



# STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT

PREFERRED PROJECT REPORT  
MOORE COLLEGE  
NEWTOWN CAMPUS  
PART 3A CONCEPT PLAN SITE

**REVISED** 27 AUGUST 2010

Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Pty Limited  
Level 3, 4 Glen Street Milsons Point  
NSW Australia

Telephone +61 2 9922 2344 Facsimile +61 2 9922 1308

ABN: 16 002 247 565

Nominated Architects

Ridley Smith : Reg No.2268; Graham Thorburn : Reg No.5706; Geoffrey Deane : Reg No.3766

This report has been prepared under the guidance of the Expert Witness Code of Conduct in the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules and the NSW Land & Environment Court Practice Directions relating to the provision of evidence by expert witnesses. The opinions in the report represent the professional opinions of the author based on an assessment of the available information cited in the report.

This document remains the property of Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Pty Limited.  
The document may only be used for the purposes for which it was produced.  
Unauthorised use of the document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

# **STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT**

## **FOR MOORE COLLEGE NEWTOWN CAMPUS**

### **PART 3A CONCEPT PLAN SITE**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This Statement of Heritage Impact has been prepared in accordance with the standard guidelines of the NSW Heritage Office to accompany the Preferred Project Report for a Part 3A Concept Plan and Project Application for proposed works to Moore College Newtown Campus. It is proposed to consolidate the College on the site and provide additional college accommodation specifically in the form of a new Research and Resource Centre with associated parking.

The design of the scheme has been arrived at taking into account the heritage issues in the development of the Preferred Project Report and has been informed by the development of a Conservation Management Strategy for the concept plan site. This revised statement assesses potential impacts arising from the Preferred Project which has been prepared in response to the requirements of the Department of Planning and submissions received during the exhibition period.

The assessment of potential heritage impact has been undertaken by Don Wallace, Senior Heritage Consultant, under the direction of Robert Staas, Director / Heritage Consultant of NBRS+PARTNERS Architects. The development proposal and works to the heritage building have been prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier. The Preferred Project Report has been prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier.

This Statement of Heritage Impact should be read in conjunction with the Preferred Project Report and the Conservation Management Strategy.

#### **1.1 Heritage Listings**

##### **National Heritage List**

- Not listed on the National Heritage List – does not warrant listing as an item in itself on this list which is reserved for places of outstanding heritage value.

##### **Commonwealth Heritage List**

- Not listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List – unable to be listed on this list unless it changes ownership to the Commonwealth Government.

##### **State Heritage Register**

- Not listed on the State Heritage Register – below threshold for State listing.

## Local Environment Plan

- It is subject to listings on the South Sydney Local Environment Plan (LEP) 1998 under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (EP&A Act) with 21 King Street, 23-25 King Street, 33-35 King Street and 6-20 Little Queen Street within the Part 3A Concept Plan Site being listed as heritage items in Schedule 2 of the South Sydney LEP 1998.
- Parts of the site lie within two conservation areas – the King Street Conservation Area (CA31) and the Bligh and Camperdown Terrace Conservation Area (CA5). Information from the conservation area maps are set out below.

	Contributing	Neutral	Detracting	Heritage Item
1 King Street	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
3-5 King Street	Yes	-	-	No
7 King Street	Yes	-	-	No
9 King Street	Yes	-	-	No
11 King Street	Yes	-	-	No
Knox Building (13-15 & 17-19 King Street)	Yes	-	-	No
21 King Street	-	-	Yes	Yes
23-27 King Street	Yes	-	-	Yes
29-31 King Street	Yes	-	-	No
33-35 King Street	Yes	-	-	Yes
2-16 Carillon Avenue	-	-	Yes	No
18-28 Carillon Avenue	28 Yes	-	18-26 Yes	No – 28 Draft Item <sup>1</sup>
30-44 Carillon Avenue	Part Yes	Part Yes	Part Yes	No
84-86 Campbell Street	-	Yes	-	No
1-13 Little Queen Street	Yes	-	-	No
15-17 Little Queen Street	-	Yes	-	No
2-4 Little Queen Street	-	Yes	-	No
6-20 Little Queen Street	Yes	-	-	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Deaconess House (Former Mary Andrews House) has been recommended for inclusion as a draft heritage item on the draft City of Sydney Local Environment Plan which is currently being prepared.



