

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	Mod2022/0722
Proposed Development:	Modification of Development Consent DA2021/2608 granted for Use of Premises (Warehouse 1) as an Indoor Recreation Facility (swim school), internal fit-out, reconfiguration of car parking and signage
Date:	11/01/2023
To:	Thomas Prosser
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 1282038 , 4 - 8 Inman Road CROMER NSW 2099

Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>This application has been referred as the site contains a heritage item, being Item I52 - Roche Building, listed in Schedule 5 of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011. The site is also within the vicinity of 2 other heritage items, being Item I53 - Givaudan-Roure Office and Item I38 - Trees-Campbell Avenue.</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>Details of these heritage items, as contained within the Warringah Heritage Inventory, are:</p> <p>Item I52 - Roche building <u>Statement of Significance</u> A substantial & excellent example of an industrial complex in the late 20th Century international style. Displays high degree of integrity. One of first industrial complexes set in substantial landscaped grounds. Socially significant due to landmark nature</p> <p>Item I53 - Givaudan-Roure office <u>Statement of Significance</u> A representative example of an inter-war dwelling. Displays good integrity with much original fabric. Historically it is a rare survivor of development of this area prior to release & development for industrial purposes.</p> <p>Item I38 - Trees, Campbell Ave <u>Statement of Significance</u> The collection of trees in the south-east sector of the Roche Products site, facing South Creek Rd and Campbell Ave at Dee Why have a moderate degree of heritage significance at the Local level. They have existed on this site since the turn of the 19th -20th century and may have been associated with the nurseryman Charles Hirsch who owned the land immediately to the north during that period. They are esteemed by local residents and confer on the area a distinctive sense of place. While the trees are not individually rare, the presence in Dee Why of such a mixed collection of trees in good condition and representing planning takes of their period is rare.</p>		
Other relevant heritage listings		
SEPP (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021	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	No	However, Roche building previously on the RAIA Register - also included within RAIA publication - "444 Sydney

Significance		Buildings"
Other	No	
Consideration of Application		
<p>This application is a modification of Consent DA2021/2608 which approved the use of Unit 1 as a swim school. The previous approval included the installation of 2 swimming pools and associated amenities. This modification proposes to remove the smaller proposed swimming pool and relocate the mechanical room from the mezzanine to the ground floor, in the space available by the deletion of the small swimming pool. There are no external changes as result of this modification.</p> <p>The warehouse unit in question was approved by DA2019/1346 as part of an overall redevelopment of the former Roche site. Important original Roche buildings on the site were incorporated into the redevelopment, to retain important elements of the site's heritage significance, including the office buildings and cottage fronting Inman Road.</p> <p>This modification proposal, consisting of internal changes to a new warehouse building, will not affect the fabric of the heritage buildings being retained on the site. Therefore, it is considered that there will be no impact from this proposal upon the heritage significance of the Roche buildings being retained as part of the site redevelopment. Given the changes are all internal, there is also no impact on the 2 heritage items in the vicinity (being Givaudan-Roure office and trees fronting Campbell Ave).</p> <p>Therefore, no objections are raised on heritage grounds and no conditions required.</p>		
Further Comments		
<p><u>Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of WLEP 2011:</u> Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? No Has a CMP been provided? N/A Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? No Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? N/A</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.