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AIM: The aim of this essay is to make a study of the Royal Park to Clifton Hill railway and to assess any influence the line had on North Carlton.

SYNOPSIS: The Railway:

The section of line across North Carlton was part of the "Outer Circle" scheme of diverting traffic from Gippsland, via the Eastern and Northern suburbs, to Spencer Street, and is closely linked with the development of Melbourne suburban railways. The line was never used for this purpose because of operational handicaps, and, because of its very nature, proved of no benefit to the areas it served.

The North Carlton station is of interest, as it was a standard railway plan at the time.

Effects: Transport:

The limitations of the Railway were obvious to the residents of the areas it served, and the opening fostered considerable comment by the press.

Land:

The main effect of the railway was the need to resume land and to close or re-locate
streets in North Carlton. Property owners were compensated for land resumed, and for depreciation on sections of their property which had not been bought. There appeared to be no effects on the value of other property in the area.

CONCLUSION:

Apart from the property owners whose land was resumed to the railway, we may conclude that the line had little effect, if any, on North Carlton concerning either property or transportation.
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History of the line to opening:

The Melbourne suburban railway system of the early 1870's consisted of two independent systems. In the southern and eastern suburbs, the private Melbourne and Hobson's Bay United Railway Co. operated lines to Sandridge, St. Kilda, Brighton Beach and Hawthorn, with the main city terminals of Flinders Street and Princes Bridge Station. In the north and west, Government-owned lines ran to Williamstown, Bendigo and Albury, with the main terminus at Spencer Street Station. No connection existed between Spencer Street and Flinders Street Stations until 1879.

In 1872, the Government decided to build a line to the "Gipps Land" district in the east, and negotiations were commenced for the purchase of the Hobson's Bay Company's lines as a possible means of entry for the proposed line to Melbourne. In July 1873, the Victorian Railways Engineer-in-Chief, Thomas Higinbotham, submitted plans and estimates of seven alternative routes to bring the proposed line into Melbourne. One proposal was to construct a railway from Oakleigh through Caulfield Gardiner, Upper Hawthorn, Camberwell, Kew, Northcote, North Fitzroy, North Carlton, to a junction with the existing Government lines at North Melbourne. The route was dubbed the "Outer Circle", and Higinbotham claimed it would obviate the need for the purchase of the Hobson's Bay system, or pay running rights into Melbourne over its lines,
as would be necessary if the Gippsland line were connected to it. An expensive connexion between Flinders Street station and the Government lines at Spencer Street would not be needed as all traffic could be routed via the Outer Circle to give connexion with the Government system. The line would "provide railway service to a large and important suburban area; provide an easy and cheap means of extending railways to Heidelberg and other places north and north east of the Outer Circle line; and serve as an approach for all Government railways to a central passenger station, if this were subsequently found desirable." The proposed route was 15½ miles long and was estimated to cost £292,455.

Thus, in its original form, the section of line across North Carlton was but a part of a grand scheme to bring all Government lines to a central terminus. One would wonder whether at the time those responsible had been influenced by the London example, where each company had its own terminus in the city and had no thoughts of a central passenger station, the advantages of which are enormous. Higinbotham obviously had visions of a central Government station, completely independent of the private Hobson's Bay system. It is easy to understand that at that time Spencer Street station would have been thought to overwhelm Flinders Street station in importance. All Government lines were in the North and West, and it is not unreasonable to have expected Melbourne to have grown into these areas and contain the greater part of its population.
Negotiations for the purchase of the Hobson's Bay Co's. lines collapsed in November, 1873; the Government would not agree to the terms laid down by the Company, which was working at a steady profit. Postponement of the Gippsland line followed, and Higinbotham's plans abandoned, which is hard to understand since a failure in negotiations would seem to give more weight to his scheme.

It was not until November 1878 that the Hobson's Bay United Co. was purchased by the Government for a sum of £1,320,820 at £80 per £50 share. During its lifetime, the railway had returned its shareholders £49 per £50 share on working operations. The Gippsland line was, at this time, nearing completion, and it would seem that the directors had held out for as long as possible until the Government had to purchase the Company or face the unsatisfactory alternative of paying running rights into Melbourne. Connection of the Gippsland line was made at South Yarra in April 1879.

Higinbotham had been removed from office in January 1878 as a result of a political deadlock in which the Berry Government was debarred from obtaining money to carry on public services. A ruthless purge followed in order to conserve funds in hand, and Higinbotham was one of the many to be sacked, and, was consequently not in office at the time of the purchase of the Hobson's Bay Co. or the completion of the Gippsland line. Higinbotham had lost his battle for the Outer Circle - or so it would seem.
Apparently, the arguments put forward by Higinbotham were still fresh in the minds of the parliamentarians, for, in December 1880, 23 new lines were authorised, among them one from North Melbourne to Coburg, and one from Clifton Hill to Alphington. In the preliminary debate, Thomas Bent had moved an amendment to substitute the word "Northcote" for "Clifton Hill", the object being to adhere to the original "Outer Circle" scheme. The amendment was not carried, and the Clifton Hill to Alphington line was completed in 1885, the Coburg line being opened in 1884.

It must be realised that the Clifton Hill line started at Clifton Hill and finished at Alphington - it had no connexion to any other line! It was not officially opened for traffic until 1888, when connexion was made at Clifton Hill with the Royal Park line. Leo Harrigan, in his "Victorian Railways to '62 (P. 102)" reports that, according to unofficial information, residents adjacent to the Clifton Hill, Alphington line ran their own train service during the period the line lay idle with a gas engine supplied by John Danks & Son fitted to a carriage, and operated by a driver who was also the guard and ticket seller.

Duncan Gillies introduced the proposal for the Royal Park-Clifton Hill line and the Oakleigh to Alphington line as part of the Railway Construction Bill of 1884. Gillies argued for the proposed lines under the terms of Higinbotham's "Outer Circle" scheme, claiming that the railway would divert a considerable amount of traffic from Gippsland from the
suburban system between Oakleigh, South Yarra and Melbourne, and would allow firewood from the Lilydale line ready passage to the northern suburbs.¹

One of the provisions of the Railways Commissioners Act passed the previous year was that Commissioners were required to support with evidence of likely traffic and revenue any new line that they proposed. The provision had been designed in an attempt to eliminate "political railways" in which lines were constructed not for reasons of necessity, but more for selfish political reasons.

When questioned about the future prospects of the lines proposed, Gillies replied that the Commissioners were not able to furnish details in every case, since past experience had shown that the actual traffic that resulted from the opening of a new line more often than not bore no similarity with the estimate. He was able to say, however, that by analogy with other similar districts, the lines would pay, and even if they did not pay, in themselves they would act as feeders to other lines that would pay, and hence, in the long term, would be financially satisfactory lines.

Many members could not see this overall purpose for the Outer Circle and opposed it on a local basis. One Member, Mr. Mason, considered there was no justification for the

¹ The Railway Construction Bill was Dubbed the "Octopus Act" from the "tentacle"-like spread of the 66 new lines that were proposed.
Royal Park to Clifton Hill section, since the line, as proposed, would serve suburbs, the residents of which already had ample transport in buses and cabs, whereas "some country people had no transport at all."

Also, under the same Bill, was a proposal to build a viaduct between Spencer Street and Flinders Street Stations. The two stations had been connected by a "tramway" since 1879, but this line was used only at night, to avoid street traffic congestion, for the interchange of rolling stock and goods traffic. One, Mr. Woods, during the second reading of the Bill, doubted the need for the viaduct, saying "what traveller from Williamstown or Coburg, for instance, wants to go to Flinders Street station? Is not the Government proposing to build the Outer Circle railway?" He said, that when the viaduct was first thought of, the "Outer Circle" scheme was not contemplated, but the case was different now. Flinders Street station could not possibly hold any more passenger traffic, and, when the Outer Circle scheme was complete, he could not see what purpose the viaduct would serve. (The viaduct was opened for traffic in 1891).

Despite the arguments against the scheme, the Outer Circle railway was approved under the Octopus Act and the Royal Park to Clifton Hill section was opened four years later, on May, 8th, 1888.

The Outer Circle scheme seemed sound in principle, but contained some flaws. The line between Oakleigh and
Alphington was built with a ruling grade of 1 in 50, and, from a point near Hartwell to Roystead, a distance of 2 miles was laid at an almost continuous ascent of 1 in 50. In operation, this would require assistance from another engine, or a reduction in the load of trains coming from Gippsland.

As can be seen from the map, Clifton Hill had a reverse junction, and trains bound for Melbourne had to run into Clifton Hill and have their engines run round to the other end, so they could proceed to Melbourne. Because of this operational difficulty, the Outer Circle could hardly be considered a "through" route to Melbourne. A loop to by-pass Clifton Hill would have required another expensive viaduct over the Merri Creek. Perhaps the line should have been routed via Northcote, as Thomas Bent had argued, for after all.

