

# Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2022/0469
•	

Date:	23/06/2022
То:	Jordan Davies
• ` ` '	Lot 11 DP 1207743 , 1102 Barrenjoey Road PALM BEACH NSW 2108

#### Officer comments

### HERITAGE COMMENTS

# Discussion of reason for referral

The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the site adjoins a heritage item and is located opposite another

"Barrenjoey House" (restaurant and accommodation) - 1108 Barrenjoey Road

Norfolk Island Pines - 1149 Barrenjoey Road

# Details of heritage items affected

Details of the items as contained within the Pittwater inventory is as follows:

#### **Barrenjoey House**

# Statement of Significance

Barrenjoey House is historically significant as it has been in nearly continuous use as a restaurant and guest house since it was built in 1923 by Albert Verrils. It was also the first place in Palm Beach to have a telephone and as such it holds social significance for the Palm Beach community.

#### Physical Description

This plastered two-storey plastered brick building with pitched roof was built as a guest house in 1923. It features a sunny dining room with windows the length of one wall overlooking the water and a large terrace with canvas canopy for outdoor dining. The interior retains traditional character including wallpaper and emu chandeliers.

#### **Norfolk Island Pines**

# Statement of Significance

The Norfolk Island Pines are of local historic and aesthetic significance as a fine representative example of the widespread use of this species for ornamental plantings in coastal areas.

#### Physical Description

A fine planting of mature specimens of Araucaria heterophylla (Norfolk Island Pine) in Pittwater Park, adjacent to the public wharf at Palm Beach and across Barrenjoey Road from Barrenjoey House. The trees are along the western and southern edges of this park which includes a children's playground and car park. The trees provide welcome shade for picnickers using the Pittwater beach

Other relevant heritage listings			
Sydney Regional	No		
Environmental Plan (Sydney			
Harbour Catchment) 2005			
•			

DA2022/0469 Page 1 of 3



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 site is not a heritage item but is located adjacent to a heritage item and within a key urban setting of Palm Beach. The heritage item critically affected by the proposal is Barrenjoey House, whose significance is not in dispute and for which its historical details and aspects of that significance can be found in Council's heritage inventory entry for the property. Across Barrenjoey Road the stand of Norfolk Island Pines along the western and southern ends of the Park and associated carpark area is also listed. The significance of these trees is also not disputed.

This referral responds to DA2022/0469, which presents a new proposal for the development of the subject site, following earlier schemes and a modification proposal relating to the erstwhile approval for the site. The scheme follows protracted discussions with Council officers in which all participants have sought to achieve a mutually satisfactory and better heritage outcome for the property and the Palm Beach locality in which it is so prominent.

The plans which are the subject of this application have emerged from discussions and responses by Council to several schemes explored by the proponents and their architect and heritage consultants. The development is obviously one of critical importance in the future of Palm Beach and Barrenjoey House, as reflected in the nature of the many submissions received by Council from residents and the public.

In the discussions and successive iterations of the design, the impact of so large a building on Barrenjoey House has been a central concern expressed by Council. The scale, bulk, and in particular height and length have been much discussed, as has the character and architectural expression that such a major building might assume. Earlier schemes referenced architectural styles and detail that were not seen as consistent with the desired future character of Palm Beach, or compatible and considerate of Barrenjoey House. The relative length of the building, compared to Barrenjoey House, its height and the various schemes for a colonnaded facade treatment of verandahs, balconies and glazed gables and dormer windows, have been matters of review. It has been suggested and has been explored, that the building might be divided into "bays" and articulated to break up its length.

In the current scheme, the form of the building has been arranged as a central breakfront element with three pier-supported, hip roofed balcony structures; similar vestigial elements are found to each side with one above the double-width parking garage entrance. Above the verandah/balconies of the ground and first floor, a third level of hipped, glazed wall forms follows the planning with tow glazed gable elements set above the separating spaces of the front balconies. The verandah plate level of the balconies picks up the gutter line of Barrenjoey House but the third level above this is all much higher and more visually complex than the roof of Barrenjoey House and despite its articulation, imparts a scale and height which diminish the older building.

In my opinion, the scale and height of the building remain problematic and with this obvious and apparent difficulty, the request through a Clause 4.6 Objection is not well founded and unreasonable,

DA2022/0469 Page 2 of 3



posing a clear conflict with the heritage considerations that the proposal must address. The third level is an undeniable problem, and should be eliminated, or substantially reduced to in-roof forms, avoiding gables and dormers. Its expanse is not clearly appreciable from the streetscape imagery. The current gabled glazed forms in particular are obtrusive and unhelpful. The level also extends to the end wall lines, with only some slight setback at the southern end - both of these end elevation treatments accentuating the building's height.

While the ground floor colonnade is understandable and the idea supportable, it can still be reduced in scale and height for beneficial effect, using the valances suggested by Council to help visually humanize the scale of the square arches. The first floor level is more problematic in that it is of excessive height, more suited to a public building or palazzo that a contemporary domestic apartment building. Its floor level is already higher than the first floor of Barrenjoey House, and the eaves and gutter line are equal to the older building when they could be lower, to beneficial effect. There are reductions possible in scale and expression by address of these detail matters, which cumulatively, inflate the building's size in context.

There are different strategies and design philosophies abroad in which the brief for this project might be approached in different ways. Three virtually separate buildings could be set upon a car park basement platform and better relate to the scale of Barrenjoey House, while adopting a different design character which while contemporary, might strike a less challenging affront to the heritage building, and to the character, scale and grain of development in this important "west village centre" of Palm Beach.

The current proposal has not brought the development to a format acceptable in heritage terms. The design changes suggested above may be helpful in determining how the scheme can avoid its current problems – scale, bulk, height, length, and a design character which is not respectful of the adjacent heritage item, the established character of the locality, or its desired future character as expressed by Council.

Therefore Heritage is unable to support the proposal.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP.

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? Has a CMP been provided? Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided?

**Further Comments** 

**COMPLETED BY: Robert Moore** 

DATE: 23 June 2022

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.

DA2022/0469 Page 3 of 3