

Locality: Place HEYFIELD
address: Citation 24 GEORGE STREET
date 2016 Hotel
Place type (when built): Local government level Local Planning Scheme: Yes Vic
Recommended heritage protection: Heritage Register: No
Heritage Inventory (Archaeological): No

Place name: Railway Hotel



Architectural Style: Victorian, Federation Free Classical
Designer / Architect:
Construction Date: c1885, c1918, 1940

Statement of Significance

This statement of significance is based on the history, description and comparative analysis in this citation. The Criteria A-H is the Heritage Council Criteria for assessing cultural heritage significance (HERCON). Level of Significance, Local, State, National, is in accordance with the level of Government legislation.

What is significant?

The Railway Hotel at 24 George St, Heyfield, is significant. The form, materials and detailing as constructed in c1885 and c1918 are significant.

Later outbuildings, and alterations and additions to the building are not significant.

How is it significant?

The Railway Hotel is locally significant for its historical, social and aesthetic values to the Shire of Wellington.

Why is it significant?

The Railway Hotel is **historically and socially significant at a local level** as it illustrates the establishment and development of Heyfield from its early period, when the railway came to the town in 1883 which ended the region's isolation, and when the town grew as a result of the growing timber industry in the region, which quadrupled the town's population between 1933 and 1954. Publicans Bridget and Thomas Clark purchased the land on the south side of George Street in 1884 and the hotel was completed for them in 1885. The hotel may have first served as the Temperance Hotel, which also operated as a boarding house. The Railway Hotel is mentioned in the Wise Post Office Directories for the first time in 1895. The hotel was run by a number of publicans, including the Clark family, Thompson, John Morgan and Patrick Sullivan (husband of the Clark's daughter). In 1911, under Morgan, the hotel offered accommodation, billiards and horses and buggies for hire. The Clarks also owned two shops and cottages, and the weatherboard Commercial Bank on the same property, fronting George Street. Thomas Clark died in 1918 and it is possible that this made money available for the owner, his wife, to upgrade the façade to brick, for her son-in-law P. Sullivan who was the publican. However in 1920, following Bridget Clark's death, the hotel was sold out of the Clark family. This was also about the time when work started on a new butter factory, cattle sales held in the town fortnightly and construction commenced on the Glenmaggie Weir nearby. In 1940 the hotel underwent alterations, additions and renovations, designed by Maffra architect Stephen P. Ashton. These additions may have comprised the construction of the plain street façade along part of the Pearson St elevation, retaining the Victorian buildings within. Further alterations to the interior were carried out in the early 2000s. Despite being vacant in late 2015, the hotel is of social significance as a building that has served as a social and entertainment centre for the community for over 130 years, since its opening in 1885. (Criteria A, & G)

The Railway Hotel is **aesthetically significant at a local level** as a representative example of a hotel with an intact c1918 façade in the Federation Free Classical Style, constructed onto a timber Victorian building completed in 1885. The hipped roof form and timber rear elevations (and probably the internal structure) date to the Victorian period, while the decorative parapeted brick facades on George St and Pearson Streets (overpainted) to the north and west elevations date to c1918, which reflect the Federation Free Classical style. The Federation Free Classical style is evident in the engaged piers at the corners and ends of the building, which extend from ground level above the verandah to the top of the parapet, the bold cornice moulding below the parapet, and the form and detail of the parapet comprising the arched sections of smooth and rough-cast render, with the largest section containing the

words 'Railway Hotel' in relief. Also notable in the tuck pointed brickwork below the verandah, the profile and form of the verandah with a slightly-concave roof, corrugated iron cladding, and timber frieze with vertical slats. Also significant is the chamfered corner entrance, the openings to the c1918 brick structure (any modern doors and windows are not significant), rendered sills to the windows, and the leadlight highlights that reflect an Art Nouveau influence of the c1918 period, that has been retained above the doors on the corner and George Street entrances. The hotel is also aesthetically significant as a landmark historic building on the streetscape corner of Pearson and George Street Heyfield. (Criterion D)

Statutory Recommendations

This place is recommended for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Wellington Shire Planning Scheme to the boundaries as shown on the map.

External Paint Controls	Yes
Internal Alteration Controls	No
Tree Controls	No
Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-3	No
Prohibited Uses May Be Permitted	No
Incorporated Plan	No
Aboriginal Heritage Place	Not assessed

Map of recommended boundary for Heritage Overlay

[extended to cover the verandah]



KEY

- Recommended for Heritage Overlay
- Title boundary

Railway Hotel
24 George St, Heyfield

Project: Wellington Shire Stage 2 Heritage Study
Client: Wellington Shire Council
Author: Heritage Intelligence Pty Ltd
Date: 12/2/16

History

Locality history

The first European contact in the area was made by both Angus McMillan and Paul Strzelecki in 1840 when they crossed the Thomson River near present Heyfield. Hayfield pastoral run was occupied in 1841, supposedly named for the tall waving grass covering the plain. A small settlement known as Heyfield Bridge was soon established on the north side of the Thomson River. Gold was discovered in the Great Dividing Range in the 1860s, and Heyfield was located on route which stimulated the growth of the town. Heyfield township was surveyed in 1864 and was part of Maffra Shire from 1875. The town had two hotels by the early 1860s and a sawmill operated during this early period. By the 1870s the town had a tannery, flourmill, a brickworks, school and Anglican and Methodist churches. A bridge over the Thomson River was built in 1876, on James Tyson's Heyfield Run (Context 2005:39; Fletcher & Kennett 2005:65).

