



STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT

CONCEPT PLAN & PROJECT APPLICATION
MOORE COLLEGE
NEWTOWN CAMPUS
PART 3A CONCEPT PLAN SITE

16 OCTOBER 2009

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 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 Urban Design Report and has been informed by the development of a Conservation Management Strategy for the concept plan site.

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 Urban Design Report has been prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier.

This Statement of Heritage Impact should be read in conjunction with the Urban Design 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 also 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 |
| 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 |



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.



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 seven storey building at the landmark intersection of Carillon Avenue and King Street.

Design statements are set out in Allen Jack + Cottier's Urban Design Report. That report has been informed by the heritage value of the site throughout its investigation.

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

Concept Plan Drawings:

- 09027_CP1000 Overall Site Plan
- 09027_CP1100 Demolition Plan
- 09027_CP2001 Basement 1 Plan
- 09027_CP2002 Basement 2 Plan
- 09027_CP2101 Level 1 Plan
- 09027_CP2102 Level 2 Plan
- 09027_CP2103 Level 3 Plan
- 09027_CP2104 Level 4 Plan
- 09027_CP2105 Level 5 Plan
- 09027_CP2106 Level 6 Plan
- 09027_CP2107 Level 7 Plan
- 09027_CP2108 Level 8 Plan
- 09027_CP2109 Level 9 Plan
- 09027_CP2110 Level 10 Plan
- 09027_CP3100 North Elevation
- 09027_CP3101 South Elevation
- 09027_CP3200 Section A1
- 09027_CP3201 Section A2
- 09027_CP3202 Site B Section 1
- 09027_CP3203 Site B Section 2
- 09027_CP3800 Shadow Diagram 1
- 09027_CP3801 Shadow Diagram 2

Research and Resource Centre Project Application Drawings:

- 09027_PA0000 Cover Sheet and Site Location
- 09027_PA1000 Site Plan Existing
- 09027_PA1001 Site Plan Proposed
- 09027_PA1100 Demolition Plan
- 09027_PA2001 B1 Floor Plan
- 09027_PA2002 B2 Floor Plan
- 09027_PA2101 Level 1 Plan
- 09027_PA2102 Level 2 Plan

- 09027_PA2103 Level 3 Plan
- 09027_PA2104 Level 4 Plan
- 09027_PA2105 Level 5 Plan
- 09027_PA2106 Level 6 Plan
- 09027_PA2107 Level 7 Plan
- 09027_PA2108 Roof Plan
- 09027_PA3100 Elevations
- 09027_PA3101 Elevations
- 09027_PA3200 Sections
- 09027_PA3201 Sections
- 09027_PA3202 ESD Section
- 09027_PA3300 Photomontage 1
- 09027_PA3301 Photomontage 2
- 09027_PA3302 Photomontage 3
- 09027_PA3800 Shadow Diagrams 1
- 09027_PA3801 Shadow Diagrams 2
- 09027_PA3802 Shadow Diagrams 3
- 09027_PA4200 Materials Board
- 09027_PA2120 Parking – Ground Floor Plan
- 09027_PA3120 Parking - Elevations and Sections
- 09027_PA4120 Parking – Photomontage 1
- 09027_PA4121 Parking – Photomontage 1

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 are retained and conserved;
- Retention and adaptation of 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 have been mitigated by preliminary design reviews and modifications to the final proposal.

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.

- *Is 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 NBRS+Partners has been ongoing in the development of the Concept Plan. 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 of sufficient size and quality.

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 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 relate principally to zero lot boundary development/nil setback 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 reinforced by the removal of motor vehicles and the roadway's potential pedestrianisation. 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 lower scale 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. This approach realises the gateway potential of the landmark site as an entry to Newtown from the City.

- *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 above do not significantly adversely affect the identified heritage significance of the property. 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.



Don Wallace

For and on behalf of

Robert Staas
Director / Heritage Consultant
NBRS+PARTNERS ARCHITECTS