

people place heritage

CONTEXT

Review of HO49 &HO50
Manuka Road
BERWICK

Final report

18 MAY 2017



Prepared for
City of Casey

© Context Pty Ltd 2016

Project Team:

Annabel Neylon, Associate

Report Register

This report register documents the development and issue of the report entitled *Review of HO49 and HO50 Manuka Road, Bernick*, undertaken by Context Pty Ltd in accordance with our internal quality management system.

Project No.	Issue No.	Notes/description	Issue Date	Issued to
2211	1	Final Report	18 May 2017	Anne Grogan

Context Pty Ltd

22 Merri Street, Brunswick VIC 3056

Phone 03 9380 6933

Facsimile 03 9380 4066

Email context@contextpl.com.au

Web www.contextpl.com.au

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
Limitations to this report	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Methodology	2
1.3.1 History	2
1.3.2 Description	2
1.3.3 Comparative analysis	3
1.3.4 Assessment against criteria	3
1.3.5 Statement of significance	3
1.3.6 Mapping and curtilages	4
1.3.9 Statutory recommendations	4
1.3.10 HERMES entry	5
1.4 Recommendations	5
1.4.1 HO49 'Clover Cottage'	5
1.4.2 HO50 'Minard'	8
1.5 Protection of Heritage Places in the event of development to surrounding area	10
RECOMMENDATIONS	11
APPENDICES	14
Appendix A - New Citation HO49 Clover Cottage and Gardens	14
Appendix B - New Citation HO50 Minard	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was commissioned by the City of Casey to undertake a review of the existing Heritage Overlay curtilage and citations of HO49 ‘Clover Cottage’ located at 54-60 Manuka Road, Berwick and HO50 ‘The Minard’ located at 62-70 Manuka Road, Berwick.

The curtilage of HO49 and HO50 in Manuka Road Berwick have long been identified as needing review, having the Heritage Overlay applied in a very limited manner to HO49 and applied in a very liberal manner to HO50.

This report recommends that:

- HO49 should be applied to the existing timber cottage and a large portion of the garden at 54-60 Manuka Road, Berwick, significantly enlarging the existing Heritage Overlay. It also recommends that a new citation and Statement of Significance is adopted for the place, which is consistent with the revised curtilage. It further recommends that the entry in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay should be changed to ‘Clover Cottage and Gardens’, and that tree controls apply to the entry.
- HO50 should be applied to the existing residence (constructed of brick and timber) and an area of land which provides an appropriate garden setting. It also recommends that a new citation and Statement of Significance is adopted for the place which is consistent with the revised curtilage. It further recommends that the entry in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay be changed to ‘Minard’ rather than ‘The Minard’ and that the schedule does not apply tree controls to the entry.

This report builds on and supersedes initial advice provided by Context in December 2016, which provided an initial recommendation of a proposed curtilage for each place, based solely on a desktop review of the existing heritage citations for each place within the HERMES database, and a report prepared in July 2016 by Andrew Long and Associates ‘Historical Cultural Heritage Assessment – Implications for Development’.

The recommendations and assessment of this report are consistent with the approach set out in PN001 *Applying the Heritage Overlay* (2014), and more broadly, principles and guidance set out in *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance*, known as *The Burra Charter*.

It is recommended that Council amend the existing HO curtilage, Schedule entry and citation as set out in this report.

Limitations to this report

Very little additional historical research was able to be undertaken as part of this report due to time and budget constraints.

The limited amount of additional research undertaken was reliant on desktop and on-line resources, all of which are listed as references.

It is recommended that further research be undertaken to prepare comprehensive locality histories to support the place histories for HO49 and HO50, and that detailed research into the history and development of each place be undertaken in the future.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to review the cultural heritage significance and appropriate curtilage for the heritage places at 54-60 Manuka Road (HO49) and 62-70 Manuka Road (HO50) in Berwick.

1.2 Background

Council have identified an apparent anomaly with the Heritage Overlay curtilage applied to two adjoining properties in Manuka Road, Berwick, both included on the Heritage Overlay of the City of Casey.

HO49 – ‘Clover Cottage’, located at 54-60 Manuka Road, Berwick – which has a very small HO polygon applied only to the late nineteenth century timber cottage, but does not extend to include built and landscape elements which may contribute to the heritage value of the place, or have significance in their own right.

HO50 – ‘The Minard’ located at 62-70 Manuka Road, Berwick – where the HO polygon applies to the whole title of land, representing some 56 acres, while the citation only makes reference to a small brick villa known as ‘Minard’ on the land.

HO49 and HO50 are included in an extensive area that is currently under consideration for rezoning and a planning scheme amendment as part of a proposed development by Parklea Developments. Rationalisation of the heritage overlays HO49 and HO 50 is being considered as part of this wider process.

Figure 1 illustrates the two existing heritage overlay areas in relation to the overall property boundaries.




Figure 1. Detail of Heritage Overlays HO49 and HO50 within the Study Area (Source: HERMES database – accessed 13/07/2016). Source: Land Channel Maps

Parklea Developments commissioned a report on the cultural heritage value and implications for development for both sites in 2016. This report, ‘Historical Cultural Heritage Assessment – Implications for Development’ prepared by Andrew Long and Associates in July 2016 (the

Report) seeks to confirm the extent of the standing Heritage Overlay listings (HO49 and HO50) and identify whether each overlay accurately reflects the relevant HO listing.

The City of Casey commissioned Context to conduct an independent peer review of the document and provide guidance on the recommended changes to the Heritage Overlay set out in the Andrew Long and Associates 2016 report.

The initial advice provided by Context was that the findings of the Andrew Long and Associates report was supported in principle. A subsequent site visit revealed that the landscape surrounding Clover Cottage (HO49) had not been attributed sufficient significance in that report, and the recommended revised curtilage for HO49 required revision.

Examination of the existing HERMES citations in light of the site inspections also revealed that both citations for HO49 and HO50 required updating to:

- a) Adhere to current practice note PN001 *Applying the Heritage Overlay*
- b) Accurately describe the significant elements and overall significance of the places
- c) Correct historical anomalies included in the citations

1.3 Methodology

This assessment was prepared in accordance with *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Heritage Significance* (rev. 2013) and the Victoria Planning Provisions Practice Note No. 1 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' (2015) (the 'Practice Note').

The Burra Charter was written by the heritage professional organisation, Australia ICOMOS, in the 1970s, and has been revised several times since, most recently in 2013. This document established so-called 'values-based' assessment of heritage places, looking at their social, aesthetic, historic and scientific values. Since that time, standard heritage criteria have been based on these values. In the late twentieth century, the most commonly used standard criteria were the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) criteria for the Register of the National Estate.

The AHC criteria have since been superseded by the Heritage Council Criteria for the Assessment of Cultural Heritage Significance (HERCON). These assessment criteria were adopted at the 1998 Conference on Heritage, and by the Heritage Council of Victoria in 2008, and are substantially based on the AHC criteria. The Practice Note recommends the use of the HERCON criteria for carrying out heritage assessments.

1.3.1 History

The existing place history for each place was reviewed, and a brief contextual history for Berwick was inserted into the citation to provide some context for the place history.

The locality history for Berwick was taken from material produced by Context in 2004, when considering the historical development of the township of Berwick. Ideally, this contextual history would be further amplified to provide a more holistic view of the locality's development over time.

The existing histories were re-written with appropriate emphasis on the historical development of each place. These revised histories were based on very little new research other than on-line sources such as Parish and Township Plans, Title searches, newspaper articles and unpublished articles. An existing report prepared by Context in 2004 on the Clover Cottage and Gardens (HO49) was also used extensively. All sources have been referenced.

1.3.2 Description

The description for each place was revised, based on the site visit. Photographs were uploaded to support the description for each place.

1.3.3 Comparative analysis

Comparative analysis is an essential step to determining if a place or precinct meets the local (or State) threshold for heritage significance. The ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ Practice Note (2015) advises that:

... some comparative analysis will be required to substantiate the significance of each place. The comparative analysis should draw on other similar places within the study area, including those that have previously been included in a heritage register or overlay.

In this process, similar places within the locality (in terms of date, type, and/or use/theme) already included in the Casey Heritage Overlay and recorded in the HERMES database were used as ‘benchmarks’ to provide a basis for comparison. Alternatively, if there were no other examples within the locality, comparison was extended to the municipality.

Both places were compared against others according to a range of criteria, including how well they represented a historical theme, their design quality, intactness, integrity and rarity.

Both places were considered to be of equal or better quality than the ‘benchmark(s)’ and so considered to meet the threshold of local significance.

