

## Heritage Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2023/0422
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Alterations and additions to a dwelling house including a carport with studio and lane extension
<b>Date:</b>	29/08/2023
<b>To:</b>	Gareth David
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 113 DP 6937 , 91 Florida Road PALM BEACH NSW 2108

### Officer comments

<b>HERITAGE COMMENTS</b>		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the subject property is within a heritage conservation area and adjoins a heritage item</p> <p><b>Florida Road Heritage Conservation Area</b></p> <p><b>The Moorings - 93 Florida Road</b></p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p><b>Florida Road Heritage Conservation Area</b></p> <p><u>Statement of Significance</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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><b>The Moorings</b></p> <p><u>Statement of Significance</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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		
RAIA Register of 20th Century Buildings of Significance		
Other	No	

#### Consideration of Application

This application constitutes a further proposal for alterations and additions to the cottage at 91 Florida Road, formerly known as 'T'idapa'. The cottage has been identified as contributory item within the HCA and as such the proposals for it have been subject of extended discussions with the applicants and their architect. These have been entered into with good spirit and the intent by all involved to determine a scheme of the house which will respect its undoubted heritage interest while responding to the obvious desirability of enhancing its usefulness and utility in support of its conservation. The cottage is a rare survivor in Palm Beach of the earliest phase of its suburban consolidation when its intentionally rustic or artistic and modest beach cottage retreats were built by discerning owners. The current proposal represents a reworking of earlier proposal DA2021/2539 which was withdrawn. The new proposal builds on the advice provided by Heritage in its response to that proposal.

In the prior proposal Heritage provided the following advice. *'T'idapa is a small cottage, now set upon a highly valuable site. In this context it is similar to other significant small buildings, like most of the Castlecrag dwellings design by Walter and Marion Burley Griffin. To add to them without eclipsing their heritage values is difficult and almost certainly devolves immediately to how extra accommodation to suit their current day purposes can be added as a linked or detached pavilion, that does not challenge the significance of the building or its context. The proposed detached carport/studio behind and above the house follows this thinking and in heritage terms could be supported as a solution for this property. it would be read behind and above the main house, and seen to defer to the original building.*

*Further accommodation might be possible, concealed within and below a terrace set in front of and below the house - and read from the frontage as a stone-built terrace. It would be sited so as not to require change in the existing cottage. As a way forward for the property, this should be discussed.'*

It was further noted on the previous scheme *'In adding substantially to the front of the dwelling, the proposal could not be concluded to be consistent with its existing form, as the front elevation and detail of the cottage would be extensively changed. The way in which the house sits upon the ground of the site, set upon its sandstone piers with broad batten lattice infill, as viewed from the street below, would be lost'*.

This new proposal presents the same essential components but is informed by Council's concerns and suggestions. Heritage will consider each of the three main components in turn.

#### Changes to the cottage

These involve demolition of partition walls and sections to combine spaces (kitchen), allow circulation (bedroom 1) and access to the new rear (ensuite) bathroom upon the back verandah. A new bay window is proposed along with the delineation and fit out of two new bathrooms. The combined kitchen is to be refitted and a new access stair to the cottage (shared with the front addition) is proposed at the north east corner.

It is suggested that these works could be supported subject to the following changes to reduce the impact:

- Deletion of Window W21 beside the new bay window
- Deletion of louver window panel forming part of W17
- All new windows to be of timber joinery construction matching the detail and scantlings of existing
- Salvaged timber elements, doors and windows and stonework to be reused on site
- At the north east corner the vertically timber boarded timber balustrade to the new return entry stair gives over emphasis and too much weight to this element which should be replaced by an open metal work balustrade
- The roof of the cottage seems noted to be replaced with metal roofing; this should be Custom Orb profile, corrugated galvanised steel left natural to weather or if Colourbond, finished in Woodland Grey or Jasper with compatible flashings and rainwater goods.

#### Lower foreground addition

The scheme proposes a half embedded and part excavated lower ground level providing additional accommodation all set under a roof top terrace whose trafficable area is limited by a vertically cantilevered metal balustrade and planters. The whole is set down below the lattice screens and piers under the cottage proper so that sight lines to the cottage should see it substantially much as currently presented. This part of the scheme appear to promise a more successful outcome than earlier proposal, subject to the amendment of the stair as noted above and the adoption of an appropriate colour scheme and integration into an overall planting scheme. It would make sense to tone down the joinery of the new lower level so as to not give it undue emphasis. A limited colour palette scheme supporting the black stained cladding would pursue this.

#### Carport studio

The carport develops the earlier carport scheme which was supported as an approach to adopt. There might be an advantage for the ridge of the gable to be set across the carport so as to avoid the height of the gable rearing up behind the cottage and visually increasing its height. Steps in the plane of the boarded cladding (such as a shadow line) at the carport floor and studio sill level might further break up the verticality of the structure. The proposed 'Rough Federation Render' to the Livistona Lane retaining wall will need to be replaced with irregular rough course sandstone walling and the timber cladding balustrades on the access stairs could similarly be changed to metal. The landscape setting between the cottage and carport studio should endeavour to retain the surviving early landscape elements such as the stonework, walls and paths.

#### Conclusion

Heritage would like to acknowledge the consideration and effort that the owners and architect have gone to respond to Heritage's concerns with the earlier proposals. The revised scheme that has now come forward presents a much more satisfactory proposal for 'T'idapa' than its predecessors and subject to the changes required above could be supported.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP.

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? A CMP or Conservation Management Strategy could be produced to guide the works and conservation of the house

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.