parking, and the local traffic to and from its industrial premises is probably heavier, but not significantly so.

All these streets have T intersections with Grattan Street at their northern ends.

Pelham Street at the southern boundary of the precinct is another wide street with light traffic and centre parking.

There is little doubt that this street system has more than adequate capacity for the traffic currently moving into, out of, and through the precinct. Except under abnormal conditions it would remain more than adequate to cope with the extra traffic generated by doubling the floor area on the redevelopment sites (from 1:1 to 2:1, approximately) which is more or less what the site controls here recommended would allow. Abnormal conditions would be a new major use generating high vehicle numbers with peak loads, for example a multi-level parking station, or a large public theatre or concert hall.

That is not to say that such uses could not be accommodated as regards traffic, but rather that they would have to be the subject of specific traffic studies, if proposed.

In addition to the effect on traffic of increased building density, one must also consider the effect of change of use on vehicle trip origins and destinations. In particular, the progressive change to university uses in the precinct would be expected to result in more vehicle movement between it and other parts of the university.

There are two things to be said about this: one, that movement involving right-hand turns across Grattan Street is and will continue to be dangerous and therefore should be discouraged; two, that the 1970 Report principle,
of restricting vehicle movement about the grounds to essential traffic, also applies here. Taken together, these two points imply restricting rather than easing direct vehicle access across Grattan Street from the north ends of Barry and Leicester Streets; in fact, the closing of these two streets at that end.

Essential traffic is that which is required for the transport of goods, handicapped or important people, or for the provision of services. Some of this traffic is between the university and the outside world, some involves movement between one part of the university and the other. Only in the latter case is there likely to be any inconvenience if the route which must be taken is made somewhat circuitous, and even so the inconvenience is small; a matter of several more minutes at most. The potential gains, on the other hand, are the prevention of dangerous vehicle movements, the elimination of through traffic in the precinct, discouragement of non-essential traffic, improved pedestrian access, and more landscaped areas.

The simple closure of Leicester and Barry Streets at their north ends is sufficient for traffic purposes, but greater benefits to pedestrians and landscaping would result from extending the closures about 50 metres to the south. In Leicester Street the bowling club retains an entrance to its car park within this area, and as long as this remains the width of the closure would have to be not more than about 20 metres from the Grattan Street kerb alignment to keep the entrance open. In Barry Street however there is no such restriction.

6.3 Internal Lanes.

The existing lanes within the blocks have presumably been evolved to give service access to the existing or former pattern of land subdivision and ownership. As that pattern changes, so will the service access requirements. It is unlikely that the present lane system will remain the best answer to those requirements. It should therefore be University policy to acquire title to any lane which gives access only to University-owned properties, and to consolidate it with those properties for the purposes of future development.

6.4 Parking.

A comprehensive study of parking needs in the precinct is beyond the scope of this report. Ideally it would take into account the parking requirements of the University as a whole, together with the legitimate demands upon the precinct of non-university parking. It would seek to balance these respective claims at the same time as forecasting their likely trends in the future.

Such a study would be a major task. Because both university and city policies are involved, it should properly be carried out as an exercise of the 'joint planning body' recommended (as noted in 3 above) in the City of Melbourne Strategy Plan. Obviously this would be a long-term exercise, if it happens at all.

Meanwhile some provision has to be made for future street parking and on-site parking in the precinct. The following observations are intended to contribute towards this end, as well as providing a starting-point for
The University received a preliminary Parking and Traffic Study from Harris Lange and Partners in 1970, the specific recommendations of which were incorporated in the Master Plan Report of that year. Whilst directed primarily to the problems of the main site, the study also examined those of the surrounding area, and its findings are still generally relevant. It stressed the need for a further comprehensive study.

6.4.1 Street Parking.

In the streets around University Square the pattern is unchanged from that shown on Harris Lange's Fig 2-1 (Fig. 7 of this report). Harris Lange did not conduct a detailed inventory of spaces because, although "the external street system contributed markedly to parking supply", the non-university demand was unknown, and Melbourne City Council could not forecast what changes, if any, were likely.

