

## COMMENCEMENT

The meeting formally opened at 2:30 pm.

## IN ATTENDANCE

Clr Ross Williams (RW)	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Clr Jim Sanderson (JS)	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Brian McDonald (BM)	Heritage Architect
Lucy Creagh (LC)	Hunters Hill Trust Representative
Helen Temple Berry (HTB)	Community Representative
Bronwyn Doutreband (BD)	Community Representative
Graham Atkins (GA)	Community Representative (Alt)
Robert Moore (RM)	Heritage Architect – Representative of the Institute of Architects

HTP and BD left the meeting from 3.53 pm to 4.35 pm when item 3.3 - 24 Viret Street was discussed.

## ALSO PRESENT

Steve Kourepis	Director, Development & Regulatory Services, Hunters Hill Council
Kate Higgins	Heritage Adviser, Hunters Hill Council
Nick Tobin	Acting General Manager, Hunters Hill Council (for part of the meeting)
Stuart Dutton	Director, Service Delivery and Special Projects (for item 2.1)
Sarah Jenkins	Administration, Hunters Hill Council (for part of the meeting)
Philippa Hayes	Planner, Hunters Hill Council (for items 3.2 and 3.7)

## APOLOGIES

Michael Lehany	Heritage Landscape Adviser
----------------	----------------------------

Note: Michael provided comments prior to the meeting. These have been incorporated into the minutes.

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairperson called for Declarations of Interest. HTP and BD declared an interested in 24 Viret Street.

## CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel of previous Meeting held on 19 May 2021 were read and were adopted.

Item 3.1 – It was recommended by HTB that an additional dot point to be added to 18 The Point Road

It was agreed that the minutes would be corrected to include this additional point

## BUSINESS ARISING

### 2.1 2:30 PM - BORONIA PARK FACILITIES PRE-LODGE MENT

#### PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Alan Croker, Heritage Consultant
- Sagar Hauhan, Heritage Consultant
- Andrew Hipwell, Architect

In considering the proposal the Panel advised:

- The aesthetic values of Boronia Park have been assessed as being of State significance.
- Securing the undercroft (using sliding gates and fence) would create a long imposing wall without transparency. The building is not visually permeable.
- The scale of the proposed building is a concern. There may be the opportunity to lower the roof level by using a different roof form.
- The roof form is ungainly. Consideration could be given to a shallow hipped roof (ie having consistent eaves line around the building)
- The blank walls and dark walls of the ground floor are a concern.
- It is a shame that mature trees are being removed.
- The footprint of the building and its dark colour make the building more visually imposing than it needs to be.
- It is important to carefully choose the dark colour as some dark colours can be very noticeable.
- At night the building will be very visible due to the extent of windows at night and the brightness of the building may be disturbing at night.
- There was a concern about the relocation of the oval fence – about 3- 4 metres (to flatten the end of the oval). The original fence alignment is proposed to be changed.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal and recommends the design be modified.

## REPORTS

### 3.1 3:00 PM - ST JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, LOT 2 MARY STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2021-1091)

#### PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Oliver Petrie, Architect (TKD)

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- There was some concern that recladding with materials of a dark colour will make the building more visually intrusive with regard to its impact on the surrounding streetscapes.
- The building presents an industrial appearance to Short Street. Extensive use of CFC and metal cladding is part of the problem. The south-west corner is of particular concern.
- The building terminates the vista along Short Street and therefore its design needs careful consideration. There is a lost opportunity to improve the contribution of the existing building to Short Street.
- Sandstone cladding should be considered for facades facing the surrounding street. Consideration should be given to retaining the existing face brickwork wall.
- There is some concern about the cumulative impact of this building and other nearby buildings.
- There are brick and sandstone buildings in the immediate context which can be used for guidance in the selection of appropriate new materials.
- In summary, the key issue is that the materials and colours proposed for the cladding are inappropriate in the context and need to be revised. Warmer colours would be more appropriate, and perhaps more texture.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Panel advise the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, that it has some concern in relation to the current development application and does not support the current design.

### 3.2 3:30 PM - 46 RYDE ROAD, HUNTERS HILL (DA2018-1125-1)

#### PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Sarah Blacker, Architect
- Sarah advised that the solid roof of the “pergola” would not be higher than the already approved metal edge framing.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel supports the proposal.

### 3.3 4:00 PM - 24 VIRET STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2021-1115)

#### PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- John Oultram (Heritage Consultant)
- Nicholas Byrne (Architect – DKO)
- Josie Chong (Architect – DKO)
- Camilla Firman (Planner – Mecone)
- Simon Ainsworth (Owner)

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- Sufficient landscaping needs to be provided. The minimum required by the controls must be achieved, including the provision of trees.
- More montages are needed in order to understand the relationship of the building to the context
- The design is well resolved, however there is some concern about its relationship to its context . A high wall would be presented to Enderslea. It is also very close to the neighbouring house (so garden setting reduced). These matters should be reviewed.
- The presentation to the water needs some thought.
- The Sydney Harbour SREP and its DCP must be consulted.
- A site inspection was requested.

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel acknowledges the challenges of the site, however does not support the proposal in its current form. A site visit is requested.

