


Extension to Fernwalk Conservation Area Pymble (C9)


Contents

Maps.....	2
Comments	4
Submission summary table	5
Rating review	8


Maps

1. Exhibited rating map



<p>LEGEND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">ContributingDetractingNeutralGazetted Conservation Area - GeneralHeritage Item - General <p>Cadastral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cadastral 22/11/2016© Land and Property Information (LPI) <p>Date: 22/11/2016</p>	<p>Draft Heritage Conservation Area</p> <p>Fernwalk Conservation Area</p> <p>Pymble</p> <p>C9</p>	
--	---	---

2. Revised rating map



Legend	
	Contributing
	Detracting
	Neutral
	Gazetted Conservation Area - General
	Heritage Item - General
	Original Proposed HCA Boundary
	Revised HCA Boundary

Date: 17/04/2018

Draft Heritage Conservation Area
Area Review - Feb 2018

Fernwalk Conservation Area
Pymble
C9

Contribution Rating Map
Recommendation -
Not recommended to proceed



Comments

The area reviewed was a proposed extension to the Fernwalk HCA (C9) that included 13 properties located on Wellesley Road and Church Street Pymble.

The area was identified for listing as a Heritage Conservation Area by Perumal Murphy Alessi in 2015 as part of the larger Pymble East Heritage Conservation Area. The statement of significance prepared to support the listing states:

The Pymble East study area is of local historic and aesthetic significance retaining streetscapes of good, high quality and mostly intact, representative examples of single detached houses from the Federation, Inter-war and Post War periods constructed following the late 19th and early 20th century subdivisions and establishment of the North Shore Railway line in 1890. The street alignments and subdivision patterns significantly reflect the early boundary lines and connections between the early estates and subdivisions north of what is now the Pacific Highway and railway corridor.

The predominant early 20th century development of the area also reflects the evolution of rail and road networks and particularly improvements of the rail network in the late 1920s and 1930s. The early patterns generally remain discernible, however, are now overlaid with subsequent land amalgamations and subdivisions which reflect the ongoing growth and development of the area. The built context is enhanced by the natural topography, street proportions, grassed verges, street trees and individual garden settings which greatly contribute to the visual and aesthetic character of the area.



As a result of the statutory public exhibition process, 7 objections were received all against the proposal. No submissions were received directly in support of the draft Fernwalk HCA extension however three submissions were received in support of all the proposed conservation areas considered by the peer review.

Issues raised in the submissions included the lack of heritage significance, increased development restrictions and reduced property value. These issues are addressed in the main report.

In light of the public exhibition submissions the area was reviewed again which included several site visits and historical research by Council officers.

The ranking of each property within the draft conservation area is included below. In this relatively small extension the ratings on five houses changed from contributory to neutral the main reason being unsympathetic additions and loss of design integrity. Based upon the reassessment the extension to the Fernwalk Conservation Area is not recommended to proceed.

Submission summary table

No	Issue/Concern	Comment
5	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Opposed because of further restrictions to property.</p> <p>The area you are currently proposing has houses that do not justify this rezoning. The block of houses you are proposing to enforce stricter controls have no reasonable justification for doing so.</p>	<p>Please see main body of the report on restrictions. It is not recommended that this HCA extension proceed.</p> <p>Image is of the side.</p>  <p>Front – from street view</p> 
9	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Opposed due to E4 Environmental Living zoning. More restrictions would be too much for home owners to manage.</p> <p>House sale concern, would like a property impact sales report to be done.</p>	<p>Opposition noted</p> <p>The lot is zoned E4 which is a reflection of the high environmental values on the site. A heritage conservation area recognises the heritage values on the site. Development in the form of alterations and additions can still occur but must give consideration to conserving the recognised environmental and heritage values. For more information on developing this specific site please contact Council's duty planner service.</p> <p>There have been numerous studies on the impact of listing on house prices.</p>