In 1883, a railway line from Traralgon extended to Heyfield. The railway ended the region's isolation as it significantly shortened the travelling time to Melbourne and stimulated industries. Heyfield's business centre gradually moved towards the railway station. In 1898, James Tyson's Heyfield Run was subdivided and 114 lots were sold for dairying and cropping. Further subdivision occurred in the town after 1900. Heyfield became a service centre for the surrounding farming and pastoral district (Fletcher & Kennett 2005:65-6). The town became busy when work started on the Glenmaggie Weir in the 1920s, and a tramline was built from Heyfield to the weir site to transport materials needed for the huge project (Context 2005:22). In 1922 a new butter factory was built, with cattle sales held in the town fortnightly (Fletcher & Kennett 2005:65-6). In the 1940s the Victorian Rivers and Water Supply Commission began works in the area, employing several hundred men to raise the walls of the Glenmaggie Weir and carry out irrigation works. After this project was completed in 1960, about 60 families remained in the area (Fletcher & Kennett 2005:66).

Heyfield grew substantially from the 1950s as the centre of a saw milling industry (Context 2005:39). Between 1933 and 1954 the population of the town quadrupled from approximately 500, to peak at 2,184 people in 1954 (Victorian Places). The alpine timber industry was to not only transform the alpine ash forests and send roads threading into this isolated area, but also to transform Heyfield, below the mountains on the red gum plains (Context 2005:21). After the 1939 fires with their horrific loss of life and the destruction of Victoria's main mountain ash forests and hardwood timber supplies, the state's timber industry was restructured. The Forests Commission surveyed the untapped and inaccessible alpine reserves of timber. Saw mills would be relocated to towns away from the forests and milling operations would be centralised in the towns to be known as conversion centres; one town nominated was Heyfield (Context 2005:21). In 1950, during the heart of the post-war timber shortage, seven saw mills were established in Heyfield which was quickly transformed into a timber town (Context 2005:21). It is suggested that the one town had the most mills in the southern hemisphere, in the 1950s (HDHS). Streets of mill workers houses were hastily built on the perimeter of the town – 185 houses altogether – giving workers proper housing and access to educational, health and shopping facilities that they had been denied when they lived in the forests. Most of the 1950s mill houses are now in private hands, some have been renovated (Context 2005:21). In the 1950s, a soldiers' settlement was also established in the newly irrigated farms to the south of Heyfield (Fletcher & Kennett 2005:66).

By 1958, the Heyfield Sawmillers Logging Company was formed to co-ordinate operations over concerns of diminishing reserves of millable timber (Fletcher & Kennett 2005:66). As logging allocations have been reduced over the second half of the twentieth century,

companies in Heyfield have amalgamated until the situation in 2001 where only one company, Neville Smith Pty Ltd, owns the two remaining saw mills. Because of the shrinking allocations, in the 2000s, timber is trucked to Heyfield from all parts of Victoria (Context 2005:22). Since the town's population peak in 1954 (totalling 2,184 people), the population reduced to 1,830 by 1971 and steadily reduced to a total of 1,459 in 2011 (Victorian Places). The town is suggested to retain the largest mill in the southern hemisphere (HDHS).

In 1994, Wellington Shire was created by the amalgamation of the former Shires of Alberton, Avon and Maffra, the former City of Sale, most of the former Shire of Rosedale, as well as an area near Dargo which was formerly part of Bairnsdale Shire. In 2011, timber logging and milling accounted for 11.4% of employment in the Heyfield area, with farming totalling 6.6% (Victorian Places).

Thematic context

This place is associated with the following themes from the *Wellington Shire Thematic History* (2005):

9. Developing cultural Institutions and Way of Life

Hotels were often one of the first buildings erected in a new settlement, as the social centre for the growing community, as a resting place on a coaching route and in the northern part of the Shire, en route to the goldfields. They provided lodgings and stables for travellers and before the establishment of public, commercial and government buildings, the rooms could also serve as meeting rooms for local groups, public meetings and travelling doctors who periodically tended the community.

Some of the earliest remaining hotels in the study area are the Exchange Hotel, Rosedale (c1863), Macalister Hotel in Maffra (c1863, 1922 additions), Railway Hotel in Heyfield (1885, 1940 additions) and Briagolong Hotel (1874; altered). Later hotels appeared once the towns were further established and provided competition to the earlier hotels, such as the Maffra Hotel (1900). In the twentieth century, earlier buildings were replaced, or re-built due to fires, such as the Tinamba Hotel (1924), Cricket Club Hotel in Cowwarr (1929), and Commercial Hotel in Heyfield (1930). The hotels continue to serve as social and entertainment venues for the present communities.

Place history

Bridget Maria Clark, housekeeper, received the Crown Grant for four lots on the south side of George Street (lots 1-4, section 8, Township of Heyfield; which extended from Pearson to Clark Street) in April and August 1884 (Township Plan; LV:V1634/F620). Bridget retained ownership of the land until her death in 1920 (Will & Probate). Bridget Maria Clark was the wife of Thomas Clark and mother to a number of daughters and a son John James Clark (Will & Probate). Clark Street to the east was named after the family (FitzGerald 1991:10).