1.3.4 Assessment against criteria

In accordance with the ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ Practice Note (2015), heritage places are identified as meeting either the threshold of ‘State Significance’ or ‘Local Significance’.

Places of Local Significance can include places that are important to a particular community or locality. Some places of local significance may also be important to the entire City of Casey, but this is not essential to meet the Local Significance threshold.

The Practice Note advises that assessment of whether a place meets the local or State threshold should be determined in relation to model heritage criteria (also known as the HERCON Criteria) which are as follows:

Criterion A: Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).

Criterion B: Possession of uncommon rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history (rarity).

Criterion C: Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of our cultural or natural history (research potential).

Criterion D: Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments (representativeness).

Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic significance).

Criterion F: Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period (technical significance).

Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions (social significance).

Criterion H: Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history (associative significance).

In the context of this assessment, where the criteria say, ‘our cultural or natural history’, it should be understood as ‘Berwick or Casey’s’ cultural or natural history’.

1.3.5 Statement of significance

The existing Statement of Significance for each place was revised summarising the most important facts and the significance of the place.

Each statement was prepared in accordance with *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (rev. 2013); using the HERCON criteria, and applying the

thresholds of local significance. Each assessment is summarised in the format recommended by the 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' Practice Note (2015), namely:

What is significant? - This section should be brief, usually no more than one paragraph or a series of dot points. There should be no doubt about the elements of the place that are under discussion. The paragraph should identify features or elements that are significant about the place, for example, house, outbuildings, garden, plantings, ruins, archaeological sites, interiors as a guide to future decision makers. Mention could also be made of elements that are not significant.

How is it significant? - A sentence should be included to the effect that the place is important because of its historical significance, its rarity, its research potential, its representativeness, its aesthetic significance, its technical significance and/or its associative significance. These descriptors are shown in brackets at the end of the heritage criteria listed above. The sentence should indicate the threshold for which the place is considered important.

Why is it significant? - This should elaborate on the criteria that makes the place significant. A separate point or paragraph should be used for each criterion satisfied. The relevant criterion should be inserted in brackets after each point or paragraph. Each point or paragraph may include the threshold for which the place is considered important.

1.3.6 Mapping and curtilages

The 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' Practice Note (2015) states in regard to mapping:

The Heritage Overlay applies to both the listed heritage item and its associated land. It is usually important to include land surrounding a building, structure, tree or feature of importance to ensure that any development, including subdivision, does not adversely affect the setting, context or significance of the heritage item. The land surrounding the heritage item is known as a 'curtilage' and will be shown as a polygon on the Heritage Overlay map. In many cases, particularly in urban areas and townships, the extent of the curtilage will be the whole of the property (for example, a suburban dwelling and its allotment).

However, there will be occasions where the curtilage and the Heritage Overlay polygon should be reduced in size as the land is of no significance. Reducing the curtilage and the polygon will have the potential benefit of lessening the number of planning permits that are required with advantages to both the landowner and the responsible authority.

It is the case for both HO49 and HO50 that the revised curtilage for each individual place recommended is less than the extent of the title boundaries (see Figure 1 and Figure 4).

As noted above, when a place of heritage significance is included in the Heritage Overlay with a boundary less than the cadastral boundaries, additional land is included around the element of heritage significance. This land is known as the curtilage.

Inclusion of a curtilage is recommended by the Practice Note in order to: *retain the setting or context of the significant building, structure, tree or feature and to regulate development (including subdivision) in close proximity to the significant building, tree or feature.*

The precise areas recommended for HO protection are described in each place citation and aerial photos showing the proposed boundaries for places with a curtilage as shown in Figures 3 and 4.

1.3.9 Statutory recommendations

The statutory recommendations for each place are made in accordance with relevant policies and guidelines set out in the 'Applying the Heritage Overlay' Practice Note (2015).

The Practice Note describes additional controls that can be ticked in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay for a place or precinct, including:

- External Paint Controls – to control changes to paint colours; particularly important if evidence of an early colour scheme survives; note that a planning permit is always required to paint a previously unpainted surface (e.g., face brick, render, stone, concrete, timber shingles).

- Internal Alteration Controls – to be used sparingly and on a selective basis for special interiors of high significance.
- Tree Controls – to be applied only where a tree (or trees) has been assessed as having heritage value, not just amenity value.
- Fences and Outbuildings which are not exempt from advertising planning permit applications – demolition applications for early fences and/or outbuildings that contribute to the significance of a place must be publicly advertised if this box is ticked, and the accelerated VicSmart permit process cannot be used; note that a planning permit is required to alter, demolish or replace a fence or outbuilding even if this box is not chosen, however public notice of the permit application is generally not required.
- Included on the Victorian Heritage Register – can only be entered by Heritage Victoria.
- Prohibited uses may be permitted – this allows additional uses not normally permitted in a given zone, subject to a planning permit; it is most frequently used to give redundant buildings a wider range of future use options to ensure their long-term survival, e.g., purpose-built shops in residential areas.
- Incorporated Plan has been adopted for the place/precinct – an incorporated plan is sometimes prepared to introduce permit exemptions for a precinct, or provide specific guidance in managing a complex site.
- Aboriginal heritage place – note that Aboriginal heritage significance was not assessed as part of this report.

1.3.10 HERMES entry

The ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ Practice Note (2015) specifies that:

All statements of significance should be securely stored in the HERMES heritage database.

Where a planning scheme amendment has resulted in the addition of, or amendments to, places in the Heritage Overlay, the strategic justification (that is, heritage study documentation and statements of significance) should be entered into the department’s HERMES heritage database.

A citation and statement of significance for each place has been entered into the HERMES database, and a copy is included at the end of this report.

1.4 Recommendations

1.4.1 HO49 ‘Clover Cottage’

Curtilage

The current curtilage of HO49 is limited to the footprint of the c. 1900 timber cottage (See Figure 1).

This re-assessment determined that the gardens surrounding the cottage and extending to the north, south and western title boundaries were of at least local heritage significance, and formed an important part of the heritage place.

In order to comply with the Practice Note ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ (2015), the curtilage for HO49 should be significantly increased to include all of the significant elements of the heritage place, as shown in figure 3).

The revised boundary will protect all of the significant elements within the Heritage Overlay and maintain links between the cottage and garden as a significant element in its own right. It will also contribute to the understanding of the historical context of the site and the aesthetic appreciation of the various elements.

This represents a larger revised curtilage than was suggested by Context's earlier report (December 2016), reflecting the knowledge and understanding gained by inspecting the elements of the site in person.



Figure 2: Pink area – existing Heritage Overlay Area (currently applied to cottage only); Blue hatched area is recommended curtilage for Heritage Overlay Area.

Statement of Significance

A revised statement of significance for the place has been prepared and included in the citation in the HERMES database. The revised citation is re-produced below:

What is Significant?

Clover Cottage and Gardens, at 54-60 Manuka Road Berwick. The significant elements of the place are:

- *The collection of Camellia species and varieties, many of which were bred, grown and or planted by Frederick Tuckfield c. 1955-1973.*
- *The garden design, planting, layout and materials, designed by John Stevens c.1955, incorporating earlier plantings and residential garden immediate to the dwelling*
- *The specimen of Quercus macrocarpa Bur Oak at the rear of the modern restaurant building*
- *The red-brick glasshouse and remnant paving and timber camellia shelter remains c. 1955-1960*
- *The timber residence c.1900 with later additions, to the extent of its location on the lot, the form of the building and roof.*
- *The boundary plantings of Cypress and Pine*

The following structures and elements are not significant: all modern shelters, pergolas, carports, garages, rotundas, the 1980s restaurant, paving, garden beds and stone walls at the front of the modern restaurant, front entrance gates, carparking areas, the fountains imported from France and England c. 1980s (with the exception of the c.1802 hand-carved convict sandstone fountain imported from Tasmania), c.1850 gates and fence at the front of the restaurant.

How is it Significant?

Clover Cottage and Gardens are of local historical and aesthetic significance to the City of Casey.

Why is it Significant?