For these reasons, the lines were never used to any great extent for the purposes for which they had been built, and, in fact, the Royal Park to Clifton Hill line was never used by the public to any great extent at all! The travelling public from Heidelberg soon found that it was cheaper and quicker to change to a tram at Johnston Street and complete their journey to the city, than to travel across the top of Fitzroy and Carlton to Melbourne via Royal Park and North Melbourne. For the residents of North Carlton, already served by trams, the line proved of no benefit at all!

By May 31, 1888, only two weeks after the opening, a deputation of Northern Suburbs residents urged the Government to build lines linking the Collingwood and Fitzroy "cockspurs" to Flinders Street.
A(11) Direct Link to Melbourne:

The inadequacies of the Northern Suburbs railways were obvious. The position was that the Government had built lines to Heidelberg and Whittlesea (opened 1889 with a junction to the Royal Park - Clifton Hill line between North Fitzroy and Clifton Hill) supposedly serving the Northern suburbs, but which were rendered ineffective by their circuitous route to Melbourne.

In 1890, a Railways Construction Bill authorised the construction of two lines to Collingwood and Fitzroy, at a total cost of £911,151. Perhaps, because of the depression, work was not started, and, in 1891, a Standing Committee was formed to investigate the existing position and review the two lines that had been authorised. After a lengthy investigation of witnesses, which included local businessmen, residents, and technical experts on a number of proposals for elevated railways and underground railways, the Committee decided that, whilst both lines were desirable, the Collingwood line would be cheaper to build, as it would not require such extensive tunnelling as the Fitzroy line would at the city end of the line.

No further action was taken until 1898, when another Standing Committee was formed to investigate and advise which of the two lines to build. Many witnesses still favoured the construction of both lines. It was argued that, if both lines were built, Heidelberg and Outer Circle traffic could be handled over the Collingwood route, and Northcote, Preston,
Whittlesea, North Fitzroy and North Carlton traffic handled over the Fitzroy route. Arguments put forward for the Fitzroy line were that it was 15 chains shorter than the Collingwood line. The Collingwood line could never be made to serve North Fitzroy, North Carlton, Brunswick or any of the Western portion of the area, as the distance to Melbourne would be greater than the present circuitous route.

One, John McMahon, giving evidence, said that "the importance of the North Carlton district and its population must be recognised by making it the terminus of an adequate service." A loop between North Carlton and the Brunswick line was suggested, allowing trains to be extended from North Carlton to Brunswick.

Sound as these arguments may appear, the Committee recommended the construction of the Collingwood line. Reasons given were, that Fitzroy was already well served by trams; it was a shorter distance and time from the Heidelberg and Riversdale (Outer Circle) lines; the Collingwood line would generate more revenue; the line was less costly to construct and had better grades and curves; there would be less tunnelling, and, if asked which line they would prefer, the Railways would favour the Collingwood line first. The residents of North Carlton were never to be served by an efficient rail service! The Princes Bridge to Collingwood line was opened in November, 1901, thus giving a direct link to Melbourne 13 years after the opening of the Northern Suburbs Railways.
Train Services:

Up until 1904, there was a frequent train service from Spencer Street to Clifton Hill, Collingwood and Preston, via North Carlton. In this year, the Northcote loop was opened and all Preston line trains were routed via Collingwood and Clifton Hill. A local service was run to North Fitzroy via Clifton Hill, and, at various times, the experiment was tried of running "round-a-bouts" from Prince's Bridge to Flinders Street, but without success.

Whilst the local service still provided North Fitzroy with a suburban service (via Clifton Hill), North Carlton was only served by an Up and Down Whittlesea train twice a day. North Carlton thus had the unique distinction of being a country station (in terms of train service) practically within site of the Melbourne Town Hall!

This situation lasted until 1921, when the line was electrified and the North Fitzroy local service extended to North Carlton. The railway service could not compete with the direct tram routes, and the service was progressively withdrawn. Late in 1948, it was announced that "on and after Monday, November 15, 1948, all regular passenger services will cease to run on the double line between Royal Park and North Fitzroy, on the North Fitzroy Suburban line between North Fitzroy and Northcote Loop Junction, and on the North Fitzroy Country line between North Fitzroy and Northcote Loop Junction."
As a suburban railway, time had run out and the line became "goods only", as it has remained until the present day.
CONSTRUCTION OF THE LINE:

The contract for the Construction of the Royal Park to Clifton Hill, North Fitzroy to Fitzroy and Johnston Street to Heidelberg Road (Contract No. 2372) was let to one, John Horna, on the 21/12/85, for the sum of £48,732:12:6. (See attached copies). The form of contract was standard for all lines at the time, as was the lengthy specification schedule, which detailed everything from the iron work being equal to the best Staffordshire iron in quality, and able to withstand a load of 20 tons (no mention was made of any standard test section) to the wood for fence posts being free from loose knots, shakes and decay.

The specified date for the completion of all works was the 31st December, 1887. Due to numerous delays, works were still in progress when the line was opened on May 8, 1888.

All railway correspondence is held in the Latrobe Library's archives, and can be found in the Engineer-in-Chief's letter-books, in which correspondence is noted; and under the Secretary's Branch. Needless to say, much of the correspondence, although catalogued in the index, is missing from the actual files containing the original letters, and hence, only patchy information is available as to the cause of the delays.

In a letter, dated 17/7/88, Home was asking for compensation for delays caused by:
1. Delay at Park Road Bridge caused by the fact that he had not received amended plans for the bridge.

2. Delay at Sydney Road bridge because of a dispute between the City of Melbourne and the Department as to the width of the bridge. (No correspondence could be found regarding this matter.)

3. Delay to footbridge at Longmore Crescent since Horne had not received any amended plans. Other delays were caused by alterations to the levels of formations.

Shortly before the line was opened to traffic, Horne had written complaining of the slowness of works at the St. George's road crossing. Trams were passing over the works "night and day" seriously delaying the positioning of iron girders under the crossing, and urging the Department to solicit the Tramway Company's co-operation. One would hesitate to suggest that, fearing competition, the Tramway company was actively endeavouring to delay the opening of the line!

On Wednesday, 21st November, 1888, a deputation of Carlton residents met representatives of the Commissioners at the north end of Rathdown street to discuss the possibility of the erection of a platform at this location. The deputation wanted Rathdown street closed and provision made for the erection of a platform, should the traffic warrant it. Somebody, at least, had confidence in the future of the line!
RAILWAY TODAY:

The section of line between North Fitzroy and Northcote Loop junction has recently been lifted, and hence, the railway is, in effect, today a branch line to Fitzroy from Royal Park.

The line today carries a substantial amount of goods traffic to Fitzroy, where there is a large distributing centre for briquettes. This traffic comes from Gippsland, and it is ironical to note that the railway is today serving to some extent the purpose for which it was intended, except that the traffic is coming from the opposite direction via Spencer Street!

Barley silos have been constructed on land adjoining North Fitzroy station and contribute to the traffic on the line. (Unofficial sources state that the Brunswick City Council opposed their construction and tried to impose a restrictive weight limit on road vehicles leaving the site).

The railway land adjoining North Carlton station, formerly occupied by Brown and Dureau, metal merchants; and H. Astbury, fuel merchant; has been recently surveyed with a view to filling and levelling the site. The Victorian Butter Co-operative plans to erect a cool store on the site. The cool store is to be a despatch point for the Port of Melbourne and requires an intermittent inwards rail service of butter from the country. The outwards despatch of butter to the wharves is to be handled by road transport.
TENDER.

SCHEDULE OF RATES CONTRACT.

To the Victorian Railways Commissioners, hereinafter called "the Corporation."

Under and subject to the Conditions of Tendering annexed hereto, the undersigned do hereby tender and offer to execute and perform the several Works and Provisions, and supply all Materials and Labor and everything of every kind respectively named, shown, described, and alluded to in the Specification, Conditions of Contract, and Schedules of Quantities and Rates annexed hereto respectively, to be executed and supplied by and on the part of the Contractor for the construction of the Royal Park and Clifton Hill Railway, of the Fitzroy Branch Railway, and of portion of the Richmond and Alphington Railway, from Johnston-street to Heidelberg-road, in conformity with the said Specification and under and subject to the Conditions of Contract, also hereto annexed, at the rates set out in the said Schedules of Quantities and Rates. The undersigned agree to be bound by and submit to the said Specification, Conditions, and Schedules of Rates.

The Total amount of this Tender, calculated according to the said Schedules of Quantities and Rates, is the sum of Forty eight thousand seven hundred and thirty six pounds twelve shillings and six pence (£48,736.12.6)

Witness my hand, this 21st day of December, 1885.

