UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
MASTER PLAN REPORT 1991
In March 1971, the Council of The University of Melbourne adopted the Master Plan Report 1970; this was followed a decade later by a second comprehensive planning study, the Master Plan Report 1981.

This Report, the Master Plan Report 1991, incorporates The Education Precinct (the site of the Institute of Education which was formerly the Melbourne College of Advanced Education), The Recreation Grounds Reserve (including proposals for future changes) and a Review of Planning Developments.

By following the planning concepts laid down in the previous Reports, we have achieved over the past twenty years significant improvements to the University and provided an environment appropriate to a major centre of excellence in learning and research. The Master Plan Report 1991 will form the basis of planning into the 21st century.

The contribution of Bryce Mortlock, Master Planner to the University since 1968, was recognised by the Council of The University of Melbourne in 1988 by awarding him the Doctor of Architecture, honoris causa.

Special mention should be made of the work of the Chairman of the Buildings Committee, Professor B. A. Sheehan, the Registrar (Property and Buildings) Mr A. W. Bradley and his staff and the former Deputy Vice-Principal (Property) Mr M. R. Pawsey.

D. G. Penington
Vice-Chancellor
Dear Professor Sheehan,

I have pleasure in submitting this Master Plan Report 1991, which is the third comprehensive planning study arising out of my appointment in 1968 as Master Planner. It is particularly gratifying to be able to record that the principles recommended in the original (1970) Report have successfully guided the development of the grounds throughout the twenty years since their adoption, and to note that they are now to be applied to the integration of the Education Precinct into the University Master Plan.

A report such as this is necessarily the outcome of a long period of constructive collaboration between myself and the University. It could not have been written without the help of yourself, the members of the Buildings Committee, the Registrar (Property and Buildings) and his staff. The former Deputy Vice-Principal (Property), Mr. M.R. Pawsey, has played a major part, especially in conducting critical negotiations with the Melbourne City Council. My gratitude and thanks are due to all.

The Melbourne architect Peter Elliott has been my associate in the preparation of the report. I am indebted to him for valuable advice and suggestions, for much of the on-the-spot research, and for all the line drawings, including adapting to the report format the Recreation Grounds plans of Lionel King and the building envelopes and amendments plans of Blomquist and Wark.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Bryce Mortlock
Master Planner
April 1991
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION
A. THE EDUCATION PRECINCT
   - A1. Objectives of this part: 1
   - A2. Planning principles: 1
   - A3. The existing education precinct: 2
     - A3.1. Existing architectural character: 2
     - A3.2. Existing buildings: 3
       - A3.2.1. Buildings of architectural or historic value: 3
       - A3.2.2. Buildings of economic value: 3
     - A3.3. Existing external spaces: 4
     - A4.1. Summary: 5
     - A4.2. Building envelopes: 6
       - A4.2.1. The function of envelope diagrams: 6
       - A4.2.2. The Swanston Street envelope: 8
       - A4.2.3. The transverse envelope: 9
       - A4.2.4. The Alice Hoy envelope: 10
       - A4.2.5. The 1888 envelope: 10
       - A4.2.6. Provisional envelopes: 10
       - A4.2.7. Colonnades: 10
     - A4.3. Traffic, parking and pedestrians: 10
       - A4.3.1. Objectives: 10
       - A4.3.2. Traffic: 12
       - A4.3.3. Car parking: 13
       - A4.3.4. Pedestrians: 14
       - A4.3.5. Landscaping: 16

B. THE RECREATION GROUNDS RESERVE
   - B1. Introduction: 17
   - B2. Site use and administration: 17
   - B3. Existing site and facilities: 17
     - B3.1. Sport and Physical Recreation Centre: 17
     - B3.2. Beaurepaire Centre: 17
     - B3.3. Playing fields and practice areas: 17
     - B3.4. Pavilion area: 17
     - B4. Storage: 18
     - B5. Parking: 18
   - B6. Proposed development plan: 19
     - B6.1. Sport and Physical Recreation Centre: sports stadium: 20
     - B6.2. Beaurepaire Centre: 20
     - B6.3. Playing fields and practice areas: 21
     - B6.4. Pavilion area: 21
     - B6.5. Future grandstand complex: 21
     - B6.6. Traffic: 21
     - B6.7. Possible car park: 21

C. REVIEW OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENTS
   - C1. Developments since 1981: 22
     - C1.1. Buildings constructed since 1981: 22
     - C1.2. Victorian Architecture Medal: 22
     - C2. Changes to Master Plan envelopes: 22
       - C2.1. Changes approved in March 1990: 22
         - C2.1.1. Institute of Education (MCAE) site: 26
         - C2.1.2. Economics and Commerce extension (south): 26
         - C2.1.3. Howard Florey Building extension (west): 26
         - C2.1.4. Old Pathology southern facade and the Richard Berry Precinct: 26
         - C2.1.5. Southern Precinct: 26
         - C2.1.6. Computer Centre Building: 26
       - C2.2. Recommended changes to Eastern Precinct: 26
     - C3. Negotiations with external authorities: 27
       - C3.1. Conservation issues: 27
       - C3.2. Planning Scheme Amendment RL5: 27
       - C3.3. Master Plan Agreement: 28
       - C3.4. Knowledge Precinct: 28
     - Table C1.1: 29
     - Diagram C2.1: 23
     - Diagram C2.2: 24
     - Diagram C2.3: 25
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

MASTER PLAN REPORT 1991

INTRODUCTION
In March 1971 the Council of the University of Melbourne gave authority for
the release of the University of Melbourne Master Plan Report 1970 under the
seal of the University. The principles of the 1970 Report have governed the
development of the University grounds since that time.

In 1981 it was thought desirable to review the history of the Master Plan’s first
ten years, and to record the changes to buildings and grounds which had
occurred under its control during that period. The result was the University of
recapitulated the essentials of the 1970 Report.

The Master Plan Report 1991 fittingly marks the close of the Master Plan’s
second decade and looks forward to its third. The 1991 Report is divided into
three parts, as follows:

Part A: The Education Precinct
This part applies the Master Plan principles to the site of the Institute of
Education, formerly the Melbourne College of Advanced Education, which is
now part of the University grounds.

Part B: The Recreation Grounds Reserve
This part extends the scope of the Master Plan to include proposals for future
changes to the Recreation Grounds Reserve.

