

The Chairman  
Joint Regional Planning Panel  
Sydney East Region  
c/- Strand Estates Pty Ltd  
144 Pacific Highway  
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060

Dear Sir

**Proposed Redevelopment  
144-150 Pacific Highway, North Sydney  
Heritage Response to JRPP Report  
DA 467/11**

This brief heritage response has been requested by Strand Estates Pty Ltd in relation to the comments provided by the North Sydney Council Heritage Officer in the JRPP Assessment Report and Recommendation for this project.

Graham Brooks and Associates prepared the Statement of Heritage Impact for the original DA submission. We are therefore familiar with the heritage issues associated with the project.

In general we agree with the Heritage Officer's evaluation of the likely heritage impact on items in the vicinity of the site. We do question some of her analysis and recommendations as they are essentially focussed on amenity and not heritage outcomes.

**Response to Heritage Comments**

1. The property is not heritage listed, is not in a heritage conservation area but is in the vicinity of a number of heritage items.

Agreed

2. The proposed development will have no impact on the heritage significance of a number of heritage items in the vicinity, namely 172 Pacific Highway, 168 and 170 Pacific Highway, 6 Napier Street and 1-7 Napier Street.

Agreed

3. Any amendments to the proposed development should not result in any additional shadows being cast on the garden areas surrounding the Donbank Historic Cottage at 6 Napier Street.

Agreed, on the basis that the garden setting is an important component of the heritage significance of this small Colonial period building.

4. Any amendments to the proposed development should not result in any additional shadows being cast on any private open space associated with the four single storey, historic terraced buildings at 1-7 Napier Street.

Disagree. These small buildings were almost totally redeveloped to reflect the historic terraced houses that were formerly on the subject site and are currently used for commercial purposes, as they have been for many decades. They are located at some distance to the south of the subject building. The Heritage Officer's comments about protecting future amenity in their private open spaces, if they were to revert to residential use, do not stand scrutiny from a heritage perspective. The suggestion that some future residential use would be a desirable heritage outcome is of marginal relevance at best. The historical residential setting of these houses was dramatically changed in the middle decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and has continued to be degraded in recent years with the continual development of large scale commercial buildings in its immediate vicinity. This concern and recommendation should be discounted by the JRPP.

5. The only heritage item that is likely to be affected by the proposed development is the two storey Federation style residence at 1 Doohat Avenue.

Agreed

6. The most likely affect of the proposed development on 1 Doohat Avenue results from the increase in scale of the row of modern buildings that form its urban backdrop.

Agreed.

The subject house has been listed in recognition of its fine Federation architectural qualities. Its immediate setting is within the residential scale of Doohat Avenue. However, a relatively bulky building was approved in its rear yard some time ago, which imposed itself on the immediate architectural and spatial context of the historic building.

7. The setting of the property has already been negatively impacted upon by commercial development along Doohat Lane

Agreed to some extent.

The setting of the historic house is primarily within the residential setting of Doohat Avenue. The quality and relative importance of the side laneway in relation to the setting drops quickly as the laneway extends away from the Doohat Avenue frontage. The location of the building, just off the Pacific Highway, being principal national road corridor leading north from Sydney has always been affected by the higher level of development activity that is a natural outcome of the primacy of that highway corridor. The automatically conclude that any non-residential building greater in height than two storeys has a negative effect on the setting of No1 Doohat Avenue is both unreasonable and unrealistic.

8. It is recommended that the bulk and scale of the building as viewed from Doohat Lane be reduced by setting the building back a minimum of 5 metres from the laneway boundary from Level 6 and above to achieve a podium that provides a transitional element from the height of the residential development in Doohat Avenue. Blade walls should also be setback above Level 6 podium on the laneway frontage.

Disagree

The building is already set back above the loading dock podium by approximately 3.5 metres, creating the significant break in the bulk of the building at the lower levels. It is also located at some distance down a relatively narrow laneway, well behind the Doohat Avenue streetscape. The additional setback recommended by the Council Heritage Officer will not achieve any marked difference in the views to the currently proposed architectural and massing composition when considering its potential impact on the heritage item.

9. The garage door be amended to be an architectural element that positively contributes to the streetscape.

Disagree

Amendments to the garage door of a substantial loading facility are unlikely to achieve any marked differences that will be perceptible in terms of the potential heritage impact on the heritage item.

10. The existing pedestrian link between the North Sydney CBD and the heritage items, conservation area and school to the north along Doohat Lane should be retained.

This is not a heritage issue. We understand that separate discussions have been underway with Council with regard to the provision of a through site link along this axis.

Yours faithfully  
Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G. Brooks', with a stylized, flowing script.

Graham Brooks  
Director  
[grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com](mailto:grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com)