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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

DFP has been commissioned by Lilac Pty to provide urban design and heritage services for Stage 1 development application for a mixed-use residential development incorporating adaptive re-use of the former Halvorsen’s Boatshed at 20 Waterview Street Putney (the Site). An Urban Design Report and Heritage Report have been submitted responding to Ryde Council’s Statement of Facts and Contentions lodged with the Land and Environment Court on 22 February 2019. The site is listed as a heritage item Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 (SREP SH 2005) and contains the remnants of James Squire’s wharf, an archaeological item of State significance (although not listed in the State Heritage Register).

A range of matters was discussed at a Section 34 Conference on 26 September 2019 with representatives of Ryde Council. The application has been amended to respond to the unresolved issues. This report brings up to date the urban design and heritage responses to the issues raised.

1.2 Material Relied Upon

For the purposes of preparing this report, we have reviewed documents and undertaken the following investigations:

1. Site inspections;
2. Updated Stage 1 Development Application Drawings by Jackson Teece architects – DA 000-006, 100-105, 200-202, 300-304, 400-408, 500-504, 600-601 and 700-708-Revision 4 and 5 Dated 22 October 2019
3. Updated Landscape Plans by Taylor Brammer - LA 01-14 dated 12 September 2019
5. Statement of Heritage Impact by DFP Planning Pty Ltd dated 22 May 2019
9. On site structural inspection by Simon Wiltshier of Mott MacDonald 19 July 2019
10. Structural Report by Mott MacDonald dated 16 September 2019
11. Structural Report on excavations near boat shed by Mott MacDonald dated 9 October 2019
12. Fire Engineering Advice by Holmes Fire LP dated 3 September 2019
2 Site Context

2.1 Location
The Site is located at 20 Waterview Street Putney. (see Figure 1).

![Site Location](source: Sixmaps)

2.2 Site Description
Refer to previous reports.
The site is zoned IN4 Working Harbour.

![Site Context](source: Sixmaps)

2.3 Surrounding Development
The land to the east and west is zoned RE1 Public Recreation Foreshore. Bennelong Park is on the eastern side and a parcel of Crown Land is on the western side. The area immediately to the west of the site is overgrown and unused. The land on the north side of Waterview
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Street is zoned R2 Low Density and comprises detached dwelling houses of one and two storeys overlooking the site from an elevated position.

2.4 Summary and Development Statistics

The proposed development application is for Stage 1 concept approval and comprises:

• Retention of the boatshed, the primary heritage item on the site;
• Retention and protection of the remnants of James Squire’s wharf;
• Site excavation;
• Removal of the eastern lean-to and northern extension from the 1942 boatshed;
• Adaptive re-use of the boatshed for commercial, food services and 19 apartments;
• Construction of 18 townhouses along the Waterview Street frontage;
• Two apartment buildings comprising 33 apartments;
• Waterfront public open space as part of a Parramatta foreshore public recreation trail;
• Through site links from Waterview Street to the waterfront;
• A public plaza on the north-east side of the boatshed;
• Associated landscaping;
• Vehicular access via Waterview Street; and
• Associated parking and delivery facilities.

3 Background

The project is the subject of Land and Environment Court Proceedings 2019/00025398 and 2019/00254350 and subsequent conciliation conference. The City of Ryde Council has prepared a Statement of Facts and Contentions, lodged with the Court on 22 February 2019 on Lilac No 1 proceedings on and Lilac No 2 proceedings number 2019/00254350 Statement of Facts and Contentions dated 12 September 2109. The application was referred to the Council’s Urban Review Panel (URDP) on 5 July 2018.

Following the advice of the URDP and an assessment of the application, the Council sent a letter to the applicant on 22 August 2018 outlining: the issues raised by the URDP; internal referral responses; and a referral response from the Office of Environment and Heritage. The issues raised in relation to urban design and heritage are broadly covered in the Statement of Contentions. There have been subsequent submissions of revised sketch plans responding to the URDP comments and exchanges of correspondence.

A without prejudice meeting took place with Council representatives on 28 July 2019 and Section 34 Conference on 26 September 2019.