Historically, the timber residence c.1900 and the early mature specimens of exotic trees (now part of the c.1955 garden, are significant as fabric which represents the late nineteenth century development of small self-sufficient farms on the Suburban areas immediate to township settlements such as Berwick. Although the timber cottage

itself is altered, and the trees from this period have been incorporated into a later design, the cottage's form and materials, and its location and setting clearly denote it as a Victorian farmhouse. Its location on a large (if reduced from the original 21 acres) lot, and placement, set well back from Manuka Road, on a rise above Cardinia Creek clearly distinguish it from other similar building types from the same period in the township of Berwick. (Criterion A)

Of further historical significance is the remaining John Stevens' garden design, as a rare surviving example of this prominent landscape architect's early residential work, which survives with a high degree of integrity. There are no other known examples of a designed residential landscape from the mid twentieth century within the municipality. Other examples of designed landscapes are generally public, or much earlier Victorian designs (although few are associated with a proven designer), or have been substantially altered through subdivision or simplification, such as 'Edrington', 'Hillsley', 'Eyre Court' and 'Tulliallan'. The only other comparable example from this period is the home gardener designed cactus collection and exotic garden at Hallam Park, which is a modest residential garden. (Criterion A, B and G)

The garden is of aesthetic significance as a design which creates a sense of overall enclosure, with a series of enclosed spaces within, represented by intimate walks and spaces, garden rooms and large shrubberies which separate broad swathes of open lawn. The design, which incorporated existing mature trees, creates a sense of anticipation through its use of the shrubberies and serpentine lines to create contrasts between light and dark spaces, provide contrasts in texture and create filtered landscape views. (Criterion E)

The mature exotic garden commissioned by Frederick Tuckfield and designed by John Stevens' is of historical (associative) significance for its direct and strong association with both Stevens as evidenced through:

- the integrity of Stevens' surviving garden design (including layout, materials, planting) specifically designed as a display garden for Tuckfield's substantial *Camellia* collection;
- the high percentage of *Camellia* species, varieties and forms which survive throughout the garden, many of which were bred, grown or developed by Frederick Tuckfield;

The direct association with both Stevens and Tuckfield is evident both in the physical fabric set out above, as well as through documentary and oral sources, including verbal recordings of John Stevens, local and state newspaper articles relating to the community and scientific use of the place and the *Camellia* collection and records of the plants developed by Tuckfield held by the *Camellia Society of Victoria*. The now mature layer of mid twentieth century planting, in particular the *Camellia* collection, along with the remnant *Camellia* shelter, the brick glasshouse and paving enriches and historical and associative significance of the place to Frederick Tuckfield as it clearly demonstrates the passion and interest of Tuckfield in collection, breeding and creating new *Camellia* varieties, and furthering the genus. (Criterion A and H)

The *Camellia* collection itself, in its setting is of scientific significance as a rare and unusually large collection of the genus, particularly in a residential setting. In addition, the mature Bur Oak *Quercus macrocarpa* is of scientific (botanical) significance as a particularly outstanding specimen of its species. (Criterion F)

Statutory recommendations

External Paint Colours <i>Is a permit required to paint an already painted surface?</i>	No
Internal Alteration Controls <i>Is a permit required for internal alterations?</i>	No
Tree Controls <i>Is a permit required to remove a tree?</i>	Yes
Victorian Heritage Register <i>Is the place included on the Victorian Heritage Register?</i>	No
Incorporated Plan <i>Does an Incorporated Plan apply to the site?</i>	No
Outbuildings and fences exemptions <i>Are there outbuildings and fences which are not exempt from notice and review?</i>	No

Prohibited uses may be permitted <i>Can a permit be granted to use the place for a use which would otherwise be prohibited?</i>	Yes
Aboriginal Heritage Place <i>Is the place an Aboriginal heritage place which is subject to the requirements of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006?</i>	No

- Tree Controls should be applied through the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay at Clause 43.01s.
- No other additional controls to be applied through the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.
 - Remove existing External Paint Controls

Other matters

Amend the place name to 'Clover Cottage and Gardens' [emphasis added]

1.4.2 HO50 'Minard'

Curtilage

The current curtilage of HO50 includes all of the land included on the title (see Figure 1).

The significant heritage elements on the site are limited to 'Minard' a small brick and timber villa located on the northern boundary and its immediate garden setting, and a number of very large, mature exotic trees (mainly specimens of English Oak). The Oaks appear to pre-date the residence 'Minard' and are believed to be associated with the development of the (now demolished) homestead 'Manuka Park' which was originally located on this land.

This re-assessment determined that the curtilage of HO50 should be reduced to the extent of the villa 'Minard' and its garden setting. This supports the recommendation made by Andrew Long and Associates 2016 report, and would include the significant parts of the heritage place.

The footprint of the Minard building is quite small. The recommended revised HO50 curtilage has been considered to include landscaped areas around the building, so as to maintain the building in its garden setting, and maintain views to the building.

Consideration was given to whether HO50 should be applied to the mature exotic trees, particularly the two largest Oak trees located on the land. A Heritage Overlay can be applied to separate, non-contiguous areas, but only when those places have a demonstrated single theme or history (PN001, 2015). The historical connection of Manuka Park and Minard has not been demonstrated or proven through historical research to date and therefore inclusion in HO50 is not warranted.

It may be that these trees warrant an individual Heritage Overlay in their own right, but this will require further research and assessment to determine. In any case, the whole of this area is covered by a Significant Landscape Overlay (SLO4) which requires a permit to remove, destroy or lop any vegetation.



Figure 3 – Revised curtilage for HO50 (shown by blue outline), pink shading represents existing HO50



Figure 4 – Revised HO49 and HO50 showing both places – blue indicating recommended HO for each place and pink shading represents the existing Heritage Overlay

Statement of Significance

A revised statement of significance for the place has been prepared and included in the citation in the HERMES database. The revised citation is re-produced below:

What is Significant?

Minard, located at 62 Manuka Road Berwick, including the cellar and garden setting.

How is it Significant?

Minard is of local historic and aesthetic significance to the City of Casey.

Why is it Significant?

Minard is of local historic significance as it demonstrates two key periods of development within the suburban lands of Berwick – the creation of small, self-sufficient farms on the outskirts of Berwick from c1871-1890, as represented by the small timber cottage at the centre of Minard, and the later consolidation of small farms into more intensive industry in the early twentieth century, including new industries, such as holiday accommodation (Criterion A).

The house itself has aesthetic significance as it represents typical elements of the form and style of modest Victorian and Edwardian domestic architecture as represented in the City of Casey, and retains a high degree of

integrity. While minor alterations and additions have occurred, the periods of development, and differing architectural styles are clearly evident in comparing the two principal parts of the dwelling. The later section is constructed from timber, has a shallower gable roof, with simple, small four pane sash windows and a modest two-room form. The brick section demonstrates a new design and decorative approach to architecture, including the high-pitched gable roof, decorative large window set into the façade with side lights and timber detailing, the decorative 'rising sun' motif on the bargeboard and the elevated positioning. The inclusion of the cellar is of interest, as it is unusual within the municipality (Criterion D and E).

Statutory recommendations

External Paint Colours <i>Is a permit required to paint an already painted surface?</i>	No
Internal Alteration Controls <i>Is a permit required for internal alterations?</i>	No
Tree Controls <i>Is a permit required to remove a tree?</i>	No
Victorian Heritage Register <i>Is the place included on the Victorian Heritage Register?</i>	No
Incorporated Plan <i>Does an Incorporated Plan apply to the site?</i>	No
Outbuildings and fences exemptions <i>Are there outbuildings and fences which are not exempt from notice and review?</i>	No
Prohibited uses may be permitted <i>Can a permit be granted to use the place for a use which would otherwise be prohibited?</i>	Yes
Aboriginal Heritage Place <i>Is the place an Aboriginal heritage place which is subject to the requirements of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006?</i>	No

- No additional controls to be applied through the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.
- Remove existing Tree Controls from HO50

Other matters

Amend the place name to 'Minard' (remove 'The')

1.5 Protection of Heritage Places in the event of development to surrounding area

The area of Manuka Road in which HO49 and HO50 are located is likely to experience significant development pressure in the coming decade. In this context, it is timely to consider how the identified heritage values and fabric of both places are conserved in the event of possibly subdivision and development of the land adjacent to, and between the heritage places.

In particular, consideration should be given to the impact of development on the heritage places themselves, given their central location within the overall area planned for development and the consequent likelihood they will be 'islands' within areas of intensive new urban development.

There are examples of other heritage places within the municipality where this has not been well considered, and the outcome for both property owners and Council has been disappointing.

There are a number of key strategies which can address this issue:

1. Appropriate application of the Heritage Overlay
The recommendations in this report provide for an appropriate Heritage Overlay

curtilage, as well as an appropriate and defensible statement of significance. Together, these will provide sufficient guidance on what the significant fabric and values of the place are, which will assist in decision making about the development of the place into the future.

The application and retention of an appropriate Heritage Overlay curtilage will also increase the potential for the place to be viewed in its original landscaped setting and therefore contribute to the ongoing appreciation and understanding of the place.

