

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 4.40 pm in the Council Chambers

IN ATTENDANCE

Clr Jim Sanderson	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Lucy Creagh	Hunters Hill Trust Representative
Helen Temple Berry	Community Representative
Michael Lehany	Landscape Adviser
Brian McDonald	Heritage Architect
Graeme Atkins	Community Representative
Bronwyn Doutreband	Community Representative

ALSO PRESENT

Steve Kourepis	Director, Development & Regulatory Services
Kate Higgins	Heritage Adviser

APOLOGIES

Clr Ross Williams	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Peter Lonergan	Representative of the Institute of Architects

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were the following declarations of interest:

- Helen Temple Berry and Lucy Creagh with regard to 28 Madeleine Street. They left the meeting at 6.20 pm and returned at 7.11 pm.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel of previous meeting held on 17 March 2020 were read and were Moved by Graeme Atkins and were Seconded by Lucy Creagh.

BUSINESS ARISING

2.1 SITE INSPECTION -

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

A site inspection was made to 5-7 Alexandra Street, Hunters Hill.

REPORTS

3.1 4.40 PM – 9 MARY STREET, HUNTERS HILL – ST JOSEPHS SCHOOL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

In considering the proposal, the Panel advised:

- Concern was raised regarding impacts of the basement extension on existing trees, in particular tree T57.
- A concern was also raised about the clarity of information to understand the impact on existing trees.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel supports the proposal in its present form subject to there being no additional impacts on tree T57. The Panel supports the amendments.

3.2 4.50 PM - 28 HILLCREST AVENUE, GLADESVILLE (DA2021-1040)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

In considering the proposal the Panel advised:

- The heritage impact statement does not make any proper assessment of the characteristics of the conservation area, the main characteristic of which is single storey early twentieth century houses with side setbacks (wider on one side).
- The proposal is contrary to the character of the conservation area.
- It is very important that architects and designers understand the context of a site within a very cohesive conservation area, and take into account the positive characteristics of the context when preparing designs for alterations and additions. This includes building form, detail, materials, colours and landscaping.
- The existing house is very intact and is located within a very intact streetscape.
- The first floor addition is too visually dominant and is too far forward.
- Upper floor additions of this type have never been supported by the Panel.
- Upper floor additions must be set well back, retain the main roof form of the existing house, and minimise wall plate heights by pitching roofs no higher than 2 metres from the upper floor level.
- In general, attic type rear additions are preferred.
- The dark grey roof colour is not sympathetic to the streetscape.
- The function of the proposed subfloor basement is not explained. It appears excessive for storage, and an excavation of this extent could prejudice the foundations of the retained portion of the house.
- The proposed removal of the existing windows and front door, and the introduction of a new portico would adversely impact on original features and the architectural character of the existing house.
- The proposed alterations are excessive as they detract from the contribution of the existing house to the conservation area.
- The lack of landscape area detracts from the garden setting of the house

- and the green and leafy character of the streetscape.
- The garage should be a lightweight structure that is visually recessive.
- The proposal would detract from the attractive and cohesive character the streetscape, and would set a bad precedent.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its present form and recommends that a more modest alternative design sympathetic to the heritage context be prepared.

3.3 6.20 PM - 28 MADELINE STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2021-1056)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Jeff Dagiiesh, Architect
- Daniel Ward, Architect
- Bonnie and Kevin, owners
- Stephen Davies, Heritage Planner
- Andrew Martin, Town Planner

In considering the proposal, the Panel advised:

- The existing house makes a substantial contribution to the conservation area and should be retained. The age of the house is significant - about 100 years old. The architectural character of the existing house is attractive and it is located on a key corner site at the junction of three historic streets. It is surrounded by many heritage items in Madeline and Ady Streets, many of which date back to the earliest decades of Hunters Hill's settlement.
- The proposal is essentially demolition of the existing house rather than alterations and additions.
- A sympathetic first floor addition, which retained the ground floor facades, may be acceptable, although the Panel does not generally favour first floor additions above contributory buildings in the conservation area.
- The basement garage is not supported for a number of reasons. It is doubted that the existing walls could be retained if new basement piers are built. The thickness of the retaining walls of the basement would reduce the space available for the two car parking spaces shown. This possibly makes the basement parking unviable except for a single car. The basement garage is very likely to result in demolition of the entire house and necessitates removal of the existing floors at the very least. The basement garage is not appropriate in this historic setting.
- A lightweight carport on the western side setback is an option. It must be located at least 1 metre behind the façade.
- The tea room and tea pavilion are not supported. The tea room projects forward of the house with a terrace above. The loss of trees for the purpose of the tea room and tea pavilion is not supported. If the removal of these trees has previously been approved, then replacement trees should be proposed.
- Infilling of the verandah with a solid looking screen removes building modulation and is not supported.
- There is a concern about the impact on the heritage item next door - dewatering leading to settlement of the heritage item.
- Kevin Faye, a furniture expert, active member of the National Trust and

early supporter of heritage conservation, was a resident of the house and this should be acknowledged in the heritage impact statement.

