

**Robertson  
&  
Hindmarsh  
Pty Ltd**

ABN 47 000 915 622

Architects  
Conservation Architects  
Landscape & Interior Designers

26 Station Street  
Naremburn NSW 2065

E-mail: rharch@ozemail.com.au  
Web: www.robertsonandhindmarsh.com.au

Phone: (02) 9439 7779  
Fax: (02) 9439 7775

31 July 2018

The General Manager  
Inner West Council  
7-15 Wetherill Street  
LEICHHARDT NSW 2040

Attention: Niall Macken  
Team leader – Heritage & Urban Design

Dear Sir,

**“Bertsonie”, 73 The Boulevarde, Dulwich Hill**

I confirm that we have received the following additional documents/information from Inner West Council subsequent to the submission of our report dated 19 June 2018:

Heritage Assessment 73 The Boulevard (sic) Dulwich Hill, NSW 2203, dated 30 May 2018.  
Attached to that report at Annexure C were:  
Letter dated 25 May 2018 from NBRS Architecture heritage including their Appendix A –  
Historical Summary, and  
Letter dated 31 May 2018 from GML Heritage.

Undated history by Urbis,  
Copies of the Petersham Subdivision and Building Registers and Valuation Books.

**URBIS Heritage Assessment report, dated 30 May 2018:**

**History:**

It is my opinion that the history of the various subdivisions of the original Toddington estate contained within in the report dated March 2018 by Sue Rosen Associates, “Heritage Assessment 73A The Boulevarde, Dulwich Hill”, dated March 2018, is a clearer representation of the sequence of allotments and owners than that contained within the URBIS Heritage Assessment report.

**Significance Assessment:**

**Criterion a: Historical significance:**

We reiterate our original assessment in our report dated 19 June 2018 with regard to the historical significance of the property and repeat that it meets the threshold for listing at a local level in this regard.

Principals  
(nominated responsible architects):  
Dr Scott Robertson FRAIA ARB No: 4122  
Jan Robertson FRAIA ARB No: 4182

Criterion b: Associative significance:

As stated in our report of 19 June 2018 the plan of the house still allows an interpretation of a way of life of a group important to NSW's cultural history (ie the well-to-do middle class)

Criterion c: Aesthetic significance:

With regard to aesthetic significance the URBIS report fails to describe or assess the architectural characteristics, especially the interior, of the house at 73 The Boulevard. In fact, there is no mention of the interior in the assessment and the photographs of the house contained in the report concentrate on the altered fabric and do not adequately cover the surviving original fabric of the Hall, Living Room and the two front Bedrooms. In this regard any assessment in the report cannot be supported as there is no description or discussion. There is no attempt at placing the interior within a context of interwar housing design and no mention of the its Craftsman interior.

Criterion f: Rarity:

With regard to rarity, there is no evidence in the URBIS report to support the contention that the house is not rare as there have been no detailed studies of the interiors of interwar houses. The house is an early 1920s house with a significant, mostly intact Craftsman interior. Again, the lack of description or any attempt at a comparative analysis of what evidence is publicly available with regard to the prevalence or likely influences on the house at 73 The Boulevard.

Criterion g: Representative

Unlike the URBIS report our report found that the house demonstrated "the principal characteristics of a class of the local area's cultural places" and, therefore, met the guideline for inclusion under this criterion at a local level.

**NBRS letter and Historical Summary, dated 25 May 2018 at Annexure C of the URBIS report:**

On page 9 of the NBRS Historical Summary the author states:

"Based on later annotations in the *Petersham Valuation Book* 1920 and the corresponding entries in the *Petersham Council Building Register* for 1921, it can be established that the existing building was constructed by Barnett Hyman in 1921. An application for a cottage on Lot 32 was submitted to Council on 31 May 1921, and was subsequently approved. The applicant for Building Application 67/1921 was noted as G. Hokin & Co. (Garrett, Hokin & Co ) for the owner who was noted as Hyman. The value of the building was estimated at £2 000."

Examination of the source documents shows that the above NBRS statement is not accurate.

Petersham Council Building Register 1920-25:

Application 67 of 1921 is listed as "G. Hokin & Co / 1 DF Cottage / Lot 32 boulevard / S & F / 1 new dwelling / Estimated value 2000 / Fees 1".