Part C: Review of planning developments
This part contains
  • a brief description of the developments which have occurred in the grounds
during the period of almost a decade since the 1981 Report;
  • a summary of the changes to master plan envelopes which have been
approved during that period, or which are currently proposed for approval;
  • a report on the progress to date of discussions with the Melbourne City
Council on the RL5 Master Plan and conservation issues.
PART A: THE EDUCATION PRECINCT

A1. OBJECTIVES OF THIS PART

As a result of the amalgamation of the University of Melbourne with the Melbourne College of Advanced Education, resulting in the formation of the Institute of Education, the former college site is now part of the University grounds. It is therefore necessary to consider how the college site, now the Education Precinct, may be brought within the scope of the University’s Master Plan. Matters for consideration include the application of the Master Plan principles to the future development of the precinct, with due regard to the conservation of valuable buildings and external spaces; the delineation of building envelopes; provision for parking; vehicle and pedestrian movement; and landscaping.

Of particular importance is the need to overcome the effects of the historically separate development of the college site and the University grounds, and to integrate them by reducing, wherever possible, the physical barriers that presently exist at the former common boundary, and by providing improved access routes between them.

Achieving these objectives is the subject matter of this Part.

A2. PLANNING PRINCIPLES

The 1970 Report laid down the planning principles which have governed the management of the University grounds and its buildings since that time. The principles of the 1970 Report were not limited in their application to the main site, but were intended to apply equally to the expansion areas, such as the Eastern Precinct and the University Square Precinct. Application of the principles to the latter was detailed in the University Square Precinct Report 1977. Similarly, this 1991 Report will illustrate the application of those principles to the Education Precinct.

It is not intended to quote here the detailed recommendations of the 1970 Report, which should be read in that document. However it may be useful to mention some of the major objectives. They may be stated as follows (relevant sections of the 1970 Report in brackets):

- Attainment of the maximum building volume consistent with defined standards of amenity and known physical constraints (1.3).
- The academic centre should be developed as intensively as possible (3.3).
- 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 undercover 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.
- Develop the grounds for optimum use and enjoyment by people on foot (3.6).
- Landscaping should retain existing natural features, particularly mature trees (3.73).
- Open areas for casual recreation in the form of parks and spaces available to all (5.1).
A3. THE EXISTING EDUCATION PRECINCT

A3.1. Existing architectural character

The buildings in the Education precinct vary greatly in quality and building type, reflecting the diversity of styles and functional requirements which have influenced the development of the site over the 100 years of its history. There is no consistent overall architectural character, to which new buildings should conform.

In this respect the precinct differs only marginally from the rest of the University. In the latter there has been an attempt in some quarters to coin a general term “collegiate gothic”, and to cast it over a fairly diverse collection of buildings of pre-world war 2 vintage, some of which appear to the sceptic’s eye to have no recognizable gothic characteristics. However that term could hardly be stretched to cover the post-war buildings. They display a diversity which would frustrate even the most ingenious attempt to bring them within a single stylistic classification.

In this context the problems confronting the designer of a new building are not as great as may at first appear. Insofar as they are merely stylistic, a competent architect can usually solve them by combining architectural good manners with a sympathetic choice of materials. The more serious problems of bulk, form, overshadowing, and the like, are controlled by the envelope restrictions of the Master Plan.

Much the same will apply to the Education Precinct. The 1888 building is the only one to display a strong and lively architectural character, but subsequent buildings have chosen to turn their backs on this stylistic precedent, without managing to establish a common architectural character of their own. In the dominant post-war buildings this stylistic diversity is compounded by a diversity of ponderous forms and masses, and by uncomfortable relationships between adjoining buildings.

As in the rest of the University, the massing and relationships of future buildings will be controlled by master plan envelopes. Within this framework, selection of a suitable architectural character will depend ultimately on the skill of the project architect, assisted by such general guidelines as are given in this Report. The practice of adding further particular guidelines as part of each project brief should be continued.
A3.2. Existing buildings

The existing buildings likely to be retained fall into two categories as shown on drawing No.A3.2; those of architectural or historic value, and those of economic value.

A3.2.1. Buildings of architectural or historic value

The criteria for architectural and historic values are subjective. Judgements will differ, even amongst specialists; and the experience of recent decades clearly shows that the consensus of such judgements may vary with time. The consensus at any particular time may be given legal or quasi-legal reinforcement by National Trust classification or by listing on the National Estate Register or Historic Buildings Register.

The 1888 building currently has National Trust classification, and is recommended in this Report for preservation, together with the adjoining South Garden and front fence to Grattan Street, also classified.

No other building is classified or registered, and none is recommended in this Report for preservation on the score of architectural or historic value.

A conservation report for the precinct carried out by Andrew C. Ward and Associates, dated 30 August 1989, recommends that the Frank Tate Building, completed in 1940, be National Estate and Historic Buildings registered. This report does not agree with that recommendation.

A3.2.2. Buildings of economic value

Buildings which do not meet the criteria for preservation on the grounds of architectural or historic merit may nevertheless be retained so long as they satisfy economic criteria; that is, so long as they remain structurally sound, provide useful space, are economic to maintain, and do not occupy sites which are needed for other purposes considered more important by the University.

All the buildings on the site other than the 1888 building may be assessed on the score of their economic value, or lack of it. They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smyth</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Tate</td>
<td>1939 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Hoy</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1969 - 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>1971 - 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of these “buildings of economic value” are likely to remain in the precinct for a long time. However the progressive implementation of this Master Plan will require the early demolition or removal of the John Smyth, the portables, the Frank Tate, and the cafeteria building on Swanston Street at the east end of Alice Hoy.

All these buildings except the last were proposed to be demolished in the State College Master Plan Report 1976 by Eggleston MacDonald & Secomb.

A3.3. Existing external spaces
The existing external spaces are shown on site plan diagram No.A3.3. They vary widely in both quality and amenity. Only two of them, both adjoining the 1888 red brick building, are worthy of preservation in their present state: zone 1, the lower court with plane tree; and zone 2, the south garden by Guilfoyle. These and the other zones are discussed below.

Zone 1: Lower Court
The court immediately to the north of the 1888 building, with its superb plane tree, is a significant intimate space, valued as a major outdoor meeting and relaxing area. It requires minimal alteration to paving surfaces and seating. If it were possible to relocate the child care facility with its outdoor playground then this area would be free for more general use.

