

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 4pm (with earlier 3pm site meeting).

PANEL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Clr Ross Williams	Chairperson, Councillor
Clr Jim Sanderson	Councillor
Ms Helen Temple Berry	Community Representative
Ms Lucy Creagh	Hunters Hill Trust
Ms Bronwyn Doutreband	Community Representative
Mr Robert Moore	Representative of the Institute of Architects
Mr Michael Lehany	Heritage Landscape Architect
Ms Chery Kemp	Council staff – acting heritage advisor
Mr Shahram Mehdizadgan	Council staff – acting Director

Apologies

No apologies were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil response.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel of previous Meeting held on 19/10/2022 be adopted. Moved by Helen seconded by Jim. Carried.

REPORTS

3.1 3PM - ON SITE MEETING AT 25 ERNEST STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2022-0152)

PANEL COMMENTS FOLLOWING THE SITE VISIT

Comments from the Panel:

- Removal (and partial removal) of voids against front sandstone wall, and removal of chimney breast internally to ground floor level would cause unacceptable incremental change to the heritage item.
- The property is a very historic property, being an early marine villa, overlooking the Lane Cove River. It is one of a number of surviving houses and gardens of the earliest settlement phase of Hunters Hill. These places are important remnants of the early history of the area and must be protected as they contribute to the exceptional cultural landscape of Hunters Hill. The

subject site is particularly important due to the width of its frontage to the river.

- The existing separation between old and new remains a relevant approach to adding to heritage items. The void of the existing design provides for this. It is a concern that current proposal will diminish this approach, thereby adversely affecting the heritage item.
- There is sufficient of the built fabric remaining to make it possible to discern the original spaces of the original building.
- Removal of the chimney breast and wall will deny the ability to understand the original spaces – the original 4 rooms, including skirting boards reflecting previous uses.
- Given the extent of change to the original building, it makes what remains even more precious.
- The proposed open plan approach is not sympathetic to the character of the original building.
- Disconnection of the existing chimney from the original fireplace degrades the heritage values of the building.
- There is a concern about the cumulative impact of further removal of original fabric. The removal of original fabric and the loss of understanding of the spaces of the original building adversely affecting its heritage values.
- The Panel raised the issue that some of the elements proposed to be removed were required to be retained as part of a previous approval.
- That earlier approvals should be referred to ensure continuity of the assessment of heritage values.
- The infill of the void is not supported and the Panel recommends that no opening be made in the sandstone wall at the ground level entry to the original section of the house.
- This property is mentioned in a James Broadbent authored catalogue of an exhibition titled “India China Australia: Trade and Society 1780-1850” and original Chinese glazed ceramic tiles which formed part of the original balcony balustrades were removed and remnant tiles now form a display at one end of the waterfront balcony.

RECOMMENDATION

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

3.2 4PM 5-7 ALEXANDRA STREET, HUNTERS HILL (DA2022-0182)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Presenters:

- Graham Brooks, GBA Heritage
- Nancy Aly, Project Manager
- Michael Esba, Applicant

Graham Brooks pointed out that: the architect of the proposal has changed, the existing stair has been kept, the rear wing addition has been pulled away from the

existing house, more heritage research has been undertaken to understand the existing structure and construction dates of additions. The existing structure has been heavily modified over time. The rear addition is 2 storeys but set well back. A single pitched roof is proposed over the older rear wing to be retained. More variety is introduced to the landscaping. The architectural expression of the new rear addition, particularly to the 1st floor is lighter so as not to compete with the architecture of the main house. Graham Brooks explained these were a vertical slatted timber screen to the 1st floor. It was clarified that these screens were operable in front of doors. The timber slatted screens have been extended around to the western elevation of the rear addition as well. The timber screen extends above the gutter height. Graham Brooks explained this would essentially be a gutter behind a fascia. Glazing has been removed from one side of the walkway

Michael Esba explained some landscape changes have been made in response to previous CAP comments. The mature tree proposed to be removed has health issues.

Michael Esba and Nancy Aly pointed out the owner required more storage space on the property, and to protect the vehicles from the weather – which is why it is proposed to completely enclose an existing garage that is currently open to the garden.

Comments from the Panel:

- The landscape design be modified to a more informal garden design with more complexity and a greater variety of plant species including species which contribute to the natural environment, with more detail provided on the landscape plan
- There is a concern about tree loss.
- The walkway to the garage should be redesigned as an open loggia structure more in keeping with the garden setting – rather than having a wall glazed. Or deleted completely.
- A number of concerns about the lack of information on the documentation were raised. The wall surface of the rear addition behind the timber screening is not shown/noted. There is no detail on the treatment of the edges of the timber slatted screens.
- The Colorbond “Monument” roof colour chosen for the rear skillion roofs is not an appropriate colour, both from sustainability point of view and also because it reads as a dark roof. A lighter colour for this roofing is recommended.
- The panel commended the applicants on retention of the existing staircase and the separation of the rear 2 storey addition into a rear pavilion.
- The panel recommends that the applicant provide more detailed architectural plans that show clearly what early fabric is being retained and what is being demolished (using different colours for early fabric of differing dates).
- The panel expressed concern about the removal of any original fabric, internal or external, particularly in relation to new or enlarged openings in

sandstone walls, however this will be clarified in the floor plans requested above.

- The garage structure remain open to the garden or be enclosed with lightweight materials, and a detailed elevation provided.