The date of construction of the Railway Hotel is not generally agreed upon, however, it is agreed that it was constructed for owners Thomas and Bridget Clark (EGRPC 1980; MDHS 1985; HDHS). The Clarks moved to Heyfield from Toongabbie in 1876-7, where they had run a hotel (MDHS 1985). One source notes that the Heyfield hotel was built in 1876 (EGRPC 1980), while a second states that it was built in 1878 (HDHS). However, in May 1885 a local newspaper advertised that tenders would be received by Thomas Clarke of Heyfield, 'for the completion of the erection of Clarke's hotel, Heyfield' (*Traralgon Record*, 8 May 1885:3). The date of this request for tenders and the fact that Clark received the Crown Grants for the land in 1884 strongly suggest that the hotel was built (or definitely completed) in 1885.

An article in October 1887 noted that Bridget Maria Clark was the owner of the Temperance Hotel, where she lived, which also operated as a boarding house (*Maffra Spectator*, 13 Oct

1887:3; 12 Oct 1887:2). In 1891, local newspaper articles reported on a meeting held at 'Mr T Clark's Palace Hotel' (*Traralgon Record*, 12 Jun 1891:2; 15 Jun 1891:3). The Temperance Hotel, Heyfield still served as a boarding house in 1892 (*Maffra Spectator*, 2 Jun 1892:3). It has not been confirmed if this refers to the existing Railway Hotel or another building owned or occupied by the Clark's, however, a journal (date not confirmed; probably early 20th century) notes that there were four hotels in Heyfield in the 'early days'. It stated that 'Tom Clark conducted the Railway Hotel which was formerly a boarding house' (Farvis).

The Railway Hotel is mentioned in the Wise Post Office Directories for the first time in 1895 (FitzGerald 1991:21), named after the nearby station. By 1895, local articles referred to Thomas Clark of the Railway Hotel, Heyfield (*Gippsland Times*, 17 Oct 1895:3; 25 Feb 1897:3). Catherine Clark was the publican between 1895 and 1898, followed by Bridget M. Clark until 1901. Some later publicans included (but is not limited to) John Morgan in 1911, Patrick Sullivan in 1931, Mrs E. Carmichael in 1941 and G. Hosie in 1951 (FitzGerald 1991:21).

Bridget Clark subdivided the lots (around the existing hotel) and on-sold or leased them out from 1899, but retained the hotel and its property (LV:V1657/F252). A photo dating to c1895 (Figure H1) showed the corner timber building with a low parapet reading 'Thompson's Railway Hotel'. A hipped roof with two brick chimneys ran parallel to George Street, while a second hipped roof ran parallel with Pearson Street. A chamfered corner held the main entrance to the hotel, below a skillion-roof verandah that continued along the two main elevations (FitzGerald 1991:21).

In 1911, the Victorian Post Office Directory listed John Morgan as the proprietor of the Railway Hotel, located opposite the railway station, with 'superior accommodation for travellers; only best brands all liquor and cigars; charges moderate; billiards; horses and buggies for hire' (VPO Directory 1911). A photo dating to c1911 (Figure H2) showed 'Morgan's Railway Hotel' painted on a low parapet along the main facade (fronting George Street). The hotel had a verandah, hipped roof and retained two brick chimneys (since removed) (HDHS; FitzGerald 1991:20).

Upon his death in 1915, Thomas Clark (1839 -1915) had lived in Heyfield for over 30 years. He was 'identified with storekeeping and hotelkeeping business in the town' (*Gippsland Times*, 29 Apr 1915:2). The license was transferred from Mrs B. M. Clark to Mr P. Sullivan of Stratford (*Gippsland Times*, 14 Feb 1918:2). Patrick Sullivan was the husband of the Clark's second daughter, Kate Clark (*Gippsland Times*, 25 Feb 1897:3) whilst Kate's mother Bridget Clark, continued to own the hotel. The existing brick façade, parapet and timber verandah may date from soon after Thomas Clark's death, as the Clark's owned a lot of property and his death may have made finances available for his wife who owned the hotel to spend money on upgrading it for her son-in-law P. Sullivan, who had the licence of the hotel. The Federation Free Classical architectural style of the existing brick façade and parapet and timber verandah is also consistent with this date. The quality of the design indicates the work of a competent and experienced architect, and it may have been by Mr S. P. Ashton, but no evidence has yet been found.

At the time of Bridget Maria Clark's death in August 1920, she had let the Railway Hotel for 3 pounds per week to P. Sullivan. Upon the same land, Bridget Clark also owned two shops with a cottage attached and a 'weatherboard building used as a bank' (Figure H5) let at 1 pound per week (Will & Probate). The weatherboard building was the Commercial Bank, located to the east on George Street (demolished) (FitzGerald 1991:20). Clark also owned land elsewhere in Heyfield and the greater area, including a house on the south side of Mustons Lane, just west of Licola Road, where she lived at the time of her death (lots 8, 9, 14 & 15, Section B) (Will & Probate).