**Figure 1** City of Sydney Conservation Area 5 'Bligh & Camperdown Terrace' showing contributing, neutral, detracting and heritage items. The map has been annotated by NBRSPartners to show the Concept Plan site bordered in blue. The Carillon Avenue sites and Campbell Street (North) sites have been excluded from the conservation area following Council's review of the boundaries of the conservation area. As stated above, Deaconess House could be considered a draft heritage item whereas it is shown here as a contributing item in an excluded area.



**Figure 2** City of Sydney Conservation Area 31 'King Street' showing contributing, neutral, detracting and heritage items. The map has been annotated by NBRSPartners to show the Concept Plan site bordered in green. Note that heritage items within the LEP schedule are not all shown on this drawing and that 21 King Street (a heritage item) is indicated as 'detracting'.

## 1.2 Heritage Significance

*Moore Theological College Newtown Campus Part 3A Concept Plan Site* is of cultural heritage significance because:

- It contains two of the earliest buildings on King Street (33 and 35 King Street) and the substantially intact Little Queen Street south which together demonstrate the first phase of residential subdivision and development of the Camperdown Terrace Subdivision;
- Little Queen Street is an enclosed laneway streetscape with simple and austere two storey row houses with bald-faced facades which is rare in the locality and provides an intimate ambience and distinct sense of place;
- The site contains Deaconess House which was established on Carillon Avenue in 1916 and has continuing significance in the history of theological education of Anglican women as well as aesthetic significance as a two storey brick and slate building with characteristics of the Federation Queen Anne style;
- The corner position at Carillon Avenue and King Street has landmark significance as a principal gateway site from the city into Newtown; and,
- The site demonstrates the expansion and development of Moore Theological College on the southern side of Carillon Avenue following the 1939-45 war.

## 2.0 PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

The site comprises a variety of building types and styles, in heights ranging from single to four storeys built from the mid-nineteenth to late twentieth century. The condition and intactness of individual buildings varies. Refer Conservation Management Strategy for further detail.

## 3.0 THE PROPOSAL

The proposal includes an overall concept plan for the site together with a specific project application for two parts of the site to develop a Research and Resource Centre with supporting car parking. The Research and Resource Centre comprises a modulated six storey building at the landmark intersection of Carillon Avenue and King Street. Heights and setbacks in parts of the exhibited concept plan and exhibited project plan have been modified in the Preferred Project. Generally, these have been reductions in heights and increases in setbacks and are shown in the Preferred Project Report and on the architectural drawings.

Design statements are set out in Allen Jack + Cottier's Preferred Project Report. That report has been informed by the heritage value of the site throughout its initial investigation and further in response to submissions received which has led to the Preferred Project.

The Preferred Project is set out on the following drawings by Allen Jack + Cottier.

Concept Plan Drawings (included in the Preferred Project Report):

- 09027\_CP1000 Location Plan (GFA) (p54 PPR)

- 09027\_CP1100-A Demolition Plan
- 09027\_CP2001 Basement 1 Plan (p35 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2002 Basement 2 Plan (p36 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2003 Basement 3 Plan (p37 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2101 Level 1 Plan (p38 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2102 Level 2 Plan (p39 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2103 Level 3 Plan (p40 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2104 Level 4 Plan (p41 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2105 Level 5 Plan (p42 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2106 Level 6 Plan (p43 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2107 Level 7 Plan (p44 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2108 Level 8 Plan (p45 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2109 Level 9 Plan (p46 PPR)
- 09027\_CP2110 Level 10 Plan (p47 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3100 Carillon Avenue Elevation (p49 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3101 South Elevation (p48 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3200 Site A Section 1 (p50 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3201 Site A Section 2 (p51 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3202 Site B Section 1 (p52 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3203 Site B Section 2 (p53 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3800 Shadow Diagram 1 (p39 PPR)
- 09027\_CP3801 Shadow Diagram 2 (p39 PPR)

Research and Resource Centre Preferred Project Application Drawings:

