

10 November 2022

## **HERITAGE REPORT: PPSSTH-97. DA: 2021.358 35-37 QUONDOLO STREET, PAMBULA**

I have been requested by the Southern Regional Planning Panel to provide heritage advice in the following terms:

- 1. The veracity and completeness of the assessments of heritage conservation matters in the context of the requirements of Clause 5.10 (1), (2), (4), (5) and (6) of the Bega Valley Local Environmental Plan 2013*
- 2. The appropriateness of the proposed bulk, scale, form and finishes of the proposed development, in the context of the Quondolo Street Conservation Area, relevant planning controls, history of the building and issues raised by the members of the public in public meetings and submissions.*
- 3. The potential for alternative building forms and finishes which would be more compatible and appropriate to the relevant historical context and existing built form character of the village*

It is noted that the hotel is not listed as a heritage item however it is located in the Pambula Heritage Conservation Area, and adjacent to heritage listed premises.

I have read the Council Assessment Report, dated 19 July 2021, recommending approval of the proposal.

### **1. THE VERACITY AND COMPLETENESS OF HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS**

Three heritage impact assessments have been prepared for this matter. Two of were for the Council, Trevor King and Dr Peter Kabaila, and one, with addendum, has been prepared by the applicant's heritage consultant, Philip Leeson Architects.

#### **Trevor King**

Trevor King confirmed that it has largely lost its integrity, and that while the current façade is traditional it has no relation to the original building.

*With the above factors in mind, new plans for the re-development of the property should be developed in consultation with a town planner and suitably qualified heritage consultant/architect. The Royal Willows site is a very important element of the townscape of Pambula as described in the heritage listing nomination but its ongoing commercial viability as hotel is seriously open to*

*question and the owner's right to pursue a change of use or redevelopment option is both fair and reasonable.*

#### **Peter Kabaila**

Dr Kabaila provided a memo in respect of the proposal that it should be refused however an alternative could be a revision of the design to "repair" the proposal. He acknowledges the hotel has been through 5 different architectural style phases.

Peter has made a number of recommendations and the principal ones include:

- Try not to stretch the current frontage as one form, by providing two bays to indicate the original length of the hotel.
- The two parapets may differ in design and colours, to match the rhythm of the parapet length more accurately.
- Include pitched roof forms, preferably with symmetry.
- Ceramic wall tiles to 600mm
- Potentially move driveway entry to bottle shop
- Provide robust timber verandah posts
- Review sign writing
- Details of landscaping to be provided

#### **David Hobbes, Heritage Consultant at Philip Leeson Architects.**

David, as part of the HIS for the site has developed Specific Design Guidelines:

- The new building must align with the front boundary on Quondola St, noting that the existing structure is located c.0.5m forward of the building line.
- There should be an awning over the footpath, ideally with posts for the greatest length of frontage possible, which continues the established pattern of awnings down Quondola St.
- The length of frontage given up to vehicle entry should be kept to a minimum.
- The frontage should be "active" as far as possible, i.e. glazed shopfronts, not blank walls.
- The café could have some outdoor seating within a semi open loggia behind the boundary line.
- The bottle shop and associated activities should be as unobtrusive as possible from Quondola St.
- There should be an inviting pedestrian arcade entry to the supermarket and to any other retail tenancies. Ideally one of the retail tenancies on the frontage would be a café/restaurant which takes the opportunity to display interpretative material outlining the history of the site, e.g old photos, newspaper articles etc.
- The new building as seen from Quondola St should be of a modern design but which is sympathetic to the historic character of the streetscape in terms of form and scale. Avoid overly decorative treatments (scrolls, brackets, curved roofs etc). Use geometric forms which echo the Art Deco character of adjacent buildings.

- The bottle shop forecourt should be incorporated into the overall envelope and roofline of the building.
- There should be a parapet above the awning line, on the front boundary, which echoes that of adjacent heritage buildings. The main roof of the building should be largely concealed behind the parapet and take the form of a series of small gables, at least for the front half of the building.
- Council would consider a partial second storey as long as it is set well back from the frontage and the bulk is moderated by an appropriate roof form. This is particularly encouraged if it reduces the overall building length and preserves the mature trees halfway down the block. The trees will help to obscure the building bulk when viewed from the rear.
- The south side of the building, visible from the main street should be broken up down its length by some form of setback or inset and a variety of wall materials.
- Council would prefer that the bulk of the building is not clad in tilt up concrete panels. Ideally a variety of material would be used including smooth rendered painted surfaces, weatherboard or corrugated colorbond.

## Response

All of these documents contain valuable information and provide for my **Heritage Response**. The information is available to properly consider the heritage significance of the property and to make recommendations regarding its future on heritage grounds.