At the present time there are about 200 car parking spaces in Barry and Leicester Streets. Adding those in the section of Grattan Street opposite the precinct, and (say) half of those in the sections of Bouverie, Pelham and Berkeley Streets encircling it, gives a total of about 330 street parking spaces in the precinct or adjacent to it. Most of these are metered.

The proposal to close off the north ends of Leicester and Barry Streets over a distance of 50 metres would cause a net reduction of 20 spaces. None of the other recommendations of this report would have any significant effect on available street parking spaces.

On any reasonable assessment, most if not all of the presently available spaces should be regarded as serving primarily the parking needs of those occupying or visiting the properties in or near the precinct. That they are so regarded by the City Council, and are not meant for park-and-ride commuters, is shown by the fact that most of them are short-term metered. (Council has considered all-day parking meters in the vicinity of the University, but not in these streets. Harris Lange, op.cit.,2.6.4).

Therefore as the properties in or near the precinct come increasingly into university ownership or use these parking spaces should legitimately be regarded as increasingly oriented to that use; or to put it another way, an increasing proportion of the street parking in the area should be included in any assessment of total parking available for university purposes - including any assessment of off-street parking requirements.

6.4.2 Off-Street Parking.

Harris Lange made a very qualified estimate in 1970 of the total demand by 1985 for parking spaces associated with the University (on or off street) at 4500 spaces (op.cit.3.2). It should be noted that this was before the OPEC oil price increase and talk of impending energy crisis, and assumed a rate of increase of student driven cars which may not now be justified. In any case it was stressed that the estimate should not be used in lieu of a proper parking and travel study. (Loder & Bayly's Parking and Traffic Study, February, 1975, re-estimated the total at 4600.)
At that time, according to an estimate by Clark, quoted by Harris Lange (op.cit.2.4), there were more than 5,500 on-street spaces available within 5-10 minutes walk of the University. However Harris Lange proposed to leave these entirely out of account on the ground that "the University should ... aim at satisfying all demand by use of off-street parking facilities." (op.cit.3.3.1).

That is tantamount to saying that street parking is available to all users except those associated with the University, a view which is hardly reasonable. In pursuing the stated aim of satisfying the demand for parking generated by its users, the University should, as noted above, be entitled to take street parking into account. The extent to which it may do so should be one of the subjects of further study, together with a new assessment of total future demand, and an inventory of existing on-site spaces. Only when all these data are available will it be possible to determine objectively how many more on-site spaces will need to be provided, and where.

The Council's recently established Residents' Preference Parking Scheme has most impact in Carlton and Parkville and little impact in South Carlton.

In the meantime, however, each new building project will be subject to whatever formula Melbourne City Council has in force at the time for the provision of associated off-street parking.

At present this is one space to 93m² of floor space for academic uses, with residential use varying according to type.

The total gross site area of the two blocks in the precinct (inclusive of internal lanes) is 34 540m². Total potential floor area at an overall plot ratio of 1.5:1 is 51 810m²; at 2:1 it is 69 080m². Car spaces required at 1:93m² (ignoring residential uses) are respectively 560 or 744.

Unless and until the formula is changed, these figures are, very approximately, the order of on-site parking spaces which would have to be provided if the sites were completely redeveloped for academic use.

The whole exercise is highly theoretical, but nevertheless it is interesting to note that at 30m² per car (South Lawn underground carpark, a very efficient layout, gives 24.2m² per car) the area required to park 560 and 744 cars is 16 200m² and 22 320m² respectively, or 48 and 65 per cent respectively of the gross site area. This strongly suggests the feasibility of continuing to provide such parking on one level under buildings or podia, as has already been done successfully on the main site.

6.5 Pedestrians.

From the beginning, a primary aim of the Master Plan has been to make it easier, safer, and more pleasant to move about the University on foot, and this aim must be pursued just as vigorously in the University Square precinct.

There are two aspects to be considered: ease of movement within the precinct itself, and its interconnection with the rest of the University.
6.5.1 Movement within the Precinct.