2. Prepare Conservation Management Plans with detailed policy and action plan (if required) to assist in guiding and planning change and conservation of the significant place and its fabric and values.
3. In the absence of any formal local policy providing guidance on consideration of development applications in Heritage Overlay areas, utilize existing resources, such as *The Burra Charter* (2013) and *The Heritage Overlay: Guidelines for assessing planning permit applications in Heritage Overlay areas* (2007).
4. Ensure that new access roads do not intersect the Heritage Overlay areas, and ensure that, where possible, the residential building/s retain their context and continue to allow the façade to roadway.
5. Specify the type and height of fencing to be used between new development and the heritage places (this could be addressed through policy in the CMP). This should be transparent to a minimum of 70% (i.e. post and rail fencing rather than standard paling fence)
6. Ensure that the new residential development addresses the residence – for instance, it is not appropriate to have rear yards of new developments addressing principal elevations of a residential building (for instance, the north and east elevations of Minard).

The most effective way to achieve this is through the inclusion of Conservation Management Plan forming part of either a Section 173 Agreement on the title, or by making the Conservation Management Plan an Incorporated Document through the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, to form the basis of permit exemptions as well as policy and decision making.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- HO49 is expanded significantly to included areas of significant garden and landscape elements as per Figure 2.
- HO50 is reduced significantly to cover the area including and surrounding Minard, a small brick and timber villa to the extent shown in Figure 3.
- City of Casey endorse the revised citations for HO49 and HO50 included in Appendix A of this report.
- Amend the place name for HO49 from ‘Clover Cottage’ to ‘Clover Cottage and Gardens’
- Amend the place name for HO50 from ‘The Minard’ to ‘Minard’
- Amend the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay as set out in Section 1.4.1 and 1.4.2
- Make the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan for each of the heritage places a condition through the Schedule to the Development Plan Overlay, or through an alternate planning mechanism.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - New Citation HO49 Clover Cottage and Gardens

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Name	Clover Cottage and Garden	
Address	54-60 Manuka Road BERWICK	Significance Level Local
Place Type	Cottage	
Citation Date	2004	

Recommended VHR - HI - PS -
Heritage Protection

History and Historical Context

Locality History

Taken from 'Berwick Township Precinct' citation HERMES No. 44242

Most of the city of Berwick, including the Berwick Township, was originally part of Robert Gardiner's Berwick pastoral run. There are said to have been early wattle and daub huts built on the eastern side of Most of the Berwick Hill for families drawing water from the Cardinia Creek (Beaumont, 1959:17). However, a permanent Berwick township was not established until the 1850s. At that time when large pastoral runs were subdivided and homestead blocks and other Crown Allotments sold, a Berwick Village Reserve began to appear on official maps. This reserve was bounded by the main Gippsland Road (later the Princes Highway), the Cardinia Creek, Inglis Road and Clyde Road (*Town and suburban lots, Berwick*, 1866).

The earliest Berwick Township plans located the proposed town on the north side of the Gippsland Road close to the Cardinia Creek. Surveyor Robert Hoddle's plan showed twelve blocks, stretching from Campbell Street to Cardinia Street, bounded on the north by Palmerston Street. No town blocks were planned for the present High Street commercial precinct, nor for any land west of Campbell Street. Hoddle commented that the numbered blocks had been pegged out and 'will be sufficient for the requirements of the locality for some time'. The land west of Campbell Street to Lyall Road he considered was an area where the township might expand in the future. This plan marked with a cross a possible site for a church and school house as 'required here by Gardiner and others' (*Berwick Township*, 1852). This was the site chosen soon afterwards for Bain's Berwick Hotel.

However, early purchasers of town land were more influenced by topography than surveyor's plans dreamed up in Melbourne. The development of the township turned out to be from west to east rather than from east to west, with a concentration of occupancy along High Street. Much of the story can be learned by studying the sequence of township maps drawn up from the late 1850s until the present time.

An 1858 Public Lands Office map showed the township at this time still bounded on the north by Palmerston Street. However, new Blocks 13-16 had been already marked out, stretching along High Street from Lyall Road to Peel Street and backing onto Wilson Street (now known as Wilson and Scanlan Streets) (Public Lands Office, 1858) By this date most allotments with High Street frontages had been sold. This included the new Block 16 between Lyall Road and Wheeler Street, the site of the Berwick High Street commercial precinct. About half this block had been purchased by Robert Bain, owner of the historic Berwick Hotel.

The 1858 map also showed many allotments sold in Blocks 8 and 9 bounded by Neill, Palmerston and Havelock (now Scotsgate Way) Streets. Very few allotments had been sold in the blocks at the eastern end of the township near Cardinia

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Creek. This became the site of much later development and was the area where post-war residential housing occurred.

The 1858 map also showed the location of a cemetery allotment of eight acres far north of the early township near the Village Reserve boundary now Inglis Road.

Several decades later, an 1871 Department of Lands and Survey map of Berwick Town and Suburban Lots (*Town and suburban lots, Berwick*, 1871) indicated a further extension of the township westward and included all the land marked as part of the original Berwick Village Reserve. The township then comprised 32 blocks bounded by High Street, Cardinia Street, Brisbane Street and Lyall Road. It now included all the area west of Campbell Street that makes up the Older Residential Area identified in the 1993 Heritage of the City of Berwick Study.

There were also twenty-six suburban lots bounded on the north by Inglis Road and on the west by Cranbourne (now Clyde) Road. The cemetery block of eight acres was indicated bounded on the north by Inglis road and on the west by Buchanan Road.

Early views of the township in 1877, 1887 and 1891 however, indicate that, apart from the cluster of buildings along High Street and the old residential precinct west of Campbell Street, Berwick remained an extremely small town during the last century (Beaumont, 1959:16, 24, 32). It remained, relatively small well into the present century, retaining a village-like character.

Later township maps, c1912 and later, indicate another important feature in Berwick's development, the setting aside of land for public parks and recreation reserves. Ten acres in Crown Allotment 10, south of the Cemetery site, became a public park. This was formerly known as the Berwick Recreation Ground and is now the Arch Brown Reserve. Along the Cardinia Creek public reserves were marked out, including the sites of the Akoonah Park and the Berwick showgrounds.

Place History

The land on which Clover Cottage and its associated garden now stands was purchased as Lot 25 in the Township of Berwick by M. O'Connor in 1871, comprising 21 acres on Cardinia Creek (*Towns and Suburban Lots, Berwick*, 1878). The original lot has been subdivided into two parts, an 8 acre section (the subject site) and the balance (13 acres) remaining at 42 Manuka Road. The date of the subdivision is unknown, but is believed to be in the period c1940-c1955 as prior to that time, the property was used for a variety of small agricultural and animal husbandry purposes, requiring the larger acreage, as discussed below.

It is believed that the extant timber cottage, set well back from Manuka Road was constructed c. 1890-1900 by the Greaves family who owned the allotment in the latter part of the nineteenth century (Context 1993:359). The physical form of the cottage supports this date, as the original form appears to be a typical double fronted symmetrical timber house, probably of 4-6 rooms, arranged off a central passageway, perhaps with a skillion addition at the rear, and a simple convex timber verandah across the facade. The residence is set well back on the allotment, but still addresses Manuka Road, rather than Cardinia Creek to the rear. The cottage has had various alterations and additions to its original form over the years, but is still readable as a late Victorian timber residence.

There are a number of mature exotic trees in the garden of outstanding size which appear to date from this late nineteenth century period, being substantially larger than others known to have been planted in the 1950s, and comparable in size to those known to have been planted in the late nineteenth century on adjacent properties, such as the former Manuka Park at 62-70 Manuka Road. Further supporting the early planting date are other comparable examples of exotic plantings located on 42 Manuka Road, which was originally part of the 21 acre lot developed first in the late nineteenth century. It is not known whether the Greaves' who owned Clover Cottage at this time were connected with the prominent Greaves family of "The Springs" at nearby Narre Warren South. Further research into the Greaves family association with Clover

Cottage would enhance the understanding of this early period of development.

A review of local and Victorian newspapers in the interwar period show that after the Greaves family ownership, the property was either owned or leased by a variety of socially prominent families in both the locality and more generally, in Melbourne society at the time. The first reference in any newspapers to the name 'Clover Cottage' appears in the 1930s in reference to the residence of Mrs L. Stead and her daughter (*The Argus*, 4/10/1937:9). By the following year (1938), Mr and Mrs Ken and Gwen Moore resided at the property. Mrs Moore, a renowned horsewoman, heavily involved in the hunt club and thoroughbred breeder established the property at Manuka Road as a stud and training facility in the late 1930s through to c.1948. The property was then occupied by Wing Commander L. M Bailey and his family, prominent socialites, from c1949 through until c1955, when it was purchased by Frederick Tuckfield, the founder and owner of Tuckfield's Ty-nee Tips Tea. The history of ownership is relevant in that it gives an understanding of the layered nature of the gardens which survive today. It is understood that in c1955 there were mature trees, some shrubs but very little else. It is presumed that each period of ownership impacted on the place in the form of some planting, given the use of the property by each owner, although detailed research into plantings in the interwar period have not been undertaken as part of this report.

