

31 October 2025

NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Att: Jasmine Tranquille

Dear Jasmine,

Response to submissions

59–63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield

1 Executive Summary

Urbis has been engaged by Castle Hill No.8 Pty Ltd to provide ongoing heritage consultation advice in regard to the development on the subject site located at 59–63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield which is legally described as: Lot 30 of DP4215, Lot 71 of DP4665, Lot 1 of DP127411, Lot B of DP344051 and Lot 7 of DP17373.

The subject site does not include any listed heritage items (under Schedule 5 of the *Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015* (KLEP) or the State Heritage Register). The subject site is located within the *Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield Conservation Area (C42)* which is listed under the KLEP.

SSDA Application SSD-79276958 was lodged by Castle Hill No.8 Pty Ltd in April 2025 seeking development consent for the following works:

The project includes the construction of a new 9-storey residential flat building development which includes the provision of in-fill affordable housing on the site at 59–63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield. The development will comprise 174 market dwellings and 46 affordable units (5 in perpetuity and 41 for a minimum of 15 years).

Specifically, this SSDA seeks approval for:

- Site preparation including demolition of all existing structures and site;
- Tree removal;
- Site amalgamation;
- Construction of a residential flat building with basement parking;
- External landscaping works;

The purpose of the project is to deliver high quality market and affordable housing within convenient walking distance of Lindfield Station.

This letter has been prepared as an addendum to the updated *Heritage Impact Statement; 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield (October 2025)* prepared by Urbis to address the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEAR's) issued for project SSD-79276958. This addendum Letter has been prepared to respond to the RtS themes broadly and specifically as submitted by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) on 10 July 2025 and Ku-ring-gai Council on 3 June 2025.

This response follows amendments to the proposed development which are summarised below and noted where relevant throughout this response.

- Setbacks have increased to all sides of the building (increased by 3m to both ground floor and tower levels)
- Total units have reduced to 212
- Loading dock has been relocated internally
- Façade adjustment to suit internal unit changes
- Basement levels for parking requirements to suit reduced units
- Landscaping adjusted to suit setback changes
- Landscaping screening added to southern elevation along the easement

2 Response to Submission

The design of the proposed development has been further updated and a response to the RtS submission has been included below:

DPHI RFI	
Heritage	The full response to RFI items issued by DPHI are included within the updated "Heritage Impact Statement: 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue + 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield" (October 2025) prepared by Urbis within the following sections: Executive Summary, Section 6: Heritage Impact Assessment and Section 7: Conclusion and Recommendations.
12. Update the HIS to respond to the following comments:	The following summarised response has been provided to respond to the DPHI RFI. The aforementioned HIS should be referred to for a full response.
a. update references to consider Council's final scheme	▪ The development scheme proposed for the subject site will establish a needed source of high-density residential living opportunities within the vicinity of
b. consider the context and topography of the site, noting that the heritage items to the south are located at a much lower level	
c. confirm whether the potential provision of a side gate forms part of this application	
d. assess the cumulative impacts of the development on the adjoining heritage items	

and the conservation area considering the broader legislative context

e. clarify the conclusion that the proposal would not result in adverse heritage impact to the conservation area.

multiple public transport corridors as per the provisions in Chapter 5 of the Housing SEPP for identified sites within a 400m walking catchment of Lindfield train station in the Ku-ring-gai LGA. The subject SSDA was lodged in April 2025 under the 2024 TOD controls prior to the adoption of the Preferred Scheme by Council on 5 June 2025 . Since lodgement, DPHI have turned off the TOD provisions for new DA's except for a list of nominated 'saved' sites, including the subject site, located at 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield. The TOD provisions therefore still apply to the subject SSDA.

- It is noted that the proposed building would be of a different scale and typology than that which currently exists. However, the proposal exists in a legislative context which will facilitate significant uplift of the same type in particular areas. The development would be in line with the planned future character of this surrounding area, including the newly revised Council's Preferred Scenario update. Council have applied the preferred TOD scenario up to the west side of Trafalgar Avenue however have not considered the eroded subdivision pattern on the east side of the street or the fact that the subject site will now relate to a higher density contemporary streetscape, not the primary streetscapes within the Middle Harbour Conservation Area, to which the houses within the subject site never directly visually related. Given the contextual analysis provided, Urbis is of the opinion that the preferred TOD scenario should also apply to the east side of Trafalgar Avenue.
- The development has been designed to provide a transition from the current low density to 4-9 storeys. As outlined in this report, various architectural devices have been employed to moderate the difference in scale between the development and the existing heritage context including a podium, articulation of form, materiality and setbacks from heritage items to the north.

