

## Heritage Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2022/1715
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Alterations and additions to a dwelling house including a swimming pool
<b>Date:</b>	03/11/2023
<b>To:</b>	Gareth David
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 56 DP 7794 , 60 Hudson Parade CLAREVILLE NSW 2107

### Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the property was identified as potentially being of heritage significance.		
Details of heritage items affected		
There is no inventory information for this property. However the property is a brick and concrete dwelling designed by the well known Australian architect Bruce Rickard in the late 1980s.		
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	N/A	
Consideration of Application		
<p>This response to amended plans follows on the initial discussions with the owners and their architects in which the unusual nature of this house as a Rickard design - one that has not been heritage listed, but which clearly has an importance as both an exemplar of his work and part of his body of work - was freely acknowledged and indeed cited by the owners as pivotal in their decision to buy the property.</p> <p><b>APPROACH</b></p> <p>The extent of change - demolition and integration of new areas - within the existing house was a concern arising out of the original modification plans, and following a site meeting and inspection and discussions with the owners and their architects, comment was provided and emphasis placed upon keeping the most obvious and significant characteristics and characteristic parts of the house, while acceding that change of the comparatively simple and "lesser" parts of the house might occur, depending on design.</p>		

While the house is not a heritage item it is clearly of heritage interest and its conservation as an example of Rickard's work - and in part, a strategic one - is more than desirable. There is, according to one's philosophy, a responsibility involved. There are very obvious resonances between this house, the Mackenzie House as it is called in the authoritative Rickard "Catalogue Raisonné", and the earlier Curry House 2 (1980) which is arguably one of Rickard's master-work domestic statements and achievements.

To this end the preparedness of the owners and their architects to work with Council in addressing the heritage dimensions of the project is most welcome and much appreciated.

It could be argued that the key areas of the house, and those to which significance obviously attaches, are those extending back from the "rear" east wall of the kitchen. The areas east of the stair, focussed on the entry and lesser bedrooms and service areas, are plain by comparison and while there is function as a "foil" to the more ambitious, primary statement areas of the house, there is an acknowledgeable capacity for adaptation.

These comments examine the changes to the existing house, the link passage and central pool area, and the new garage and guest pavilion.

#### THE EXISTING HOUSE

The amended plans retain the main roof profile, distinguishing the addition by a lowered break roof at the current end gable. While it is regrettable that demolition extends to the kitchen area and its north bay, the new work retains the essential manner of integration with a projecting bay to the north and rear of the projecting terrace (and master bedroom) below. Revised bedrooms, bathrooms and a revised line of wall to the southern elevation complete the adapted house. The new southern side of the house allows for a new line of corridor access and stairs connecting the levels, within a differentiated timber-walled lateral extension kept under the existing main roof form. The projecting corner music room is an interpretation of Rickard's opening corner of the existing house.

The drawings show the ground around the projecting new lower ground living area and studio to be more level and finish-paved, where in its current perhaps less formal presentation, the ground is left more natural and unfinished. This might be contemplated in the new landscaping of this area, which will admittedly have a different relationship with the site. However in light of other changes made to better reflect Rickard's design, this matter will not be pursued.

#### LINK PASSAGE AND POOL

The linking passage between the new arrival areas and the new main circulation areas of the house has been lightened in its treatment from the original presentations. Some concern must arise from the proposed pool in its shape and landscape setting, as its scale and size in the central space, its angularity and that of the associated walls are all something of a strong departure from the simple shape and settings of Rickard's pools, which suggest that a simpler, orthogonal character for the pool and its containing walls would be more appropriate. Its angularity and shapes reflect the new garage/guest pavilion but are arguably promise a discordant and divergent character from the house, with which it will read strongly.

#### GARAGE/GUEST PAVILION

In its scale, bulk and dramatic presence this element of the proposal represents the most challenging and obvious change to the setting of the Rickard house. Like the pool, the angularity of the pavilion's roof with its concrete prow-shaped projection to the street, is divergent from Rickard's line and character. The original building cannot be seen to great advantage from its street frontage and its substantial setback, to enjoy the best views from the land, left opening for the pavilion strategy which is now part of a way to retain and adapt the house in the context of its highly upscaled values and the current expectations of such a site.

## CONCLUSION

The heritage question to be addressed in assessment of the proposal is whether or not the significance of the house will be unacceptably compromised by the proposal. Three aspects of it require focus - the existing house, the proposed addition (garage pavilion and link) and the pool court and landscaping between the house and addition.

The additions to the house have been negotiated to a responsive approach in the changes required. The key aspect of the house - its presentation to the Sound, recognisably its designer's work, will remain.

The new garage pavilion and link will be recognisably a "different work" and will constitute a different approach path and experience to the house. Their reconciliation with the retained Rickard nucleus of the house has been carefully considered. Opinions on their success will vary.

The pool court continues design themes and character inherent in the new elements into the setting of the existing house, its alterations and particularly the retained Rickard projections to the north. In my opinion the pool court and pool could beneficially adopt a simpler, more rectangular line in its interface with the retained Rickard core of the dwelling, and I would recommend this be put to the applicants for their consideration. A reduction in the different line and angularity of the pool and associated stairs and simpler landscaping reflecting Rickard's approach may be helpful. Heritage will condition that the pool shape be amended to straighten its edges and its setback to the north increased to allow for more soft landscaping.

Inherent in these conclusions are the opinion that the significance and circumstances of the house do not support a greater intervention by Council. It is often a convenient excuse in such circumstances to rely on the existence of other greater and better examples of an architect's work. This is frequently raised by heritage consultants in support of adverse approaches and impacts on significant buildings. However, the unlisted status of this house and its comparison with other works by Rickard lead to a conclusion of that effect.

## SUMMARY

Therefore Heritage can support the proposal subject to two conditions being a full photographic archival recording of the site, and amending the pool shape and increasing the northern setback to allow for more landscaping.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP.

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? No

Has a CMP been provided? No

Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? No

Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? No

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:

## CONDITIONS TO BE SATISFIED PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF THE CONSTRUCTION CERTIFICATE

### **Pool Design and Setback**

Amended plans shall be issued to the Certifier prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to include the following details:

- An increase to the pool's northern wall outside edge setback to 2m with the additional setback area replaced with soft landscaping; and
- The pool amended to a straightened edge design.

Details demonstrating compliance with this condition are to be provided to the Principal Certifying Authority.

Reason: To provide an appropriate pool and landscaping design to the Rickard House

### **Photographic Archival Recording**

A full photographic archival recording is to be made of the site (including interiors and exteriors), surrounding structures and buildings as well as their setting (including any major landscape elements). This record is to be prepared generally in accordance with the guidelines issued by NSW Heritage and must be submitted to Council's Heritage Officer for approval, prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

The photographic record should be made using digital technology and must include:

- Location of property, date of survey and author of survey;
- A site plan at a scale of 1:200 showing all structures and major landscape elements;
- Floor plans of any buildings at a scale of 1:100;
- Photographs which fully document the site cross referenced in accordance with recognised archival recording practice to catalogue sheets.

Details demonstrating compliance with this condition are to be provided to the Principal Certifying Authority.

Reason: To provide an archival photographic record of this site prior to the commencement of any works.