In August 1920, the hotel was transferred into the ownership of Ellen O'Brien of Cowwarr, and Aletitia Garvey, married woman of Glenmaggie. In January 1928, the hotel was sold to Patrick Sullivan (licensed victualler) and Catherine Sullivan, both of the Railway Hotel (LV:V1657/F252; V5369/F755).

The hotel was owned by Myrtle Coloe, married woman of Heyfield from 1936 (LV: V5369/F755). In June 1939, tenders were called for the 'alterations, additions and renovation to the Railway Hotel, Heyfield'. The architect was Mr S. P. Ashton of Queen Street, Maffra. Tenders closed in April 1940 (*Gippsland Times*, 5 Jun 1939:8; 4 Apr 1940:8). The location and appearance of the alterations are unknown, but they retained the c1918 brick façade and verandah, and appear to have retained the original Victorian building hipped roof forms.

In the 1940s, the hotel provided accommodation (*Gippsland Times*, 5 Feb 1945:3). A photo dating to the c1970s (Figure H3) showed the hotel with a timber frieze (with vertical slats) running the length of the verandah at this date. The roof cladding was coloured green and 'Railway Hotel' was written on the shorted parapet fronting Pearson Street (HDHS).

By 2005 the owners had carried out extensive renovations but had 'reserved the hotel's special character' (Context 2005). Modern additions have been added to the rear (east) of the hotel, while outbuildings remain to the south of the hotel. One building to the south serves as a residence (Colliers). The early stables have been demolished (HDHS).

In 2015, the building continues to serve as a hotel with nine rooms of accommodation recently constructed (Visit Heyfield 2015; Colliers).

Stephen P. Ashton, architect

Stephen Percy Ashton (b.1882 d.1954) was a Maffra-based architect (*Gippsland Times*, 30 Aug 1943:2; 1 Nov 1934:5). In 1905, Ashton was appointed Clerk of Works on the Upper Maffra's Mechanics' Institute, to extend it and install acetylene gas lighting (VHD). He constructed a shop at 75 Johnson Street, Maffra (1908). Ashton designed the Foster Building in Maffra (1908), an early example of concrete block construction in Victoria, which is a technique which began to be adopted in Victoria in about 1905, when American block-making machinery became readily available (VHD).

In 1915, Ashton was given a send off at the Maffra Metropolitan Hotel, before departing for military service as a Lieutenant in the Light Horse Regiment. An article reported that 'no man would be more missed out of the town' as 'his services had been indispensable to the hospital and other charities' including the 'artistic manner in which he had carried out stage settings and decorations in the cause of charity' (*Maffra Spectator*, 18 Nov 1915:3; AWM).

During the post-war period, Ashton designed the Commonwealth Milk Factory in Maffra, as well as the large brick sugar store of the Maffra Beet Sugar Factory, both in 1922 (Context 2005:12, 14). Ashton also designed further buildings using concrete and concrete block construction, including the Cowwarr Cricket Club Hotel (1929) and the Cowwarr Public Hall (1930) (VHD). In the 1930s, Ashton served as a Maffra Shire Councillor while continuing to practice as an architect (*Gippsland Times*, 1 Nov 1934:5). His later works included the Sister Muriel Peck Memorial Infant Welfare Centre (1951) and St Philip's On-The-Hill in Morwell East (1952).



Figure H1. A photo dating to c1895 of the 'Thompson's Railway Hotel'. The photo shows the corner weatherboard building with a low parapet reading 'Thompson's Railway Hotel'. A hipped roof with two brick chimneys ran parallel to George Street, while a second hipped roof ran parallel with Pearson Street. A chamfered corner held the main entrance to the hotel, below a slightly concave skillion-roof verandah that continued along the two main elevations (FitzGerald 1991:21).



Figure H2. This photo dating to c1911 showed 'Morgan's Railway Hotel'. The hotel had a verandah, hipped roof and retained two brick chimneys (since removed) (HDHS).



Figure H3. Photo dating to c1970s that shows the hotel with a timber parapet on the right hand side, and timber frieze (with vertical slats) running the length of the slightly concave skillion verandah at this date. The roof cladding was coloured green and 'Railway Hotel' was written on the shorted parapet fronting Pearson Street (HDHS).



Figure H4. Photo showing the unpainted red brickwork, and the window and door fenestration which appears to match the Victorian era windows shown in Figures H1 and H2. The highly decorative turned timber posts and timber verandah valence are typical of the Federation era design (see inset detail). Although this photo was taken in 1975 the building, including the verandah, as seen in this photo, is virtually unchanged from its appearance when it was built c1918.

Source: Doris Kemp "History of the Maffra Shire to 1975" p112 113. Photo 1974-5.



Figure H5. c. 1920s view of George St, Heyfield. Showing the George St elevation soon after it was constructed, was the same as in the 1975 photo in Figure H4. The tones of the colour scheme is also evident, such as the unpainted red brickwork, dark and light coloured rendered parapet, unpainted galvanised iron roof cladding, dark coloured verandah fascia and posts, and light coloured timber slatted verandah. It also shows the timber Commercial bank building owned by Bridget Clark.

Source: Heyfield & Districts Historical Society (HDHS) collection.

Sources

Australian War Memorial, 'Stephen Percy Ashton', <<https://www.awm.gov.au/>>, accessed 10 Dec 2015.