The Tuckfield's relocated from there home in Manor Grove, North Caulfield in c1956 to allow Fred to concentrate on his passion for breeding, growing and furthering the development of the Camellia in his semi-retirement from business interests (Calabretta & Ridge, 2013:41). Tuckfield was fascinated with Camellias (tea is manufactured from a species of Camellia) and is believed to have grown thousands of specimens, representing hundreds of varieties in the gardens at Clover Cottage (Context 2004:3).

Tuckfield's son in law, Michael Freer is quoted below (ibid.)

His garden and glasshouse at Manor Grown, North Caulfield were overflowing with potted camellias. In 1955 he bought Clover Cottage at Berwick, a 70 year old house on several acres of bare paddock and turned this into a magnificent landscaped garden which was ranged as one of the best in Australia and was frequently open to the public. Here camellias were the centrepiece, especially the large flowered Camellia reticulata, of which he bred new varieties. One of these, Samantha named after a Grand daughter, won several prizes. At one time, Fred was the president of the Victorian branch of the Australian Camellia Research Society.

Tuckfield regularly exhibited at Plant Shows and often won gold medals. It was here that he met landscape architect, John Stevens (later OAM), who was a judge at many of these shows (Context, 2004:3).

Tuckfield engaged landscape architect, Stevens in 1955 to design the gardens at his new property in Berwick, to be completed prior to his relocation to the property in 1956. The garden represents one of Stevens earliest large scale residential garden designs, and is interesting as it demonstrates the two great interests of Tuckfield at the time, his Camellia collection and his passion for the environment.

From the 1950s onward, Tuckfield encouraged innovative gardening techniques, which would now be considered 'environmentally friendly'. These included use of trickle watering systems, mulching, banning of pesticides and insecticides and other chemicals. He made a number of passionate public appeals against the indiscriminate use of pesticides, which e believed was rapidly destroying the balance of nature (Context, 1993:359).

According to Steven, apart from mature trees, there was very little landscaping on the property prior to his beginning work there in 1955. The exception was a small area of gardens around the house, which was generally retained, as were the mature trees (Context, 2004:2). Although not fully researched, it is believed that the Camellia shelter, the Glasshouse and red brick paving which survives on site was constructed in the c.1955-1956 period, to allow Tuckfield to fully engage in his Camellia breeding and growing.

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Stevens was commissioned to design an extensive exotic 'display' garden which provided good areas for showcasing Tuckfield's immense Camellia collection, as well as an area which could be planted out with native plants (Ibid.). The design was separated in two distinct parts, with the timber house, its immediate garden and a series of Camellia growing and breeding structures (such as glasshouse, shade house etc.) dividing the two parts.

The area to the rear of the residence, running down the slope to Cardinia Creek was planted and laid out with native plants, and designed to native birds, insects and small animals. Stevens, when interviewed by Context in 2004 stated that this part of the design [provided] "a sanctuary like environment for about 70 species of birds . and an immense bee population." (Context, 2004:2). Little of this section of garden remains, other than a small number of now mature native trees towards the rear of the allotment. The two Golden Elms at the rear of the residential garden are also likely to be a part of the John Stevens design, and represent an interface area between the richer texture of the display and residential garden with the native garden.

The exotic display gardens were believed to extend from the existing small residential garden around the house and camellia breeding facilities to extend to the boundaries of the lot to the north and south, and to Manuka Road to the west. This garden was designed incorporating most of the existing mature trees, adding new sweeping areas of lawn, shrubberies, driveways and small intimate garden spaces, many of which survive today. The shrubberies were rock edged, and filled with specimens and collections of Camellia, supported by other shrubs, intermixed with mature trees, which were sometimes retained as specimen trees (such as the Bur Oak) or incorporated into the garden beds (such as many Poplars, some Oaks and others).

Stevens designed this landscape relatively early in his career as 'landscape architect' having established the first business of its kind in Melbourne in 1952. He later was responsible for many award winning or acclaimed institutional and industrial landscapes, and undertook works to Como House garden, as well as designing parts of the large garden featuring native species at Russell Grimwade's 'Mie gunyah' in Toorak (Context, 1993:360). The State Library of Victoria holds a collection of John Stevens' work. It would be useful to undertake further research to determine whether the original design of Frederick Tuckfield's display garden survives within this collection.

Tuckfield died in 1973 and his estate auctioned the property in 1975. At this time it was described as 'a three bedroom weatherboard home set in approximately 8 acres of famous gardens created by the late F. S Tuckfield [emphasis added], running back to Cardinia Creek' (Context 2004:2). The Camellia Society were interested in purchasing the property but were unable to raise sufficient funds (Ibid.). It has been said that Mrs. Tuckfield removed a number of the more rare or sentimentally important specimens of Camellia from the gardens prior to departure (Ibid.).

The property was purchased in April 1976 by John and Engelenia Chipperfield and Trevor Burr. In the late 1970s two new extensions were added to the building, and the return verandah (now on three sides) was added. The stumps were replaced with concrete stumps in the 1990s (Long and Associates, 2016:14). It appears that many of the existing window and door openings at the front of the house have been altered at some time during the 1990s, and replaced with multi-paned modern 'french' doors.

The large modern restaurant building set at the front of the lot, addressing Manuka Road was constructed in the late 1980s by the three owners. The building is a large domestic styled structure with dormer windows in a spreading roof. The property operated as a restaurant and function centre until 2016 when it was purchased by the current owners.

During the period 1976 through 2000, the garden was added to by the Chipperfields and Trevor Burr, including in particular, hard and soft landscaping works, particularly around the new restaurant building, which was previously an area of lawn. Other major work includes the construction of entrance gates on Manuka Road, creation of a gravelled car parking area at the front of the property, the installation of a very large set of gates, fence and denoting the entrance to the new restaurant building, and delineating the car parking area from the function centre and gardens. Some new structures have been erected around the residence, including an aviary, a garage, a modern iron shed. The 'native' gardens have

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

been largely removed, replaced with modern exotic plantings or areas of lawn. New animal shelters and pens have been erected towards the rear of the site.

John Stevens - landscape architect

(Taken directly from Context, 2004:3)

John Stevens (b.1920) graduated as a landscape architect in 1938 and worked as a landscape designer with R P Knight landscape contractors before serving in World War II.

After returning from the war, landscape architectural designer Stevens established his own firm in 1952. The firm was the first of its kind in Victoria and one of the first in Australia. Stevens designed landscapes for a number of significant architects including Roy Grounds, Robin Boyd, Stephenson & Turner, Bates Smart & McCutcheon and Godfrey Spowers. According to Professor Philip Goad, "The scope and variety of projects . set new standards for non-residential garden design in Australia." (Goad, in Aitken and Looker, 2002:569). Notable commercial gardens that Stevens has designed include ICI House in Melbourne, described by Goad as "a distinctive Modernist contribution to the post war city". (Ibid.)

Stevens was the Visiting Lecturer in Landscape Design at the University of Melbourne from 1954-1964, "through which he influenced a generation of architecture and town planning students".¹⁹ Then from 1964-1984 he returned to private practice as the landscape architect for the Australian National University. His design contributions to the ANU have resulted in what is now acknowledged as one of Australia's most beautiful institutional landscapes. (Ibid.) In 1977 he returned to practice in Melbourne. Stevens was a Founding Member of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects and was also active in heritage conservation.

Compared to his commercial and institutional work, Stevens residential designs are less well known. He designed a relatively small number of domestic gardens, including Clover Cottage, Como House in Toorak and Miegunyah for Russell Grimwade (Toorak) (Context, 1993:359).

References

The Argus, **Monday 4 October 1937** p 9 (Family Notices)

Aitken, Richard & Looker, Michael & Australian Garden History Society 2002, *The Oxford companion to Australian gardens*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, Vic

Beaumont, Norman E. (Norman Edward) 1959, *Early days of Berwick*, 2nd ed, Berwick and District Agricultural and Horticultural Society, 1959, Berwick

Calabretta, Mark & Ridge, Cheryl, 2013 'Tuckfield's birds and other cards: types, variants, chronology, exchange tokens, albums and miscellany' (unpublished article)
<http://members.iinet.net.au/~mcalabre@netspace.net.au/> (Accessed 2/05/2017)

Context Pty. Ltd & Berwick (Vic.). Council 1993, *Heritage of the City of Berwick : identifying & caring for important places*, City of Berwick, [Narre Warren, Vic

Context Pty. Ltd., 2004, 'Heritage Impact Assessment: Clover Cottage and Gardens, 54-60 Manuka Road, Berwick, July 2004' unpublished report prepared for City of Casey.

