

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 2.30 pm.

IN ATTENDANCE

Clr Ross Williams	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Clr Jim Sanderson	Councillor, Hunters Hill Council
Bob Moore	Representative of the Institute of Architects
Michael Lehany	Landscape Adviser
Brian McDonald	Heritage Architect
Lucy Creagh	Hunters Hill Trust Representative
Helen Temple Berry	Community Representative
Bronwyn Doutreband	Community Representative
Graham Atkins	Community Representative (Alt) – arrived at 3.15 pm

ALSO PRESENT

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

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairperson called for Declarations of Interests:

- Lucy Creagh declared an interest in Item 3.2 - 30 Alexandra Street, Hunters Hill. Lucy left the meeting at 4.35 pm and returned at 5.02 pm.
- Graham Atkins – Item 3.4 - 23 Ernest Street, Hunters Hill. Graham left the meeting at 5.45 pm and returned at 6.20 pm.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel of previous Meeting held on 18 August 2021 be adopted. Moved by Clr Jim Sanderson. Seconded by Brian McDonald

BUSINESS ARISING

2.1 2.30PM CHARACTER STATEMENTS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Paul Davies

Paul Davies advised that a key purposes of the character statements is to provide a reference to aid assessment of development applications and to inform challenges to inappropriate proposals. They also guide applicants to understand appropriate development. The incremental loss of contributory elements in conservation areas has an adverse impact over time. Paul has tried to describe the relationship between buildings and their setting. The way new development fits into the existing patterns of landscape and built elements character is critical.

The Panel proposed that the northern side of Princes Street be investigated as a possible conservation area. Paul said that he has undertaken some research of the area and is worth considering. Robert Moore agreed with Paul that the defensibility of listings in a Court process is important. Robert also mentioned that the support of property owners is a good foundation for heritage listing.

There was general discussion about conservation areas and character areas. Michael put forward the view that proposed HCA No. 4 has greater heritage value than described by Paul and noted the importance of significance statements. Lucy said that she has access to a heritage report on proposed HCA. 4 that she would be happy to share with Paul. Jim noted that character areas/statements will not protect areas from unsympathetic development. Lucy suggested that streetscape and public domain features eg street trees, footpath widths, views etc, are discussed at the start of a character description. Paul was happy to prepare a summary character statement.

Brian commended Paul's report as an excellent and comprehensive background for more succinct character statements that applicants and applicant's consultants will bother to take the time to read and digest.

The Panel generally supports the removal of Pulpit Point from HCA No. 1. Steve noted that removal from the HCA would not allow development of a greater scale.

The Panel supports the urgent need for the preparation of inventory sheets for heritage items and for the urgent identification and mapping of contributory properties as well as identified Heritage Items in conservation areas. These will provide a strong visual tool to identify clusters or streets with their own particular character within the larger Conservation Areas.

The Panel supported the idea that Hunters Hill should be considered for a Commonwealth heritage listing.

REPORTS

3.1 4.00PM BORONIA PARK SPORT AND COMMUNITY FACILITY (DA2021-1184)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Nick Tobin, Acting General Manager Hunters Hill Council
Stuart Gordon, contract assessment planner

- Stuart Dutton, Director Service Delivery and Special Projects
- Panel comments Stuart Dutton advised that gates are needed for the central passageway for reasons of security. He said that the hipped roof was investigated but it did not work aesthetically, because “*it would look like a shed*”, colours are continuing to be considered. He advised that the location is predetermined by the plan of management for the park. Light at night will be managed by the restriction on the hours of use, use of directional lighting, and use of curtains. Stuart noted that the use is congruent with the heritage values of the park.
- The panel provide the following comments:
- Clr Jim Sanderson noted that, as the *Heritage Impact Statement* assessed aesthetic significance of Boronia Park at State level, respecting the aesthetic values of the park is incredibly important
 - Brian was very disappointed that previous comments of the Panel had not been taken into account, especially as council is the proponent. He did not agree that his suggestion for a hipped roof would make the building appear bulkier. He suggested that the security gates be visually permeable. He was very disappointed with the response.
 - Robert said that the large area of glazed wall will mean that the building will be very visible at night. He suggested shrouded light fittings that direct light downwards and have little light leakage could be used. He said that the soffit of the roof overhang and the internal ceiling will make the roof appear like an aeroplane’s wing and questioned the resulting visual dominance in a context which has high aesthetic significance.
 - Graham queried the size of the first floor community room as it increases the bulk and scale of the building.
 - Helen queried the location of the building. The active sports area – the fenced oval, the historic grandstand and the square open playing field adjacent have a special relationship to each other. This wide open space is surrounded by bush, and has glimpses of the city on the horizon. This is part of the character of Boronia Park. The bush land has a parallel natural heritage significance. The proposed new very large facility detracts from the character of the playing field area. Helen mentioned that the historic grandstand has been overlooked and it is an important historic element in the park and had been earmarked for attention in the Government grants.
 - Lucy raised a concern about the scale of the building – being 50 metres long, and the safety of having such public facilities in the middle of the park. She feels the building is in the wrong place. Brian agreed that the building could be anywhere. He said that it is unresponsive to the character of Boronia Park. Lucy noted that community consultation supported a smaller building and in a different location.
 - Nick noted that Council had already approved the location of the building.
 - Michael asked what the dark materials of the façade were. He stated that the dark colours are completely out of keeping with the park. He wondered what was happening with the fence. Nick noted that the fence will be relocated in order to accommodate the new building.
 - The Panel feels that its comments have not been taken on board and expressed great concern that the representatives of the Council (the proponent) have not taken the panel’s recommendations on board,

whereas a private applicant is expected to seriously consider the panel's recommendations (which are adopted by the Council on most occasions).