- 09027\_PA0000-B Cover Sheet and Site Location
- 09027\_PA1000-C Site Plan Existing
- 09027\_PA1001-D Site Plan Proposed
- 09027\_PA1100-C Demolition Plan
- 09027\_PA2001-D B1 Floor Plan
- 09027\_PA2002-D B2 Floor Plan
- 09027\_PA2003-C B3 Floor Plan
- 09027\_PA2101-F Level 1 Plan
- 09027\_PA2102-F Level 2 Plan
- 09027\_PA2103-F Level 3 Plan
- 09027\_PA2104-F Level 4 Plan
- 09027\_PA2105-F Level 5 Plan
- 09027\_PA2106-F Level 6 Plan
- 09027\_PA2107-E Level 7 Plan
- 09027\_PA2108-B Level 8 Roof Plan
- 09027\_PA2120-D Ground Floor Plan – Site B
- 09027\_PA3100-E Elevations
- 09027\_PA3101-E Elevations
- 09027\_PA3200-E Sections
- 09027\_PA3201-E Sections
- 09027\_PA3202-B ESD Section
- 09027\_PA3300-B Photomontage 1
- 09027\_PA3301-A Photomontage 2
- 09027\_PA3302-A Photomontage 3
- 09027\_PA3800-B Shadow Diagrams 1
- 09027\_PA3801-B Shadow Diagrams 2

- 09027\_PA3802-B Shadow Diagrams 3

## **4.0 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

### **4.1 Introduction**

The following assessment is based on the guidelines set out by the NSW Heritage Office publication 'Statements of Heritage Impact', 2002.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item or conservation area for the following reasons:

- All heritage items within the concept plan site and the draft heritage item known as Deaconess House also within the concept plan site are retained and conserved;
- Retention, conservation and adaptation of the retained contributory items will enhance the viability the conservation areas;
- The development reinforces the significance of the landmark site at Carillon Avenue and King Street and provides a strong gateway to King Street, Newtown, from its City Road approach;
- The continued evolution of the concept plan site reinforces the significance of Moore College in this part of Newtown in which the College has had a presence since 1889; and
- The development will be supported by heritage interpretation.

Aspects of the proposal which might detrimentally impact upon heritage significance had been largely mitigated by preliminary design reviews and modifications to the final proposal. In response to the requirements of the Department of Planning and submissions received during the exhibition period, the design was modified. The modified scheme is the Preferred Project. This scheme further mitigates impacts upon the heritage elements and conservation area by reducing the scale of the development from the scheme exhibited.

The following sympathetic solutions have been considered and discounted for the following reasons:

- Adaptation and redevelopment within the existing buildings cannot provide adequate accommodation for the needs of the College. The approach has been to retain and conserve the most significant elements of the site and mediate their interfaces with new contemporary facilities.

### **4.2 Demolition of a building or structure**

- *Have all options for retention and adaptive reuse been explored?*

Elements of highest significance are being retained and adaptively reused. Elements proposed to be demolished are of lesser significance.

- *Can all the significant elements of the heritage item be kept and any new development be located elsewhere on the site?*

New development is located on parts of the site with lowest significance and the element of greatest massing has been sited to reinforce the landmark potential of the triangular site at Carillon Avenue and King Street as a

gateway to King Street – a role originally played by the toll bar which has long since been demolished.

- *Its demolition essential at this time or can it be postponed in case future circumstances make its retention and conservation more feasible?*

Demolition of elements of low significance is planned in the Concept Plan as is the feasible retention, conservation and adaptive reuse of elements of higher significance.

- *Has the advice of a heritage consultant/specialist been sought? Have the consultant's recommendations been implemented? If not, why not?*

The advice of NBRSPartners has been ongoing in the development of the Concept Plan and the development of the Preferred Project. The advice and recommendations are outlined in the Conservation Management Strategy against which the impacts of the scheme are set out here and which provides additional guidance on implementation and mitigating measures and strategies.

#### **4.3 Major partial demolition (including internal elements)**

- *Is the demolition essential for the heritage item to function?*

Demolition of elements of lesser significance will allow significantly improved amenity to the College on the site and will assist in improved use of the retained heritage elements of greatest significance.

- *Are important features of the item affected by the demolition (eg fireplaces in buildings)?*

Important elements of the retained items will be conserved in accordance with the recommendations of the Conservation Management Strategy and, where necessary, more detailed conservation investigation and advice.