Zone 2: South Garden
Originally laid out by W.R. Guilfoyle, the south garden and its front fence, both National Trust classified, comprise the authentic historical foreground to the 1888 facade, itself classified. Building and garden together provide a satisfying image of the former college, and this grouping with its frontage to Grattan Street should remain the formal entrance to the precinct.

Zone 3: South West Corner
This zone is essentially an open underdeveloped space split fairly equally between sealed bitumen car park and a sloping raised lawn adjoining the west wing of the 1888 building. It is on a north/south pedestrian route connecting with the main University grounds, but pedestrians are required to walk through the car park, since no separate pathway exists, before linking up with the narrow north/south alleyway between Engineering and the Education Precinct.

If the car parking is removed, as proposed in Section A4.3, this zone can become open space forming an extension of the South Garden, landscaped in sympathy with it.
Zone 4: Upper Plaza
This zone comprises the raised hard paved plaza wrapping around the north and west sides of the Frank Tate building, including the external access stairways. The space between the ERC and Science buildings, hitherto an extension of this Upper Plaza, is being filled in by further building at the time of writing this report.

At present the Upper Plaza is isolated by its height, by the abrupt changes of level between it and adjoining open spaces (approximately 1.5 metres on the north, 6 metres on the south), and by the formidable means of access. The proposal (see Section 4) to raise Education Court to approximately the same level and provide an underground car park would integrate this plaza with the precinct's major open space.

Zone 5: Main Car Park
At present the open space to the north of the precinct functions mainly as a hard paved car park for some 160 vehicles, as well as a major pedestrian circulation route off Swanston Street and between buildings. It is the largest single open space in the precinct.

The potential exists for putting the cars underground and creating a large landscaped court similar in principle, if not in detail, to the existing South Lawn of the University, enclosed by low to medium rise buildings. That proposal is recommended in this Report.

A4. MASTER PLAN PROPOSAL
A4.1. Summary
The essentials of the master planning proposals of this report, which are illustrated on plan A4.1, may be summarized as follows:

• Create a major new landscaped, traffic-free court (Education Court) at approximately the level of the ground floor of Alice Hoy;

• Remove surface parking to an underground car park beneath Education Court;

• Enclose Education Court on the east (the Swanston Street frontage) and the south by buildings within new building envelopes;

• Preserve the 1888 building in its garden setting fronting Grattan Street, and enlarge the garden by removing surface parking;

• Retain and enlarge the lower courtyard containing the plane tree;

• Revise and improve the access between the Precinct and the rest of the University.

The various elements of these proposals are discussed in more detail below.
A4.2. Building Envelopes

A4.2.1. The function of envelope diagrams

This report uses the same graphic device as previous Master Plan reports for delineating the permissible limits of new building: the envelope diagram. The function of building envelopes is explained in previous reports, and by now should be well understood, but to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding it is repeated below, substantially as given in the 1981 Report, pages 64 and 65:

- The new building envelopes show where new buildings, if needed, may be built, and where they may not;
- the envelopes do not imply that new buildings shall or must be built within them. If the new buildings are not needed, they will not be built;
- therefore the envelopes in themselves do not imply the demolition of existing buildings, regardless of whether the existing buildings fall inside or outside the envelopes. The criteria for the retention or demolition of existing buildings are architectural, historic, or economic value, as stated in item 3.2 above;
- however once an existing building has been demolished, any part of its site which falls outside a new building envelope reverts to open space.

The proposed building envelopes are shown on diagram A4.1. A new building envelope is proposed on the Swanston Street frontage (the Swanston Street envelope), and a transverse wing separates Education and Lower Courts (the transverse envelope). Envelopes may be presumed to coincide with certain existing buildings. All these envelopes are discussed below.
A4.2.2. The Swanston Street envelope

The proposal to place the main building envelope on the Swanston Street frontage has been discussed with Melbourne City Council planners, and there was agreement that the urban streetscape could benefit from being defined by a continuous building of this form.

The envelope defines a height limit intended to be capable of accommodating six storeys above basement level. This should result in a height above street level which on average is approximately the same as that of the Arts Centre, allowing for the fact that the height diminishes towards the north, as Swanston Street slopes upward.

The Arts Centre has only a minor setback (about 1 metre) from the street frontage, which is inadequate for serious landscape treatment. The new envelope defines a setback of 3 metres which, taken together with the existing footpath, should allow the young elm trees, which the City Council has planted in the footpath, to attain their mature canopy size without interference from the building.

However it is desirable to leave some scope for the “modelling” by the project architect of the building’s street elevation, to avoid the monotonous appearance of a uniform flat facade of this scale. It should be permissible for architectural features such as columns, pilasters, string courses, cornices, window bays, balconies, awnings and the like to break through the envelope, even coming right up to the street alignment, provided the street tree plantings are not interfered with, and provided the encroachments do not occupy an unreasonable amount of setback ground area.
It is impossible to anticipate the locations and extent of this modelling in the envelope diagram, and therefore it is not shown; instead it is recommended that it be negotiated with the project architect in the sketch design stage. See diagram A4.2.2.

Setbacks from the envelope limits, such as for example a recessed upper storey or storeys, are of course within the discretion of the project architect, if required by the brief.

There should be a major pedestrian entrance through this building to Education Court and thence to the grounds generally. The architectural design should give this entrance due prominence, and to this end its portico might be one of the architectural features projecting up to the street frontage. It should also afford enticing glimpses through the building into Education Court.

The envelope is in contact with the north face of the Arts Centre, and any building within it should likewise be in contact.

---

**A4.2.2 The Swanston Street envelope**

This envelope is intended to accommodate a building of three storeys above Education Court level, which will make it approximately five storeys above Lower Court level. It forms the division between the two courts. It is stepped on the south to avoid overshadowing the Lower Court. The building should make use of the stepping to provide a pedestrian connection between the upper and lower court levels in easy stages, avoiding the abruptness of the existing steps. See diagram A4.2.3.

---

**A4.2.3 The transverse envelope**

This envelope is intended to accommodate a building of three storeys above Education Court level, which will make it approximately five storeys above Lower Court level. It forms the division between the two courts. It is stepped on the south to avoid overshadowing the Lower Court. The building should make use of the stepping to provide a pedestrian connection between the upper and lower court levels in easy stages, avoiding the abruptness of the existing steps. See diagram A4.2.3.
A4.2.4. The Alice Hoy envelope

An envelope defines the existing Alice Hoy building, including the extra strip formed by increasing its width to the south, under construction at the time of this report. The envelope additionally permits the extension of this increased width to the western end of the building, in place of the Gelman Hall building, which is outside the envelope for the following reason.