- The location of this development is appropriate given the intersection it would be in which includes a disparate combination of elements on the edge of a conservation area including vacant land and late 20th century and contemporary housing.
- The design of the proposed scheme is sensitive to the characteristics of the *Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield Conservation Area (C42)* and the extant structures located on the subject lot. The form, massing, materiality and façade articulation of the proposal is informed by the local visual context of the site's intersection location and its sloping topography, additionally the proposal respects the established setback pattern of the Trafalgar Avenue streetscape.
- The driveway will not incorporate a side gate, however a 1800mm high open steel palisade security fence and gate will be provided to the pedestrian side pathways at the northern and southern boundaries.
- The southern sloping topography of the subject site and its context in relation to the adjoining locally listed heritage items has been considered throughout the resolution of the development. Whilst the adjoining heritage items located along Middle Harbour Road are situated on lower relative levels than the development, measures have been implemented throughout the design resolution phase of the proposal to limit and mitigate potential visual impact to the adjacent items arising from the proposal. The development incorporates a 6m setback at the podium level to the southern boundary which increases to 9m at the base of the tower form in order to respect the adjoining heritage items along Middle Harbour Road. Additionally, the material palette of the development has been informed by the surrounding HCA and incorporates a combination of traditional brown brick materiality applied to the podium form and a lighter contemporary colour treatment to the tower form which provides visual differentiation from the adjacent heritage items

and appears recessive. Additional plantings will be incorporated to the southern boundary line to further minimise visual impact to adjoining heritage items to the south and will be in line with the densely vegetated character of the surrounding HCA.

- A considered series of undulating setbacks within the vertical façade expression presents the proposal as a small village of individual buildings on the subject site rather than a monolithic structure.
- Measures to moderate the difference in scale and maintain some architectural dialogue with the adjacent heritage items to the north-east have been incorporated in the proposal as outlined in Section 6 to minimise heritage impacts.
- Substantial setbacks from the adjacent heritage items including a spacious separating courtyard and the use of a podium have been integrated into the scheme to give less prominence to the highest part of the development.
- A considered approach to vegetation will be included within the scheme to respect the character of the Heritage Conservation Area's streetscape. Large mature trees plantings along Trafalgar Avenue will be prioritised to create continuity with the character of surrounding streetscape.
- The cumulative impacts of developments of this type, in the immediate vicinity of the subject site, will be somewhat limited due to the adoption of Council's TOD Preferred Scenario, which applies only up to the west side of Trafalgar Avenue. It is understood that the subject site is one of few sites that are 'saved' in the immediate area (to the east of the Council Preferred Scenario), in terms of the applicability of the original TOD Scheme. Other saved sites include the proposed developments located at 24-26 Russell Avenue, Lindfield and 27-29 Tyron Road, Lindfield. However, the other sites are located substantially to the north-west of the

concentration of the heritage items on Middle Harbour Road. These other saved sites are also not located within any Kur-ring-gai HCA and the heritage items within the vicinity of the subject site are situated outside the perimeter of the mapped Transport Oriented Development Area. Therefore, the saved sites have limited potential to have an additional impact on the items of significance and no additional future TOD developments are likely to be proposed east of Trafalgar Avenue. The cumulative visual effect of the buildings that are likely to result from the Council Preferred Scheme, immediately across the road from the subject site, are anticipated to be acknowledged by Council.

For the reasons stated above, the proposed works are recommended for approval from a heritage perspective having regard to the proposed recommendations below.

Recommendations:

A heritage consultant is to be included in the final resolution of the below:

- Detailed design resolution of the façade to be in line Heritage Impact Statement.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

B. Desired future character – Retain Heritage Significance of the Area

As indicated above, development consent must not be granted to residential development unless consideration is given to when the proposed residential development is compatible with the desired elements of the character of the local area. The character of the local area is characterised by its heritage

Urbis Heritage Response

RFI query: The bulk, scale, massing and overall design of the proposal is inappropriate and not compatible within the site's sensitive heritage context.