Bairnsdale Advertiser (and Tambo and Omeo Chronicle)

Colliers International real estate agents, '24 George Street, Heyfield, Victoria 3858', <<http://www.colliers.com.au/15370/#>> accessed 9 Dec 2015.

Context Pty Ltd (2005), *Wellington Shire Heritage Study*, prepared for Wellington Shire Council.

East Gippsland Regional Planning Committee (EGRPC) (October 1980), 'Sites and Features of Historical Significance in the East Gippsland Region'.

Farvis, Luton (n.d.), journal extracts provided by the Heyfield & Districts Historical Society.

FitzGerald, Leanne (1991), *Heyfield 1841-1991, a pictorial history*, Upper Ferntree Gully.

Fletcher, Meredith & Linda Kennett (2005), *Wellington Landscapes, History and Heritage in a Gippsland Shire*, Maffra.

Gippsland Times

Heyfield & Districts Historical Society (HDHS) collection: historical information and photos generously provided by Louise Hill-Coleman and Merryn Stevenson, provided Nov 2015.

Kemp, Doris, "History of the Maffra Shire to 1975", 1975.

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited above.

Morwell Historical Society (HS), 'Morwell on the March 1950-1959', <<http://www.morwellhistoricalsociety.org.au/>>, accessed 10 Dec 2015.

Maffra & District Historical Society (MDHS) (1985), *Maffra Past and Present*, Maffra [Vic].

Ovens and Murray Advertiser [Beechworth]

The Maffra Spectator

Township of Heyfield Plan

Traralgon Record (and Morwell, Mirboo, Toongabbie, Heyfield, Tyers and Callignee Advertiser) [Traralgon].

Victorian Heritage Database (VHD), citation for 'Foster Building, 67-71 Johnson Street, Maffra' <<http://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/>>, accessed 10 Dec 2015.

Victorian Places, 'Heyfield', <<http://www.victorianplaces.com.au/>>, accessed 24 February 2016.

Victorian Post Office (VPO) Directory (1911), as cited in FitzGerald (1991).

Visit Heyfield Region, 'Railway Hotel, Heyfield', <<http://www.visitheyfield.com.au/>>, accessed 9 Dec 2015.

Will & Probate of Bridget Maria Clarke, PROV, VPRS 7591/P2/Unit 635; VPRS 28/P3/Unit 1115

Description

This section describes the place in 2016. Refer to the Place History for additional important details describing historical changes in the physical fabric.

The Railway Hotel was built on the site c1885, with major additions to the façade, parapet and verandah c1918. The roof form and rear elevations (and probably the internal structure) date to the Victorian period (the Victorian era chimney's are missing), while the highly decorated parapeted brick facades and timber verandah with splayed corner linking the north and west elevations date to c1918, and they reflect the Federation Free Classical style. The plain parapet along Pearson St is not part of the c1918s building. The c1918 fabric of the building is in good condition and retains a high level of integrity.

The hotel is located on the corner of, and fronts both, George and Pearson streets. The building sits on the title boundaries and has a return verandah with splayed corner which extends over the pedestrian footpath.

Aerial. The building is formed by a large hipped roof section that fronts George Street and a smaller hipped roof section which fronts Pearson Street, which date to the early Victorian development of the hotel (and are evident in a c1895 photo). Adjoining both of these sections at the centre of the plan is a narrow hipped roof section (date not confirmed). A hipped roof verandah extends along the north and west elevations of the hotel which dates from c1918. The roof and verandah are clad with corrugated iron (the building does not appear to retain any Victorian chimneys).

A number of modern additions and outbuildings extend to the rear (south) of the hotel, to the rear of the property.

Figure D1. The two main elevations of the hotel have a brick parapeted facade (overpainted) which extends above the verandah roof to form an ornate parapet, which conceals the Victorian buildings with hipped roofs behind them. The north elevation, corner bay and adjacent bay on the west elevation retain tuck pointing to the bricks (overpainted). An entrance is located on the chamfered corner, entered by two concrete steps. The parapet extends across the entire north elevation and part of the west elevation, past the corner entrance. The rendered (overpainted) parapet is formed by rendered engaged piers which extend from ground level. In between the piers are shorter sections which rise in a slight arch, faced with rough-cast render. At the centre of the north parapet is a large section which rises in a larger arch, with the words 'Railway Hotel' in relief. Below the parapet on both elevations is a bold cornice mould.

A modern sign projects from the parapet at the corner.

Figures D1 & D2. The hipped verandah has a slightly-concave profile and is clad with corrugated iron, supported by (new – see Figure H4) stop-chamfered timber posts which have been spliced in to the top of the original turned timber posts (just below the timber valance). The verandah has a timber frieze with vertical slats that date from the original c1918 structure. A shorter parapet constructed of simple panels is located at the south end of the west elevation (date not confirmed).

Figures D1, 2 & 3. The openings to the north and west elevations appear to be very similar in layout to the Victorian facades (see Figures H1 & H2). The windows have a rendered sill with a wide rendered band below (overpainted), dating to the c1918 development.

All of the doors and windows to the north and west elevations are modern alterations.

Figure D4. The corner entrance and entrance on George Street retain leadlight highlights with an Art Nouveau influence which date from the c1918 works.