### 3.4 4:35 PM - 22 VERNON STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2021-1122)

#### PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Victor Placancia - Owner
- Rob Mills - Architect – Director, Rob Mills Architecture & Interiors
- Ryan McCully – Architect, Rob Mills Architecture & Interiors
- Christine Chen, Rob Mills Architecture & Interiors
- Stephen Davies - Director of Urbis Heritage Consultants
- Yvette Middleton - Associate Director of GSA Planning Development & Town Planning Consultants

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- There is a concern about the extent of removal of existing building fabric in the historic building and that the building is not being appropriately restored.
- The previous comments remain relevant as the design approach remains the same. Arches are not characteristic of Hunters Hill.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.

### 3.5 5:00 PM - 59 THE POINT ROAD, WOOLWICH (DA2021-1131)

## PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Architect: Alec Tzannes
- Planner: Stephen Kerr
- Heritage consultant: Stephen Davies
- Property Owner: Nick Messina

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- It is a concern that the front garden is given over to a utilitarian use – being primarily used for car access.
- The four car garage would be quite prominent in the streetscape. The four car wide garage door is inconsistent with development characteristic of the area.
- The basement to the house should be more sympathetic to the character of the house – rather than a structure which has a quite different architectural aesthetic. This would allow the proposed new base of the house to better blend with the existing house.
- The three storey scale of part of the building is a concern.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form. It is recommended that the design be reconsidered.

**3.6 5:55 PM - 43 WOOLWICH ROAD, WOOLWICH (PRELIMINARY)**

## PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by:

- Gabrielle Suhr (Architecture team - presenting)
- Mitchell Solomonson (Architecture team)
- Andrew Martin (Planner)
- Sophie Bock (Heritage Consultant)
- Steffan Ippolito (Client/Owner).

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- The lane is one of the most attractive lanes in the conservation area.
- The proposed long two storey wing will have a significant impact on the lanescape. The scale of the proposed wing along the lane is a concern.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to locating the bedrooms to the other side of the garden. Another suggestion was that the Master Bedroom not be two storeys – especially as this scale creates an uncomfortable relationship with the existing house.
- The house is a heritage item and the most important element on the site with its garden. Any addition must be subservient to the existing house.
- Mansard roofs and steel box windows are not sympathetic to the existing house, nor to the character of the conservation area. White walls are also unsympathetic.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal.

**3.7 6:25 PM - 70 PRINCE EDWARD STREET, GLADESVILLE (DA2021-1100)****PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

The Panel was addressed by:

- Andrew Minto - planner
- Anne Waer – heritage consultant
- Jaci Chen – architect
- Alleni, owner

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- Demolition of the existing house is the first consideration. It was queried that the house is beyond repair.
- Anne Warr advised that as the roof has been lost for some time the fabric of the house is in very poor condition. While some sandstone elements are OK most other elements are not. She is of the view that the heritage values of the cottage is not such that it warrants the extensive costs of repair and restoration.
- A condition report is required in order to substantiate the demolition of the building. Also advice is required as to whether or not there are any structural issues with the existing building.
- Any new building must take design cues from contributory buildings in the locality. Appropriate landscaping is also an important consideration. Both a new building and the landscape must be compatible with the positive characteristic of the streetscape.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that the Panel requires further information in relation to the demolition of the existing house before they can consider the suitability of a proposed new house.

**3.8 6:50 PM - 3 SHORT ST, HUNTERS HILL (PRELIMINARY)****PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

The Panel was addressed by:

- Anne Warr (heritage architect)
- Andrew Martin (town planner)
- Charles Street (owner)
- Geoff Dalgliesh (design architect)

In considering the proposal the Panel advised that:

- It was suggested that the roof height be lowered in order to reduce the visibility of the proposed addition. No higher than the existing ridge. A 2700mm ceiling height on the ground floor and 2400 ceiling height on the

first floor was suggested. The architect noted that the ground floor ceiling is driven by existing structure.

- It was noted that the addition will be visible from the street when viewed obliquely.
- The glazed NE corner is not sympathetic and needs to be reconsidered. A skylight was suggested.
- It would be better to further “detach” the proposed addition from the existing house.
- The lack of soft landscaping in the backyard is a concern. It was suggested that the size of the deck could be reduced.
- A more traditional form could be explored if this would reduce the wall plate height.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services, be advised that of the Panel’s comments on the preliminary design.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **4.1 7:15 PM - DRAFT CHARACTER STATEMENTS**

#### **PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

RW outlined the importance of the character statements.

SK said info from the study will lead to changes to the local environmental plan, including mapping changes.

It was suggested that a separate meeting could be held for the sole purpose of discussing the draft character statements. (Before caretaker mode starts on the 6 August 2021).

The “meaty” statements in the preamble need to be captured in the recommendations/conclusion.

### **4.2 PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

#### **PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

SK advised that Peter Lonergan has formally resigned from the Panel and will no longer represent the Institute of Architects. His replacement is Robert Moore, who was welcomed by the Panel.

### **4.3 QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION**

#### **PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

LC noted that the quality of the printed documentation provided is inadequate to properly understand proposals.

SK noted that electronic documents can be viewed on-line through the Planning Portal. SK suggested an alternative methodology for viewing documents be investigated and discussed.

The next meeting of the Conservation Advisory Panel Meeting will be held on 18 August 2021.

The meeting closed at 7.45 pm.