

## Heritage Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2022/0840
<b>Date:</b>	16/09/2022
<b>To:</b>	Maxwell Duncan
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 1 DP 932637 , 41 Pacific Parade MANLY NSW 2095

### Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the property the subject property is within proximity to heritage items, listed in Schedule 5 of Manly LEP 2013:</p> <p><b>Item I2 – All stone kerbs</b> - Manly municipal area</p> <p><b>Item I191 - Street trees</b> - Pacific Parade</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>Details of the heritage items as contained within the Northern Beaches inventory is as follows:</p> <p><b>Item I2 – All stone kerbs</b>  <u>Statement of significance:</u>            Stone kerbs are heritage listed.  <u>Physical description:</u>            Sandstone kerbing to streets relating to paving and kerbing of streets in the nineteenth century. Mostly located within Manly Village area and adjacent lower slopes of Eastern Hill and Fairlight.</p> <p><b>Item I191 - Street trees</b>  <u>Statement of significance:</u>            Listed for its aesthetic importance to the streetscape.  <u>Physical description:</u>            Avenue planting of mixed tree species planted in carriageway. Species include Port Jackson Fig, Brush Box and Camphor Laurel.</p>		
Other relevant heritage listings		
Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	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	No	
Consideration of Application		

The proposal seeks consent for alterations and additions to the existing property including a new rear two storey extension and extensive parking bay to the front of the property. The proposal was referred to an external heritage advisor who provided the following comments.

- The proposal is supported by a Heritage Impact Statement which makes some important concessions in regard to the heritage value of this property, notwithstanding the absence of heritage listing or inclusion in a HCA. The report is presented to address the potential significance of this site (and the house) and the impact of the proposed works both upon the dwelling and on its context.
- Two items of Heritage are mentioned as potentially affected but only one seems identified - the street trees.
- While the heritage assessment of the property carefully chooses its phrasing its acknowledges that this is an example of a Victorian period dwelling which makes "some contribution to the area" including the perception of a "strong heritage character from Pacific Parade". importantly it is also acknowledged that it retains its garden setting.
- Assertions in regard to the impact of previous alterations to the dwelling are not supported by evidence in the Statement. To assert that the dwelling has no social significance requires evidence of investigation to identify or discover any such value.
- In summary the HIS concedes that the dwelling has historic, aesthetic and representative value, and makes contribution to the streetscape, but supports the acceptability of the proposal.

In my opinion:

- This is a strongly characterful Victorian villa/cottage distinctive for its polygonal front asymmetrical bay and vermont verandah, which retains significant detail. It presents as intact and authentic to the street and these values are open to knowledgeable interpretation and consolidation in any improvement of the house, by informed conservation and adaptation works. The house is of a character and quality which would suggest it could be a pattern book design or designed by a local architect.
- No evidence of the internal condition is provided but the plan drawing suggests that the interiors retain much of their layout and should not be discounted. A Heritage Architect might provide a different view with a less costly strategy for the retention of its interior walls and features which could enable its presentation as a sensitively modernised Victorian villa.
- The combination of the the complete gutting of the house, and an unsympathetic dominating addition will render it essentially valueless in heritage terms. This approach extends to the front garden where the streetscape contribution, and setting of the house itself, are to be negated by an inappropriate parking bay more suited to a commercial context. The domestic front garden and setting of this house, so consistent with the street should be retained and any parking for the property provided with access from the rear lane.
- The form of the first floor addition is unsympathetic and this is reinforced by the fashionable but inappropriate materials unrelated to this dwelling. The planning of the upper level could easily be rationalised to allow a better form recessively placed behind the hipped roof of the existing house. A straight front wall is clearly necessary, preferable to an abrupt, stepped and complicated form. A hipped roof kept low and set behind and off the existing hipped roof

should be preferred. Materials should respond to those in the existing house. The upper level should not have windows to the front or should conceal them to assuage the building's scale, and be proportioned and detailed to maintain a low profile. Elongated horizontal strip windows may be fashionable but are oppositional in style to this house and diminish its integrity for no advantage.

- In short, the proposed extension has not been composed to minimise the impacts of the development upon the house and the streetscape, which they could easily have been. The proposal is regrettably disordered in context and would be disruptive of the existing streetscape qualities. A cohesive and positive outcome supporting the house and its larger context is possible.

Based on the above, Heritage would be unable to support the proposal and would recommend changes to address the above concerns.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of Manly LEP 2013.

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.