Figure D5. The rear (south) elevations, dating to the Victorian period, are clad in weatherboard, with the hipped roofs evident above.



Figure D1. The two main elevations of the hotel have a brick envelope (overpainted) which extends above the verandah roof to form an ornate parapet, which conceals the Victorian hipped roof. An entrance is located on the chamfered corner. The parapet extends across the entire north elevation and part of the west elevation, past the corner entrance.



Figure D2. A shorter parapet constructed of simple panels is located at the south end of the west elevation (date not confirmed).



Figure D3. The openings to the north and west elevations appear to be very similar to the Victorian era openings, in the Victorian facades (see Figures H1 & H2). Note the concave verandah structure.



Figure D4. The corner entrance retains leadlight highlights with an Art Nouveau influence dating from the c1918 construction.



Figure D5. The rear (south) elevations, dating to the Victorian period, are clad in weatherboard, with the hipped roofs evident above.

Sources

All photos taken in 2015 by Heritage Intelligence Pty Ltd as part of Wellington Shire Stage 2 Heritage Study.

Comparative Analysis

Railway Hotel, Heyfield – c1885 single-storey timber Victorian hotel with a new rendered brick facade built c1918 in the Federation Free Classical style. The Federation facade is highly intact with the original roof forms and earlier timber elevations evident at the rear of the

building. It is a dominant single-storey building on a corner lot addressing two streets. Recommended for the Heritage Overlay as part of this Study.

Comparable places:

Macalister Hotel, 2 Johnson Street, Maffra – c1863 Victorian single-storey building with a new rendered façade built in 1922 in the Free Classical style with Egyptian Revival influences in the decoration to the openings. A highly intact Interwar façade that probably retains remnants of the original c1863 building (at least the roof form) which was the first hotel in Maffra. It is a landmark building at the northern entrance to Maffra. Recommended for the Heritage Overlay as part of this Study.

Rosedale Hotel, 29-31 Lyons St, Rosedale – built as a single-storey building in 1858 with additions dating to 1927. It is a two-storey brick construction with a facade, roof form and parapet that dates to the Interwar period. It is significant as an important early hotel complex in Gippsland, for its association with builder William Allen (and others), for the plan of the complex, and for its contribution to the townscape. Retains the 1858 stables and a two-storey kitchen and staff quarters built 1863. (VHR H645)

Ship Inn Hotel (former) & Cordyline tree, 73 Tarraville Rd, Port Albert – c1856 intact single-storey weatherboard hotel with timber shingle roof below the later corrugated iron roof. It is significant as the oldest hotel building in Port Albert and among the early hotels in Gippsland, and for its historical associations. (HO135)

Latrobe Hotel (former), 511 Raymond St, Sale – a small Victorian single-storey brick building (1900). Every window and door opening has been filled in, thus presenting a blank rendered and painted wall to the street which has compromised the integrity of the front elevation of the building. The existing citation for this building states that it is significant as a rare example of an early hotel unusually located in a residential area of Sale, as a hostel later run by the Church of England and as an important landmark building. (HO185)

Commercial Hotel (former), 20 Reeve St, Tarraville – c1854 double-fronted timber building of a residential scale with a high-hipped roof. It is significant as one of the oldest hotels in Gippsland, for its integrity, and as a remnant of the commercial strip on Reeve Street. The verandah has been largely in-filled on at least two elevations, including the façade but this is easily reversible. (HO40).

Management Guidelines

Whilst landowners are not obliged to undertake restoration works, these guidelines provide recommendations to facilitate the retention and enhancement of the culturally significant place, its fabric and its setting, when restoration works or alterations to the building are proposed. They also identify issues particular to the place and provide further detailed advice where relevant. The guidelines are not intended to be prescriptive and a pragmatic approach will be taken when considering development proposals. Alternative approaches to those specified in the guidelines will be considered where it can be demonstrated that a desirable development outcome can be achieved that does not impact on a place's heritage integrity.

The building facades are in good condition, however, there are some recommendations below especially relating to sub floor ventilation, down pipe outlets into drainage pits, and some guidelines for future development and heritage enhancement.

1. Setting

- 1.1. Retain clear views of the two street elevations.

- 1.2. Ensure signs and services such as power poles, bus shelters, signs, etc are located so that they do not impact on the important views.
- 1.3. New interpretation storyboards should be placed to the side of the building not directly in front of it, if possible.
- 1.4. Paving
- 1.5. Appropriate paving could be pressed granitic sand, asphalt or concrete. If concrete is selected, a surface with sand-coloured- size exposed aggregate would be better with the historic building.
- 1.6. Ensure the asphalt or concrete does not adhere to the building itself. Insert 10mm x 10mm grey polyurethane seal over a zipped Ableflex joint filler around the plinth, to ensure concrete does not adhere to it, and to allow expansion and joint movement and prevent water from seeping below the building.