RECOMMENDATION

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

3.3 4.30PM 9 WERAMBIE STREET, WOOLWICH (DA2022 0187)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Presenters:

- Mark Armstrong – ARC Architects
- Louise Oxnevad – ARC Architects
- Gus Charbel - Owner
- Brenda Charbel – Owner + 3 of 4 daughters
- Peter Weir of Weir and Phillips Heritage Architects

Mark Armstrong showed a view of the existing house from the waterfront, and pointed out this is a large waterfront adjacent to a heritage item “Wonga” on the western side of the property. There are substantial trees on the waterfront which are being retained. The current house is not ideal, with a constrained lower level floor plan and there are only 3 bedrooms, with the 4 children currently sharing bedrooms. The building line on the waterfront of the proposed new building is pulled back behind the waterfront building line of the adjacent heritage item, which assists in making the new house recessive in relation to the heritage item. The upper levels are stepped back, with the 4th level 25m back from the waterfront building line of the existing house. A photomontage was circulated which showed the top (4th) level of the proposed new house seen from the waterfront. The house is 20m from the street, behind a garage which is also setback from the street. The proposal puts the garaging beneath the building. The proposed building is pulled back from side boundaries 2m to introduce plantings along the western side particularly.

Mark Armstrong advised that the earlier pre-1943 house has been subsumed by later (circa 1980s) additions, including the garage.

Mark Armstrong said that the existing rock shelf it is being retained.

Mark Armstrong said the levels has 3m to 3.5m high ceilings instead of 2.4m so the level heights are increased compared to the existing house on the site.

Brenda Charbel pointed out the family need for floor space in the new building and how the house steps down the slope of the site.

Comments from the Panel:

- The Panel agreed the demolition of the existing house within the conservation area would be acceptable subject to the proposed development being sympathetic.
- The way the new north elevation to the waterfront presents with large areas of glass should be carefully reconsidered.
- The waterfront façade of the proposed house should be better articulated with detailed design elements to “soften” its presentation to the river and better fit within the setting of “Wonga”.
- A sandstone clad base to a new building, should be considered as it would be more in keeping with the context.
- The scale and proportionality of the design, the solid to void percentages, and how the new building will fit into the context, particularly as viewed from the waterfront, needs to be carefully reconsidered.
- A concern was raised about the proposed materials.
- From the water the underside of cantilevered areas can be seen, increasing the visual impact.
- Concern was expressed about how the new house could be seen as 4 storeys from the water and the opposite peninsula.
- There is a notable natural looking slope on the existing layout of the site with a stair going through the site, which responds to the natural topography, whereas the proposed new landscape design introduces an undesirable architectural formality that is not responding to the topography and interfering with the ground levels. This is a concern.
- The existing Jacaranda tree should be retained with slight modifications to the new house design.
- The balconies are also large and take away from the landscaped area
- Hunter’s Hill is the oldest garden suburb, and the CAP would like to encourage gardens rather than modern landscaping that relies on pebbles and buxus hedging.
- The Panel requested a site visit to examine the existing landscaping and topography and the relationship to the heritage item next door.
- Further feedback will be provided to the applicants following the site visit.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Panel advise its preliminary comments to the Director, Development and Regulatory Services.

3.4 5.00PM 38 HILLCREST AVENUE, GLADESVILLE (DA2022 0155)

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Presenters:

- Geoff Dalgliesh, Architect
- Stephanie & John Elias, property owners
- James Phillips, Heritage Consultant

- Daniel Ward, Architect

Presentation by Geoff Dalgliesh, the existing house is heavily modified and proposed to be demolished. The proposed new house has 1.5m side setbacks, and a 2 storey rear section is proposed, with a single storey presentation to the street. A swimming pool and landscaping is also proposed. James Phillips said the existing house is not contributory to the conservation area, but the design maintains a cottage presentation to the street and the existing side setbacks. The rear section is designed as a rear pavilion with good separation from the single storey section at the front.

Geoff Dalgleish advised that the continuous raised planter bed along the driveway was to provide a landscaping buffer between this property and the neighbouring property.

Geoff Dalgleish pointed out the height of the ground floor at the front is similar to that of the existing house and the neighbours.

James Phillips said that the height above the footpath level to the terrace is 2100mm.

Geoff Dalgliesh said that the proposed arrangement is to get two car spaces while minimising visual impacts.

Geoff Dalgliesh said the idea of the gable roof to the street is to get the similar proportions, but with stripped back detail to fit the new building into the conservation area.

Comments from the Panel:

1. The Panel was satisfied that demolition of the existing house within the conservation area was acceptable subject to the new design being sympathetic.
2. A concern was raised about the height of the proposed - almost like 3 storeys at the front due to the height above the footpath.
3. The gable and the details could be refined to add more detail.
4. The windows in the proposed house appear super-sized, and atypical of the conservation area. Window opening sizes should be reconsidered. Also, introducing transom lights would assist to break up the expanse of window. The roof slope of the rear roof must match that of the front section. The pitching point of the rear roof should be lowered (to ensure the height of the roof doesn't increase).
5. The colour scheme utilising black and very dark colours while currently fashionable, is not in keeping with the colours characteristic of contributory buildings in the conservation area. In particular black or very dark grey roofs are not sympathetic. The materials and finishes must be rethought so as to ensure they are sympathetic to the conservation area. Materials and colours commonly used for contributory buildings should be used.

6. The underground car parking pushes the height of the house up at the front. The extent of excavation is excessive. It was recommended that a design which required less excavation be considered.
7. The applicants should also consider the following:
 - refine details to make the house design more complimentary to the conservation area, such as more detailed window design, more detailed gable design.
 - modify external materials proposed to lighter coloured materials using earthy tones.
 - modify the parking arrangements to a tandem carport and reduce the amount of excavation proposed.
 - introduce more soft landscaped area and natural ground level along the north-eastern boundary of the property.
 - modify the roof pitch of the rear section of the proposed building to a steeper pitch by lowering the roof pitch point.

RECOMMENDATION

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

The meeting closed at 7.30pm.

The next meeting is Wednesday 14 December 2022.