There is no statement that the land is owned by Barnett Hyman in this primary source document.

Petersham Council Building Valuation Book 1920-22 (as at 1 January 1920):

"Boulevard 71 / Owner Miller Alfred Leslie Accountant / Occupier owner

Boulevard 73 / Owner Mitchell William George Builder Brook Lodge ... Petersham / Occupier Martin Mrs Mary".

This primary document of 1920 maintains Mitchell as the owner of 73 The Boulevard (sic) and that Mrs Martin was still the occupant. It is not until the 1923-25 Valuation Book (as at 1 January 1923) that Barnett Hyman is listed as the owner of 73 The Boulevard and William George Mitchell is listed as the owner of 73A the Boulevard.

The sequence of Land Titles provides a more accurate representation of the ownership of the land and the process of subdivision.

William George Mitchell purchased the residual portion of the Toddington estate from Robina Tait in March 1892. This residual estate comprised Lots 32, 33 & Part Lot 34 of DP 114 and Lots 3, 4 & part Lot 5 of DP 218. This estate contained Toddington house which was used by the occupant, Mrs Mary Martin as a private hospital. The address of the hospital in the Sands Directory was given as 73 The Boulevard.

Lots 32, 33 & Part Lot 34 fronted The Boulevard and were re-subdivided into three equal-frontage lots Lots A, B & C. Lot A became No. 71A, Lot B became No. 73 and Lot C became No. 73A The Boulevard (Figure 2.11 in the Rosen report illustrates this).

Analysis of the owners and occupiers (see Appendix A to this letter) indicates that No 71A The Boulevard was occupied by its owner, Richard Williams, in 1922 which indicates a completion of construction in 1921. Likewise, William Mitchell is also recorded as living at No 73A in 1922 which indicates a completion in 1921.

No 73 The Boulevard was not occupied by Barnett Hyman until 1923 which would indicate a completion date of 1922. Building Application 1921/67 was lodged at Petersham Council by G. Hokin & Co as the applicant. Hokin & Co was not the registered owner so it could be assumed that the company was engaged by the owner of the land to construct the house. Hyman was also not the registered owner at the time of the lodgement of the BA but he still could have commissioned the design of the house and the engagement of Hokin & Co to construct it. It is also possible that Mitchell engaged Hokin & Co to construct the house at No 73 but, given the stylistic difference between Nos 73 & 73A The Boulevard it is more probable that the designers of the two houses were different and, therefore, it was Hyman who commissioned the design of the house at No 73 The Boulevard.

NBRS also state that Hyman did not live at No 73 The Boulevard. If the Sands Directory is correct then Hyman is recorded as being the occupant of the house in both 1923 and 1924.

**GML letter, dated 31 May 2018 at Annexure C of the URBIS report:**

The author of the GML letter states that the most intact central room of the interior of the house at No 73 The Boulevard is not rare. No evidence is given to back up the statement that the interior is not rare. The letter's author provides no list of comparable or better Craftsman interiors. The letter also does not give an accurate description of the extent of the intact rooms (ie the Hall, the Living Room with the inglenook, and the two front Bedrooms). No mention is made of the surviving service hatch for food deliveries and no mention is made of the 1922 garage.

In addition, no discussion of the impact of the changes to the house is given. The enclosed front verandah is a reversible alteration that could be removed to reinstate the open front verandah. Such a reversal would not impact the significant fabric of the front verandah or front wall of the house. Whilst the addition of the first floor has altered the original proportion of wall to roof when viewed from the street it is a sympathetic addition that integrates with the overall design (in contrast to the 1980s first floor addition to the neighbouring house at No 73A The Boulevard). Reversible alterations have not been an impediment to listing other buildings in New South Wales (eg Elizabeth Bay House, Lyndhurst, Hyde Park Barracks, etc).