May, Leonard, 2017 - Personal Communication, May 2017

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Maps and Plans

Victoria Public Lands Office 1858, *Township of Berwick*, Public Lands Office, Melbourne

1866. *Town and suburban lots, Berwick*

1871. *Town and suburban lots, Berwick*

Description

Physical Description

Clover Cottage and Garden is a later Victorian timber double fronted timber residence with a corrugated galvanised iron steel hipped roof. The residence is surrounded on three sides by a return verandah, with a concave roof profile, also in corrugated iron, supported by timber verandah. The verandah has a timber valance, curved brackets, paired posts and a wrought iron balustrade. The verandah appears to have been replaced in the past to accommodate extensions, although it may replicate some decorative features and materials of the original.

The house, originally a symmetrically arranged simple residence, typical of the late Victorian period has been added to substantially in the form of additions to both sides, and the rear. The windows and window openings on the facade and the north and south elevations, originally likely to have been double hung timber windows, have been replaced with full length modern timber French doors. The original door has also been replaced. One original window, a simple double hung sash window survives on the southern elevation. The additions to the residence have multipaned windows.

Immediate to the southeast of the residence are the remnants of structures and paving associated with Frederick Tuckfield's Camellia growing, breeding and developing enterprise. The ruins of a Camellia Shelter (apparently visible and intact in air photos from c.1975 [Andrew Long & Associates, 2016:8]) is represented by a rectangular structure with horizontal timber lath fencing to approximately 1.8m is in fair to poor condition. Adjacent to this is the relatively intact red-brick greenhouse, used for propagation of the Camellias. The greenhouse has many broken panes of glass, but is otherwise in good condition. A series of red brick paved paths intersect this area, connecting the surviving structures, and those associated structures which have been demolished. There are also Naturalistic rockery edging and some stepping stones in this area which remain and are part of a previous design.

Two modern free standing iron and weatherboard sheds are also located in this area, and are later additions, un-related to the period pre-1975.

The garden comprises two main areas, with centralised interface area, represented by the red brick paving, the glass house, red brick paving and residential garden immediate to the rear of the residence, from the planting immediate to the front of the house, through to the two Golden Elms set in lawn at the rear of the residence.

The first area is located between Cardinia Creek and the residential garden interface described above. This is the area where John Stevens designed the 'native' gardens for Tuckfield. There are a few specimen trees, and clusters of native trees which survive in this area, although the integrity of the layout and planting design in this area has been mainly lost, or overlaid with new gardens of features, such as horse yards, rose gardens, fruit trees, lawns and other items. Native trees which are clearly identifiable as remnants of Stevens' 1955 design include specimens of *Grevillia robusta* Silky Oak, *Melaleuca sp.* Melaleuca, *Banksia integrifolia* Coastal Banksia, *Banksia marginata* Silver Banksia, *Casuarina stricta* She Oak, *Casuarina sp* Casuarina., *Lophostemon confertus* Brush Box, *Agonis flexuosa* Willow Myrtle and some species of *Eucalypt* and *Corymbia*. A particularly fine example of *Ulmus glabra* 'Lutea' Golden Elm is located on the

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

area of lawn between the residential garden and the native gardens, originally designed to create a transition through counterpoint with the grey-green native foliage.

The second area relates to the exotic display garden which extends from the residential garden to the north, south and west through to Manuka Road. This includes mature exotic trees which predate the John Stevens design and relate to earlier periods of ownership, as well as the hard and soft landscaping, and plantings associated with John Stevens 1955 design. Integrated into the existing fabric is clearly a range of shrubs, particularly Camellias which were added to the garden by Tuckfield in the period 1955-1973, and later plantings and modifications undertaken by the Chipperfields and Trevor Burr between 1976-2016.

The earliest trees in this area date from the late nineteenth century or early twentieth century, and are outstanding in terms of their age, size and form. Generally, these trees are in very good condition for their age. The species which appear to represent this early planting are various mature specimens of Poplar, Elm and Oak, including a magnificent specimen of Bur Oak *Quercus macrocarpa* located between the rear of modern restaurant building and the front of the timber residence.

Boundary plantings of Cypress and Pine to the north, south and west appear to be later, and may date from the subdivision of the original 21-acre lot, in the mid twentieth century. These plantings are important however, as they give the gardens an enclosed, private sense of place, with the additional benefit of creating a protected and sheltered microclimate, which has allowed the highly ornamental and often delicate specimens within the gardens to flourish.

The numerous serpentine edged garden beds which intersect areas of sweeping lawn, and create in places intimate garden rooms, walks and spaces, are densely planted with a variety of shrubs, with Camellia being the predominant visual display plant throughout. It is believed that much of the design and layout of the beds, walks, driveway, spaces and lawns and retained specimen trees are consistent with Stevens' original design. Similarly, the shrubbery beds, dense with camellias an interplanted in and around existing and new exotic tree species is also part of this design. Many of the beds are rock edged, which is typical of the rural residential garden design of the mid-twentieth century, and may date to this period. Some areas have been stabilised with the insertion of cement mortar between the rocks, which is likely to have been a later addition, possibly associated with the public use of the place. Garden beds closer to the restaurant itself (c. 1980s) are bluestone with cement mortar, and the plantings and construction of these beds is sympathetic to the rest of the gardens, but clearly modern. The paths, driveway entrances and other access areas are topped with fine gravel.

Mature specimens of exotic trees which appear to date from Stevens' design in the modern display area include, but are not limited to *Cupressus macrocarpa* and *C. macrocarpa* 'Aurea' Monterey Cypress and Golden Cypress, *Cedrus atlantica* and *C. atlantica* forma 'Glauca' Atlas Cedar and Blue Atlantic Cedar, *Ulmus glabra* 'Lutea' and *U. minor* 'variegata' Silver Elm and Golden Elm, *Populus species* Poplar, *Quercus robur*, *Q. canariensis* and *Q. macrocarpa* English Oak, Algerian Oak and Bur Oak, and *Pinus radiata* Monterey Pine.

There is a very rich and varied collection of both *Camellia sasanqua* and *Camellia reticulata* dating from the c1955-1973 period, as well as other species of Camellia, and varieties and forms which have continued to be added during and after Tuckfield's ownership across the site. It is likely that many specimens were bred or grown by Tuckfield, either in his North Caulfield home, or at Clover Cottage. Tuckfield developed, bred and registered over 20 varieties of Camellia, many of which is likely survive in the garden at Clover Cottage. A survey into the variety and species of Camellia which survive is highly recommended to be undertaken by an expert in this area.

Views to the cottage are framed by the placement of garden beds and specimen trees, and are a key aspect of the design of the garden. The approach through the garden to the cottage itself also provides variety and interest as different areas of the garden present themselves in a deliberate design.

The frontage to Manuka Road has modern stone entrance piers and fencing, and is defined by a row of Cypress (c.1950-

1970). This leads immediately to a large gravel parking area running parallel with Manuka Road and another curved driveway leading to the cottage. There are a number of smaller modern built structures and shelters located throughout the garden. These are constructed of timber and iron. There are three fountains, all of which have a separate provenance to the site itself, and were installed in the period 1980-2000. Similarly, the large wrought iron entrance gates and stone piers and fencing at front of the modern restaurant are believed to date from C. 1850 and were imported by the previous owner from a cemetery in England in the 1980s. The wrought iron is marked Chas. Marshall Pty. Ltd.

The exotic display garden is in excellent condition, and believed to retain a high degree of integrity.

Recommended Management

In order to conserve the heritage significance of this place, it is recommended that the following objectives be given priority in the future maintenance or development of the property:

- Conserve the fabric of the original section of Clover Cottage, which is of significance;
- Conserve those parts of Clover Cottage which demonstrate important successive stages of development of the property and/or provide intact evidence of changing architectural styles/construction techniques;
- Conserve significant outbuildings and maintain a visual relationship between the outbuildings and the main house in order to demonstrate the historical use of these buildings;
- Conserve significant plantings and garden layout on the property, and maintain a visual relationship between the layout, plantings and the significant buildings on the property;
- Prevent development adjacent to significant parts of original buildings from overwhelming the heritage characteristics of the original building and the site as a whole;
- Encourage any new development on the site to relate in form, scale and materials to the significant parts of the existing built form, but be clearly contemporary in design;
- Encourage the continuation of use(s) of the premises for purposes which are compatible with historical uses of the site;
- Promote further research on the fabric of the buildings to identify sections associated with the original building or other important stages of development;
- Conserve the significant garden layout and the visual relationship between the significant buildings on the site;
- In the case of subdivision of the property, particular attention should be paid to retention of a substantial proportion of the garden within the same allotment as the original Clover Cottage building.