John Horne
Hodgkinson Street, Clifton Hill

Witness to the Signature of the Contractor
This Contract, made the fifth day of January in the year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and eighty-five, Between John Horne, Hodgson Street, Clifton Hill, in the County of Victoria, Contractor, hereinafter and in the Documents annexed hereto called "the Contractor" of the first part and The Victorian Railways Commissioners hereinafter and in the said Documents called "the Corporation" of the second part—

Witnesseth that the Contractor for himself his heirs executors and administrators hereby covenants with the Corporation to execute and perform the several works and provisions and supply all materials and labor and everything of every kind respectively named shown described and referred to in the Specification Conditions of Contract and Schedules of Quantities and Rates hereto respectively annexed to be executed and supplied by and on the part of the Contractor for the construction of the Royal Park and Clifton Hill Railway, the Fitzroy Branch Railway, and portion of the Richmond and Alphington Railway from Johnston-street to Heidelberg-road in conformity with the said Specification and under and subject to the Conditions of Contract also hereto annexed at the rates set out in the said Schedules of Quantities and Rates, AND the Contractor for himself his heirs executors and administrators hereby covenants with the Corporation and the Corporation hereby covenants with the Contractor to perform faithfully and comply with and submit to all and singular the conditions stipulations and requisitions and all matters and things contained expressed and shown in or reasonably to be inferred from the said Specification Conditions of Contract Schedules of Quantities and Rates and by and on the part of the Contractor and the Corporation respectively to be performed fulfilled and observed, AND it is also mutually covenanted that if the party hereto of the first part shall consist of two or more persons the term "the Contractor" hereinafter and in the Documents annexed hereto shall bind such persons jointly and severally and their respective heirs executors and administrators, and such persons shall jointly be entitled to the benefit of this Contract and these presents and the said Documents shall be read and construed accordingly.

Signed sealed and delivered by the above-named

John Horne

in the presence of

R. D. Sutherland

The Common Seal of the Corporation was affixed hereto in the presence of the undersigned, two of the Victorian Railways Commissioners, on the day of One thousand eight hundred and eighty-five.

SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS ANNEXED TO WHICH ABOVE CONTRACT REFERS.

The line crosses some of the busiest northern outlets of Melbourne and all crossing gates and warning devices have been removed. This requires in operation that a train must stop at each level crossing whilst a signalman, who travels with the train, stops road traffic with his red flag and allows the train to proceed. The authors have noted several abrupt stops on the part of motorists, and one can imagine their consternation at coming across a railway they did not know existed, or did not know was still operating!
PART 2: EFFECTS OF THE RAILWAY
A THE OPENING OF THE RAILWAY

The Royal Park to Clifton Hill Railway was opened along with the Cockspurs on May 8, 1888.

Because the line had its main effect on the welfare of the Heidelberg residents, an opening banquet was held in the Heidelberg Shire Hall. The proceedings were reported in the "Argus", May 9, 1888. Among the dignitaries present at the opening were:-

Mr. Robert Walker
Mr. Pearson - Minister of Education
Sir W.V. Clarke - M.L.C.
Mr. D. Melville - M.L.C.

From the opening banquet onwards, the railway provoked a good deal of comment as to the wisdom of its location and route and also to its convenience and future as a profitable venture. The reason for the construction of the line and the hopes that it would fit into the larger Outer Circle scheme have already been discussed. The immediate use of the line was to facilitate a railway link with Spencer Street Station and Heidelberg. It was to this point that the speakers at the opening directed their remarks.

Mr. Robert Walker proposed a toast to "the Ministry". He remarked that Heidelberg now had a Railway, whereas before they had to take a coach to Melbourne. The coach journey took one hour, but now the rail journey took 1½ hours.

Mr. Walker remarked that, although Heidelberg had a Railway,
they did not have one to Melbourne. Residents were taken around the northern suburbs of Melbourne and then "dumped" on the West side of the city. Mr. Walker concluded by expressing hope that Heidelberg would get a railway direct to Melbourne.

Mr. Pearson, the Minister for Education, represented the Government and the Railway Commissioners at the proceedings. He apologised for the absence of the Premier, Mr. Deakin, and the Chief Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Gillies. Mr. Deakin was busy and Mr. Gillies was ill. The "Argus" reported that Mr. Pearson had heard it suggested that the illness was of that opportune type which occasionally men plead when they don't want to fulfil an engagement. This, he claimed, was not true in Mr. Gillies's case. However, the resulting ridicule of the railway made it appear that Mr. Gillies's illness was, at the least, opportune.

Mr. D. Melville, M.L.C., remarked that the line was "a remarkable railway - it would take anyone anywhere." On the journey from Spencer Street he had not lost sight of the Exhibition Building dome for one hour. Mr. Melville attacked the general state of railway development, claiming that it should have been at least 10 years ahead. As to the new line, he felt it would not satisfy anyone.

Mr. Robert Harper - the Member for Heidelberg, was less complimentary. He said that the new route was "supremely ridiculous and perfectly absurd" and that "those two cockspur lines are infamous". What was wanted, he said, was an under-
ground line through Fitzroy and Collingwood. There was so much confusion and competition for railways that when he had complained to the government about the proposed route, he was told that if he did not keep quiet, Heidelberg would get no line at all.

The criticism which was voiced at the opening banquet caused some editorial comment on, not only the new railways, but to the general state of the Railways Department.

("The Age", May 11, 1888) commented that "It is quite clear that the Johnston Street and Fitzroy cockspurs and the line between Alphington and Clifton Hill were not constructed in the interests of the travelling public, since they were useless by reason of their incompleteness; and there is room for suspicion, therefore, that their chief object was to enhance the value of the property of certain land speculators."

Although this comment does not specifically attack the Royal Park to Clifton Hill section of line, it is clear that this line was also built without regard to the travelling public. It was the circuitous route of the Royal Park - Clifton Hill line which made the Melbourne to Heidelberg line so impractical. The line also fed into the cockspurs via an area which was well served by other means of transport, mainly trams. Thus the line was of little use for its entire length.

The "Age" continued, "The Minister of Railways is said to be animated by the most friendly feelings towards the Tramway Company. While the State has been pottering over little isolated patches of railway, the Tramway Company has laid
down its lines and practically monopolised the traffic of Collingwood and Fitzroy". Again, this comment could be extended to Carlton, as Carlton's trams had, until this time, no railway competition. "It may be said that the Railways Department cannot be blamed, since all lines, even those which are most closely associated with suspicions of jobbery and corruption, were sanctioned by Parliament. Each Railway Bill authorises a whole batch of lines .......... and as nearly every member is interested in one of these lines, he is careful not to imperil it by taking objection to any shady project with which it is bracketed."

The "Age" suggested certification of Railway projects by Commissioners before presentation to Parliament as "it is highly inconceivable that these gentlemen would have forfeited their reputations by recommending the extraordinary course adopted in the Northern suburbs."

"It is high time that more light was thrown upon the circumstances which surround railway construction in this Colony. The theatre of intrigue has shifted from the Lands Department to the Railways Department."

"Carlton Gazette", Friday, May 11, 1888, reported the opening of the North Suburban Railway, and commented that "it will be really hard to say who is going to receive any benefit from the line, as it has been made such a complete botch that it is looked upon by the majority of the residents of the district as one of the grossest pieces of political jobbery that has been perpetrated by any Government within
the history of the Colony. As far as Carlton is concerned, there is nothing to be gained. We are already well served by the tram lines, and when the line which is in the course of construction along Rathdowne Street is completed, we doubt very much whether the amounts taken for fares will pay the men's wages who will be left in charge of the stations."

It was clear that, from the first day of operations, the North Suburban Railway was headed for trouble. The Royal Park to Clifton Hill section was of little use to Carlton or Brunswick, as it travelled east-west through these districts connecting with the Nicholson Street, Rathdowne Street and Lygon Street Tramways as the city was due south. It was cheaper and quicker to take a tram down Nicholson Street to the city rather than to take a train to Spencer Street.

The Fitzroy and Collingwood cockspurs were in an even worse position, as the journey to Spencer Street started by travelling north, then west, and finally, south, the journey from Collingwood to Melbourne taking six miles, compared with two miles by the Johnston Street cable trams.

The journey from Heidelberg was also shortened by alighting at Collingwood and taking the tram.

The fact that the Railways Department had built railway lines which did not seem to serve any specific purpose and that looked such bad financial risks, caused the press to talk about "jobbery" and "political bungling" and to wonder about "the value of the property of certain land speculators." The charge about land speculation seems extraordinary, as the main
claim of the press was that the lines were no asset at all, so we would expect the lines to have shown little, if any, influence on the value of property close by.

The controversy surrounding the Northern Suburban railway was that the lines did not meet the Northern suburbs needs — indeed the line from Collingwood to Royal Park was dubbed the G.W.R. - The Great Way Round.

By May 31, 1888, only two weeks after the opening, a deputation of Northern suburbs residents urged the Government to build a direct link from Collingwood to Flinders Street. The deputation suggested two routes, one direct through Fitzroy, or via Richmond and Jolimont. This direct link to Melbourne would entirely supersede the newly completed railway.
(1) Background: Railway construction had passed from the control of the Board of Land and Works to the Victorian Railways Commissioners by the Victorian Railway Commissioners Act of 1883 (No. 767), and, as such, all titles to land resumed for railway purposes were held by the Commissioners. The Department handled all transfers of land, through the Crown Solicitor's office (as it does today) having no legal branch of its own.¹

Valuations of property required for railway purposes were made at this time by one, B. Cowderoy², a Crown Valuer, who acted for the Commissioners.