It is strongly recommended that the Gelman Hall building be removed so that an effective pedestrian link can be created between the new Education Court and Monash Road, and thence to the remainder of the grounds. This north-west corner of the precinct is the ideal point at which to form such a link, and in any case the wall of buildings on the western boundary of the Alice Hoy building makes it impossible to create a satisfactory opening at any other point.

The removal of Gelman Hall can be accomplished only if the functions served by the hall can be accommodated elsewhere, presumably in new building envelopes, in a space bearing the Gelman Hall title.

Other aspects of this recommendation are discussed in A4.3.2 Traffic and A4.3.4 Pedestrians. See diagram A4.2.4.

A4.2.5. The 1888 envelope

The 1888 building may be assumed to define its own envelope, since it is a building of architectural and historical value and is recommended in this report for preservation, as stated in A3.2.1 above. The envelope includes the later addition to the east of the west wing, which has been carefully designed and executed so as to be entirely in keeping with the original building.

A4.2.6. Provisional envelopes

The existing Arts, Science and ERC buildings may be assumed to define their own envelopes for the period of their economic life, which is expected to be considerable. It will be time to consider possible new envelopes to replace them if and when that period comes to an end.

A4.2.7. Colonnades

Serious consideration should be given to providing a colonnade around Education Court as part of the new buildings in the Swanston Street and transverse envelopes, and along the south side of Alice Hoy. The attractiveness of a colonnaded court is eloquently attested by the Old Quadrangle; and it has the practical advantage of giving weather protection to pedestrians, and solar screening to the buildings.

The colonnade may be up to two storeys high, and if it is built as an adjunct to the building as illustrated by the section diagram A4.2.2, it may be wholly outside the envelope. No attempt has been made to show this in plan on the envelope diagram, but if adjunct-type colonnades are proposed by building designers, the envelope may be assumed to embrace them to the extent shown on the section diagram.

A4.3. Traffic, parking and pedestrians

A4.3.1. Objectives

In the 1970 Report (3.6, page 26) the overall aim of traffic planning is stated in one sentence: “It is to make satisfactory provision for essential vehicle traffic whilst developing the grounds for optimum use and enjoyment by people on foot.”

This overall objective was to be accomplished by

- reducing surface parking in the grounds;
- eliminating through traffic by treating the external public streets (Grattan, Swanston, College Crescent, Royal Parade) as the ring road for the grounds, and reducing internal roads to short spurs and loops off the ring; and
- segregating pedestrians and vehicles so as to make the grounds a traffic-free pedestrian precinct of linked landscaped courts.

Measures to achieve these aims were developed with the assistance of traffic engineers Harris Lange and Partners, and successfully applied to the main grounds.

Now that the College Precinct is an integral part of the grounds it shares the University’s objectives, and similar measures should be adopted to achieve them. The proposed measures are described below.
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A.4.3.2. Traffic

External access:
The Education Precinct lies within the “ring road” system, and therefore is readily adapted to the ring road access strategy. See diagram A4.3.2.

The existing road off Grattan Street in front of the 1888 building will be retained.

The existing entry point off Swanston Street immediately north of the Arts Centre has to be retained to provide access for service and emergency vehicles to the Lower Court area. It will become an underpass beneath the new Swanston Street building envelope.

- Another underpass off Swanston Street will give access to the proposed new underground car park. This is discussed below: see Car Parking.

Internal access:
The precinct currently has vehicle access from within the University grounds at two points on the western side, both from a spur service road off Monash Road. Both will need to be retained. They are:

- a ramp immediately to the north of Science. This will have to be extended to provide emergency access to the new Education Court, which will be approximately at the same level as the ground floor of Alice Hoy; and

- a service access point at the rear of Science.

However, note that the spur service road is proposed to be closed between Monash Road and the service entry point to Chemical Engineering (165), as part of the opening up of the north-west corner of the precinct to the main grounds (see A4.3.4 Pedestrians below). Access to all these points will then be via the service road off Monash Road between Education Technology (161) and Walter Boas (163).

Service and emergency vehicles:
Emergency vehicles will thus have access to every external courtyard space. Apart from this and the service access discussed above, the entire precinct will be “traffic free”.
A4.3.3. Car parking

There are currently 166 marked car parking spaces in or adjoining the precinct, in the three main locations shown on diagram A4.3.3 (a). In addition approximately 67 cars are permitted to park in tandem spaces, so that the total surface parking capacity is 233.

It is proposed to eliminate all of this surface parking and replace it with an underground car park beneath the proposed new Education Court (see A4.1 above). This proposal is the key to achieving the objective of converting the entire Education Precinct into "a traffic-free pedestrian precinct of linked landscaped courts", and it follows the successful precedent of the car park beneath the South Lawn.

The underground car park would occupy the area shown on diagram A4.3.3 (b). Its capacity would be approximately as follows:

- One level: 140 spaces
- One and a half levels: 200 (130 + 70)
- Two levels: 250 (130 + 120)

A separate feasibility study will be necessary to determine which of these (or other) possibilities is finally adopted, taking into account factors such as:

- excavation costs;
- cost of relocating major services known to exist but at unknown depths - sewer, stormwater, water, fire service, electricity, etc.;
- possible need to underpin existing adjoining structures;
- construction costs;
- landscaping; and
- the likely return on the investment.

Other possibilities include the degree to which the underground car park extends into the basements of the proposed new buildings. These options should remain open for decision after they have been considered and reported on as part of the parking feasibility study.
Car park access:
Traffic consultant advice on vehicle access to the proposed underground car park has been obtained from Ratio Consultants Pty Limited.

As stated above (A4.3.2. Traffic) entry to and exit from the car park will be by a single access driveway directly off Swanston Street, approximately midway between Grattan Street and Monash Road, as shown on Diagram A4.3.2. This is consistent with the City of Melbourne policy of keeping the number of crossovers to a minimum. The number of crossovers to the site from Swanston Street will in fact remain the same, since this one will replace the existing driveway giving access to the present Main Car Park.

The driveway would have separate entry and exit lanes, the dimensions of which would depend on the number of cars and their daily movement pattern. Assuming that most cars are parked all day, and their periods of arrival and departure are not heavily concentrated, one 3.5 metre lane in each direction should be sufficient for approximately 200 cars. The existing driveway satisfactorily serves about 160 cars.