The proposed scheme responds to a needed source of high-density residential living opportunities within the vicinity of multiple public transport corridors as per the provisions of the TOD SEPP. The area's future character is expected to evolve significantly due to the subject site's proximity to Lindfield and Roseville train station and the effect of the TOD SEPP and therefore the HCA will exist in the context of higher density development than what exists today.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection	
Summary of Heritage Issue Raised	Urbis Heritage Response
significance. The site is located within the 'Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield' (C42) heritage conservation area (HCA) and also directly adjoins the following 4 x local heritage items as prescribed in Schedule 5 of the KLEP: ▪ I452 – 34 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield; ▪ I453 – 32A Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield; ▪ I479 – 1 Valley Road, Lindfield; and ▪ I480 – 3 Valley Road, Lindfield; The bulk, scale, massing and overall design of the proposal is inappropriate and not compatible within the site's sensitive heritage context. The existing contributory buildings on the site provide a significant contribution to the heritage character of Lindfield. The demolition of these buildings and the construction of the proposed building will fail to conserve the heritage significance of the heritage conservation area and the adjoining heritage items.	Council have applied the Preferred TOD Scenario up to the west side of Trafalgar Avenue however have not considered the eroded subdivision pattern on the east side of the street or the fact that the subject site will now relate to a higher density contemporary streetscape, not the primary streetscapes within the Middle Harbour Conservation Area, to which it never applied. Given the contextual analysis provided, Urbis is of the opinion that the preferred TOD scenario should also apply to the east side of Trafalgar Avenue. The proposed development has included considered design elements to soften the overall appearance of the scheme in its bulk, scale and massing in relation to the site's surrounding heritage context. The proposal features an undulating primary façade projection to Trafalgar Avenue in conjunction with modular vertical massing to reduce appearance of its overall bulk and scale and to present more as a series of smaller buildings rather than a singular monolith. Notwithstanding, changes have been applied to the development to lessen the bulk of the development and the curtilage around the significant items in the conservation area, including and increase in setbacks from all boundaries by 3m (podium and tower levels). The additional landscaping that can be accommodated in this setback will further soften the interface between the development and the surrounding items. RFI Query: The existing contributory buildings on the site provide a significant contribution to the heritage character of Lindfield. The demolition of these buildings and the construction of the proposed building will fail to conserve the heritage significance of the heritage conservation area and the adjoining heritage items. Urbis has conducted contextual analysis of each individual property that forms part of the subject site within the conservation area. Both of the only two buildings which are easily visible from Trafalgar Avenue within the subject site have been altered. More notably however, these are separated from the key streetscapes in the conservation (e.g. Middle Harbour Road) area by virtue of the sites fronting the northernmost section of Trafalgar Avenue. This

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

Urbis Heritage Response

section of Trafalgar Avenue has three modified houses on the east side, with an inconsistent architectural rhythm. A third of the other (west) side of the street is occupied by the side boundary of a house that fronts Russell Street. The street gains some more architectural consistency and consistency in lot layout to its southwest end. However, generally it does not represent a cohesive streetscape like elsewhere in the conservation area.

Urbis has therefore provided a Revised Statement of Significance that has been informed by detailed historical research and on-site fabric analysis. The Revised Statement of Significance provided by Urbis has found that:

The dwelling located at **59 Trafalgar Avenue** has limited ability to contribute to the HCA as, due to its location and lot orientation, it is not visible in the same context as any other early development within the HCA except the altered dwelling at 61 Trafalgar Avenue. The dwelling's presentation to the streetscape has been heavily altered from its original construction - the original height plane of the roof has been raised and no longer reflects the original design. The original roof form has been altered through the contemporary upstairs extension that presents to the streetscape with a free-style contemporary insertion on the left-hand side. Other contemporary elements such as the veranda's timber filigree and two-storey rear addition have been incorporated across the primary-façade which deviate from the site's original presentation. Overall, no significance has been identified to warrant an individual listing in the dwelling's own right.