With regard to the typology of the house not being rare in the inner west of Sydney it should be stated the building type of a freestanding bungalow on a separate block of land is not rare in the context of the inner ring of suburbs developed in the interwar period. However, the survival of an intact Craftsman interior in the main suite of rooms is rare as these interiors rarely make it to statutory heritage listings and have not been systematically recorded or studied. It is even rarer for such an interior in a middle class bungalow to survive unscathed. More often, the interiors of the typical 1920s Californian Bungalow reflect transitions between decorative Federation interiors and the restrained English Arts and Crafts interior of stained timber accents. Full-blown wall panelling and inglenooks are rare in the typical 1920s bungalow.

GML state the builder of No 73 The Boulevard was George Hoskins. However, Inner West Council records inherited from Petersham Municipal Council state the applicant was G. Hokin & Co. As discussed earlier in this letter, it is not clear who commissioned G. Hokin & Co to lodge the application and construct the house.

We disagree with the GML statement that the house does not satisfy the criterion of historical significance. As stated in our report of 19 June 2018, the house does fulfil this criterion at a local level as it demonstrates the subdivision of larger estates and the subsequent urban infill. The Craftsman interior demonstrates the historical influence of American culture on Australia. Moreover, the 1922 garage demonstrates the introduction of the motor car to the middle classes and the need to house this very expensive asset.

**More intact examples:**

At the Land & Environment Court hearing it was suggested by the applicant's heritage consultant that a more intact example of a house of the period was opposite the subject site, at No 102 The Boulevard. From an examination of the photographs of the house available on-line it appears that the house is an earlier house in a transitional style. Its overall form is Federation whilst its dark bricks indicates a construction date after World War 1. The only relatively intact room shown in the on-line real estate photographs is the Living/Dining Room which displays elements of the earlier English Arts & Crafts movement and does not have any of the characteristics of the American Craftsman interior. The other spaces and exterior at the rear depicted in the photographs show that the original character of the house has been changed and modernised. For example, the photograph of the bedroom indicates that the fireplace has been removed whereas the fireplaces in the bedrooms of "Bertsonie" are intact.

It was also suggested by the same consultant that sufficient interwar houses were already protected in the Inner West Local Government Area within HCA35 – Interwar Group – Dulwich Hill and Marrickville. The houses in that Heritage Conservation Area are small bungalows constructed in the period 1936-1941. They are 1930s hipped roof cottages that display the design aesthetic of the post-Great Depression and do not in any way resemble the aesthetic sensibility of the period when "Bertsonie" was designed and constructed some 15 to 20 years earlier.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SBR', followed by a horizontal line.

Dr Scott Robertson  
for Robertson & Hindmarsh Pty Ltd

## APPENDIX A

Table showing owners & occupiers 69-75 The Boulevard (1920-1925)

No.	Lot (Mitchell's subdivision)	Owner (Valuation Books)	Occupier (Sands)
<b>1920</b>			
69		Frederick George Hagley, civil servant	Frederick Hagley
71		Alfred Leslie Miller, accountant	Alfred L. Miller
73		William George Mitchell, builder	Mrs Martin, private hospital
75		..... Hogarth	Mrs Mary Hogarth
<b>1921</b>			
69			Frederick Hagley
71			Alfred L. Miller
73			Miss Pitt, private hospital
75			Mrs Mary Hogarth
<b>1922</b>			
69			Frederick Hagley
71			Alfred L. Miller
73	Lot A		Richard Williams
73A	Lot C		William G. Mitchell
75			Mrs Mary Hogarth
<b>1923</b>			
69		Frederick George Hagley, clerk	Frederick Hagley
71		Alfred Leslie Miller, accountant	Alfred L. Miller
73 / 71A	Lot A	..... Williams .....	Richard Williams
73	Lot B	Barnett Hyman, freeholder	Barnett Hyman
73A	Lot C	William George Mitchell, builder	William G. Mitchell
75		..... Hogarth	William Welch
<b>1924</b>			
69			Frederick Hagley
71			Alfred L. Miller
71A	Lot A		Richard Williams
73	Lot B		Barrett (sic) Hyman
73A	Lot C		William G. Mitchell
75			T.W. Begg
<b>1925</b>			
69			Frederick Hagley
71			Alfred L. Miller
71A	Lot A		Richard Williams
73	Lot B		Hector Hubbard
73A	Lot C		William G. Mitchell
75			T.W. Begg, solicitor