**A4.3.4. Pedestrians**
The traffic and parking proposals will achieve the objective of segregating vehicles and pedestrians and creating a “traffic-free pedestrian precinct of linked landscaped courts”. Two aspects remain to be considered: pedestrian movement within the precinct itself, and pedestrian links connecting the precinct with the rest of the University. See diagram A4.3.4 (a).

Movement within the precinct:
Internal movement will be mostly through the precinct’s open spaces, the linked courts. Specific landscaping studies should be prepared for each of these, and should make suitable provision for pedestrian movement by way of pathways, paved surfaces, steps, ramps and the like. All changes of level should be connected by ramps suitable for wheelchair access.

Wherever possible, buildings should provide pedestrian thoroughfares from court to court at critical points, and covered way movement by means of colonnades and the like.

Interconnection with the University:
Between the precinct and the rest of the grounds there are formidable physical barriers, which appear to be intractable to all but very long term planning provisions. Such provisions are beyond the time scale contemplated by this report. Nevertheless some worthwhile improvements can be made.
The barriers consist of the wall of buildings on or near the western boundary presented by the Science and ERC complex on the east or precinct side, and the Engineering workshops on the western side.

A walkway exists between them, which forms a north-south link into the main grounds from the precinct's Grattan Street entrances. The redesigned landscaping of the south-west corner should preserve this connection. Some tidying up of the backyard type service areas along this route should be attempted in the short term, and in the longer term perhaps a connection through the Engineering buildings into the south-west corner garden may be possible; but these seem to be the limit of possibilities in this area.

In the north-west corner, however, the prospect is more hopeful. It is strongly recommended that the new Education Court be linked to the main grounds through an opening created by the removal of the Gelman Hall building at the western end of the Alice Hoy building, and by the closing of the section of service road as described above (A4.3.2 Traffic). The transition from the Education Court level down to the Monash Road footpath can then be attractively developed with terraced steps and an unobtrusive ramp as shown on diagram A4.2.4 and illustrated in the accompanying sketches.

This proposal offers the only effective means of breaching the wall of buildings which currently shuts off the precinct from the University on the west; and fortunately it places the opening at the very point where it will be most effective.

On the north the main central entrance of the Alice Hoy building is being altered, as part of the building works in progress at the time of writing, to provide both pedestrian access and visibility through to the present Main Car Park, and therefore to the future Education Court.

If and when redevelopment should occur on the Richard Berry site north of Monash Road, consideration should be given to a bridge link across Monash Road from the new building into the stair hall at the west end of Alice Hoy.
A4.3.5. Landscaping

The 1980 Report (page 36) makes the point that the spaces between buildings are as important as the buildings themselves, and should be treated accordingly. Landscape objectives and the means for achieving them are discussed at some length in the 1980 Report, and reiterated with much added detail in the Landscape Elements Report of 1974. These Reports can be left to speak for themselves. The principles they laid down have been embodied in the actual development of the existing grounds, which therefore provide a set of practical precedents for the landscaping of similar spaces within the College Precinct.

Subject to these guidelines, detailed designs should be prepared by landscape consultants. This Report offers only a few further observations, some of which have already been made above in A3.3 Existing external spaces.

Expert advice should be sought on the replanting of Monash Road following the completion of the Alice Hoy extensions. Those extensions have caused the loss of the planting screen in front of the building which formerly did much to soften its uncompromising facade, and planting of at least the same scale is needed as a replacement. Ideally it should be matched on the north side of the road to create an avenue planting effect. The building envelope on the Richard Berry site could be further revised if necessary to permit this.

Monash Road must always remain a vehicle thoroughfare, and therefore can never aspire to the pleasant condition of Masson Way; nevertheless much could be done by avenue planting to give it a unified treatment.

Education Court should not be entirely hard paved, and the substructure should be designed to allow for some tree planting, perhaps just one large tree in the centre. The obvious precedent is the South Lawn, but only in principle; it should not be copied down to the last detail.

There are good things in the Education Precinct at present; the South Garden and the Lower Court, for example. However much of the remainder is reminiscent of the main grounds before 1970. It can be similarly transformed by the measures proposed in this Report.
PART B: THE RECREATION GROUNDS RESERVE

B1. INTRODUCTION

Three separate Crown Grants each form an integral part of the University of Melbourne precinct in Parkville. They are the University grounds; the Recreation Grounds Reserve; and the Colleges.

The Colleges are separate and autonomous bodies, affiliated to the University; whereas the University Grounds and the Recreation Grounds are both in University ownership and controlled by the University Council. It is desirable, therefore, to include the Recreation Grounds within the scope of the University Master Plan, as proposed in this part of the 1991 Report.

B2. SITE USE AND ADMINISTRATION

The 1874 Crown Grant for the Recreation Grounds Reserve requires the site to be “used for a recreation ground for the members of The University of Melbourne and of the affiliated Colleges and for the Undergraduates and Students of such University...”.

Administration of the Recreation Grounds is the responsibility of the Committee for Sport and Physical Recreation. The Committee has to manage the sport and recreational facilities, both indoor and outdoor, of the Recreation Grounds, so as to meet the physical recreation needs of staff and students of the University and Colleges, whether as individuals, or as members of groups including 45 sports clubs.

B3. EXISTING SITE AND FACILITIES

The Recreation Grounds Reserve is surrounded on the east, north and west by the Colleges, and on the south by the University grounds.

Vehicular and pedestrian access to both the University and the Recreation Grounds Reserve is provided by Tin Alley, which runs east and west across the north boundary of the University, with its entrance from Swanston Street. Its junction with Royal Parade is exit only.

The Recreation Grounds Reserve may be considered as four distinct interrelated areas. They are as follows:

B3.1. Sport and Physical Recreation Centre

This is a building, partly single storey and partly two storey, containing the following facilities:
- administrative offices
- club meeting rooms
- equipment stores
- weight training rooms
- changing rooms
- sports medicine rooms
- squash courts.

Prior to 1990, there was an air supported plastic membrane “Stadium” structure (the Airhall) on the roof of the single storey wing which was used extensively for indoor sports and physical recreation. This reached the end of its useful life and has now been removed.

B3.2. Beaurepaire Centre

This is mainly a single storey structure which has the following facilities:
- 25 metre swimming pool
- changing rooms
- offices
- trophy hall
- gymnasium
- basement plant room.

