

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2021/2625
Date:	31/03/2022
To:	Nick Keeler
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 504413 , 16 A Ruskin Rowe AVALON BEACH NSW 2107

Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>This proposal for alterations and additions to an existing dwelling has been referred for Heritage comment as the subject property is situated within the sensitive Ruskin Rowe subdivision recognised as a Heritage Conservation Area in the Pittwater LEP 2014. The context in which the dwelling is located constitutes an historic and sensitive, developed environment in which buildings are “dispersed” within a considered, densely vegetated landscaped setting.</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>Details of the Ruskin Rowe Conservation Area</p> <p>The nature of the HCA is such that development involving individual sites and houses within it, on its component lots, could adversely affect the heritage significance of the subdivision and combined setting. The way in which individual dwellings affect the shared landscape of the HCA is critical to maintenance of its values and importance. This perspective has been applied in considering the response of the proposal.</p> <p><u>Statement of Significance</u></p> <p>The Ruskin Rowe Heritage Conservation Area is significant in the evolution and pattern of the history of New South Wales for its design principles and patterns that are still clearly legible.</p> <p>The street is named after Harry Ruskin Rowe, a prominent Sydney architect who subdivided the area in 1950. Rowe's vision was to create a special subdivision with large lots in which vegetation would dominate over houses. This area represents the most "pure" example of the character of residential developments which were occurring in the Avalon area after WWII. Ruskin Rowe has research potential for its innovative subdivision design and is also scientifically significant due to the low density nature of the area and the retention of a wide range of fauna, including koalas, bandicoots and native birds.</p>		
Other relevant heritage listings		
Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	No	Comment if applicable
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		
<p>The proposal involves alterations and additions to the front of the dwelling, which strategically improves its amenity through enlarged accommodation, new garaging, a new entry incorporating lift access from the garage, new entry stairs and a swimming pool located unusually at the entrance to the house. It logically adopts and extends the established design language of the existing dwelling, although it is a large addition, extending across the front of the house. It will read as a compatibly extended dwelling.</p> <p>The existing side setbacks of the house are retained and thus its effects upon its neighbours each side, and the separating spaces between the houses are not of concern in a heritage sense. The characteristic, deep setback of the dwelling from its street frontage is also not affected to any concerning degree, although the character of the new approach driveway to the house will affect how the house is seen in its garden setting – as will its materials and colour palette. In short the house is receiving new additions without any consequent adverse impact in terms of bulk, scale, and form – which is unusual and welcome.</p> <p>Therefore, no objections are raised on heritage grounds and no conditions required.</p> <p>Two concerns could be shared with the applicant for discussion about minor but helpful positive amendments, which could support the better integration of the altered dwelling in its context :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of a glazed and probably reflective glass balustrade to the pool will, in its frontal location, be prominent and debatably inconsistent with the overall presentation and character of the house;. A see though, minimal metal balustrade would be less intrusive and just as friendly to desirable through-vision; and - The extent of the work provides an opportunity to consider the colour of the building as presented to the street and in the collective character of the houses and street combination. A more recessive colour scheme than the white and off-white combination could settle the house better into its verdant landscaping and the dense gardened character of the precinct, as was intended by its developer. <p><u>Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP2014:</u> Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? No Has a CMP been provided? N/A Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? Yes Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? Yes</p>		
Further Comments		
<p>The proposal is acceptable in heritage terms, with suggestions posed as to the nature of the front pool balustrade and the colour scheme for the house, as detailed above.</p> <p>COMPLETED BY: Robert Moore, Heritage Advisor (external) DATE: 31 March 2022</p>		

The proposal is therefore supported.

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

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.