The dwelling at **61 Trafalgar** has limited ability to contribute to the HCA as, due to its location and lot orientation it is not visible in the same context as any other early development within the HCA, it is not on a principal street surrounded by contributory items, but is on the short southern end of the conservation area containing only two dwellings fronting the street which is the altered dwelling at 59 Trafalgar Avenue. The dwelling's presentation to the streetscape has been altered from its original construction - Around 40% of the front elevation of the dwelling (south end) is a circa 2006 addition.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection	
Summary of Heritage Issue Raised	Urbis Heritage Response
	These dwelling are not visible in the same context as any other early development within the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. The dwelling at 63 Trafalgar Avenue presents distinctly to the streetscape as a contemporary construction. The dwelling dates from 1991 and therefore features no heritage significance or ability to contribute to the character of the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. The dwellings at 1A and 1B Valley Road both feature a battle-axe lot orientation and are not visible from either Trafalgar Avenue or Valley Road streetscapes. Additionally, neither dwelling presents with any assortment of elements that give them architectural merit and therefore they cannot contribute to the heritage character of the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. As such, the existing dwelling group is unable to provide a significant contribution to the heritage character of the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area and their demolition would not impact the legibility or significance of the broader heritage character of Lindfield.
C. Heritage Impacts Heritage Objectives <i>The heritage provisions of the KLEP 2015 under clause 5.10 set the objective “to conserve the environmental heritage of Ku-ring-gai”. A further objective set by the KLEP is “to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views”. These objectives follow the standard instrument established by the NSW Government SEPP.</i> <i>The Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan sets further detailed objectives and controls to implement these KLEP</i>	RFI QUERY: 1) DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AT 59, 61, 63 TRAFALGAR AVENUE, LINDFIELD AND 1A, 1B VALLEY ROAD, LINDFIELD. As discussed above, through detailed historical analysis and contextual observations contained within “Heritage Impact Statement – 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue, 1A + 1B Valley Road, Lindfield” (Urbis, April 2025), Urbis has found that the existing dwelling group is unable to collectively make a significant contribution to the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. RFI QUERY: (2) INAPPROPRIATE SETTING AND VIEW IMPACTS The development has been set back an additional 3 metres from all boundaries to reduce impacts on the setting. The increased setbacks would be occupied by additional landscaping. The following additional Visual Impact Assessment: “Appendix A 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue & 1A-1B valley Road, Lindfield” has been provided by Urbaine in relation to the subject site.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

objects in relation to conserving significance, fabric, setting and views for heritage conservation areas and heritage items.

Transport Orientated Development

The Guidance to Transport Orientated Development Brochure by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure May 2024 Page 11 states "Development Applications in heritage conservation areas.

Any new apartment buildings proposed in an HCA should be appropriate to the context, and build upon the features of the HCA, whilst delivering increased housing density.

The guide outlines the steps needed to ensure our heritage places are conserved, maintained and enhanced through good design, while realising good development outcomes.

(1) DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AT 59, 61, 63 TRAFALGAR AVENUE, LINDFIELD AND 1A, 1B VALLEY ROAD, LINDFIELD.

The proposal will result in the removal of five (5) existing dwellings currently located at 59, 61, 63 Trafalgar Road, Lindfield and 1A, 1B Valley Road, Lindfield that collectively make a significant contribution to the heritage conservation area (C42).

(2) INAPPROPRIATE SETTING AND VIEW IMPACTS

Urbis Heritage Response



Camera positions map with proposed D.A site in magenta



Viewpoint 1

While some visual impact is anticipated to the northern views from adjacent heritage items located at 32A and 34 Middle Harbour Road as a result of the proposal, the tower form of the development will feature lighter morning earthy tones which will appear recessive against the skyline. The development will additionally feature a 9m setback at the base of the tower form from the southern boundary to further reduce impacts to views north from Middle Harbour Road.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

Clause 5.10 in KLEP

Under clause 5.10 set the objective “to conserve the environmental heritage of Ku-ring-gai”. A further objective set by the LEP is “to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views”

Inconsistent with the Burra Charter

The Burra Charter – the Australia ICOMOS charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance – is the key document guiding conservation practice in Australia. The following Article 8. Setting states:

“Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual setting and other relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place. This includes retention of the visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.”