The principal matters for consideration at this time for Clause 10.10 are:

*(4) Effect of proposed development on heritage significance The consent authority must, before granting consent under this clause in respect of a heritage item or heritage conservation area, consider the effect of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the item or area concerned. This subclause applies regardless of whether a heritage management document is prepared under subclause (5) or a heritage conservation management plan is submitted under subclause (6).*

*(5) Heritage assessment The consent authority may, before granting consent to any development—*

- (a) on land on which a heritage item is located, or*
  - (b) on land that is within a heritage conservation area, or*
  - (c) on land that is within the vicinity of land referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),*
- require a heritage management document to be prepared that assesses the extent to which the carrying out of the proposed development would affect the heritage significance of the heritage item or heritage conservation area concerned.*

*(6) Heritage conservation management plans The consent authority may require, after considering the heritage significance of a heritage item and the extent of change proposed to it, the submission of a heritage conservation management plan before granting consent under this clause.*

- With respect to these clauses I do not consider a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) is required for the site. The site is not listed however is important for its contribution to the Conservation Area.
- A heritage management document has been prepared under the heading of a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) by the applicant.

- The principal issue with the HIS is that, although it has been prepared in accordance with the NSW Heritage Office Guidelines for the preparation of SOHI, all the information that is relied upon for my consideration of the matter is not included in one comprehensive document. [REDACTED] et al has prepared a comprehensive history, Trevor King has prepared an assessment of the evolution of the building and fabric, Philip Leeson Architects have assessed the proposal in the context of the Conservation Area and Dr Kabaila has developed various recommendations based on his research and observations.
- The heritage advice report prepared by Trevor King is an annexure to the HIS however it does not form a logical part of the HIS. The HIS does not include an assessment of significance, does not include an assessment under the provisions of the LEP and DCP and does not include a review of the Heritage NSW Guidelines.
- It is my recommendation that the information available from various sources be integrated into a more comprehensive Heritage Impact Statement (HIS), including the various investigations. I would add that it should also include a more detailed mapping of the internal and external fabric of the building, with periods of construction if available.
- It is unlikely that the comprehensive HIS may change my recommendations for the future of the existing building or the design of a new building on the site. It is my observation that the HIS prepared by the applicant used other consultant sources and these should have been reiterated or re-examined in a comprehensive document. The HIS should thoroughly examine the existing history and fabric before a conclusion for the demolition and future design is reached. The HIS should also discuss in more detail the overall impact on the conservation area. Recommendations in the existing HIS have not been incorporated in the latest plans prepared by the applicant.
- The issue also arises as to whether a revised HIS should be prepared before the recommended changes to the plans are made, as summarised below under Question 2, which should raise issues related to the development, or whether the applicant prepares amended plans to accommodate the recommendations and the HIS is then prepared to assess those changes.

## Conclusion:

1. It is recommended that a revised HIS should be prepared to better comply with NSW Heritage Guidelines, including a Statement of Significance and a response to relevant controls. It should incorporate the various sources of information already prepared by the expert parties and local residents, as summarised above, into a single document.
2. The revised HIS may be informed by the existing plans, with recommendations to provide guidance for the proposed form and materials or be informed by amended plans.

## **2. THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROPOSED BULK, SCALE, FORM AND FINISHES OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, IN THE CONTEXT OF THE QUONDOLO STREET CONSERVATION AREA, RELEVANT PLANNING CONTROLS, HISTORY OF THE BUILDING AND ISSUES RAISED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IN PUBLIC MEETINGS AND SUBMISSIONS.**

The relevant planning controls, history and issues raised have been dealt with above in Question 1 relating to the formulation of the Heritage Impact Statement.

There are two aspects of the appropriateness of the proposed development and I will include comments from the heritage consultants.

The first is the **streetscape presentation** and the second is **context** which is dealt with under heading 3 below.

The overall scale of the proposal to Quondolo Street is considered suitable by all parties. The proposal extends the existing former hotel along the street and removes the makeshift bottle shop and non-heritage motel. The extension respects the scale of the shops, with associated parapets, along Quondolo Street.

#### **Agreement between all heritage consultants:**

- There is a case for demolition and the erection of a new development
- There is a case for extending the shops down Quondolo Street
- An awning should be erected over the footpath.
- The verandah should have posts.
- Parapets on the buildings are appropriate.
- The roof form over the former original area of the hotel should be pitched.
- The scale of the proposal should be ameliorated by materials and form and be different to the proposed plan and tilt up slabs.

#### **Disagreement between heritage consultants**

The matters not agreed:

- The parapet design – differences in design detail
- The bottle shop location – difference relating to side location from Quondolo Street
- The verandah design – difference between existing curved roof design and a flat roof design with fascia.
- The shop front design- differences in relation to how contemporary the design should be.
- Overall bulk and form

#### **Conclusion:**

Based on the research, the three heritage consultants views, my own inspection of the site and consideration of submissions I **consider** that the following responses are appropriate:

1. The demolition and erection of a new development is appropriate having regard to the amount of change over time to the hotel and its current condition.
2. The extension of the hotel footprint is acceptable.
3. The new verandah should not mimic the later curved roof design of the hotel and should be as proposed, being a flat roofed verandah, with fascia, and post supported.
4. The parapets should be revised to provide for a recognition of the existing parapet shapes over the existing hotel location to differentiate the former hotel site and the proposed extension.
5. There should be a traditional pitched roof form over the former hotel site.

