

13 August 2020

The General Manager
Burwood Council
PO Box 240
Burwood NSW 1805



Dear Sir/Madam

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT
134A-134C BURWOOD ROAD & 29A-33A GEORGE STREET BURWOOD
BD.2018.125**

1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

A Concept (or Stage One) Development Application was lodged for the above site in October 2018 and a modified Concept Application in July 2019, including Statements of Heritage Impact (SHI) prepared by GBA Heritage which include a detailed history and description of the site and a grading of the heritage significance of its elements. A supplementary SHI dated 6 February 2020 accompanied a further modified Concept Application.

Council subsequently requested further modification as outlined by CityPlan Heritage in their letter dated 27 July 2020. This supplementary accompanies a further modified Concept Application and addresses the key concerns expressed by CityPlan.

2. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

2.1 Building 2 : Student Accommodation Building

CityPlan's letter states as follows:

It is... unclear whether the awning of Building 2, which is a horizontal element that takes one's attention at public domain level relates to any horizontal element of the Church or the steeple. It is recommended that either the sill level of the windows on the Church tower or the splayed top of the first buttress is taken as a height for the awning to allow a better relationship with the heritage item and the adjoining show awnings to the south.

The proposal has been modified so that the awning aligns with the sill of the spire window. This has a positive heritage impact compared to the earlier proposal as it creates greater visual sympathy with the Church. We understand that CityPlan has confirmed to Council that this will allay their concerns on this matter.

GBA Heritage
Heritage Consultants

Level 1, 71 York Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T: +61 2 9299 8600
F: +61 2 9299 8711

gba@gbaheritage.com
www.gbaheritage.com

Nominated Architect
Graham Leslie Brooks
NSW Architects
Registration 3836

GBA Heritage Pty Ltd
Incorporated in NSW

ABN 56 073 802 730
ACN 073 802 730

2.2 Building 1 : Tower Building

2.2.1 The 'slot'

CityPlan's letter states as follows:

The width of the slot-cut between the two primary mass of the tower (Building 1) needs to be further considered to ensure it does not become a wind tunnel that may affect the air circulation between the buildings and the public domain. This could be a matter for an engineering solution, but it has potential to create some issues to the lower buildings around it in particular the sandstone structure of the Church and the Hall.

The 'slot' has now been greatly reduced in depth. This slot is part of the articulation of the tower massing, intended to split the mass into two more vertical elements as a means of achieving greater sympathy with the Church and spire, and generally reducing the apparent mass behind the heritage building. The depth of the slot therefore need only be sufficient to create this visual perception of a division into two masses and could probably be achieved with a depth of a metre or so. Thus the heritage impact of the modified slot is acceptable.

Our understanding is that CityPLAN has confirmed to Council that this is an appropriate solution of this concern and can be further detailed at DA stage as an engineered solution.

2.2.2 Height of the north section

CityPlan's letter states:

The three times proportional height of the Church tower coincides approximately with the height of the tower at 29 George Street, which would make the proposed tower (Building 1) more compatible with the Church tower as a background. This would also aid in a more compatible and proportional height to width ratio between the new Building 1 and the pedestrian way as noted in the previous heritage comments. At a minimum, it is suggested that the height of the north-western wing of the proposed tower (Building 1) be reduced to the height of the 29 George Street for an acceptable and more articulated tower form within the immediate visual curtilage of the heritage item.

It has been clarified that 'the north-western wing' refers to the whole section north of the 'slot', which we refer to herein as 'the north section' of the tower. This section of the tower has been reduced in height to that of 29 George Street.

2.2.3 Footprint of the north section

A further modification to the tower design is proposed, namely to realign the 'slot' with the passage between the Church and Building 2, creating a 'north section' of smaller footprint than in the previous proposal. This would have the following positive heritage impacts compared to the earlier proposal:

- Even at the reduced height, the north section of the tower, standing behind the Church and spire, would be 'slimmer' and more vertical in proportion, providing a more sympathetic mass as a backdrop when seen from Burwood Road.
- The south section of the tower is angled to face south-west rather than west, so as to reduce the mass behind the Church and to present less mass directly to Burwood Road. Realigning the 'slot' will place more mass in the south section, decreasing the mass directly facing Burwood Road and decreasing the visual impact on the heritage items.

- The site would be divided more clearly into two subtly defined zones:
 - a 'heritage' northern zone including both heritage buildings, the low-scale Building 3 and the slimmer north section of the tower as a backdrop; and
 - a 'contemporary' southern zone including Building 2, the south section of the tower and the other tall buildings in George Street.

Thus the proposed realignment of the 'slot' and the modified footprint of the north section of the tower will have a positive heritage impact compared to the earlier proposal. Our understanding is that CityPlan has confirmed to Council that this is acceptable from a heritage perspective.

3.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed modifications will enhance the relationship of the proposed buildings to the heritage items on the site and further mitigate their impact on the site's heritage significance. Thus the modifications will have a positive impact on the proposal, which will have an acceptable impact on the site.

The modifications are consistent with the objectives of the relevant established heritage guidelines.

It is therefore recommended that Council approve the modified proposal.



Dov Midalia
Senior Heritage Consultant
dovmidalia@gbaheritage.com