Statement of Significance

What is Significant?

Clover Cottage and gardens, at 54-60 Manuka Road Berwick. The significant elements of the place are:

. The collection of Camellia species and varieties, many of which were bred, grown and or planted by Frederick

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Tuckfield c. 1955-1973.

- . The garden design, planting, layout and materials, designed by John Stevens c.1955, incorporating earlier plantings and residential garden immediate to the dwelling
- . The specimen of *Quercus macrocarpa* Bur Oak at the rear of the modern restaurant building
- . The red-brick glasshouse and remnant paving and timber camellia shelter remains c. 1955-1960
- . The timber residence c.1900 with later additions, to the extent of its location on the lot, the form of the building and roof.
- . The boundary plantings of Cypress and Pine

The following structures and elements are not significant: all modern shelters, pergolas, carports, garages, rotundas, the 1980s restaurant, paving, garden beds and stone walls at the front of the modern restaurant, front entrance gates, carparking areas, the fountains imported from France and England c. 1980s (with the exception of the c.1802 hand-carved convict sandstone fountain imported from Tasmania), c.1850 gates and fence at the front of the restaurant.

How is it Significant?

Clover Cottage and gardens are of local historical and aesthetic significance to the City of Casey.

Why is it Significant?

Historically, the timber residence c.1900 and the early mature specimens of exotic trees (now part of the c1955 garden, are significant as fabric which represents the late nineteenth century development of small self sufficient farms on the Suburban areas immediate to township settlements such as Berwick. Although the timber cottage itself is altered, and the trees from this period have been incorporated into a later design, the cottage's form and materials, and its location and setting clearly denote it as a Victorian farmhouse. Its location on a large (if reduced from the original 21 acres) lot, and placement, set well back from Manuka Road, on a rise above Cardinia Creek clearly distinguish it from other similar building types from the same period in the township of Berwick. (Criterion A)

Of further historical significance is the remaining John Stevens' garden design, as a rare surviving example of this prominent landscape architect's early residential work, which survives with a high degree of integrity. There are no other known examples of a designed residential landscape from the mid twentieth century within the municipality. Other examples of designed landscapes are generally public, or much earlier Victorian designs (although few are associated with a proven designer), or have been substantially altered through subdivision or simplification, such as 'Edrington', 'Hillsley', 'Eyre Court' and 'Tulliallan'. The only other comparable example from this period is the home gardener designed cactus collection and exotic garden at Hallam Park, which is a modest residential garden. (Criterion A, B and G)

The garden is of aesthetic significance as a design which creates a sense of overall enclosure, with a series of enclosed spaces within, represented by intimate walks and spaces, garden rooms and large shrubberies which separate broad swathes of open lawn. The design, which incorporated existing mature trees, creates a sense of anticipation through its use of the shrubberies and serpentine lines to create contrasts between light and dark spaces, provide contrasts in texture and create filtered landscape views. (Criterion E)

The mature exotic garden commissioned by Frederick Tuckfield and designed by John Stevens' is of historical (associative) significance for its direct and strong association with both Stevens as evidenced through:

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

. the integrity of Stevens' surviving garden design (including layout, materials, planting) specifically designed as a display garden for Tuckfields's substantial Camellia collection;

. the high percentage of Camellia species, varieties and forms which survive throughout the garden, many of which were bred, grown or developed by Frederick Tuckfield;

The direct association with both Stevens and Tuckfield is evident both in the physical fabric set out above, as well as through documentary and oral sources, including verbal recordings of John Stevens, local and state newspaper articles relating to the community and scientific use of the place and the Camellia collection and records of the plants developed by Tuckfield held by the Camellia Society of Victoria. The now mature layer of mid twentieth century planting, in particular the Camellia collection, along with the remnant Camellia shelter, the brick glasshouse and paving enriches and historical and associative significance of the place to Frederick Tuckfield as it clearly demonstrates the passion and interest of Tuckfield in collection, breeding and creating new Camellia varieties, and furthering the genus. (Criterion A and H)

The Camellia collection itself, in its setting is of scientific significance as a rare and unusually large collection of the genus, particularly in a residential setting. In addition, the mature Bur Oak *Quercus macrocarpa* is of scientific (botanical) significance as a particularly outstanding specimen of its species. (Criterion F)

Recommendations 2017

External Paint Controls

No

Internal Alteration Controls

No

Tree Controls

Yes

Fences & Outbuildings

No

Prohibited Uses May Be Permitted

Yes

Incorporated Plan

-

Aboriginal Heritage Place

No

Other Recommendations

Original Study Grading: B (Regional)

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

Appendix B - New Citation HO50 Minard

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Name	Minard	
Address	62-70 Manuka Road BERWICK	Significance Level Local
Place Type	Homestead Complex	
Citation Date	2004	

Recommended VHR - HI - PS -
Heritage Protection

History and Historical Context

Locality History

Taken from 'Berwick Township Precinct' citation HERMES No. 44242

Most of the city of Berwick, including the Berwick Township, was originally part of Robert Gardiner's Berwick pastoral run. There are said to have been early wattle and daub huts built on the eastern side of Most of the Berwick Hill for families drawing water from the Cardinia Creek (Beaumont, 1959:17). However, a permanent Berwick township was not established until the 1850s. At that time when large pastoral runs were subdivided and homestead blocks and other Crown Allotments sold, a Berwick Village Reserve began to appear on official maps. This reserve was bounded by the main Gippsland Road (later the Princes Highway), the Cardinia Creek, Inglis Road and Clyde Road (*Town and suburban lots, Berwick*, 1866).

The earliest Berwick Township plans located the proposed town on the north side of the Gippsland Road close to the Cardinia Creek. Surveyor Robert Hoddle's plan showed twelve blocks, stretching from Campbell Street to Cardinia Street, bounded on the north by Palmerston Street. No town blocks were planned for the present High Street commercial precinct, nor for any land west of Campbell Street. Hoddle commented that the numbered blocks had been pegged out and 'will be sufficient for the requirements of the locality for some time'. The land west of Campbell Street to Lyall Road he considered was an area where the township might expand in the future. This plan marked with a cross a possible site for a church and school house as 'required here by Gardiner and others' (*Berwick Township*, 1852). This was the site chosen soon afterwards for Bain's Berwick Hotel.

However, early purchasers of town land were more influenced by topography than surveyor's plans dreamed up in Melbourne. The development of the township turned out to be from west to east rather than from east to west, with a concentration of occupancy along High Street. Much of the story can be learned by studying the sequence of township maps drawn up from the late 1850s until the present time.

An 1858 Public Lands Office map showed the township at this time still bounded on the north by Palmerston Street. However, new Blocks 13-16 had been already marked out, stretching along High Street from Lyall Road to Peel Street and backing onto Wilson Street (now known as Wilson and Scanlan Streets) (Public Lands Office, 1858) By this date most allotments with High Street frontages had been sold. This included the new Block 16 between Lyall Road and Wheeler Street, the site of the Berwick High Street commercial precinct. About half this block had been purchased by Robert Bain, owner of the historic Berwick Hotel.

The 1858 map also showed many allotments sold in Blocks 8 and 9 bounded by Neill, Palmerston and Havelock (now Scotsgate Way) Streets. Very few allotments had been sold in the blocks at the eastern end of the township near Cardinia

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Creek. This became the site of much later development and was the area where post-war residential housing occurred.

The 1858 map also showed the location of a cemetery allotment of eight acres far north of the early township near the Village Reserve boundary now Inglis Road.

Several decades later, an 1871 Department of Lands and Survey map of Berwick Town and Suburban Lots (*Town and suburban lots, Berwick*, 1871) indicated a further extension of the township westward and included all the land marked as part of the original Berwick Village Reserve. The township then comprised 32 blocks bounded by High Street, Cardinia Street, Brisbane Street and Lyall Road. It now included all the area west of Campbell Street that makes up the Older Residential Area identified in the 1993 Heritage of the City of Berwick Study.

There were also twenty-six suburban lots bounded on the north by Inglis Road and on the west by Cranbourne (now Clyde) Road. The cemetery block of eight acres was indicated bounded on the north by Inglis road and on the west by Buchanan Road.

Early views of the township in 1877, 1887 and 1891 however, indicate that, apart from the cluster of buildings along High Street and the old residential precinct west of Campbell Street, Berwick remained an extremely small town during the last century (Beaumont, 1959:16, 24, 32). It remained, relatively small well into the present century, retaining a village-like character.

