

Heritage Referral Response

Application Number:	Mod2021/1003
Date:	11/04/2022
To:	Clare Costanzo
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 6 DP 541797 , 949 Barrenjoey Road PALM BEACH NSW 2108

Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>This proposal is for a s4.55 Modification to DA2018/1655 which gained approval for alterations and additions to a heritage item, the remarkable house "Kumale" designed for the Richardson family by Peter Muller (<i>Item 2270165 - "Kumale" (house), 949 Barrenjoey Road, Palm Beach.</i>)</p> <p>The proposal seeks consent for modifications to the external approach and entry area of the house, as itemised in the HIS. Under its LEP Council must consider the impacts upon the heritage significance of the property, and whether or not the proposed changes can be sustained.</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>The works will affect only the subject Item, and by their nature will be seen mainly from the front of the property on Barrenjoey Road. Aspects of the work will be prominent and to the extent that views down into the property may be possible, other changes proposed will be visible.</p> <p>Details of the heritage item, as contained within the Heritage Inventory are: <i>Item 2270165 - "Kumale" (house), 949 Barrenjoey Road, Palm Beach</i></p> <p><u>Statement of Significance</u> Kumale, at 949 Barrenjoey Road in Palm Beach, built in 1956 to a design by well known Sydney architect Peter Muller, has historic and aesthetic significance as an excellent example of Late Twentieth-Century Organic architecture. Kumale, also known as Richardson House, is one of Peter Muller's earliest and most distinctive commissions. It is a highly individualistic work, deriving its primary inspiration from nature. The house has a high level of aesthetic value, maintained despite some changes to the fabric and its deteriorating condition. It retains sufficient integrity and substantial intactness to illustrate its original design.</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	Yes	"Kumale" is included in the AIA NSW Register of Significant 20th Century buildings
Other	No	

Consideration of Application

The proposed modifications as shown in the submitted plans are assessed within a Heritage Impact Statement prepared for the Applicant, which concludes that the works can be considered appropriate and consistent with the significance of the property. This conclusion is concurred with through this referral and the program of modified works proposed is considered to have an acceptable level of impact upon the significance of the house, and to be compatible with Council's LEP and DCP controls for the protection of heritage.

Owned for many years by the same family and the subject of comprehensive continuing works, the extensive conservation and adaptation efforts at "Kumale" are now close to being completed. The problem of vehicle access and parking for the house has been reviewed several times and most recently consent was given to DA2018/1655 which proposed a circular open 'mushroom-like' carport structure at the lower end of a vehicle ramp sloping down to the house from its street entry. The structure of the ramp was built some time ago, in keeping with previous consents.

It is now proposed, through this modification application, to re-site the carport structure to the entry area of the site, just inside its front boundary. Access for vehicles to the site is constrained by virtue of the narrow frontage, site topography, and the location of the property on an external bend of Barrenjoey Road. The key element of the proposal is the concept of limiting car access to the very top of the site – meaning that the constructed ramp is redundant in terms of use by vehicles and available for adaptation within the open areas on the landward side of the dwelling.

Details of all proposed modifications are itemised in the HIS. In summary, these modifications include relocation of the approved carport to the driveway entrance off Barrenjoey Road and the addition of solar panels, new landscaping works behind the carport connecting the carport with the main house, as well as a new entrance to the house.

Of these works, most are detailed elements which can be seen to be consistent with the works already undertaken at the house – of high quality and intent and considered in their design. The most contentious, in my opinion, are likely to be the form of the proposed carport, given its prominent location, and the intervention with live rock of the site in the formation of part of the new entry stairs. The front door of the house, to be replaced in these works is not original.

The dramatic gesture of the carport, in its more prominent location, is responsive to themes in the house, and being remote and distinct from it, is arguably supportable as a new functional element. It follows on other decisions and stages of work implemented in the adaptation of the house. The proposed location and revised access to the house remove the former intrusion of vehicles into the tight foreground space, and have made the ramp available for conversion to an unusual garden approach to the house.

Caution is desirable with proposals to further excavate/intervene with live rock on established, significant sites, although there is a long tradition of cutting in steps and pathways in the rock outcrops on which houses of the Northern Beaches were often built. Those have usually been minimal and utilitarian. Modern equipment makes such work readily possible, quick and efficient, but it should be minimised. The conditions of consent requiring archival recording of works at "Kumale" remain current and important.

Therefore, no objections are raised on heritage grounds and no new conditions required. It is noted that Condition 11 of consent DA2018/1655 requires photographic archival recording prior to CC and this condition is still relevant and should remain unchanged.

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of Pittwater LEP 2014:

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

Further Comments

COMPLETED BY: Robert Moore, External Heritage Advisor
DATE: 11 April 2022

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.