Property holders were officially notified of the Department's intentions by serving of a "Notice to Treat", which named the claimant and set out the Commissioner's powers regarding the resumption of land. The land required was, in each case, defined by its allotment and section number, and by an attached plan giving the relevant dimensions. A "Schedule of Claim" was also attached upon which claimants had to give particulars of tenancy, land and the amount of compensation they desired. After the Schedule of Claim had been returned

¹The N.S.W. Government railways has a branch which has the power to effect the transfer of titles.

²Unofficial sources state that Cowderoy was formerly employed as a valuer with the Geelong and Melbourne Railway Co..
and studied, the claimant was given the Commissioners' estimate of the value of compensation. A period of bargaining would follow until a mutually agreeable valuation had been reached. If a deadlock resulted, then the matter would be settled by arbitration, although this never happened as a result of land claims in the North Carlton area.

When resuming land for Railway purposes today, the Department is required to buy the whole of an affected allotment and re-sell later that part which is not required. Property holders are thus afforded some degree of protection as regards being left with a portion of an allotment which is rendered useless for building purposes after the required land has been taken. The absence of this provision in 1885 will be seen at a later stage.

Although the area west of Sydney Road is now Parkville, the official Parliamentary description of the line (Act No.821-Schedule 59) gives the area as North Carlton, and hence, it has been considered as such.

Street Name Changes: Streets mentioned in the following discussion have been referred to under their original names, the present names being, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Name</th>
<th>New Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Road</td>
<td>The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmore Crescent</td>
<td>Bowen Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Street</td>
<td>Arnold Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felstead Street</td>
<td>Holtom Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Street</td>
<td>Lang Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langridge Street</td>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Royal Park to Clifton Hill railway was proclaimed as the Fifty-ninth Schedule of the Railways Construction Act of 1884 (No. 821) and its official description under this Schedule is, as follows:

**RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION (48 Vict. No. 821)**

**FIFTY-NINTH SCHEDULE**

**ROYAL PARK AND CLIFTON HILL RAILWAY**

"Commencing at 2 miles 25 chains 68 links on the Melbourne and Coburg line, in the Royal Park, in the City of Melbourne, and proceeding thence towards Clifton Hill for 15 chains 5 links by a curve of 20 chains radius bearing in a north-easterly direction, passing out of the Royal Park, across Park-road, into allotment 7 of section D in Carlton North; thence for 7 chains 54 links in a straight line bearing north 87° 58' 20" east, passing out of allotment 7, across the Sydney-road, into Prince's Park; thence for 23 chains 74 links by a curve of 50 chains radius the chord of which bears north 74° 22' 20" east, passing out of Prince's Park, across the intersection of Longmore Crescent and Felstead-street, through allotments 8, 9, 10 and 11 of section 129, across a street, through allotments 20, 17, 16, 15, 14 and 9 of section 131, across Sullivan-street, through Crown land in section 132, across Storey-street, into a right-of-way; thence for 88 links in a straight line bearing north 60° 46' 20" east, passing out of the right-of-way through allotment 6, into allotment 7 of section 132; thence for
15 chains 66 links by a curve of 30 chains radius the chord of which bears north 75° 43' 50" east, passing out of allotment 7 of section 132, through allotments 8, 9 and 10 of section 132, across Langridge-street, through allotment 1 of section 133 in Carlton North, across Park-street.east, through allotments 12, 13, 14, and 15, into allotments 17 of section 6, Brunswick; thence for 77 chains 84 links in a straight line bearing south 89° 18' 40" east, passing out of allotment 17 of section 6, across Lygon-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 16, across Drummond-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 15, across Rathdowne-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 14, across Amess-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 13, across Canning-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 12, across Station-street, through allotments 4 and 5 of section 11, Brunswick, across Nicholson-street, through allotments 1 and 2 of section 7, North Fitzroy, across Rae-street, through allotments 22, 21, 20 and 19 of section 8, across Brunswick-street north, through allotments 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13 and 12 of section 8, across Best-street, through allotments 10, 9, 8, 7 and 6 of section 9, across Fergie-street, through allotment 1 of section 16, across St. George's-road, through allotments 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9, into allotment 10 of section 10; thence for 16 chains 84 links by a curve of 30 chains radius the chord of which bears south 73° 14' 10" east, passing out of allotment 10 of section 10, across Bennett-street, through allotments
16, 15, 14, 13 and 12 of section 11, across Park-street east, through allotment 39 of section 46, across a street, into Crown land; thence for 19 chains 63 links in a straight line bearing south 57° 9'40" east, through Crown land; thence for 12 chains 95 links by a curve of 13 chains radius the chord of which bears south 28° 36'40" east, passing out of Crown land in North Fitzroy, across the Plenty-road, through Crown land and allotments 11 and 8 of section 16, in the township of Northcote, across a street, and terminating in the Heidelberg-road by a junction with the authorised line from Richmond to Alphington at a point bearing easterly about 1 chain 15 links from the southern corner of allotment 7 of section 16 of the township of Northcote.

Bearings magnetic.

Limit of deviation, ½ mile."

It will be noted that this is the description of the whole line, and, for the purposes of the topic of this research, only the section of line through North Carlton and the land it affected has been considered.
(11) **LAND CLAIM PARTICULARS:**

The Royal Park to Clifton Hill Railway affected 23 privately owned properties in the North Carlton area, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Allotment</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Notice to Treat</th>
<th>See Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Donald Ross</td>
<td>2-3760</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>John Foxcroft, Jnr.</td>
<td>4-3690</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John McDonald</td>
<td>7-3843</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J.N. Wilson</td>
<td>8-3870</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ann Rogerson</td>
<td>10x-3797</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J.W. Cowling</td>
<td>10-3821</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wm. Foxcroft</td>
<td>11-3771</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Patrick Drum</td>
<td>12-3798</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W. Hutchinson</td>
<td>13-3778</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G. Sutton</td>
<td>14-3920</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C. Yoemans</td>
<td>18-3805</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W. Hutchinson</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J. whitelaw</td>
<td>17-3849</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G. Sweet</td>
<td>16-3801</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Allotment</td>
<td>Claimant</td>
<td>Notice to Treat</td>
<td>See Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G. Sweet</td>
<td>16-3801</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.R. Bentley</td>
<td>21-3792</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allotments 12 to 24 of section 131 and 3 to 9 of section 132 were Crown Land and only required the transfer of the Title to the Commissioners without the settlement of land claims. Titles to Royal Park and Princes Park were held by the respective trustees.
(III) THE LAND RESUMED

After leaving the alignment of the Melbourne and Coburg line on the east side of Royal Park station, the railway was planned to cut through Royal Park by a curve of 20 chains radius in a deep cutting to Park Road. Title to Royal Park was held by its Trustees and they were duly served with Notice to Treat No.1-8822. There is no record of any claim being made and the only statement concerning this portion of line is one written by Cowderoy, dated 10/4/90, in which he says, "The Trustees had only a dry legal interest and no improvements were taken. There was therefore no ground for any pecuniary claim."

On passing under Park Road, it was necessary to create a northern access to the service right-of-way in section D (see land survey map 313 11) since land formerly used for this purpose was required for the Railway. This required the purchase of a strip along the top of allotment 10. This allotment is shown on 313 11 as having been purchased from the Crown in 1869 by one F. Bell, but in 1885 was owned by one Donald Ross, a building contractor. Ross was building a terrace of ten houses facing Park Road on his allotment and it was the northern-most one that was required for the right-of-way.

Ross was duly served with Notice to Treat No.2 3760 (10/8/85). In his claims Ross was acted for by Messrs. Langridge and Son of Collins Street, West Melbourne, who were
The Terrace of Houses owned by Donald Ross are shown in this Extract from M. & M. B.W. Survey of 1896. The Three Northern Houses in the Terrace, together with the one originally sited on the right-of-way adjoining the railway-line, were purchased by the Railways Department.
Auctioneers, Estate Agents, Arbitrators, and Valuators.
(Perhaps this was just as well, as the few documents in Ross's own handwriting in this portfolio are illegible!).

Ross claimed, as follows:-

2 two-storied houses and land  - £2191:10: 0
Making good the party wall  - 250: 0: 0
Compulsory taking  - 200: 0: 0

£2641:10: 0

An added statement said that the depreciation of the remaining buildings was to be a subject for further consideration and adjustment.

An inter-departmental note, dated 17/10/85, from Cowderoy, suggested £2,200 as compensation, and added that Ross would not accept the Railways proposal of taking down one house and strengthening the wall of the other, and hence, the Department should purchase both, then take down the end house, strengthen the wall of the other and then re-sell it. Cowderoy added, that his proposal would "probably protect department from a claim which Mr. Ross thinks he is entitled to make for damages to his other buildings". (Referring to the statement Ross added to his claim).

During this time, Ross had received no offer from the department, and letters followed each other in quick succession from Langridge and Son conveying their client's concern over the matter.

The offer of £2,200 was sent to Ross in May 1886, which he declined. Not only did he decline the offer of £2,200,
but he also withdrew his claim for £2,641, which he said was made on the condition that the depreciation of the remaining buildings being made a subject for further consideration and adjustment. He substituted a fresh claim of £4,566:13:4, for the land; the two houses taken; loss on stoppages of works, interest, rents; and permanent depreciation of the remainder of the property.