No	Issue/Concern	Comment
		Please see the main body of the reports for comments.
29	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Other than few gum trees and the Storm Water Creek nothing would be of historical value. Therefore I think my property should not be included. Concerns about No. 15 & 17 Wellesley Road being unfairly included. Higher cost for applications with additional restrictions leading the house price to drop and sometimes difficult to sell.</p>	<p>Opposition noted.</p> <p>The creek and the trees do provide a valuable setting to the proposed HCA. The consultant has identified the Inter-war houses as another significant layer. Your house at number 15 was rated as neutral and does not contribute to the key historical layer. Number 17 was rated as contributory as it is an extant example of interwar bungalow that is considered to have retained its design integrity and adds to the Inter-war historical layer of the HCA.</p>
108	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Opposed because there are no heritage items of significance on this property, No native/gum trees on the property for preservation, No consistency with neighbouring properties that have been modified, it will impact the saleability and desirability of the house.</p>	<p>Opposition noted.</p> <p>Your property has been assessed as neutral not as contributing to the historical development layer of this proposed HCA. The “blanket” approach as referred to in your submission is consistent with heritage practice across NSW where areas with historical significance that have many contributing elements are given protection to ensure their conservation into the future. Non-contributing elements are included as they fall within this boundary and their unmanaged change could have a negative impact on the heritage values of the contributing elements. No area is without change. Change is an inevitable consequence of time. Inclusion within the boundary of the HCA will mean that future change will be managed to conserve and enhance the HCA. Inclusion within a HCA does not mean your property is now preserved and nothing will ever change again, it means that future changes will need to have consideration for conserving the heritage values that contribute to the overall</p>



No	Issue/Concern	Comment
		significance of your blanket heritage area aka heritage conservation area.
179	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Council allowed the demolition of historically significant 19 Wellesley Road Pymble, my neighbour, and approved 2 project homes. My house (17 Wellesley) has had been changed and like the street is a mish-mash of styles and materials.</p>	<p>Opposition noted.</p> <p>19 Wellesley at the time of the approved demolition was not statutorily listed and Council could not refuse the application.</p> <p>It is not recommended that this HCA extension proceed.</p>
209	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Opposed due to alterations and disadvantages when selling or renovating.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. Please see comments on housing demand in the body of the report.</p>
233	<p>Opposed to HCA.</p> <p>Opposed due to previous rebuilds and renovations on street and loss of this right. Property value decrease concern.</p>	<p>Opposition noted.</p> <p>See main body of the report on property rights.</p>




Rating review

Rating: N – Neutral, C – Contributory, D – Detracting

	PMA	2018
Contributory	7 (54%)	3 (23%)
Neutral	4 (31%)	10 (77%)
Detracting	2 (15%)	0
Total	13	13

Address	HCA Review Rating	Recommended rating	Comment
15 Wellesley	N	C	<p>Painted and filled in verandah</p> <p>On 1943 aerial. Verandah infill is reversible.</p> <p>DA0466/00- Additions plus new carport – revised plans</p> 
17 Wellesley	C	N	<p>Rendered. Has lost an important attribute of the design integrity when the brick was rendered.</p>

Address	HCA Review Rating	Recommended rating	Comment
			
19 Wellesley	D	N	While new the scale form and setback do not detract from the area. The change in rating from D to N does not impact on the outcome of the HCAs exclusion
19A Wellesley	D	N	While new the scale form and setback do not detract from the area. The change in rating from D to N does not impact on the outcome of the HCAs exclusion
21 Wellesley	N	N	No change. Battleaxe.
21A Wellesley	N	N	No change. Battleaxe.
23 Wellesley	C	N	<p>The house appears between the 1951 and 1956 aerial photograph. From the street it appears modified and BA95/1642 is for a major alteration and addition to the existing dwelling. The inventory sheet identifies the 1890s to the 1940s as the key periods of development.</p> 
25 Wellesley	C	C	Unchanged

Address	HCA Review Rating	Recommended rating	Comment
27 Wellesley	C	BL - N	<p>This house cannot be easily viewed from the street. This house has substantial additions BA89/2005.</p> 
29 Wellesley	C	C	Unchanged
31 Wellesley	C	N	<p>BA96/0437 alterations and additions.</p> 
4 Church Street	C	N	<p>House has an unsympathetic second storey addition.</p> 

Address	HCA Review Rating	Recommended rating	Comment
6 Church Street	N	N	Unchanged