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advise the Director, Development and Regulatory Services that it does not support the proposal.

3.2 4.30PM PRE-DA LODGEMENT FOR 30 ALEXANDRA STREET, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Geoff Dalglish (Architect)
Marc Lane and Joel Lohrey (owners)
Louise Doherty, Weir Phillips

Panel comments The original house was most likely built c.1925. Brian stated that the roof would most likely have been tiled (Marseille pattern) and would be more appropriate than a grey roof. Brian thought the solar panels on the main roof are problematic. Brian would prefer a flat roof over the garage than a skillion roof. Robert supports Brian's comments. He suggested finding earlier plans of the house as an understanding of the original house could guide the nature of alterations. Michael suggested that the house could have been built by the ?? who ran a very successful corner store. Michael is concerned that the Lemon scented gum does not like its roots disturbed and recommended that an arborist look at the tree. Michael thinks that the house might be in an early "green book" of Hunters Hill.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel recommended that some modifications be made to the design as discussed and advise its comments to the Director, Development and Regulatory Services for consideration in the process of a future development application.

3.3 5.03PM 2 JAMES STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2021-1169)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Ashwin Kuruvilla,
Colin Brady, Heritage Consultant
John Baker, Architect

Panel comments Lucy noted that the drawings show that the rear dormer is to be demolished. This was confirmed by the architect although the wall framing could possibly stay despite the roof being demolished. Lucy asked if the dormer could be retained as it is a documented part of the original building. Lucy suggested that the addition have a greater separation from the existing house. Lucy thinks that the addition will have some visibility from the northern end of the street. Helen thinks it would be more appropriate to have a single storey addition in a longer rear wing rather than a two storey addition. This would preserve the rear elevation of the original house including the dormer. She is also concerned about new openings in original walls in the historic part of the house. Bronwyn asked if the studio and cabana are remaining. The architect confirmed this.

It was noted that the integrity of heritage items is important and the impact on the whole of the building needs to be considered – not just what can be viewed from the street.

Brian is not concerned about the form and scale of the proposal nor the loss of the original dormer, nor the proposed colours.

Robert is also concerned about the treatment of the dormer as it is a signature feature of this building and it is a shame that it is proposed to be modified as it has a key role in demonstrating what is significant about this house. He thought that it would be useful to know what changes have been made to the original building and that previous plans made shed some light on this. The connection of the historic building and the new rear addition should not happen at the expense of the dormer.

Michael also raised concerns about the demolition of the rear dormer window as it is an unusual feature in Hunters Hill and unique architectural element. Its demolition is not sympathetic. He agrees with Robert. He supported the original front door being retained as the main entry door. He thinks the new crashes into the old. He is concerned that the original service wings may be being lost, however these are important elements of a house. There is the opportunity to reinstate lost original features such as skillion roofs typical of rear service wings. He recommended further investigation.

A site inspection was desired by the panel although COVID 19 makes this difficult.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advises the Director, Development and Regulatory Service that it does not support the design and recommends that a new design come back to the Panel for comment. The Panel requested a site visit.

5 minute break between 5.40 and 5.45 pm.

3.4 5.50PM 23 ERNEST STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2017-1098-2)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Zoltan Kovacs (Heritage Architect and Consultant)
George Karavanas (GSA Planning)

Panel comments Lucy raised a concern that at night, when the lights were on, the building would read as a four storey building from the river. This relates to previous CAP discussion of this site, noting it is situated amongst a line of historic “ marine villas” along the Lane Cove River. This design severely detracts from their integrity as an historic grouping.

Concern was raised that the modifications created an additional level with glass only hidden from view from the water by vegetation and that non-compliance with 50% garden area and FSR was not acceptable in location only separated from the river by the reserve.

Brian does not have an issue with the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advises the Director, Development and Regulatory Service that it does not support the proposal.

3.5 6.07PM 70 PRINCE EDWARD STREET, GLADESVILLE (DA2021-1100)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Andrew Minto (planner)

Anne Warr (heritage consultant)

Jaci Chen (architect)

Panel comments Brian noted the poor condition of the building as demonstrated by the photographs in the applicant's report. Lucy suggested that the stone be salvaged and reused and the bricks if possible, as well as any other components. The building needs to be dismantled rather than demolished. Ann advised that the intention is to salvage and reuse the sandstone blocks. Brian recommended a demolition specification should be prepared by a suitably qualified heritage architect. Michael wondered if some salvaged components could be used in the new house, perhaps in the details. In the same way the new design could echo some details of the original house. This would also help ensure compatibility with the streetscape.