- Bedrooms should not be located on top of the verandah as it would detract from this key architectural feature. The roof over the verandah must be retained.
- Concrete roofing that resembles first floor balconies is not supported. The kitchen should be contained within the footprint of the existing building, given its close proximity to the neighbouring heritage item.
- The removal of the original curving garden path would detract from the streetscape.
- There is concern about overshadowing of the neighbouring property - a heritage item, and that the tea pavilion shadows are not shown.
- The proposed first floor rendered balustrade is awkward and the finish needs to be reconsidered.
- Wider eaves should be provided.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its present form and recommends that a revised design, taking into account the advice provided, be prepared.

3.4 7:11 PM - 59 THE POINT ROAD, WOOLWICH (PRELIMINARY)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Alex Tzannes, Architect
- Stephen Davies, Heritage Consultant
- Steven Kerr, Planner

In considering the proposal, the Panel advised:

- It is very important to have a comprehensive method statement for constructing the basement level below the existing house.
- There is a concern that the proposed new work at basement level (lower ground) is visually dominant when viewed from the water, in particular the light coloured arch form.
- The heritage value of the existing garage and the impact of its demolition needs to be addressed. It is an attractive modest building that survives in the streetscape. The lack of practicality of the existing garage was acknowledged.
- The loss of the large garden area on the street was noted as a concern. Every effort should be made to present the house to the street in a well-established garden setting.
- The heritage impact statement needs to be reviewed. It appears to be missing a heritage item next door. It should also include an illustrated fabric analysis.
- A greater understating of the original verandah is required.
- The deep soil area should be expanded to allow for a front garden. Vertical "green" walls are not supported as a substitute. Every effort must be made to create a front garden that present to the street in a positive way.
- That a comprehensive schedule of conservation works must be provided with the application.
- There needs to be a dedicated pedestrian gate - point of arrival.
- The garage could be reduced to a three car garage. Garaging should not

dominate at the expense of a proper garden setting.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel generally supports the proposal and recommend modifications as mentioned above.

OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 5-7 ALEXANDRA STREET, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Helen spoke with Bridgit Hawthorne (who bought the building when it was a wreck) who advised the following:

- Everything that looks old is old
- Any surviving windows were put in the front of the house.
- The French doors upstairs are original.
- The staircase had been exposed to the elements, but it had been covered. Winders and treads have been replaced. There has been some work undertaken to repair it.
- The back of the house had two wings - the short wing was original and was the kitchen
- Long wing extended in 1908. Front verandah filled in at the same time.
- Floor plan of 1908 not changed.
- Big glass window were in the original opening. Big original steel girder above.
- The side wall is the side wall of the shop.
- All original plaster had disappeared.
- Garage added to stop future subdivision.
- There is a huge file in Council records with detailed heritage report dated 2011-2012.

There remains a serious concern about the approach to the proposed addition, and the Panel recommends a rethink on the design approach.

It has been confirmed that the existing stair is original. It should be retained.

The addition should be moved further back with a lightweight glazed link to the original. The link should be as narrow as possible and set back the addition so that the maximum extent of the existing rear sandstone wall remains evident. The link from the house to the garage should not have walls, should be lightweight, and should not extend across the garage. The proposed additions would result in the original form no longer being evident.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel looks forward to seeing an amended proposal that addresses the Panels comments. The Panel cannot support the proposal in its current form.

4.2 COUNCIL POLICY ON THE SALE OF REMNANT LAND

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

A discussion paper was circulated. The Panel will discuss out of session. Detailed discussion of the policy was deferred until the next meeting.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel requests that the guidelines for the sale of remnant land be put on the agenda for the CAP meeting to be held in May 2021.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the CAP will be held on Wednesday, 19 May 2021 commencing at 4.30pm in the Council Chambers. Site visits will be held prior to the start of the meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.