Connected to the west end of the Beaurepaire Centre is a small two storey building which is used partly for meeting rooms (e.g. board room, etc.), and training facilities.

B3.3. Playing Fields and Practice Areas

These facilities comprise the following:
- athletic track/hockey pitch
- cricket/football oval
- tennis courts
- cricket practice areas
- competition weight lifting training rooms (located on the “mound”).

B3.4. Pavilion Area

This area contains the following facilities:
- pavilion and changing rooms
- grounds maintenance workshop and equipment and materials stores
- aquatic clubs’ temporary equipment stores
- grandstand.
B4. STORAGE

Both the sporting clubs and the Committee for Sport and Physical Recreation itself have a great demand for storage facilities, to house objects ranging from grounds equipment (tractors, mowers, rollers) to canoes, sail boats, power boats, to mountaineering equipment, rifle club equipment, etc.

At present this is provided in a range of inadequate sheds and in part of the pavilion complex on the northern edge of the grounds; under the grandstand; in the mountaineering hut; and off campus.

The storage sheds on the site must be replaced and the areas they occupy upgraded.

B5. PARKING

There are 70 existing parking spaces in the Reserve, in three separate areas, as follows:

Immediately off Tin Alley:
- east car park: 15 spaces
- west car park: 17 spaces

On the “mound”:
- north car park: 38 spaces

These areas are shown on drawing B5.

During the day these parking areas provide overflow parking for the University; at night the reverse tends to occur.

Approximately 25 parking permits are issued to people associated with the Sports Centre, including permits issued to the Sports Union office bearers, but at any one time it is estimated that permit holders would occupy only a small number of the 70 parking spaces available.
B6. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Because of the obvious site restraints of the land locked Recreation Grounds Reserve, the existing outdoor playing and practice facilities and the indoor sport and recreation facilities are severely restricted, and any encroachment on the former to satisfy the needs of the latter is considered both impractical and unacceptable. This strongly influences the Development Plan.

Already the Committee for Sport and Physical Recreation is forced to make extensive use of external facilities, in Royal Park and all over Melbourne, for training and competitions for the University's many teams in different sports. The University of Melbourne is at a singular disadvantage because of the inadequate provision for sporting and recreational facilities.

To overcome these disadvantages, as far as that is possible within the site constraints, the Development Plan proposes a series of upgradings and changes to existing facilities, to be carried out progressively in both the short and long term, as described below.

---

**B6 Recreation Grounds Reserve**

*proposed development plan*

*Scale 1:2500*
B6.1. **Sport and Physical Recreation Centre: Sports Stadium**

This development is planned for the short term; the application for planning permission has already been lodged. It comprises:

- The ground floor extension to the east end of the building to incorporate an enlargement of the existing female changeroom, the provision of aquatic clubs' equipment storage areas (to replace the existing temporary storage sheds along the north boundary of the pavilion area) and a through-way access road from Tin Alley to the playing fields, practice areas, and pavilion area.

- The first floor addition of a two court stadium for indoor sports and physical recreation together with equipment stores.

The architectural character of the existing building will be maintained in these extensions. The external walls will be built in matching "Clifton grey" brickwork, and restricted to the same height as the adjoining squash courts. The additional height required for the sports stadium addition will be contained within a "mansard" roof form; see section diagram B6.1. Any increased shadowing from this tapering roof form will be slight, and will in any case fall mainly on Tin Alley, and not on recreational open space.

The proposal to extend to and build along the east boundary has been discussed with Newman and St. Mary's Colleges and it appears that neither has objections.

B6.2. **Beaurepaire Centre**

The future development proposed for this area comprises the following:

- Upgrading of the 25 metre swimming pool to a 50 metre pool

- Upgrading and possible extension of the existing gymnasium.
B6.3. Playing Fields and Practice Areas
The future development proposed for these fields and practice areas includes the following:

• Upgrading of the Athletic Track and the associated Hockey Pitch with a modern composition surface
• Regrading of cricket and football oval
• Possible addition of two tennis courts in the location at present occupied by the cricket practice area, and the consequent relocation of the cricket practice area to a site on the northern boundary at present occupied by the aquatic clubs' temporary storage sheds, which are proposed to be demolished.

B6.4. Pavilion Area
The future development proposed for this area comprises the following:

• Preservation and refurbishment of the pavilion and dressing rooms
• Demolition and re-building of the grounds maintenance workshop and the equipment and materials storage areas.
• Progressive demolition of the existing aquatic clubs' temporary storage sheds after the transfer of their equipment, etc. to the ground floor extension of the Sport and Physical Recreation Centre.

B6.5. Future Grandstand Complex
A new grandstand complex, incorporating clubrooms and a social club, is urgently needed. The proposed building envelopes are shown on diagram B6. They have been selected with due regard to Melbourne City Council’s request for the preservation of views to the rear of the colleges, particularly Ormond College.

B6.6. Traffic
It is not expected that increased traffic generation will result from the proposed development of the Sport and Physical Recreation Centre. The ground floor equipment storage areas simply replace the existing sheds along the north boundary of the pavilion area and the first floor stadium replaces the now defunct airhall.

The new replacement roadway under the east end of the proposed development will result in a more direct and simplified access from Tin Alley by cars, service vehicles, fire trucks, etc. to the north sides of the existing Sport and Physical Recreation Centre and the Beaurepaire Centre, the playing fields and practice areas and to the Pavilion area.

B6.7. Possible Car Park
The area beneath the Running Track has been designated as a possible site for a University Car Park since the mid 1970s. The proposal is presented in a report by the traffic engineers Loder and Bayly. It envisages one or two levels (of either 600 or 1200 cars) with access from Tin Alley. Provision has been made in the proposed development of the Sport and Physical Recreation Centre for access to the future car park by the removal of the eastern ground floor section of the storage area.

It may not be possible, even in the long term, to overcome the serious legislative and financial difficulties which face the underground car park proposal, but for the present it remains an option for the University which should not be closed off, and is therefore retained as a possibility in this Report.
PART C: REVIEW OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENTS

This part describes:

- the developments which have occurred in the grounds since the 1981 Report;
- the changes to master plan envelopes which have been approved since 1981, or are currently proposed for approval;
- progress to date of negotiations with external authorities (principally the Melbourne City Council) on planning and conservation issues.

C1. DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 1981

C1.1. Buildings constructed since 1981

The details of new buildings, extensions, and major renovations constructed or under construction in the grounds since the 1981 Report are shown on the accompanying Table C1.1. (See page 29).