- *Is the resolution to partially demolish sympathetic to the heritage significance of the item (eg creating large square openings in internal walls rather than removing the wall altogether)?*

Partial demolition of elements on the site of lesser significance is sympathetic with the heritage significance of the site as a whole and integration of new elements has been designed so as to mediate the interfaces of significant fabrics and spaces within the proposed new elements.

- *If the partial demolition is a result of the condition of the fabric, is it certain that the fabric cannot be repaired?*

Partial demolition is not principally the result of the condition of the fabric but derives from accommodation requirements.

#### **4.4 New development adjacent to a heritage item (including additional buildings and dual occupancies)**

- *How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?*

Adverse impacts have been minimised by retention of elements of highest significance and attention to massing, scale and materials at the interface between what is proposed to be retained and new development.

- *Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?*

The Deaconess Institution and Moore College have a long history on the site and wish to reinforce their presence. Their continuation on the site retains and reinforces that aspect of significance on the site and the retention of other elements of significance provides an appropriate evolution of the site.

- *How does the curtilage allowed around the heritage item contribute to the retention of its heritage significance?*

The lot curtilages of the heritage items generally relate to zero lot boundary development/nil setback or minor setback transitional zones common to inner urban development. The concept plan continues this type of development.

- *How does the new development affect views to, and from, the heritage item? What has been done to minimise negative effects?*

The landmark Carillon Avenue and King Street site reinforces the landmark gateway of the location. Views to the King Street properties are principally from the southwest and these views are retained with additional backdrop development. The quality of Little Queen Street as an intimate streetscape is retained in the development and allows for potential pedestrianisation in future development. Views to the Deaconess Institution along Carillon Avenue are retained in the proposed development.

- *Is the development sited on any known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits? If so, have alternative sites been considered? Why were they rejected?*

The development is not sited on any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits. Provisions for the investigation, discovery, identification and management of significant relics has been allowed for in the Conservation Management Strategy and will be implemented in the course of work.

- *Is the new development sympathetic to the heritage item? In what way ( eg form, siting, proportions, design)?*

The scale and massing of the building has been arrived at so as to integrate a considerably larger new landmark, gateway building adjacent to a lower scale streetscape. This has been done on King Street by the recessing of upper storeys and reinforcement of the grain and street rhythm by the use of a colonnade. At the same time, the scale of the building references and reinforces the greater scale of development nearby including Alpha House, recent University of Sydney developments and the former Grace Bros department stores on Broadway. The mediation of the mixed scales of King Street and City Road has been further mitigated in the preferred project by reducing the height, bulk and form of the proposed new buildings. The King Street elevation has been revised moving the western wall of the Research and Resource Centre above level 2 east to reduced perceived impacts on the adjoining terraces at 9-11 King Street. With regard to the concept plan:

- Site A's building east of the former Mary Andrew's House has been further set back so as to allow an increased curtilage for the draft heritage item;
- the height of building B1 on Site B has been reduced to retain some degree of dominance of the heritage listed school over that site;
- the B4 Terraces along Campbell Street have more levels than the existing terraces opposite but their form with set back roof terraces

have an acceptable response in terms of form and scale and which is capable of resulting in acceptable heritage impacts when designed in more detail.

- *Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? How has this been minimised?*

New development reinforces the landmark significance of Carillon Avenue and King Street gateway to Newtown while mediating the scale shifts with retained elements and the broader context of King Street and the City Road settings.

- *Will the public, and users of the item, still be able to view and appreciate its significance?*

Retained elements that are currently visible will be retained as visible. Some elements of greatest significance will be restored and reconstructed to their earlier form and augmented with heritage interpretation so that a greater understanding of the place's significance will be available to both the public and users of the place. Little Queen Street will be enhanced as a public domain demonstrating the earliest subdivision in Newtown as a living streetscape.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed works described in the exhibited Project Application did not significantly adversely affect the identified heritage significance of the property. The Preferred Project further mitigates and reduces adverse heritage impacts. I recommend the heritage aspects of this application be approved subject to the mitigating measures and further details set out below:

- All works to be in accordance with the Conservation Management Strategy for the site;
- The archival recording, further investigation and research recommended in the Conservation Management Strategy be carried out; and
- The redevelopment should be augmented with Heritage Interpretation of the significance of the site and its ongoing relationship with Moore College.



Robert Staas  
Director / Heritage Consultant  
NBRS+PARTNERS ARCHITECTS