6. The proposed bottle shop entrance location is acceptable
7. The shop front should be redesigned to exhibit more solid to void, albeit in a contemporary manner, to better reflect the existing shop front conditions along Quondolo Street. The facade could use timber or a tiled base to better reflect local conditions in a contemporary manner. Aluminium framing on the façade is discouraged.
8. The proposed supermarket building should be broken down in apparent length by some form of setback or inset and a variety of wall materials. Ideally a variety of material would be used including smooth rendered painted surfaces, weatherboard or corrugated colorbond.

### **3. THE POTENTIAL FOR ALTERNATIVE BUILDING FORMS AND FINISHES WHICH WOULD BE MORE COMPATIBLE AND APPROPRIATE TO THE RELEVANT HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND EXISTING BUILT FORM CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE**

The proposed supermarket is by its nature a larger footprint than the traditional shop forms along Quondolo Street. This bulk and scale is not considered excessive when viewed from the east (rear) notwithstanding that is larger than the adjoining shops to the north as the distance of the building from the boundary provides a continuity with the subdivision pattern of the other shops in the row. The height, as seen in the east elevation A201 (Gordon Building Design P/L), is no higher than the front parapets. The rendered views prepared by urbanestudio, E-W, 01.07/2022 and View from E, 01/07/2022 provide for the proposed impact of the proposal.

The form and scale of the rear building will be visible from Quondolo Street when travelling north past the existing service station and in this regard the break in form and materials would be more satisfactory to assist in resolving the issues raised by the size and bulk of the building.

#### **Alternative forms and finishes**

David Hobbes, heritage consultant for the applicant, considers that *“the south side of the building, visible from the main street, should be broken up down its length by some form of setback or inset and a variety of wall materials”*.

He also states that *“Council would prefer that the bulk of the building is not clad in tilt up concrete panels. Ideally a variety of material would be used including smooth rendered painted surfaces, weatherboard or corrugated colorbond”*.

I agree with these comments. The proposed side elevations are unrelieved and have a heavy appearance in the area. The rendered front section and tilt slab main building do not have enough visual difference to provide for a change in the apparent scale of the building and are not relieved by a major shadow line or division in the building which would assist the scale in the local context.

As discussed above, the HIS should also discuss in more detail the overall impact on the conservation area. Recommendations in the existing HIS have not been incorporated in the latest plans prepared by the applicant.

#### **Conclusion:**

The principal issue is the length of the walls of supermarket building. Whilst I consider that this is acceptable in principle the materials should be altered to compartmentalise the building form and there should be a distinct visual break in the scale.

## Further Matters

In this regard conditions should be attached to any consent that requires:

1. An archival recording of the building to be provided to Council's satisfaction prior to the issue of the construction certificate.
2. An interpretation strategy should be prepared before the issue of a construction certificate and the strategy be completed and approved by Council prior to the issue of an occupation certificate.
3. A condition relating to archaeology for a stop work on location of any relics.

## CONCLUSION:

1. It is recommended that a revised HIS should be prepared to better comply with NSW Heritage Guidelines, including a Statement of Significance and a response to relevant controls. It should incorporate the various sources of information already prepared by the expert parties and local residents, as summarised above, into a single document.
2. The revised HIS may be informed by the existing plans, with recommendations to provide guidance for the proposed form and materials or be informed by amended plans negotiated before the revised HIS is prepared. It is preferred that the plans are amended in the first instance and the HIS be based on the amended plans.

Based on the research, the three heritage consultants views, my own inspection of the site and consideration of submissions I **consider** that the following responses are appropriate:

- (a) The extension of the hotel footprint is acceptable.
- (b) The new verandah should not mimic the later curved roof design of the hotel and should be as proposed, being a flat roofed verandah, with fascia, and post supported.
- (c) The parapets should be revised to provide for a recognition of the existing parapet shapes over the existing hotel location to differentiate the former hotel site and the proposed extension.
- (d) There should be a traditional pitched roof form over the former hotel site.
- (e) The proposed bottle shop entrance location is acceptable
- (f) The shop front should be redesigned to exhibit more solid to void, albeit in a contemporary manner, to better reflect the existing shop front conditions along Quondolo Street. The facade could use timber or a tiled base to better reflect local conditions in a contemporary manner. Aluminium framing on the façade is discouraged.
- (g) The proposed supermarket building should be broken down in apparent length by some form of setback or inset and a variety of wall materials. Ideally a variety of material would be used including smooth rendered painted surfaces, weatherboard or corrugated colorbond.

It is my professional opinion that the proposal is one that, with the appropriate amendments as discussed above, should be approved. The redesign should be supervised by Philip Leeson Architects and supported by a revised Heritage Impact Statement.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Davies".

Stephen Davies  
Director