C1.2. Victorian Architecture Medal

In 1981 the University of Melbourne was awarded the Victorian Architecture Medal of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. The development of the grounds was judged “an outstanding example of urban and community design”. The bronze plaque recording the award is displayed in the north-west corner of the South Lawn adjacent to Professors’ Walk.

C2. CHANGES TO MASTER PLAN ENVELOPES

The Council of the University in August 1971, having adopted the 1970 Report in March 1971, resolved that:

“... any departure from the principles of the Report should be approved only at a meeting on a motion of which three months' notice has been given passed by a two-thirds majority of members present”.

It has been the practice, since adoption of the 1970 Report, that variations to the building envelopes in the Master Plan, including the addition of new envelopes, or changes to the size and shape of existing envelopes, be submitted in accordance with the formal procedures, even though such variations do not constitute a “departure from the principles”.

The 1981 Report contains a record of approved variations in Section 1.6 (page 53) which is supported by an overlay drawing (page 79). Subsequently, a variation was approved in 1983 to accommodate the new Zoology building and Glasshouse complex, the construction of which has now been completed.

C2.1. Changes approved in March 1990

At the time of preparing this Report further changes and additions to existing building envelopes had been considered by the Buildings Committee with the participation of the Master Planner, and recommended to Council for adoption in accordance with the formal procedures. These changes and additions were approved by the University Council (after the required notice) in March 1990. They are described below. Reference should also be made to plans showing

- the existing site, as built (diagram C2.1)
- Master Plan 1981, Building Envelopes (diagram C2.2)
- proposed Master Plan amendments 1991 (diagram C2.3).
C2.1 Existing University Site, as built
Scale 1:4000
C2.2 Master Plan 1981—building envelopes
AMENDMENTS TO THE MASTER PLAN

1. INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION (MCAE) SITE.
   1A. THE "SWANSTON STREET" BUILDING ENVELOPES.

2. ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE EXTENSION (SOUTH).

3. HONARD FLOREY BUILDING EXTENSION (WEST).

4A. OLD PATHOLOGY SOUTHERN FACADE.

4B. RICHARD BERRY PRECINCT.

5A. GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT STAGE 2.

5B. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING BUILDING.

6. COMPUTER CENTRE BUILDING.

C2.3 Proposed Master Plan amendments 1991
Scale 1:4000
C2.1.1. Institute of Education (MCAE) Site
Area 1 in diagram C2.3 is to be incorporated into
the Master Plan (as described in this Report); the
existing Institute site, as built, appears in
diagram C2.1. The new “Swanston Street
envelope” (1A) was developed, initially, for the
1992 capital submission, with scope for future
staged expansion.

C2.1.2. Economics and Commerce
extension (south)
The new envelope (2, in diagram C2.3) provides
for an eight level extension to the south of the
Economics and Commerce building for which
capital grants were sought in 1992.

C2.1.3. Howard Florey Building extension
(west)
This proposal came forward after considerable
discussion with the Institute and its consultan
to ensure that any additional building must not
further reduce the amenity of this crowded
precinct, and must be supported by approved
landscaping and parking proposals. The
envelope (3) would encompass a four storey “T”
shaped extension to the existing building.

C2.1.4. Old Pathology southern facade and
the Richard Berry Precinct
A comparison of the 1981 building envelopes,
diagram C2.2, at the east of Masson Road, with
the envelopes proposed in diagram C2.3, shows
a significant modification to the two courtyard
concept. The changes provide for the long-term
preservation of the south facade of Old
Pathology (envelope 4A) and for the retention of
Masson Road as a major pedestrian precinct. The
entrance to the avenue of elms and the important
vista from Swanston Street, which was
reinforced by planting additional trees in 1989,
would be preserved within existing envelopes on
the Swanston Street frontage by an overhead link
across Masson Road. In keeping with this
planning the envelope (4B) to the south of
Masson Road has been set back and reduced in
size.

C2.1.5. Southern Precinct
The 1981 Master Plan building envelopes
(diagram C2.2) illustrated the first notional
concepts for the Graduate School of
Management and Music on the Leicester Street
frontage and provided for unspecified future
developments on the Bouverie Street and
Pelham Street frontages. This was in accordance
with the Master Plan Supplement - The Leicester
Street Proposal - which pre-dated Daryl
Jackson’s master plan of the site prepared as an
integral part of planning the Graduate School of
Management Building Stage 1.

The Master Plan of the site has been
progressively revised with firm planning for the
Graduate School Stage 2 on the north of the
Leicester Street Site (5A) and concept planning
for Information Technology and Electrical
Engineering (5B) on Bouverie Street, as shown
in diagram C2.3. It was necessary to consider
possible future requirements to the south (5C)
when developing the IT&EE proposal; the
changes are not significant enough in themselves
to warrant a separate variation to the University
Master Plan, but it was considered desirable to
reflect current and actual planning in this 1991
variation. The total Graduate School building
envelope was recommended on that basis.

C2.1.6. Computer Centre Building
The widening of this building envelope (6) in
diagram C2.3 shows the actual site coverage of
the Thomas Cherry Building; it does not detract
from the master planning principles in the
Eastern Precinct which include the long-term
possibility of podia at first or second floor level
over the notional courtyards. The planning
principles set out in A2 would permit car parking
under these podia.

C2.2. Recommended changes to Eastern
Precinct
As a result of negotiations described below
(Paragraph C3) a further revision to the
Cardigan/Faraday Street Envelopes is
recommended. The proposed revision, which is
shown in Diagram C2.3, produces envelopes of
2/3 storeys along the Cardigan/Faraday Street
frontages, with 5/6 storey envelopes behind. The
terraces seen as important (historically and
architecturally) by the MCC have been included
on the list of buildings requiring Planning
Scheme Protection. In exchange, the MCC will
not require Urban Conservation contracts to be
applied.
C3. NEGOTIATIONS WITH EXTERNAL AUTHORITIES

C3.1. Conservation issues

During the period since the 1981 Report there has been a significant surge of interest in conservation of buildings and the environment on the part of the Melbourne City Council and the Ministry for Planning (now the Ministry for Planning and Urban Growth). In the first instance this resulted in a series of Conservation Acts, placing conservation controls over the Central Business District and some inner city areas (including Carlton).