The closure of Barry and Leicester Streets at their north ends reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflict by eliminating through traffic and providing a traffic-free pedestrian route across the precinct.

New development within the blocks should make provision for pedestrian thoroughfares across the built-up sites wherever possible, but particularly for a diagonal movement between Lincoln Square in the south-east corner and the northern end of University Square. (A corresponding diagonal movement from the south-west is less important and probably not practicable). These thoroughfares may be routes along alleyways, across courts, through building undercrofts, and so on, with minimum changes of level, and with colonnades or other means of weather protection where practicable. The thoroughfare through the Old Quad is a very good example of all these things.

6.5.2 Interconnection with the University.

As previously noted in 2, satisfactory pedestrian access across Grattan Street can only be provided by a bridge. The 1970 Report points out (3.63) that it is preferable to have the bridge land on the first floor or podium of a building so that it can link with pedestrian thoroughfares at that level; this has been the case with the Swanston Street bridge.

Neither the Tri-Radiate nor the Engineering group of buildings on the north side of Grattan Street is designed to accept such a connection, and neither would be easily adaptable. It would be more sensible therefore to make the connection into a new building. The Master Plan shows a potential new building on Grattan Street, east of the Tri-Radiate; it is recommended that the bridge be located just west of the Gatekeeper's Cottage, and either designed in conjunction with the new building or (if built first) designed so that it can be incorporated into the building subsequently. (Plan 2).

Note that the northern approach ramp picks up from close to the main north-south pedestrian thoroughfare; this is highly desirable to attract users.

The ramp at the south end would run east-west in Grattan Street immediately south of the tree trunks and passing through the lower branches of the first two. (Some branches may have to be cut).

Ideally, if the bowling club were removed, the ramp would be located south of the footpath, and clear of the trees, in the north end of an enlarged University Square.

With the construction of the bridge, the zebra crossing in Grattan Street should be removed, to discourage crossing the street at the level of traffic. It might be necessary to put up kerbside railings as a further deterrent.
7. Landscaping.

7.1 University Square.

As with the street system, it is not part of this proposal that the University should seek to own the Square, but rather that it should remain a City park, available to all. Any recommendations which follow should therefore be seen as further ideas towards a City Action Plan for the precinct.

Landscape treatment of University Square should be considered in relation to the several functions or potential functions of the Square.

These are:

- a city park, that is, a public area for casual recreation
- a town square, giving scale and outlook to surrounding buildings
- a forecourt to the University's main gates.

It is impossible to consider the last-named function without referring to the bowling club. To quote the 1970 Report (5.1): "Its (the Square's) shape and location suggest that it is the last vestige of a long-dead plan to link the University to the city with a green corridor. Whether this is so or not, its connection with the University has been broken by the placement of a bowling club at the northern or University end of the park .... we strongly recommend that the University press for the establishment of University Square as a forecourt to the main entrance by the removal of the bowling club."

Since that was written positive moves have been made to implement the establishment of the surrounding area as a university precinct, adding greater force to the argument for the removal of the club.

Whether the club stays or goes, the existing natural features of the Square should be retained, that is, its lawn surface and avenues of fine mature elms. Nothing more is needed, and anything more would detract from the splendid simplicity of the planting.

So long as the club stays, the University should press for the extension of the elm rows up to the club's southern boundary.

If the club goes, the avenues of trees, and the centre path, should be extended right up to Grattan Street, (Plan 2).

It may be observed that the centre path does not come out exactly opposite the main gates. This is of no consequence. We are not attempting to create an immense visual axis on the ground, with a distant focus (e.g. Champs Elysees/Arc de Triomphe, Versailles, Washington). A better analogy would be the Georgian squares of London, or the Place des Vosges, Paris, where the formality is evident, but stops well short of the grandiose. The green tunnel of the central avenue running the full length of the Square would be a vista sufficient in itself.

The 50 metre closures of Barry and Leicester Streets should become simply extensions of the Square, planted with lawn and nothing else, except
the continuation of the elm avenue along Grattan Street.