He added, that before he commenced building, he had offered to sell the land at market value, and, even after he had started building, he mentioned to Mr. Martin "the gentleman in charge of the survey party," that he would stop building if told to do so, but was told to go on.

Cowderoy recommended an amended offer of £2,500, and Ross was informed on 25/6/86. Things were coming to a head, and Messrs. Langridge and Son asked for an interview to place all the facts and to avoid arbitration. In reply, it was stated that the Commissioners thought the offer was reasonable and met the requirements of the case, and declined to increase their offer (14/7/86).

By this time the contract for the construction of the railway had been signed for 8 months, and this argument must have been holding up works, for, on the 19/7/86, Messrs. Langridge and Son were informed that the Commissioners would purchase four houses at the northern end of the terrace, instead of two, for £4,800. This offer was accepted by Ross.

On the 28/8/86, the department received a letter claiming interest at 3% of £4,800 from the date of the Notice to Treat
to the date of payment (£384), and also, £9:10:0 for
11 venetian blinds in the house occupied by one, Mr. Owen.

The Railways declined (17/9/86), claiming that the offer
included all losses and damages, and covered the loss of rent
of the houses taken, and that if the blinds were not the
property of the tenant, he (Ross) can have no claim to them,
having sold the property to the Commissioners. Apparently
Ross was claiming that he had fitted the house with venetian
blinds after he had been served with the Notice to Treat, and
was claiming their cost.

Langridge and Son replied (22/9/86) that one of the
Department's officers had occupation for over six months of
the two houses prior to the payment of purchase money. The
Department duly investigated this claim and found that one,
Mr. Steel, Inspector, was in occupation, and Langridge and
Son were informed of the Department's investigation (29/9/86).
Langridge and Son replied that Mr. Steel had been in occupation
of the third house of the terrace for over 8 months, and that
the venetian blinds formed no part of the property, since they
were not specially mentioned in the contract!

The matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor (18/10/86)
for his view, and his reply was that if they were attached to
the house at the time of purchase, then they would pass by
transfer to the Crown (26/10/86). Investigation proved that
the blinds were attached to the house on 12/6/86, and Messrs.
Langridge and Son were informed that Ross's claim for the
blinds could not be accepted! Messrs. Langridge and Son
replied that their client did not realise that any improvements made to the building after the serving of the Notice to Treat and before the payment of purchase money, would become the property of the Commissioners!

Ross must also have been removing some other "properties of the commissioners", since he was sent a letter threatening prosecution if he continued. The dispute centred around the disappearance of gas mantle and fittings, and, in reply, Ross claimed that he had removed them and substituted oil lighting at the request of Mr. Owen, the tenant. Other items had been stolen from the other houses, he claimed.

In March 1888, the three remaining houses purchased from Ross were sold for £2,200, as follows:-

From North to South: £650  -  Sarah M. Carden;
£750  -  T.C. Carden;
£800  -  Alexander Leitch.

The houses, in the meantime, had been rented out for £1, 22/6d. and 25/-d. per week respectively. The second house was rented by Mr. Steel – the Inspector from the Engineer-in-Chief's Branch of the Department.

The northern house of the terrace cannot have been popular (adjoining the right-of-way and the railway in the cutting), and the reserve price could not be reached. A Departmental letter states that, "In the case of the northern house, the reserve of £750 could not be obtained, and it was considered prudent to accept the highest offer made to the auctioneers of £650". Fraser and Company were the auctioneers, and, in a letter to the Assistant Engineer (22/3/88) they said, "we have
had several offers for the northern house .... ranging from £400 to £600, and today received an offer for £650. The property is much damaged and daily getting worse, so we trust our action will meet with your approval."

No mention is made as to the nature of the damage, and may have been due to neglect. In January 1889, Ross was again in communication with the Department, drawing its attention to the subsidence of the Park Road bridge, claiming that because of cracks, it is barely possible for a horse and cart to pass over, and claiming that the bridge is dangerous and could lead to an accident, particularly at night, when some horseman could fall to the line. He also complained about the scandalous condition of the right-of-way, claiming that the surface had sunken more than a foot, and previous attempts at patching it up had been done by filling without any serious attempts at consolidating the embankment. The damages referred to by the auctioneer may have been contributed to by the early subsidence of the right-of-way due to the cutting. The wall adjoining the right-of-way was the one that had to be strengthened - it may not have been strengthened enough!

The only buildings to be affected by the Railway in North Carlton had given the Department the greatest amount of trouble of all the land resumption claims in the North Carlton area!

The next allotment to be affected by the railway was owned by one, John Foxcroft, junior. The land was - allotment 7 of section D - between Park Road (now The Avenue) and Sydney
Road. Foxcroft's father owned, and had built on, the adjoining block (allotment 8 - see railway plan). Foxcroft was served with claim No.4-3690 (6/7/85). Foxcroft was, at this time, living at "Marysville" in Story Street, North Carlton (allotment 17, section 129) and gave his occupation as clerk. His land was subject to a mortgage of £600 to Mundy, Small and Kidston for the Grand Lodge Independent Order of Oddfellows. Foxcroft claimed, as follows:

Allotment 7 Section D

99' x 264'   -   £990: 0: 0
Fencing and part trenching of ground   -   65: 0: 0

£1055: 0: 0

Foxcroft had made these preparations prior to building and was claiming their expense. He added that the dividing fence between allotments 7 and 8 was owned by John Foxcroft, senior, and that the rest of the fence belonged to John Foxcroft, junior. He also added that he thought it right to inform the Department that he had made arrangements to commence building when the surveyors came through the land, and he had since deferred building until the matter was settled. Railway records do not reveal when the survey was made, and we can only conclude that it was sometime between 1880 and 1884 (see discussion page 44). Foxcroft had been in communication with the Department before he was served with the Notice to Treat in a letter dated May the 10th 1885. The Railway had been proclaimed in 1884, and, in the letter, Foxcroft claimed he was uncertain of his position and already had made the abovementioned preparations for building.
Foxcroft was offered £1000 (15/7/85), which he accepted (24/7/85). A further letter from Foxcroft (14/8/85) complains about the delay in receiving his money, as about a fortnight had elapsed, and he claimed that he had never before signed a transfer without receiving the money at the time.

After passing under Sydney Road, the railway route was surveyed to traverse the north end of Princes Park to Longmore Crescent. Title to Princes Park was held by the Trustees and they were served with a "Notice to Treat" No. 6-3821. There is no record of any compensation being claimed and apparently the matter was not pressed, as an inter-departmental letter advised Mr. B. Cowderoy, acting for the Crown Solicitor, that it was not the Department's responsibility to question further! Title to the required land was transferred to the Commissioners.

On crossing Longmore Crescent, the railway required the resumption of the whole of one allotment and a portion of two fronting Longmore Crescent. The allotments affected were 6 and 7 of section 129 and allotment 1 of section 128.

Allotment 6 of section 129 was in the name of one, Ann Jane Rogerson, wife of Will Rogerson, Police Constable, of 205 Swanston Street, Melbourne. Ann Rogerson was served with Notice to Treat No. 10X-3797 on 2/9/85. As can be seen from the map, the railway survey required only a portion of her property and was to cause her great consternation.

A schedule of claim was duly returned claiming £220, made up of 20 feet of frontage to Longmore Crescent at £10
per foot plus the cost of making 99 feet of right-of-way along the southern boundary. To add weight to her claim, Ann Rogerson added the comment that "land in this neighbourhood sold recently by auction at from £7 to £14 a foot and is not near such a good position as mine." She also claimed that the balance of land would be useless to her and would sell it for £150.

The Department had other ideas however, and, in return, valued the land required at £182 in a letter dated 7/9/85. Cowderoy said that the "claim for forming the right-of-way is untenable, as Mr. Rogerson would have to form the one of which this is only a substitution," and that the Crown offer also included depreciation of the narrow strip left.

A reply to the Crown offer was returned on the 16/9/85 claiming that £182 would be most unfair and "why not take the whole block at £305 as the remaining is useless?" It was added that further investigation had revealed that the right-of-way would cost £80 and not £20, as she offered, "and I only asked you to contribute £20." The final comment was that "I honestly maintain the land is worth £10 a foot" and that "if you cannot see your way to make a proper offer, I must respectfully leave the matter to arbitration." The weight and possible repercussions of the final comment threatening legal action must have made itself felt after the letter had been finished, for, in the margin is written that although £220 was the amount claimed £200 would be accepted without further trouble, "but it is not enough."
Apparently the Department was not perturbed by the threat of arbitration, for they did not increase their offer of £182, and a reply from Ann Rogerson, dated 5/11/85, stated that, "seeing you will not increase your offer, I am sorry to have to accept the same." She also hoped for an early arrival of the cheque so that "I may lose nothing further." The cheque had not arrived by the end of the month and prompted a letter stating that, "I should like to have the same fairness extended to me as to the rest of the sellers whom I am informed in some instances have received their money." It does not require much thought to imagine the feelings of injustice and persecution at the hands of the Government that this couple must have felt.

