

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2024/0362
Proposed Development:	Construction of a garage, driveway, inclinator and associated works
Date:	20/05/2024
To:	Megan Surtees
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 113 DP 6937 , 91 Florida Road PALM BEACH NSW 2108

Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the subject site is within a heritage conservation area and adjoins a heritage item</p> <p>Florida Road Heritage Conservation Area The Moorings - 93 Florida Road</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>Florida Road Heritage Conservation Area <u>Statement of Significance</u> The Florida Road Heritage Conservation Area includes a group of houses representing an early phase of residential development in Palm Beach. The street is an anthology of local architectural styles.</p> <p><u>Physical Description</u> The houses in the street are a mix of sizes and date from a variety of periods and appear to be a mixture of holiday and permanent homes. These are generally early to mid twentieth century buildings. Number 91 is a contributory item</p> <p>The Moorings <u>Statement of Significance</u> The Moorings at 93 Florida Road in Palm Beach, completed in 1919 to the design of the well-known Sydney architect James Peddle, has historic and aesthetic significance as a holiday house typical of the early Pittwater subdivisions.</p> <p><u>Physical Description</u> This house is located on an elevated site block. It is a one-storey stone house on a stone base with garage underneath featuring low pitched metal deck roof, creosoted slab and batten walls. Of notable interest is the thicket of palms and paperbarks in the front garden.</p>		
Other relevant heritage listings		
SEPP (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021	No	
Australian Heritage Register	No	
NSW State Heritage Register	No	
National Trust of Aust (NSW) Register	No	

RAIA Register of 20th Century Buildings of Significance	No	
Other	N/A	
Consideration of Application		
<p>The proposal has been referred to an external heritage advisor who provided comments on the previous proposals for the site. The advisor has commented as follows</p> <p>It is regrettable that the earlier garage proposals at the rear of the property did not prove possible, for access reasons I understand, and now we must consider a proposal which raises the issue of how best to integrate garaging at the frontage of the site. The architect has brought the character of the frontal addition to the house, which also reached an acceptable scheme through negotiations, to this latest phase of the property's upgrade.</p> <p>Burying the two-car garage into the site is one way of hiding the bulk and scale of what would otherwise be a substantial building placed where there has not been one previously. Single car, stone-built garages let into the site, visibly complementary but controlled in size, are one tolerable solution. However when two cars need housing, the structure begins to become large and potentially obtrusive in context.</p> <p>Having considered what the application drawings show, and indicate to be the owners' desired outcome, I'd suggest the following design adjustments aimed at reducing impact :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the width of the garage and garage door are accentuated by the upstand concrete retaining wall and "awning beam" above it ; an alternative structural concept may allow deletion of the awning beam, and lowering of the upstand wall if it has less garden bed to retain at the front of the garage roof ; this reduction of the vertical wall would mean less emphasis upon the visual impact of the structure ; - the upstand concrete wall at the southern edge of the planted roof, partly supporting a handrail, might be reduced in favour of a simple open metal handrail, so again there is less building, visual mass and complication ; - the timber clad garage door will pick up on established themes and be linked to the house ; any possible decrease in width would be welcome ; - it would be desirable to reduce the area of the stone pitched garage driveway apron ; I will send a sketch drawn over the plan to suggest how this might be achieved ; - simplified treatment of the stair to the south of the garage, which promises to become by default the main stair entrance, might also help tone down and simplify the garage surrounds and landscaping measures ; informal irregular stonework would be less obtrusive than concrete or regular stone walls. <p>The drawings also helpfully show the retention and probable enhancement of the original/early stone pier and timber rail front fence. The piers are very rare now and should be retained, meaningfully joining the new landscape works.</p> <p>Therefore Heritage is currently unable to support the proposal and requires amendments.</p> <p>Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP.</p>		

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? No Has a CMP been provided? No Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? Yes Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? Yes

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.