Helen raised concerns about the "heaviness" of the design – it would read as three storey from the street. (The architect advised that the third level is set back.)

Robert noted that one way a new building can relate to older buildings is to use vertical windows. He thinks the horizontal windows look awful. Consideration should be given to use of a hipped roof rather than the currently proposed gable at the front of the house as this would help to reduce bulk. Robert stated that the stone wall should be rebuilt as it currently appears.

Clr Jim Sanderson noted that there is a large cantilevered roof covering an outdoor area and queried if the area below could be countered as part of the landscaping. If counted as hard landscaping, would exceed one third of landscaped area.

Lucy raised a concern about the location of the water tanks and if they were plastic, as these elements are very utilitarian in character and would have some visibility from the street. It was recommended that they be relocated.

Michael is of the view that the stair at the front of the building, which appears to have a void at garden level under, would be an unattractive element. He suggested it be enclosed by sandstone or some other sympathetic wall.

Robert noted that Council could commission its own engineering assessment.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advises the Director, Development and Regulatory Service that it does not support the current design and recommends amendments to address the issues raised.

3.6 6.35PM PRE-DA LODGEMENT FOR 1 AMBROSE STREET, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Mark Armstrong and Louise Oxnevad (ARC Architects)

Anthony (owner)

Panel comments Bronwyn noted that there are currently quite substantial pillars at the driveway on Ambrose Avenue and stone walls on Passey Avenue.

Graham raised a concern that the proposed addition seems to be overpowering the existing house (former lodge). He wondered why the garage is located on an

elevated platform. The architect explained that it relates to existing ground levels. Graham asked if the garage level could be lowered.

Lucy queried if the bulk and scale of the addition could be reduced and if the garage could be set further back and lowered. She said that it is very important to engage a good heritage consultant.

Clr Ross Williams noted that the site is in the proximity of a number of heritage items and that the existing building is significant. He is also concerned about the scale of the proposal.

Helen agrees with the concerns about scale and relationship of the proposal to the existing building. She noted that the existing building is a little gem which makes an important contribution to the streetscapes. She was concerned about the impact of the garage on the character of Passey Avenue, given that the Lodge has two street frontages.

Robert said the use of brick in a similar colour to the stone is a sound direction. He recommended that the form of the roof be reviewed as it has a very large scale. Also the pergola structure rendered in white makes it seem more visible. The connection between the old and new supports the exposure of the rear wall of the lodge. He suggested that consideration be given to moving the addition away from the cottage with a small linkage at the double doors. He noted that the junction of the addition with the ensuite has many materials meeting and wondered if this could this be better managed.

Brian said that the south-east rear corner of the building should be left free and visible. The skillion roof on the upper floor of the addition is unnecessarily bulky, particularly as it would be seen from Passey Avenue. A flat roof would reduce the building bulk significantly. If light is required in the centre of the upper floor above the hallway this could be achieved by skylights or south light clerestory window. Brian asked if research had been undertaken on the house eg a rear skillion roofed section. He supported the lowering of the garage floor level. The extent of glazing at the first floor is a concern.

It was recommended that a heritage architect be engaged, as an architect would be able to engage with the design issues.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advise its comments to the Director, Development and Regulatory Services for consideration in relation to a future development application. The Panel does not support the design and recommends that a revised design come to the Panel for comment.

3.7 7.20PM PRE-DA LODGEMENT FOR 2 WOOLWICH ROAD, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Attendees Richard Mackay (heritage consultant)
Mark Armstrong and Louise Oxnevad (ARC Architects)
Nick and Jacky Stevens (owners)

Panel Brian is of the view that the proposal makes perfect sense.

comments Helen and Michael congratulated the owners for seeking to return an important historic element.
Michael thinks the stone wall is an original wall to the Passey Estate.

The Panel did not raise an issue with the changes to the rear façade (new openings). Robert noted that substantial door opening are often sheltered from rain for practical reasons and recommended an awning.

Robert raised a concern about the proximity of the car stacker to the house as it could disturb the foundations.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel supports the proposal and advise its comments to the Director, Development and Regulatory Services for consideration.

GENERAL BUSINESS

4.1 SOLAR PANELS IN CONSERVATION AREAS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

- Panel comments
- Brian advised that solar panels that fit into a slate roof are available for new houses. Lucy and Robert noted that solar panels cannot be used on original slate roofs because of issues fixing through.
 - Brian and Robert are of the view that vast arrays of solar panels are not suitable for conservation areas.
 - Robert noted that panels should be installed where they cannot be seen.

RECOMMENDATION

The Panel request a report from the Director, Development and Regulatory Services on solar panels be made to the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

The next meeting of the Conservation Advisory Panel will be held on 20 October 2021.

Agenda items to be included in the next meeting:

- Solar panels
- Re-use of sandstone