Streetscape impacts

The ‘site’ has increased prominence in the conservation area because of its corner position at the intersection of Russell and Trafalgar Avenues. This forms the gateway into the conservation area on Trafalgar Avenue and is visible from a long view

Urbis Heritage Response



Viewpoint 3

Views looking south from heritage items located at 1 and 3 Valley Road will not be impacted as a result of the proposed development as indicated by Viewpoint 3 shown above. The incorporation of a neutral material palette within the development in particular the morning earthy tones of the tower form will appear recessive against the skyline and will be additionally obscured by the existing densely vegetated character of Valley Road.

RFI QUERY: 3 INADEQUATE SETBACKS

The revised scheme submission has incorporated additional setbacks from the development to the heritage items at 1 and 3 Valley Road. The podium has been further setback by an additional 3 metres (9 metres total) from the development's northern-eastern boundary adjoining 1 Valley Road and 3 Valley Road. Additionally, the tower has been further setback from this boundary by 3 metres (12 metres total) in an effort to reduce the perceived bulk of the development from both items. The development similarly features a 9.2m setback at the podium level and 12m setback at the base of the tower form from its southern boundary to provide adequate setbacks from the adjacent heritage items located along Middle Harbour Road.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection	
Summary of Heritage Issue Raised	Urbis Heritage Response
<i>down the length of Russell Avenue. It contributes to three streetscapes in Russell Avenue, Russell Lane and Trafalgar Avenue. The proposed demolition of the buildings with mature gardens and construction of a residential flat building does not satisfy the objectives of the KLEP which is to conserve the heritage significance of the conservation area in terms of both the loss of a contributory properties and introduction of a detracting building into the conservation area.</i> <i>Inappropriate setting for the Heritage items within the vicinity and the heritage conservation area</i> <i>As detailed in B above, the proposed residential flat building is located next to 4 heritage items at:</i> Item #I479, "Dwelling House, 1 Valley Road, Lindfield" Item #I480, "Hazeldean, Dwelling House, 3 Valley Road, Lindfield" Item #I453, "Dwelling House, 32A Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield" Item #I452, "Dwelling House, 34 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield" <i>The site is also located within the Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield Conservation Area (C42).</i> <i>Views from the individually listed items will be adversely affected as they will be blocked by a proposed residential flat building. Views to the sky, trees</i>	Additionally, the south-east vertical portion of the tower has been stepped down to respond to the subject site's sloping south-east topography and to provide a transition to neighbouring buildings. RFI QUERY: 4 ADVERSE IMPACTS ON CHARACTER As discussed above, the scheme has been revised to incorporate additional setback's between the development's northern boundary and the adjacent locally listed heritage items at 1 and 3 Valley Road in an effort to reduce the appearance of the scheme's bulk within its context. Similarly, the development features a 9.2 metre setback from the southern-eastern frontage of the podium and the adjacent locally listed heritage items located along Middle Harbour Road in an effort to reduce the appearance of the scheme's bulk within its context. The increased setbacks would be occupied by landscaping to soften the interface with the surrounding area. The overall vertical mass of the building has also been informed by the south-eastern slop of the lot and has been stepped down in this direction to reduce the transition in height between the development and adjacent items along Middle Harbour Road. The Trafalgar Avenue streetscape features an irregular setback pattern however the development incorporates a 6m setback from its primary western boundary to reflect the setback alignment of the adjacent property at 55 Trafalgar Avenue. RFI QUERY: 5 INCOMPATIBLE BULK-MASSING SCALE AND FORM It is acknowledged that the scheme is of a different scale and typology than what currently exists. As discussed above, the proposal has incorporated various design elements to reduce impact on the surrounding character of the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. The proposed development has included considered design elements to soften the overall appearance of the scheme in its bulk, scale and massing in relation to the site's surrounding context. The proposal features an undulating primary façade projection to Trafalgar Avenue in conjunction with modular vertical and horizontal massing to reduce appearance of its overall bulk and scale and to present more as a series of smaller buildings

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

and terracotta roof tops will be obliterated by the proposed development. The proposed development will fail to conserve the heritage significance of these heritage items.

Summary of adverse impacts to setting and views

The proposed development will adversely impact on the heritage items and HCAs and will alter the context and setting of the existing streetscape of this section of Russell Avenue, Trafalgar Avenue and Valley Road.

