

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2019/0849
To:	Benjamin Price
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 965161 , 9 Denison Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 1 DP 965161 , 11 Denison Street MANLY NSW 2095

Officer comments

Further to a review of available documents and a site visit

The site of proposed development is not heritage listed in its own right, however, it is in the Pittwater Road heritage conservation area, and in vicinity of a number of listed items, notably including St Mary's Church, presbytery and school. The conjoined houses at Nos. 9-13 are also part of the row of historic cottages at 11-17 Denison Street (situated on the crossing with Whistler Street) and directly across similarly designed row of historic cottages at 8-20 Denison Street.

Given the topography, and the layout of sites, the roof of the subject site is facing layout of the sites, the roof of No. 9 is directly facing Whistler Street. The roof of the subject site, however, is partly visible from further points in Whistler Street, particularly in months when vegetation loses much of its leaves.

1.0 The submitted heritage report

On the same p.10, the report says: *"With respect to the subject site's heritage significance, the proposal aims to retain the heritage characteristics of the front façade."* and *"The rear of the building will be demolished, and replaced with a contemporary open-plan living, dining and kitchen area, that will suit the*

needs of contemporary families."

Note: The proposal to retain the "heritage characteristics of the front façade" is unacceptable, and was abandoned in the 1960s, particularly after the introduction of The Burra Charter. The same applies to the argument that proposal should suit the needs of the current owner.

Terminology is not in keeping with *The Burra Charter*. Instead, terms not known to me are used including, e.g. : *almost identical scale* (p. 10).

Note: "Scale" is defined as number of floors. A house may be single storey, which the terraces are now. Single storey houses are identified by not having stairs (because all rooms are on same level and thus stairs are obsolete. I do not understand how can a house have "almost" identical scale - does it remain single storey, or is its proposed to change scale to two storey? Furthermore, on the same page, the report states: "additional storey above can support the increasing density" which contradicts the previous statement, and appears to agree that the addition is a storey, and thus that proposal is to change the scale of the terraces. Note that change of scale is a major change in the architectural character of the houses. If it was approved as proposed, it would be very hard to identify the original floorplan, and one of major features of the terraces would be lost.

The submitted heritage report notes that "Each individual dwelling is a two bedroom, one bathroom, one storey cottage with rear access from Whistler Street. The subject sites are situated within the Pittwater Road Conservation Area, a conservation area that is characterised by one storey Federation terraces that are either attached or semi detached from their adjoining dwellings" - yet the report supports the proposal to convert two of these minuscule terraces into one, substantial, two-floor, six-room, four-bathroom residence.

The report supports demolition of the partition wall, now backbone of the architectural character and the floor plan, apparently for amenity reasons. This would have a major adverse impact on the terraces.

Part of the proposal is also a relatively large "eye-lid" dormer, of awkward proportions and oversized dimensions, proposed on No.9 and to face Whistler Street. This element is additionally unacceptable in its own right, due to its impact on the conservation area, as evidenced by its position and design. The awkward rear elevation to the two terraces also would have a major adverse impact on the area, as its awkward proportions and roof slope, material and general form would create a major impact in terms of visibility from Whistler Street and potential precedent.

In summary, the heritage report claims that compliance with DCP is achieved, and that heritage impact of the proposal would be acceptable. In my opinion, the arguments offered do not achieve that goal. Therefore, after I have carefully read the submitted heritage report, I cannot accept its findings and conclusions.

Based on the above, I deem the proposal to contradict the Objectives and Controls of the MLEP and MDCP heritage sections, and have major objections to the proposal from heritage perspective.

Detailed assessment against the controls can be provided, if needed by the development assessment officer.

Kind Regards
Zoran Popovic| Heritage Adviser

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.