In the case of allotment 7 of section 129, the whole of the allotment had to be resumed. The land was under the name of James William Cowling of Power Street, Hawthorn, and was undeveloped and had been owned by Cowling since its purchase from the Crown in 1879. Notice to Treat, No. 10-3821 was served, and, in reply, Cowling claimed £365 compensation (4/10/85). The allotment had frontages to both Longmore Crescent and Felstead Street. The Department's valuation was £330 (9/10/85) and, in contrast with the bargaining between Ann Rogerson and the Department with allotment 6, Cowling accepted the offer on 9/12/85, and the Title was duly transferred.

The diversion of Felstead Street caused the purchase of allotment 1 of section 128, which had frontages to
Longmore Crescent and Felstead Street. The land was owned by John McDonald who had purchased it from the Crown in 1879. McDonald was served with Notice to Treat, No.7-3843. He was acted for by David Gaunson of Eldon Chambers, Bank Place, and claimed £760 compensation. McDonald was offered £600 (16/9/85) and, in reply, claimed the land had cost him £660 in 1879 and would now accept £725. McDonald was, in return, offered his purchase price and eventually accepted and was compensated £660 plus 6% interest from the date the survey was announced to the transfer of title. (There is no record of interest being paid in every case, and the position remains unclear.)

Five privately-owned allotments fronting Felstead Street were affected by the railway. These comprised allotment 2 of section 128 and allotments 8, 9, 10 and 11 of section 129.

Allotment 2 of section 128 had been purchased from the Crown by one, Octavius Langtree in 1879 and was under the name of J. Noble Wilson in 1885. The Title was apparently still held by Langtree in 1885, as communications were addressed to Langtree, C/o J. Noble Wilson of Camp Street, Ballarat. Langtree was served with Notice to Treat No. 8-3870. The allotment comprised an 82'6" frontage to Felstead Street, and Langtree claimed at the rate of £7 per foot, making his claim £577:10:0 (19/10/85). Langtree said that the portion not required for railway purposes could be had by the Department if £20 were deducted from his claim for the portion that was required. It is evident that Langtree showed more business acumen than Ann Rogerson in his desire not to be left with an inferior block of land! (Langtree had purchased 10 allotments
in sections 127, 128 and 129 during the Crown Sales of February 1879).

Langtree was, in return, offered £500 for his land, which was accepted (19/10/85). The original survey for the diversion of Felstead Street had cut through blocks 15 and 16, which was still held by the Crown (1885). It was thus considered that if the Felstead Street diversion were moved northwards and the railway border narrowed, it would be possible to avoid allotments 15 and 16 and also cut down the proportions required of allotments 1 and 2. The final location of Felstead Street can be seen on the map. This revision caused the required proportion of Langtree's land to be reduced, the new value being £125. In an inter-departmental letter advising Cowderoy of the new valuation, it was stated that the revised valuation was a "bare proportion of £500", and that the "claimants will probably want more," (4/12/85). Langtree must have been concerned with other matters, as there was no communication until May 1886, when he accepted the offer of £125. From the Departmental admission that £125 was a low valuation of the land, it would seem that if Langtree had pressed for more, he might have been rewarded for his persistence! (The Felstead Street revision must have occurred after the transfer of title from John McDonald, since there is no communication regarding a revised land value.)

Allotments 8 and 9 of section 129 in Felstead Street were owned by one, J. Foxcroft, senior, the land being under the name of William Foxcroft. The land had been under the name
of William Foxcroft, since the Crown Purchase in May 1879, and was subject to a mortgage of £330 to the Victoria Mutual Building Society. William Foxcroft was a builder, and it may have been that the land was mortgaged to provide capital for building purposes.

From the following correspondence it would seem that, although the land was under the name of William Foxcroft and he was officially entered as the claimant, it was John Foxcroft, senior who was actually bargaining.

Foxcroft was served with Notice to Treat No.11-3771 and, in return, claimed £800 for his two allotments (15/9/85). The land boom was obviously in full swing as he gives support to his claim:

"The original cost of land has nothing to do with the present value. I purchased the land for building purposes and could not replace it in the City of Melbourne for less than I ask as compensation. In two or three years it will be worth £10 per foot. Land is selling at the present at £10 per foot about 200 yards off and at £9 per foot within 100 yards off."

Foxcroft's claim was duly considered and he was offered £600. Foxcroft was not to give in and brought forward some powerful arguments. He considered £600 was too low, and suggested a compromise of £725, considering this to be very reasonable taking into account "the immediate prospects of the locality." "The land is within the boundary of the
City of Melbourne and during the past few years there has been a great rise in the value of land within the city and there is every prospect of its further advance. For building purposes, the land is perfect — and all that could be desired, — of splended depth, grand surroundings — Royal Park, Princes Park, Colleges University, tramways and other advantages." He pointed out that land across Sydney Road was worth £9,10,11 per foot. Foxcroft now drew out his trump card. "I hesitated a long time whether I should build on the land or where I am at present living, but not wishing to give the Railways Department extra expense, I built in Park Street. (Allotments 8 and 8A, section D, between Sydney Road and Park Road (now The Avenue, Parkville) are shown on land survey map 313 11 and the Railway contract plan 2372 as belonging to John Foxcroft, senior. The Railway plan shows a building fronting on to Sydney Road. The land is now the site of the Travel Lodge Motel. Allotment 7, section D is also shown on the Railway Plan as belonging to one, John Foxcroft, junior, and it is through this allotment that the railway now runs in a deep cutting between Sydney Road and The Avenue). Continuing, Foxcroft says that "you will admit had I built on the land in question, I would have been acquiring good interest during the five years the line has been surveyed, and, on the other hand, the Department would have been put to useless expense ........"

This piece of information must have made a favourable impression, for Foxcroft was offered £750, £25 more than his suggested compromise! The offer was accepted. It would seem, from his statements, that Foxcroft had prior knowledge of the route of
the railway, and, from the other land under the name of Foxcroft between Sydney Road and Park Road along the route of the railway, one would wonder whether the land were indeed purchased for building purposes or in the hope of gain when the land was required for railway purposes. There is, of course, no evidence to support this, except Foxcroft's statement that he hesitated for a time, being undecided as to whether to build in Park Street or Felstead Street, and, deciding on the former, "not wishing to give the Railways Department extra expense". Foxcroft purchased the land in May 1879 from the Crown, and it seems inconceivable that the Crown would sell land that is to be used at some later stage for a railway. These proceedings took place in October, 1885, and, it would seem from Foxcroft's statement ("I would have been acquiring good interest during the five years the line has been surveyed") that the railway survey was known to him at least in 1880. (The Railway was not officially proclaimed until 1884). If the Railway had been accurately planned by 1880, then this may have been a reason why allotments in sections 131 and 132 (see map) were not released for sale from the Crown soon after those in sections 127, 128, 129 and 130, in 1879. The land resumption was thus relatively inexpensive through North Carlton.

Allotments 10 and 11 of section 129, fronting on to Felstead Street with allotment 11 also fronting onto Garton Street were owned by Patrick Drum, a Senior Constable, of Williamstown. The land had been purchased initially from
the Crown in 1879 by one, F. Tate, and, by 1885, had passed to Patrick Drum. Drum had other property interests in North Carlton, having purchased from the Crown allotment 11, section 109, fronting Drummond Street; allotment 10, section 102, fronting Amess Street, and allotment 1, section 90 with frontages to Church (now Fenwick) Street, Station Street and Nicholson Street.

Drum was served with Notice to Treat No.12-3798 (5/10/85) claiming his land of frontage 165 feet to Felstead Street by 66 feet deep. In reply, Drum claimed at the rate £8:10:0 per foot, his claim being £1,480:0:0, and stated in support that "land convenient to this locality has been recently sold at £25 a foot", the inference presumably being that, at £8:10:0 a foot, the Government was getting his land very cheaply. The reply to his claim (7/10/85) put the Department's valuation at £875. Drum's reply to this offer 20/10/85) was, that the "land is a corner block within 50 yards of the proposed Carlton Railway station". (Apparently Drum failed to realise that any future advantage accruing from the fact that his land was 50 yards from the proposed station, was more than outweighed by the fact that at the same time there would also be a railway line through it!)

His land was also 70 yards from Princes Park, 500 yards from Sydney Road, "one of the greatest thoroughfares out of Melbourne," and was in the vicinity of Royal Park. He went on to add that "Inferior land to this was sold by auction on Saturday last at the Corner of Brunswick Road East and
Nicholson Street for £20:10:0 per foot, and at the Corner of Reid and Nicholson Streets for £25 per foot", and hence "£875 is ridiculous." (Perhaps, by reason of his other land interests, Drum must have been a keen observer of land sales). His final comment was that "I still think my offer to accept £1,480 is a reasonable one, and, if anything, very little above the market value." This statement, that he may be asking for more than the land is worth, would indeed appear to be a bold one, especially to a Government Department!

An amended offer of £941 was sent to Drum (20/11/85) and was accepted (25/11/85).