(3) INADEQUATE SETBACKS

The proposed residential flat building does not respect the established pattern of built elements in the streetscape and the HCA in the vicinity as it is significantly larger and taller than all the buildings in this part of the street and surrounding area and has minimal setbacks

Summary of adverse impacts to setbacks

The proposed residential flat building does not adequately transition to the buildings on either side which are single or double storeys. There are insufficient setbacks between the built form and inadequate setbacks on the upper levels to provide a transition between the adjacent buildings of different scales.

Urbis Heritage Response

rather than a singular bulk. This effect has been affirmed by the projecting human-scale podium form which presents to Trafalgar Avenue. The overall form has also been informed by the surrounding heritage context of the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. The vertical massing of the development has been stepped down accordingly to the southeast to consider the falling south-east topography of the site and to minimise the impact of the scale of the development on northward views from nearby items located along Middle Harbour Road.

The following updated CGI's of the development have been provided by DKO.



Trafalgar Avenue Facade



Southern Facade

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

Urbis Heritage Response

(4) ADVERSE IMPACTS ON CHARACTER

The proposed minimal setbacks to the side boundaries on both sides, is not the general character of the streetscape and will increase the bulk of the building and have an obtrusive and unacceptable impact.

Summary of adverse impacts on character

The proposed development is in the vicinity of several heritage items and conservation areas and does not harmonise or enhance the area's distinctive identity as it will dominate the streetscape and be visible from all surrounding sides. There are limited setbacks and no transition in height.

(5) INCOMPATIBLE BULK-MASSING SCALE AND FORM

Inconsistent bulk and scale

The proposed residential flat building does not relate to the predominant scale (height, bulk, density) of the setting around it and will have an adverse impact on the heritage items and HCAs in the vicinity.

The overall scale of the proposed development is not in context with the streetscape, heritage items and HCAs in the vicinity and has no transition to the buildings on either side of the site.

Summary of bulk and scale

The proposed increased density will irreversibly degrade the heritage



Northern Facade

RFI QUERY: 6 LANDSCAPE LOSS

It is understood that some extant vegetation and mature trees on site are required to be removed as a part of the proposal. The proposal however mitigates this impact through the planting of additional supplementary street facing vegetation and vegetation located along boundary lines which will soften the appearance of the development from the street and adjoining heritage items and establish continuity with the existing vegetation throughout the Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area.

The following updated Landscape Plan of the development have been provided by Paul Scrivener which responds to the increased setbacks.

Ku-ring-gai Council Objection

Summary of Heritage Issue Raised

significance of the heritage items and heritage conservation areas in the vicinity because of the inconsistency of the existing low scale historic built form.

(6) LANDSCAPE LOSS

Loss of Trees

The loss of trees will have an adverse impact on the heritage items and HCAs in the vicinity as it will change the leafy character of the street.

Loss of planting at rear and side setbacks

The lack of planting area within the proposed side setbacks will have an adverse impact on the items and conservation areas in the vicinity as it does not provide adequate landscape amenity and is inconsistent with the neighbouring properties.

Summary of Landscape loss

The proposed loss of landscaping will have a detrimental impact on the heritage items and conservation areas in the vicinity.

(7) DETAILS MATERIALS AND COLOURS

Incompatible Building Form

The proposed bulk use of concrete and bricks will be obtrusive in the streetscape and will have an adverse impact on the heritage items and HCAs in the vicinity.

Urbis Heritage Response



Landscape Masterplan

RFI QUERY: 7 DETAILS MATERIALS AND COLOURS

Contemporary application of traditional building materials such as brick, a prevalent materiality throughout the HCA, has been incorporated into the design of the podium form to respond to the existing material palette of the surrounding Middle Harbour Road Conservation Area. Where brick application has been incorporated, its perceived mass has been broken up by lightweight materials such as glazing so as to reduce the appearance of the development as a monolithic form.

The application of a lighter colour treatment for the tower component is appropriate as it serves to differentiate the podium and tower masses and emphasises the human-scale of the podium form. The material scheme has been revised to include morning earthy tones to the tower component which allows for the development to better respond to the existing colour palette of heritage items within the vicinity and the surrounding HCA streetscape whilst still allowing for visual differentiation between the podium and tower forms.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Allie Cornish'.

Allie Cornish
Associate Director
+61 2 8233 7624
acornish@urbis.com.au