In 1984 the Melbourne City Council, without consulting the University, published a conservation report entitled “Carlton, North Carlton and Princes Hill - Conservation Study, Melbourne City Council 1984”. The report imposed very significant conservation controls over most of Carlton and over the University and Colleges. Many university buildings were identified for conservation and a number of restrictive historic precincts proposed in the University and Colleges.

The University managed to have the imposition of these controls deferred, but only by carrying out its own Conservation Report (by consultant Andrew Ward) in conjunction with the Melbourne City Council (MCC) and the Ministry. This Report, covering the main campus (including the Eastern Precinct) the residential colleges, University Square and later the former Melbourne College of Advanced Education (Institute of Education) site, was completed in 1989 and forwarded to the MCC (who sent it on to the Historic Buildings Council) and to the Ministry.

The University managed to have the imposition of these controls deferred, but only by carrying out its own Conservation Report (by consultant Andrew Ward) in conjunction with the Melbourne City Council (MCC) and the Ministry. This Report, covering the main campus (including the Eastern Precinct) the residential colleges, University Square and later the former Melbourne College of Advanced Education (Institute of Education) site, was completed in 1989 and forwarded to the MCC (who sent it on to the Historic Buildings Council) and to the Ministry.

Two separate (but related) series of negotiations are necessary as a result of this Report:

- The Historic Buildings Council has already indicated an intention to consider registering, under the Historic Buildings Legislation, a list of some 20 university buildings. The University has advised it will oppose registration of some of these buildings and hearings are expected to be held in 1991.

- The MCC proposes to extend Planning Scheme Protection to a list of these and other buildings (Planning Scheme Protection means that the University will need to obtain a planning permit before demolition of or major alteration to a listed building). Negotiations with the MCC on this list is discussed more fully below (see C3.3), but in general the University has reached agreement with the MCC on those buildings to which Planning Scheme Protection will be applied. In general, this agreement leaves the University free to proceed with the important development projects envisaged as feasible in the next 20 years.

Buildings listed for Planning Scheme Protection, and some others subject to conservation restrictions, are shown on Diagram C2.1.

C3.2. Planning Scheme Amendment RL5

The MCC in 1987 issued a Planning Scheme Amendment 453, which posed very significant threats to potential University expansion (even the limited expansion envisaged in the University 1970 and 1981 Master Plans and in previous negotiations with the MCC). This Amendment was produced after an extensive consultative process (involving the University) but, despite this, contained a number of unacceptable proposals which had not been produced during the consultations.

The University lodged formal objections to many of the Amendment’s recommendations.

In 1988, the Amendment was taken over by the Ministry for Planning and became Metropolitan Planning Scheme Amendment RL5. The University continued to object to the same provisions in RL5.

These objections were finally considered by a formal Panel in late 1989. As part of the hearings before the Panel a formal negotiation was conducted between the MCC and the University. As a result, many of the University’s objections were resolved and others were left to be considered in the context of a Master Plan Agreement between the MCC and the University (see C3.3 below).

It was a requirement of RL5 that major institutions, such as the University, should complete such Master Plan Agreements. However, in June 1990, Amendment RL5 was abandoned by the Minister. Consequently the RL5 negotiations, having reached an advanced stage, simply became another chapter in the history of the abortive dealings over planning issues with the State Government and the MCC.

The intention now is to replace RL5 by a series of local area amendments, of which the Knowledge Precinct amendment could be one (see C3.4 below).
C3.3. Master Plan Agreement

Despite the abandonment of RL5, the University and the MCC have resolved to proceed with the Master Plan Agreement. Its potential benefit is that, once signed, it will offer a reasonable level of planning certainty to the University and the MCC for the ten year duration of the Agreement. From the University’s point of view it will be a major achievement in removing many of the bureaucratic requirements of the MCC.

In 1990, after 12 months of negotiations, the main points of the Agreement had been tentatively settled, subject to ratification by the MCC and the University Council. In essence the Agreement will comprise:

- a written legal agreement, which will include an agreed list of planning scheme protected buildings;
- the University’s existing Master Plan (as updated in this 1991 Report);
- written guidelines on urban designs to meet MCC requirements.

Only projects involving buildings listed for planning scheme protection will need MCC planning permits. For all other projects no planning permits will be required.

The Master Plan Agreement will be embodied in a Statutory Amendment to the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme defining the University of Melbourne Institutional Zone. This will be one of the local area amendments partially replacing the abandoned RL5.

C3.4. Knowledge Precinct

Associated with all of these Planning Amendment matters is the creation of a Knowledge Precinct, south of the University in the area between the University and RMIT.

This “Knowledge Precinct” was one of six High Technology Precincts created by the State Government in 1987. They are intended to facilitate the transfer of technology from institutions of higher education to “spin-off” or other companies which will convert the ideas produced by research into increased productivity for the country.

Therefore the intention is that “incubator” or “spin-off” companies, created to convert research ideas into manufactured or saleable items, will find an environment conducive to their needs.
TABLE C1.1.
BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Construction Period</th>
<th>Cost ($m)</th>
<th>Function Department</th>
<th>m² Gross</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Buildings or Extensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Thomas Cherry</td>
<td>1984 to 1986</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Computer Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eggleston Macdonald &amp; Secomb</td>
<td>Leighton Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Graduate School of Management (Stage I)</td>
<td>1984 to 1986</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daryl Jackson Architects</td>
<td>Leighton Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate School of Management (Stage II)</td>
<td>1990 to 1991</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daryl Jackson Architects</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>1987 to 1989</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Zoology, Zoology Branch Library, Music, Glass Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eggleston Macdonald &amp; Secomb</td>
<td>Lewis Construction Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Alice Hoy Building Extensions &amp; Plaza Project</td>
<td>1989 to 1990</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Institute of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eggleston Macdonald &amp; Secomb</td>
<td>Hooker Cockram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Major Renovations (Whole buildings or majority of a building)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Conservatorium &amp; Melba Hall</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Faculty of Music</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Daryl Jackson Architects</td>
<td>McCorkell Constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Walter Boas</td>
<td>1986 to 1988</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, Office for Research, Internal Auditor &amp; Research Contracts</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>Peter Elliott</td>
<td>W.J. Cody &amp; Quin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Old Zoology (Baldwin Spencer)</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Commerce Student Services</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>University Architect Alan Yorke</td>
<td>Noel McInnes Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Bouverie Street Child Care Centre</td>
<td>1985 to 1986</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Child Care Centre</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>Blomquist &amp; Wark Pty Limited</td>
<td>University Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>