Three allotments fronting onto Garton Street were required for the Railway; these being 12, 13 and half of allotment 14 of section 129. Allotments 12 and 13 were in the name of one, William Hutchinson, Bookseller of "Glenhope", Princes Park North. It is interesting to note that Hutchinson was one of the first to build in the North Carlton area, having purchased allotments 3, 4 and 5 of section 129 in 1879. ("Glenhope" still stands today together with the mansion at the corner of Bowen and Lang Streets, which was then owned by one, Mungo Scott, and is now a Christian Brothers Hostel. Between the two, today is sandwiched a modest stucco Queen Anne affair, which has entirely ruined the "grand" atmosphere that this part of North Carlton must have enjoyed with its vista of Princes Park. These two houses must still be amongst the largest free standing residences in Carlton. The outbuilding shown on the Railway plan,
to Mungo Scott's house (corner Longmore and Story Streets) was a stable. Today, most of the backyard between stable and house has been taken up by a fives court. It is also interesting to note the difference of positions given "Glenhope" between Railway Plan and the M.M.B.W. survey of 1896. The M.M.B.W. survey is correct.)

Hutchinson was served Notice to Treat, No.13-3778, (28/9/85) and, in reply, claimed £660, made up at the rate of £10 per foot. Cowderoy, in return, placed the valuation at £520, which was rejected by Hutchinson who lowered his claim to £594. Hutchinson was then offered £561, which he rejected, and, finally was offered £594, his second claim, which he accepted. (The record of Hutchinson's claim is taken from a book showing the claims only, the portfolio of the actual correspondence has been lost from the Railway's Estate Office records, and hence, no reasons can be given why the Railways Department finally agreed to Hutchinson's claim of £594).

Allotment 14 of section 129 was owned by one, George Sutton. Land survey map No. 313 shows the land as

---

1 Allotments 18 and 19 of section 129 were at this time owned by Hutchinson, he having purchased them from William Foxcroft and one, H. Ward, respectively. As can be seen from the Railway Plan, allotments 18 and 19 adjoin allotments 8 and 9 which had been purchased from William Foxcroft (see page 42). Foxcroft's land was required for the railway boundary and for a right-of-way, leaving a small portion at the northern end unused. A note on the Railway Department's Estate Office copy of the Railway Plan states that the unused portions of allotments 8 and 9 were sold to W.L. Hutchinson for £15 with permission to carry his fences across the right-of-way to the railway fence. Whether Hutchinson did extend his fences across the right-of-way is unknown, but there are no fences across it today.
originally belonging to John Foxcroft, junior, who had made the Crown Purchase of allotments 14, 15 and 17 in May 1879, and building on allotment 17, (see page 37).

Sutton was served with Notice to Treat, No.14-3920 (4/11/85). His land had a frontage of 33 feet to Garton Street by 82 feet 6 inches depth, and for it he claimed £180, which was accepted by the Railways department. A study of the railway plan will show a building on the unaffected half of his land, which was apparently sub-let to one, Mrs. Ross. Sutton sent, via his solicitor, a claim for interest from the date of the Notice to the date of settlement, claiming hardship on behalf of Mrs. Ross, whose house it was said was unoccupied when the survey pegs were put in, and she had not been able to find anyone to take it since. It can be seen that, after the Railway had been constructed and Garton Street had been closed off, the only access to this property would be down the narrow service right-of-way. The prospect of this unattractive entrance was probably the reason why Mrs. Ross could not sub-let the house. This claim of hardship must have been considered reasonable, and Sutton was duly paid interest at the rate of 6% on £180 (26/7/86).

The Railway survey required that Story Street be diverted, and this affected 7 allotments of the northern portion of section 131. (The rest of section 131 affected was Crown land and only required the transfer of the title from the Crown to the Railways Commissioners).
Allotments 2, 4, 5 and 6 were owned by one, Caleb Yoemans, Accountant, of Garden Street, Northcote, and he was served with Notice to Treat, No.18-3805 (6/9/85). His claim was made up, as follows:

- Allotment 2, section 131
- Allotments 4, 5, 6, section 131
- 118 ft. 1 in. at £9 per ft.
- Compensation for depreciation of value of Parkside St. frontages of Allotments 2, 4, 5, 6 by closure of Felstead and Sullivan Streets:
  - 157 ft. at £1:10:0 per ft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotment 2, section 131</td>
<td>£75:0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments 4, 5, 6, section 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 ft. 1 in. at £9 per ft.</td>
<td>1062:15:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for depreciation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of Parkside St. frontages of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments 2, 4, 5, 6 by closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Felstead and Sullivan Streets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 ft. at £1:10:0 per ft.</td>
<td>235:10:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£1375:15:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The claim of £75 for allotment 2 is for an area of about 50 sq. ft., and one would wonder whether more careful planning might not have eliminated this inconvenience.)

In return, Yoemans was offered £670 (26/9/85). Yeomans, in reply, complained that half the depth of his properties had been taken, leaving awkward shapes, and that the closure of Holtom and Sullivan Streets would affect the

---

1 Yeomans refers to the new name of Felstead Street, but retains the old name of Sullivan Street (now Arnold Street). All street name changes in the North Carlton area bear the same correction number of M 26482 (see Land Survey Map A 11) and hence, the official change of street names presumably took place at the same time. Melbourne City Council rate books of 1884 refer to Holtom Street and not Felstead Street (also Lang Street instead of Story Street) and perhaps these names had little local use.
saleability of the land. Even so, he was willing to reduce his claim to £850 in full. The Railway's reply to this was an offer of £730, which Yoemens accepted.

Allotment 3 section 131 was under the name of W. Hutchinson (see previous discussion regarding allotments 12 and 13, section 129) and particulars regarding his claim have been lost from Railway records.

Allotment 7, section 131, was owned by one, James Whitelaw, Tobacco Maker, and was acted for by Heinecke and Fox of Spencer Street, Melbourne. Whitelaw was served with Notice to Treat No. 17-3849 (12/9/85) and claimed, as follows:-

Land to Story Street at £10 per ft.  -  £389: 3: 4
Compensation for closing Holtom and Sullivan Streets at £1:10:0 per ft.  -  58: 7: 6

Making a total of  -  £447:10:10

Cowderoy, in return, valued the land at £312, saying that the "depreciation through the closing of the adjacent streets I consider fully compensated for by the Railway Station". Whitelaw finally accepted the offer of £312.

Allotment 8 of section 131 and allotments 1 and 2 of section 131 were owned by one, George Sweet, and, having purchased them as Crown Grants in January 1880, he was served with Notice to Treat No. 16-3801. These allotments were on either side of Sullivan Street, with frontages to Parkside Street, Sullivan Street and Story Street. Sweet took advantage of this when he made his claim:
Parkside Street Frontage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allotment</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>£333: 6: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>297: 0: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story Street frontage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allotment</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>232: 0: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>198: 0: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>393: 6: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £1,453: 13: 4

It is interesting to note the difference in values between the Parkside and Story Street frontages. Parkside Street was then, of course, a through road, not having been closed off by the railway as it is today, and was thus considered more desirable than Story Street. This position is completely reversed today; the Municipal Boundary between Melbourne and Brunswick runs down the centre of Park Street (new name for Parkside Street) which is evident from the difference in standards of upkeep, the Brunswick side being quite neglected. This portion of Park Street East is extremely unattractive, in contrast to Lang Street (originally Story Street) which is now one of the pleasant streets of Carlton, with its trees and vista towards Princes Park.

Cowderoy, in reply, offered Sweet £1,187, made up of
£833 for allotments 1 and 2 of section 132, and £350 for allotment 8 of section 131. This offer was rejected by Sweet and a value of £1,225 was later agreed to.

The final property in North Carlton to be affected by the Railway was allotment 10 of section 132, owned by one, Annie Ring Bentley of 11 Drummond Street, North Carlton. The land was a Crown Grant and had been purchased in March, 1880. Mrs. Bentley was served with Notice to Treat No. 21-3792 and claimed, as follows:

For the 33 ft. frontage to Parkside Street - £297
For the 33 ft. frontage to Story Street - 198

£495

In return, Mrs. Bentley was offered £300, which she rejected, putting in an amended claim of £450. Cowderoy suggested that the Department offer Mrs. Bentley £365, saying that "nearly 4 months having elapsed since the offer was made and the land having, in the meantime, greatly increased in value, Mrs. Bentley would probably recover £11 per foot, and I would therefore suggest an amended offer of £365." (27/1/86). (Apparently the value of the Story Street frontage was being neglected.) This offer was rejected and Mrs. Bentley finally received £400.

Land affected in section 133 belonged to the Crown and the Railway then proceeded across Parkside Street into Brunswick where it ran parallel to Parkside Street in Brunswick. It is interesting to note that, according to
Railway Contract drawing No. 2373-No. 3, the railway was built over some quarries. Sections and allotments had been marked out over the quarries giving their respective owners, so presumably they had been filled by this time. The southern edges of the quarries coincide with the northern edge of Parkside Street, so presumably Parkside Street had existed before the quarries.
North Carlton Station
View Down Lang Street Towards North Carlton Station
C LAND VALUES

With the building of a railway through a residential area, one would expect to see some influence of the proposed line in the value of property and land in the immediate vicinity. The line was authorised by Parliament in 1884, so, from this date, land owners could be definite as to the route of the railway.