Consideration should be given to using brick for new paving to give visual continuity with the University walkways, and ultimately the repaving in brick of existing paths.

7.2 Streets.
Because of the dominance of the Square, further street planting in Barry and Leicester Streets is unnecessary.

Footpath planting of large trees should be considered in Bouverie and Pelham Streets, but are probably not practicable in Berkeley Street because of its width and the service traffic it carries.

7.3 Development Sites.
Landscaping of open spaces within the blocks should generally follow the pattern already established in the grounds. There does not appear to be any existing planting in the area worth preserving. The largest tree is the one just north of 218 Berkeley Street, but this, if retained, would stand in the way of linking 218 with new development, as recommended earlier (5.2.1 and 5.2.3).

In accordance with the recommendations for urban streetscape in the 1970 Report (3.53, page 22), street frontage setbacks for planting are not recommended. Small setbacks adjacent to terrace houses may be necessary to align with the houses; even then it may be suitable in some cases to enclose the space as a garden court, whilst in others it could be treated as an extension of the pavement with small scale planting.

The preceding sections have been concerned exclusively with physical planning considerations. These have been based on the assumption, stated at the outset (Section 1), that the area would become a university precinct, as a result of the University progressively acquiring more properties there and putting them to University use.

The physical planning recommendations have been deliberately framed so as to be unaffected by either the pace of the transition, or the precise nature of the ultimate use; since neither can be predicted at this time. Nevertheless it may be of some value to consider what future university uses may be located in the precinct.

There are two questions of future use:
In the shorter term, to find interim uses for existing properties purchased in anticipation of future development;
In the longer term, to forecast the likely users of future development.

The answer to the first question would seem to be; small departments and activities relatively unattached and currently dispersed (for example, in Parkville). In some cases they could be offered a permanent home in existing buildings to be preserved. In others their tenure would cease with redevelopment, but with the possibility of relocation in the new building.
Before answering the second question we should note that the physical planning principles of the 1970 Report would not prevent any department whatsoever from locating in the area; therefore what follows is merely a canvassing of possibilities and in no sense a closing of options.

That said, we may go on to observe that practical considerations as well as precedent induce us to look first to faculties which gravitate towards the southern part of the existing site.

Of these, Medicine and Engineering appear to have their future expansion well taken care of in their respective corners of the existing site, assuming Medicine has first claim on any building to the east of the Tri-Radiate and noting the accepted problem of housing Pharmacology. Given that assumption, there seem to be only two obvious outlets for Arts expansion; the high rise north of Old Arts, which would be shared with Economics, Commerce, Law, and perhaps some Union commercial functions; and University Square.

Arts is probably the most "interactive" faculty, and if so, some dispersal of its functions, giving it a centre in several university precincts, may not be without benefits. The precedent for dispersal is already well-established by its centres in Redmond Barry (Psychology, Geography,) Old Arts, Babel and John Medley, as well as locations in Parkville and Carlton.

The relationship of Music to Arts is another reason for establishing an Arts centre in University Square, if Music goes there as currently proposed.

There is also a relationship between Music and Education, which may put Education on the list of possibilities.

Another prime possibility is Law, except that Law has hitherto been regarded as the major user for future development of Carlton Area A. A further possibility again is a discrete element of Economics and Commerce such as Business Administration or the Institute of Economic and Social Research. In the longer term, the new construction site on Leicester Street may provide an area for the housing of the Residential Centre, in the event of the sale of the building in Swanston Street.

It should not be forgotten that the City of Melbourne Strategy Plan calls the area a Mixed Use Zone (see Section 3 above) in which the objective is a mixture of such things as high density residential, motels, specialized retail, wholesaling, light industry. Residential is specifically meant to include "inner-city housing for students". Of the uses listed by the plan, it is the only one which the University can provide, and to provide it in the precinct should be one of the University's objectives.

Specialized retail, wholesaling, and light industry already exist within the precinct, as do commercial and professional offices, and most of these will continue to be represented there for a long time to come. It is in recognition of this that variety and diversity rather than homogeneity of building form has been recommended in this report.
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