

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2024/1670
Proposed Development:	Alterations and additions to a dwelling house
Date:	26/02/2025
To:	Brittany Harrison
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 538888 , 77 Myola Road NEWPORT NSW 2106

Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
The proposal has been referred to Heritage as the subject site is a heritage item		
Bungania - 77 Myola Road		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p><u>Statement of Significance</u></p> <p>Bungania, at 77 Myola Road Newport, was built c.1890 by A.G. Yewen as a house for his family, has historic and aesthetic significance as a sandstone cottage dating from the early development of Newport used as an artists' colony. It is the oldest surviving building on Bungan Head, being part of the early subdivision. The house itself displays significant architectural features such as stone walls, high gothic ceilings and open fireplaces with the stone used quarried from the site. It is an important representative of its type in the locality.</p> <p><u>Physical Description</u></p> <p>The house is located on a steep sloped site covered with large rocks, trees and ferns with scenic views over Pittwater. View from the street is screened by luxuriant vegetation creating a natural bush setting. The house follows the contours of the hillside and comprises of a rambling single storey house with significant architectural features such as stone walls, high gothic ceilings, iron roof and weatherboard definitions as well as open fireplaces with the stone used quarried from the site. It is importantly representative of its type in the locality.</p>		
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	Yes	
RAIA Register of 20th Century Buildings of Significance	No	
Other		
Consideration of Application		
The proposal seeks consent for alterations and additions to the heritage item. This includes a new two storey wing with garage. The proposal has been referred to an external heritage advisor for advice. The advisor has considered the proposal and provided the following response:		

In short I am surprised and disappointed by this proposal, which comes after extensive dialogue - about options for subdivision and development, examined over time. In this my position and that of Council has been consistent, while trying above all to be constructive and helpful. I cannot conclude that this proposal is appropriate for the property, or considerate of its heritage significance, which has been examined and enunciated at length in previous advice. I cannot agree with the conclusions of the HIS that the proposal is appropriate and worthy of consent.

The scale, bulk, form and character of the proposal are such that the existing heritage item would be overwhelmed by the additions and relegated to appearing as the lesser development on its site. The juxtaposition of the two, two-storey elements, their proximity to the listed cottage, their height and bulk in particular are all such that the significance of the cottage and its appreciation would be, in my opinion, severely compromised. There is no apparent evidence of mitigation of its impacts – indeed, the ceiling height of the upper level is 3000mm, its vertical wall heights and abrupt and problematic, and no use is made of the volume within the pitched roof form.

In previous advice on the issues facing the property I acknowledged the challenges to be faced in supporting Bungania with complementary development. The work needs the highest level of heritage awareness and heritage design skills to achieve an outcome which lets the cottage speak for itself, manifest its significance, and work as a very special residential property into the future. That being said, some areas for discussion are immediately evident.

The scheme proposed will not achieve an acceptable outcome, and cannot be supported. The characteristics of a successful design might include :

- Careful separation and distancing from the cottage
- Subservient height, bulk and scale deferring to the cottage
- Recessive design and selection of materials to avoid conflict and challenge
- Response to the existing cottage form and landform of the site

In the first instance I would suggest that as in the past, a meeting might be sought with the applicant to discuss the issues raised by the proposal.

Therefore Heritage cannot support the proposal.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP.

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? A CMP might assist with the ongoing long term management of the site.

Has a CMP been provided? No

Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? Yes

Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? No

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.