2. Additions and New Structures

- 2.1. New structures should be restricted to the rear of the property as shown in the blue polygon on the aerial map below.
- 2.2. Sympathetic extensions are preferred. E.g. New parts that are in the same view lines as the historic building as seen from the street, should be parallel and perpendicular to the existing building, no higher than the existing building, similar proportions, height, wall colours, steep gable or hip roofs, with rectangular timber framed windows with a vertical axis. But the parts that are not visible in those views could be of any design, colours and materials.
- 2.3. Where possible, make changes to the original fabric, that are easily reversible. E.g. The current needs might mean that a doorway in a brick wall is not used, or located where an extension is desired. Rather than bricking up the doorway, frame it up with timber and sheet it over with plaster, weatherboards, etc.
- 2.4. To avoid damage to the brick walls, signs should be attached in such a way that they do not damage the brickwork. Preferably fix them into the mortar rather than the bricks.
- 2.5. If an extension is to have a concrete slab floor, ensure it will not reduce the air flow under the historic brick building.
- 2.6. Avoid hard paths against the walls. Install them 500mm away from the walls and 250mm lower than the ground level inside the building. Fill the gap between the path and wall with very coarse gravel to allow moisture to evaporate from the base of the wall. See section 7.

3. Accessibility

3.1. Ramps

3.1.1. Removable ramp construction

- 3.1.1.1. A metal framed ramp which allows air to flow under it, to ensure the subfloor vents of the building are not obstructing good airflow under the floor, which will allow the wall structure to evaporate moisture, reduce termite and rot attack to the subfloor structure and reduce rising damp in brick/stone walls.
- 3.1.1.2. If it is constructed of concrete next to brick walls this may cause damp problems in the future.
- 3.1.1.3. Ensure water drains away from the subfloor vents, and walls and any gap between the wall and the ramp remains clear of debris. Insert additional sub floor vents if the ramp has blocked any of them.
- 3.1.1.4. The hand rails on the ramp should not be a feature, which would detract from the architecture. Plain thin railings painted in the same colour as the walls, so that blend in, would be appropriate

- 3.2. Metal banisters may be installed at the front steps. They are functional and minimalist and they have a minor visual impact on the architecture and therefore they are a suitable design for an accessible addition.

4. Reconstruction and Restoration

If an opportunity arises, consider restoring and reconstructing the following.

- 4.1. Roofing, spouting and down pipes
 - 4.1.1. Use galvanised corrugated iron roofing, spouting, down pipes and rain heads.
 - 4.1.2. Don't use Zinalume or Colorbond or plastic.
 - 4.1.3. Use Ogee profile spouting, and round diameter down pipes.
- 4.2. Fences
 - 4.2.1. Construct a paling timber or galvanised corrugated iron fence with timber capping along the street boundaries.
- 4.3. Verandah
 - 4.3.1. Replace the existing timber posts with turned timber posts to match the original Federation ones (See Figure H4).
 - 4.3.2. Repair the verandah with concave timber structure, timber valance and re clad with galvanised corrugated iron, (unpainted), not Colorbond or Zinalume.

5. Brick Walls

- 5.1. Mortar: Match the lime mortar, do not use cement mortar. Traditional mortar mixes were commonly 1:3 lime:sand.
- 5.2. Tuck pointing is now a rare craft and expensive to repair or reconstruct, which makes caring for the existing remnants particularly important.
- 5.3. Paint and Colours (also see Paint Colours and Paint Removal)
 - 5.3.1. It is recommended to paint the exterior of the building using original colours (paint scrapes may reveal the colours) to enhance the historic architecture and character.
 - 5.3.2. Note, even though some paints claim to 'breathe', there are no paints available, that adequately allow the walls to 'breathe'.
 - 5.3.3. Paint removal: It is recommended that the paint be removed chemically from the bricks (never sand, water or soda blast the building as this will permanently damage the bricks, mortar, tuck pointing and render. Never seal the bricks or render as that will create perpetual damp problems). Removal of the paint will not only restore the elegance of the architecture, but it will remove the ongoing costs of repainting it every 10 or so years.
- 5.4. Remove any dark grey patches to the mortar joints - this is cement mortar which will damage the bricks, as noted above, and reduce the longevity of the walls. Repoint those joints with lime mortar. The mortar is not the problem it is the messenger, alerting you to a damp problem (also see Water Damage and Damp)
- 5.5. Modern products: Do not use modern products on these historic bricks as they will cause expensive damage. Use lime mortar to match existing.
- 5.6. **Do not seal** the bricks with modern sealants or with paint. Solid masonry buildings **must be able to evaporate water** when water enters from leaking roofs, pipes, pooling of water, storms, etc. The biggest risk to solid masonry buildings is permanent damage by the use of cleaning materials, painting, and sealing agents and methods. None of the modern products that claim to 'breathe' do this adequately for historic solid masonry buildings.

6. Care and Maintenance

- 6.1. Retaining and restoring the heritage fabric is always a preferable heritage outcome than replacing original fabric with new.
- 6.2. Key References
 - 6.2.1. Obtain a copy of "Salt Attack and Rising Damp" by David Young (2008), which is a free booklet available for download from Heritage Victoria website. It is in plain English, well illustrated and has very important instructions and should be used by tradesmen, Council maintenance staff and designers.
 - 6.2.2. Further assistance is available from the Shire's heritage advisor.
- 6.3. Roofing, spouting and down pipes
 - 6.3.1. Use galvanised corrugated iron roofing, spouting, down pipes and rain heads. It is preferable to use short sheet corrugated iron and lap them, rather than single long sheets, but it is not essential.
 - 6.3.2. Do not use Zinalume or Colorbond.
 - 6.3.3. Use Ogee profile spouting, and round diameter down pipes.
- 6.4. Joinery
 - 6.4.1. It is important to repair rather than replace where possible, as this retains the historic fabric. This may involve cutting out rotten timber and splicing in new timber, which is a better heritage outcome than complete replacement.
 - 6.4.2. The original external timber doors and windows require careful repair and painting.