The current application documents have taken into consideration the comments provided by the Council; the Statements of Facts and Contentions and matters raised in the without prejudice meeting and urban design and heritage advice provided by the writer was also considered.
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4.1 Introduction

This response to unresolved matters arising from the conciliation conference and should be read in conjunction with the previous Urban Design and Heritage reports responding to unresolved issues arising from the Statement of Facts and Contentions.

4.2 Contention 2 – Building Height

The Council’s planning consultant, Jeff Mead expressed a view that the building height had largely been resolved subject to an updated Clause 4.6 submission.

VISUAL IMPACT

The Council’s heritage experts expressed concern about the visibility of the silhouette of the apartment building as seen rising above the boatshed in views from vantage points identified at the meeting. The Visual Analysis Report by Clouston Revision B dated 15 August 2019 provides before and after images which demonstrate the following investigation findings;

1. From Viewpoint 1 – Meadowbank Wharf, the upper part of the lift and stair serving the rooftop communal open space of the western residential flat building will be seen over the northern part of the ridge line of the boatshed. The scale of this building element is inconsequential compared to the bulk and scale of the boatshed. No other part of the apartment buildings will be visible. The western end of the town houses (which comply with the height standard) will be seen through a screen of vegetation to the left of the boatshed.

2. From Viewpoint 2 – Ryde Wharf Reserve, the upper part of the lift and stair serving the rooftop communal open space of the western residential flat building will be seen over the extreme northern ridge line of the boatshed. Again, the scale of this small building element is inconsequential compared to the bulk and scale of the boatshed. The residential flat building will be visible between the north end of the boatshed and the Ryde Bridge supporting structure at the same height as the boatshed ridge line and the west end of the town houses will be glimpsed between the pylons of the bridge structure at a lower height. The boatshed will clearly present as the dominant landscape element in the riverscape.

3. From Viewpoint 3 – Rocky Point, on the south side of the river opposite the subject site, the apartment building will be seen set well back behind the projecting boatshed through the retained Port Jackson Fig trees and additional landscaping. The boatshed will clearly present as the dominant landscape element in the riverscape.

Drawing DA-502 demonstrates that the non-compliance with the height standard occurs along the southern edges of the residential flat buildings. The exceedance varies from 576 mm to 1148mm along the southern edge of the western building and 107mm to 850mm on the southern edge of the eastern building. Reduction of the height of the southern edges of the buildings would achieve no appreciable difference in comparison of the bulk and scale of the residential flat buildings and the boatshed. Furthermore, most of the roof areas of the buildings comply with the height standard. If the southern parts of the buildings are reduced in height by redesign, leaving the rest of the building at a compliant height behind, there would be no difference in the perception of building height in the long view from across the river.

TOWNHOUSE FLOOR TO CEILING HEIGHTS

Concern was raised whether the floor to floor height of the townhouses at 2900mm would enable 2700mm floor to ceiling heights. The townhouses are domestic construction with conventional floor spans and load bearing walls. The 200mm floor zone is adequate to accommodate reinforced concrete slabs spanning the spaces as well as ceiling finishes. The floor plans place wet areas over wet areas or circulation spaces enabling plumbing to be accommodated in a 2400mm floor to ceiling height. Refer to floor plans on drawings - DA 600 and 601.
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OVERSHADOWING OF “PRIVATE OPEN SPACES” BY RESIDENTIAL FLAT BUILDING

Concern was raised in relation to the amount of overshadowing from the non-compliant RFB to private open space areas and questions whether the private open space to the south will receive a minimum of 2 hours solar access to 50% of its area. It is understood that this concern relates to the space between the buildings and the shoreline.

This is not intended to be private open space. It will be accessible to the community and will deliver a significant public benefit. It should not be assessed as solely serving as communal open space for the residential flat buildings in accordance with Part 3D of the ADG. The roof top communal open spaces are the primary facilities for the residential flat buildings as well as the facilities at car park level. The residents of the boatshed will have opportunities for joint use of the public open spaces provided by the plaza to the north, the atrium and the waterfront space. This matter was fully addressed in the Urban Design report by DFP dated 13 May 2019.