Later township maps, c1912 and later, indicate another important feature in Berwick's development, the setting aside of land for public parks and recreation reserves. Ten acres in Crown Allotment 10, south of the Cemetery site, became a public park. This was formerly known as the Berwick Recreation Ground and is now the Arch Brown Reserve. Along the Cardinia Creek public reserves were marked out, including the sites of the Akoonah Park and the Berwick showgrounds.

Place History

The land on which Minard stands was originally purchased by G. Brown in 1871 as allotment 24 of 32 acres and 2 roods (*Town and suburban lots, Berwick*, 1878). Brown purchased the adjacent Lot 23, also of 32 acres and 2 roods at the same time. Both Lots ran between the newly created road (later Manuka Road) and Cardina Creek. (Ibid.). It appears that G. Brown was George Brown, storekeeper (draper) of Berwick, whose drapery was located in High Street Berwick. It is not known whether Brown constructed any residence on the land, but it is clear that the land was run as a farm, with a focus on breeding Draught and other horses by Brown until at least 1883 (South Bourke and Mornington Journal, 31/01/1883) after his first wife died, he built a fine brick villa 'Inveresk' located at 93 High Street Berwick (HO44).

Brown sold part of Lots 23 and 24 (totaling 21 acres) to Malwyn A'beckett, the son son of Sir William A'Beckett, late Chief Justice of Victoria in 1886 (PROV, 1883). A'Beckett operated the property as a farm for some time, until leasing the property the Misses Hedrick in 1901, who operated Manuka Park as a 'first class boarding house' offering 'superior accommodation for visitors. shooting, tennis, golf and fishing' (South Bourke and Mornington Journal 13/11/1901). The property later passed to Georgina Sarah Walker of The Big House, Beaconsfield, and later to several other owners, including Harriet Lucy Maxwell, a Mr Preston, a Mr Almond and Eleanor and Charles Keith.

The purpose and date of construction of Minard are not clear, although the fabric of the building indicates that it is a transitional Victorian-Edwardian design, so likely to date from the early twentieth century (c.1890-1910). It has previously been suggested that the rate book increase for the property noted in the period 1897-1898 may indicate a possible build date, but it appears that the building has been constructed in two parts. An examination of the fabric, including the roof form indicates that the timber section of the building which forms part of the facade is probably later (c.1920), represented by a small gable roofed 2 roomed cottage with a straight roof verandah, partially infilled. The brick section of the building, including the raised brick section of building and cellar beneath, running parallel to the timber

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

cottage appears to have been constructed in the period between c1890-1910.

The key periods of change within this period was the operation of the property as a guest house by the Misses Hedrick from 1901-1904 and the purchase in 1904 by Georgiana Sarah Walker. It is likely that the modest dwelling was constructed during this time, however its key purpose is not clear. It seems to have been long associated with Manuka Park, and there is certainly parity in the title records and newspaper articles, which sometimes refer to 'Minard' and sometimes 'Manuka Park' as the same place from c.1938 (*The Argus*, 26/7/1938). The property was purchased by J. C Wiggins in the 1960s and the property was used as a horse breeding stud from 1976.

Manuka Park homestead was subdivided from Minard at some time between 1940 and 1982, the Minard retaining 20 acres, and Manuka Park retaining 30 acres (Auction Brochure, 1982). Manuka Park Homestead was demolished the 1980s, and a new residence constructed in the mid 1980s. Of the Manuka Park homestead, only archaeological material and several very large mature trees survive.

The building known as Minard was renovated in the 1990s, with the principal window on the brick section of the facade being replaced like for like and a new (sympathetic) weatherboard section added to the rear of the building. Significant repairs were carried out to the timber section of the facade because of white ant infestation (Andrew Long and Associates, 2016:25).

References

The Argus, Monday 4 October 1937 p 9 (Family Notices)

Beaumont, Norman E. (Norman Edward) 1959, *Early days of Berwick*, 2nd ed, Berwick and District Agricultural and Horticultural Society, 1959, Berwick

Context Pty. Ltd & Berwick (Vic.). Council 1993, *Heritage of the City of Berwick: identifying & caring for important places*, City of Berwick, [Narre Warren, Vic

South Bourke and Mornington Journal 31 Jan 1883, p2.

Auction brochure, Manuka Park, 20 March 1982.

Maps and Plans

Victoria Public Lands Office 1858, *Township of Berwick*, Public Lands Office, Melbourne

1866. *Town and suburban lots, Berwick*

1871. *Town and suburban lots, Berwick*

1878. *Town and suburban lots, Berwick*

Titles

Property Titles.; PROV (Public Records Office Victoria), C/T 1479-668

Description

Physical Description

Minard is an intact, asymmetrical brick and timber dwelling constructed in three distinct parts, clearly identifiable from the building fabric. The earliest section is a transitional Edwardian-Victorian brick building of two rooms with a steeply pitched gable roof clad in corrugated iron. This section of the building is elevated to allow access to a cellar via brick steps leading down to a solid timber door. A large decorative timber window with side lights is set in the western elevation, forming part of the combined facade of the amalgamated sections of building. This timber window has been replaced with an exact replica in recent years. A smaller traditional double hung sash window is set in the eastern wall, and two similar windows are symmetrically arranged on the northern elevation. The original brick chimney survives intact in this section.

The second part of the cottage is believed to date from c.1920, and comprised of a two room timber cottage with a gable roof and skillion profile verandah. This timber cottage forms the centre and facade of the combined building. The verandah has been replaced with modern timber posts and a possibly a new profile, and the cladding on both verandah and roof replaced. A portion of the verandah has been enclosed at some time in the period 1940-1970.

The timber portion of the building which is located to the east is a modern (but entirely sympathetic) extension of modern weatherboard and glass, with a simple corrugated iron clad gable roof.

The remnants of an attractive garden surround Minard, including a brick edged path leading to the front of the timber cottage, plantings of exotic trees and shrubs which appear to date from the period c.1950-1970, and more modern plantings and garden beds.

Overall, the cottage is in very good condition, and retains a high degree of integrity.

Recommended Management

In order to conserve the heritage significance of this place, it is recommended that the following objectives be given priority in the future maintenance or development of the property:

- Conserve the fabric of the original section of the house, which is of significance;
- Conserve those parts of the house which demonstrate important successive stages in the development of the property and/or provide intact evidence of changing architectural styles/construction techniques;
- Conserve significant outbuildings and maintain a visual relationship between the outbuildings and the main house in order to demonstrate the historical use of these buildings, and evidence of their former relationship to the Manuka Park property;
- Conserve significant plantings on the property, and maintain a visual relationship between the plantings and the significant buildings on the property;
- Prevent development adjacent to significant parts of the buildings from overwhelming the heritage characteristics of the building and the site as a whole;
- Encourage any new development on the site to relate in form, scale and materials to the significant parts of the existing built form, but be clearly contemporary in design;
- In the case of subdivision of the property, particular attention should be paid to retaining the house and outbuildings within the one subdivision allotment.

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

* In the case of subdivision of the property, particular attention should be paid to retaining the house and outbuildings within the one subdivision allotment.

Statement of Significance

What is Significant?

Minard, located at 62 Manuka Road Berwick, including the cellar and garden setting.

How is it Significant?

Minard is of local historic and aesthetic significance to the City of Casey.

Why is it Significant?

Minard is of local historic significance as it demonstrates two key periods of development within the suburban lands of Berwick - the creation of small, self sufficient farms on the outskirts of Berwick from c1871-1890, as represented by the small timber cottage at the centre of Minard, and the later consolidation of small farms into more intensive industry in the early twentieth century, including new industries, such as holiday accommodation (Criterion A).

The house itself has aesthetic significance as it represents typical elements of the form and style of modest Victorian and Edwardian domestic architecture as represented in the City of Casey, and retains a high degree of integrity. While minor alterations and additions have occurred, the periods of development, and differing architectural styles are clearly evident in comparing the two principal parts of the dwelling. The later section is constructed from timber, has a shallower gable roof, with simple, small four pane sash windows and a modest two-room form. The brick section demonstrates a new design and decorative approach to architecture, including the high-pitched gable roof, decorative large window set into the facade with side lights and timber detailing, the decorative 'rising sun' motif on the bargeboard and the elevated positioning. The inclusion of the cellar is of interest, as it is unusual within the municipality (Criterion D and E).

Recommendations 2017

External Paint Controls

No

Internal Alteration Controls

No

Tree Controls

No

Fences & Outbuildings

No

Prohibited Uses May Be Permitted

Yes

Incorporated Plan

-

Aboriginal Heritage Place

No

Other Recommendations

HERITAGE CITATION REPORT

Original Study Grading: B (Regional)

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