7. Water Damage and Damp

- 7.1. Signs of damp in the walls include: lime mortar falling out of the joints, moss growing in the mortar, white (salt) powder or crystals on the brickwork, existing patches with grey cement mortar, or the timber floor failing. These causes of damp are, in most cases, due to simple drainage problems, lack of correct maintenance, inserting concrete next to the solid masonry walls, sealing the walls, sub floor ventilation blocked, or the ground level too high on the outside.
- 7.2. Always remove the **source** of the water damage first (see Care and Maintenance).
- 7.3. Water falling, splashing or seeping from damaged spouting and down pipes causes severe and expensive damage to the brick walls.
- 7.4. Repairing damage from damp may involve lowering of the ground outside so that it is lower than the ground level inside under the floor, installation of agricultural drains, running the downpipes into drainage inspection pits instead of straight into the ground. The reason for the pits is that a blocked drain will not be noticed until so much water has seeped in and around the base of the building and damage commenced (which may take weeks or months to be visible), whereas, the pit will immediately fill with water and the problem can be fixed before the floor rots or the building smells musty.
- 7.5. Cracking: Water will be getting into the structure through the cracks (even hairline cracks in paint) and the source of the problem needs to be remedied before the crack is filled with matching mortar, or in the case of paint on brick, stone or render, the paint should be chemically removed, to allow the wall to breathe properly and not retain the moisture.
- 7.6. Subfloor ventilation is critical. Check that sub floor vents are not blocked by the concrete verandah floor or paint, and introduce additional vents if necessary. Ensure the exterior ground level is 250mm or more, lower than the ground level inside the building. Good subfloor ventilation works for free, and is therefore very

cost effective. Do not rely on fans being inserted under the floor as these are difficult to monitor, they can breakdown as they get clogged with dust, etc, and there are ongoing costs for servicing and electricity.

- 7.7. Engineering: If a structural engineer is required, it is recommended that one experienced with historic buildings and the Burra Charter principle of doing 'as little as possible but as much as necessary', be engaged. Some of them are listed on Heritage Victoria's Directory of Consultants and Contractors.
- 7.8. Never install a concrete floor inside a solid masonry building, as it will, after a year or so, cause long term chronic damp problems in the walls.
- 7.9. Never use cement mortar, always match the original lime mortar. Cement is stronger than the bricks and therefore the bricks will eventually crumble, leaving the cement mortar intact! Lime mortar lasts for hundreds of years. When it starts to powder, it is the 'canary in the mine', alerting you to a damp problem – fix the source of the damp problem and then repoint with lime mortar.
- 7.10. Do not install a new damp proof course (DPC) until the drainage has been fixed, even an expensive DPC may not work unless the ground has been lowered appropriately.

8. Paint Colours and Paint Removal

- 8.1. A permit is required if you wish to paint a previously unpainted exterior, and if you wish to change the colours from the existing colours.
- 8.2. Even if the existing colour scheme is not original, or appropriate for that style of architecture, repainting using the existing colours is considered maintenance and no planning permit is required.
- 8.3. If it is proposed to change the existing colour scheme, a planning permit is required and it would be important to use colours that enhance the architectural style and age of the building.
- 8.4. Rather than repainting, it would be preferred if earlier paint was chemically removed from brick and rendered surfaces, revealing the original finish.
- 8.5. Chemical removal of paint will not damage the surface of the stone, bricks or render or even the delicate tuck pointing, hidden under many painted surfaces. Removal of the paint will not only restore the elegance of the architecture, but it will remove the ongoing costs of repainting it every 10 or so years.
- 8.6. Sand, soda or water blasting removes the skilled decorative works of craftsmen as well as the fired surface on bricks and the lime mortar from between the bricks. It is irreversible and reduces the life of the building due to the severe damp that the damage encourages. Never seal the bricks or render as that will create perpetual damp problems.

9. Services

- 9.1. Ensure new services and conduits, down pipes etc, are not conspicuous. Locate them at the rear of the building whenever possible, and when that is not practical, paint them the same colour as the building or fabric behind them, or enclose them behind a screen the same colour as the building fabric that also provides adequate ventilation around the device. Therefore, if a conduit goes up a red brick wall, it should be painted red, and when it passes over say, a cream coloured detail, it should be painted cream.

10. Signage (including new signage and locations and scale of adjacent advertising signage)

- 10.1. Ensure all signage is designed to fit around the significant architectural design features, not over them.

NOTE: The blue shaded area is the preferred location for additions and new development



KEY

- Recommended for Heritage Overlay
- Title boundary

Railway Hotel
24 George St, Heyfield

Project: Wellington Shire Stage 2 Heritage Study
Client: Wellington Shire Council
Author: Heritage Intelligence Pty Ltd
Date: 12/2/16

Resources

Wellington Shire Heritage Advisor

Young, David (2008), "Salt Attack and Rising Damp, a guide to salt damp in historic and older buildings" Technical Guide, prepared