A study of the rate books of the Princes Hill area between 1884 and 1888 reveals a rise in the value of land, but whether this was due to the proposed railway, has yet to be decided.

Unimproved blocks of land of 30' x 100' in Bowen Crescent were assessed at a nett annual value of £3. This indicates that the market value of the land, in the assessor's unbiased opinion, was £60. By 1888, the nett annual value of the same land was up to £16, which put the market price at £300. The values put on the land by the City Council seem to be realistic, as the Council had valued the land at approximately £7 - £10 per foot, which was near the price which the Railways Department compensated the land owners.

The price of land in other streets in the area did not rise as spectacularly as in Bowen Crescent, possibly because these streets did not have the direct access to Princes Park. Values in Lang Street, Holtam and Garton Streets in 1884 were approximately £80 for a 40' x 100' block, and rose to £200 in 1888. This two to three-fold rise in value was general for
the whole of North Carlton between 1884 and 1888. This period covers the land boom which broke in 1888, and the rise in value of property elsewhere was similar to North Carlton, so we cannot say that the railway had any influence at all on land prices. The only direct evidence of influence of the railway on property was hope in the hearts of a few Carlton and Brunswick speculators. In the March 2, 1888, edition of the Carlton Gazette, there was an advertisement for land in Weston Street, Brunswick. The advertisement lists the virtues of the land, including "close to the North Carlton Railway Station". Several other advertisements appear for North Carlton land in other issues.

Another person who felt that the railway was an asset, was the Crown Valuer, Mr. Cowderoy. In compensating J. Whitelaw for his land, Cowderoy claimed that any depreciation caused by the closing of adjacent streets was compensated for by the nearby location of North Carlton Station. (See p.51)

However, few people had seriously considered that the line would benefit Carlton, and, by 1890, the railways reported that it was already showing a loss. As we can assume that the railway had no influence before it was opened, we can be sure that, after it failed, it would have had less influence, except as a detracting scar across Princes Hill.
PART 3: NORTH CARLTON STATION
NORTH CARLTON STATION

The North Carlton railway station is an example of a standard plan which was designed for the Railways Department either by its own architectural office or by an outside firm. The Department's architectural office was under the control of the Engineer-in-Chief, and records of that office do not go back far enough to record the designing of the station or the names of the staff responsible. It is not even certain that the design had been let out to a private firm, as was common practice at the time. The specifications and contract for the building have been lost, although the contract drawings are still in existence. These drawings are lithographs taken from the original, but omitted any form of identification from which the designers could be traced. The drawings of Contract No. 3322 were accepted by the contractor, Parker and Vickers, on May 7, 1888. Their tender for the building of the station was £1,699:4:4.

As the station was of a standard design which was applied with variations throughout the State, its origin had no direct relationship to North Carlton. However, this did not mean that the building, despite its failings, was out of place with its surroundings. It would be expecting too much to think that the architect designed the station with Carlton (or any other particular area) in mind. By the nature of its almost random design, it could never be the best solution to a particular area or site, so it appeared that, more by accident rather than design, the North Carlton station was a quietly
successful building.

The layout of the station consisted of two platforms, separated by double railway tracks. The platforms were 460 feet long and 18 feet wide, with the station buildings on the 'down' platform (the south side in this case) and a portable timber office and waiting room (20' x 12') was situated on the 'up' platform. A siding originally ran parallel and north of the 'up' platform, and this was later made into a loop. The portable office, the loop, and most of the 'up' platform have now been removed.

The plan of the station consists of a hall-way or booking lobby, situated on a minor axis. A booking and telegraph office and station master's office are to the left of the lobby and two waiting rooms, a general waiting room and a ladies' waiting room, are to the right. Attached to the waiting rooms are the public toilets and provision for a water tank. Adjacent to the station master's office is the porter's shed. A large verandah on the north side extends to the edge of the platform.

The station was built on filled ground, and, owing to this, the building sits on brick piers and 23" brick walls which extend 8 feet to the footings. As the station embankment is only 4 feet high, this means that the footings were dug to a firm base 4 feet into the consolidated earth. The footings are 2'6" and 20" deep and made of lime concrete poured in strips under the walls and into pads under the piers which support the flooring. At ground level, the
walls of the substructure are capped with a tar dampcourse and a 20' x 8" rough axed bluestone plinth. The floor is constructed with 7" x 4" hardwood bearers supporting 5" x 2" hardwood joists at 15" centres. The flooring boards are 6" x 1 3/8" tongue and groove red deal, an imported timber.

The bricks of the 15 1/2" cavity walls are of local manufacture and the outer 9" skin is bonded in the flemish manner. This 9" skin gives adequate support to the stucco finishes around the doors, windows and also the stone corner pieces and the cornice treatment.

All openings, windows or doors, are constructed with centred brick pointed arches. In the case of the main doors, at each end of the booking lobby the arch consists of five brick courses, each course being 18" wide. Internally and externally, the bricks of the arch are plastered over with a decorative moulding which follows the curve of the arch. The windows are framed in red deal with the internal sills being polished cedar. The exterior sills are bluestone.

Outwardly, the window openings are pointed arches displaying some gothic influence, but inside, the windows are surrounded by mouldings which form a rectangle around the window — the pointed arch being expressed within the rectangle. These windows are double-hung, with the top pane of 20 oz. clear glass, and the bottom pane of 20 oz. partly obscured glass.

Internally, the rooms have 15 foot ceilings. The booking office, station master's office and the waiting rooms all
have plaster finishes with moulded cornices and skirting, the
skirting being specified as "Keene's" cement skirting -
ll" x 1\frac{1}{4}". The booking lobby has walls of face brick and a
cement concrete floor slab which is tiled in a diagonal
pattern with a 13" bluestone skirting.

The roof is framed with 5" x 2" hardwood rafters at 15"
centres with 5" x 2" collar ties with a ridge of ll" x 2"
hardwood. The ends of the rafters at the walls are keyed
into a plate attached to the ceiling joists - thus the joists
also act as ties to the rafters. The roof frame is battened
and clad with countess slates with 3" laps. The slate
probably came from Wales serving as ballast in the ship which
brought it here.

The stucco treatment over the arches over openings
continued into a horizontal band four courses deep and 6'11"
above the plinth. This band encircles the building. Above
the band a cornice, the details of which are rendered, is
corbelled out from the external 9" brick skin. The cornice
gives support to a moulded 6" cast iron gutter. Because
the roof is adequately tied with the collar ties and ceiling
joists, the cornice is a decorative feature applied to the
walls rather than an extension of the roof.

The verandah on the north side of the station is construc-
ted with angle iron spandrils spanning 10' from the lower edge
of the cornice detailing to a row of cast iron corinthian
columns which run parallel to the edge of the platform. The
spandrils at each end are filled in with lattice of wrought
iron straps which are bolted together at each junction with a washer for a spacer. The iron for this work probably came from Scotland. Cast iron decoration hangs around the edges under the gutters of the verandah, which is clad with corrugated galvanised iron. A down-pipe from the gutter feeds down through a column into a drain in the platform embankment.

The chimneys, which add much to the character of the building, contain three flues each, one flue for each of the back-to-back fire-places, and one for room ventilation, with the gratings being almost at ceiling level. These chimneys, with the flues being expressed separately, suggest an influence from the Tudor style.

The design of the building appears to have been influenced by the Gothic Revival together with Victorian fashions. Gothic elements appear in the finials, being made in the decorated manner at the two hips and in the perpendicular manner at the gable of the porch. Pointed arches and mouldings over openings are also Gothic influences.

The wrought iron and the cast iron decoration are Victorian, as is the treatment of the cornice, being a wall decoration rather than a necessary part of the roof.

The station shown in the drawings is a unit which has been designed as a single building; however, it does not appear to fulfill all the functions of a station. The waiting rooms, the booking lobby, the booking office and the station master's office are all that are provided in the unit shown in the elevation. Other evidently necessary items, such as the
toilets and the porter's room have not been provided within the main design. It might be argued that, with no sewer, a toilet block would be best at a distance, and not in or near the main buildings, but the contract drawings show these buildings were provided as skillion-roofed timber sheds set against the main building looking, for all the world, like "later additions". These timber rooms are unfortunate, as they detract from the main building, which is one of the few buildings of Carlton which can be seen totally in the round. The station was built on a raised platform in an open tract of ground with open streets surrounding it, and later, when the area was built up, the station afforded vistas along Lang Street, Langridge Street and Parkside Street.

The fortunate siting, of course, was unintentional, but it added to the charm of the station whose domestic scale was fitting for a residential area.

THE NORTH CARLTON STATION TODAY

After the last passenger services had been run on the line, the station was converted into a "temporary residence". The plans for the scheme were drawn up in 1948 and are shown in the copies. The booking office and station master's office were converted to bedrooms, with the booking lobby converted to a hall and bath room. The waiting rooms were made into a kitchen and living room, with the old toilets converted to a laundry. A 5'0" timber paling fence was built under the verandah along the platform, forming a private yard. The
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