The waterfront open space is already heavily overshadowed by the Port Jackson Fig trees that will be retained. The shadow diagrams follow the convention of not showing shadows cast by trees. The shadow diagrams show that (disregarding trees) approximately 50% of the waterfront open space will receive sunlight at midday at the winter solstice increasing to more than 50% up to 3pm. The degree of height non-compliance of the southern edges of the buildings is small and makes little difference to the shadows cast, which in any event would be, for the most part, where the retained trees will cast relatively dense shadow due to the nature of the foliage of Port Jackson Figs. It is also noted that the northern plaza will receive sunlight over the entire area between 9am and 3pm at the winter solstice.

4.3 Contention 4 – Apartment Design Guide

BOATSHED APARTMENTS – CROSS VENTILATION

This matter was addressed at page 5 of the Urban Design Report – SEPP 65 Principles by DFP Planning 14 May 2019.

An amendment to section DA30 of the plans includes the insertion of high-level windows of the apartment walls facing into the atrium within the boatshed building to achieve compliance with Part 4B of the ADG. Without ventilation through the atrium 53% of the apartments achieve cross ventilation; this increases to 100% utilising the atrium. The ADG guidelines require 60%.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

The current drawings demonstrate that the matters raised by the Council's urban designer are resolved, as follows:

- The area between the RFBs is not accessible to the public in the interests of safety and security of the residents;
- Public access is available between the blocks of townhouses;
- The separation between the western apartment building and the boatshed is confirmed as 12000mm, noting that this spatial relationship is only for one third of the length of the boatshed; and
- The interface with Bennelong Park has been improved by increasing the setback to the eastern facade of the RFB to 4000mm, enabling planting of Flowering Lilli Pillis to 3 metres height to screen the wall of the car parking and can also be improved by arrangement of apartment windows in the detailed design to provide passive surveillance of the park.
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4.4 Contention 5 – Urban Design

ACCESS FROM BENNELONG PARK

There are two points of access. The northern point of access is at grade with no steps. The pathway follows the landform with accessible gradients of 1:14 entering the site and 1:20 or less through the site.

MAIN ENTRANCE TO THE SITE

The main pedestrian entrance to the site is between the townhouses leading directly to the public plaza and easy access to the pathways to the foreshore, the apartments and the boatshed. The area is to be attractively landscaped with ‘shared way’ type paving and a separate accessibility compliant pedestrian path. Access to and through the site will be guided by way finding in the detailed design.

VEHICULAR ENTRANCE TO SITE AND CAR PARK

The amended plans provide planting areas on both sides of the entrance driveway extending along the edge of the Crown Reserve. These areas will be landscaped with screen planting growing to 5 metres in height. The existing trees in the Crown Reserve west of the site will be unaffected. There has been criticism of the presentation of the western side of the car parking level as a wall to the reserve. The side of the car park is designed to be open, with landscaping including climbers on screens at the ends of the parking rows and plants from the level above cascading over the edge.

This area is also obscured in views from the crown reserve by the large Fig tree that is to be retained.

ELEVATED PLAZA DECK NORTH OF BOATSHELD

The amended landscape plans have reduced the extent of paving and increased planted areas including canopy trees, tall palms and densely planted understorey species. See heritage comments also.

TREATMENT OF THE SIDES OF THE CARPARKING LEVEL AND INTERFACE WITH THE PARK

The amended plans incorporate communal activity rooms at the south side of the car park level with direct dedicated access from the lift and a terrace overlooking the foreshore open space. The landscape drawing LA12 shows the land is to be mounded up at the south east corner of the car park structure and densely planted to screen the wall of the upper car park level. The landscaping continues along the east side of the car park upper level in an increased 4000mm setback.

PUBLIC ACCESS ON SOUTH-WESTERN SIDE OF THE BOATSHELD

The applicant maintains the position that the proposal provides an abundance of public access along the foreshore and through the site to link Bennelong Park to the Crown Reserve on the western side.

4.5 Heritage matters

HERITAGE CONSIDERATION OF THE WHOLE SITE

This concern was raised by Lisa Trueman. The CMP assessed the outbuildings on the site as having little significance and was written on the understanding that, as a consequence of the planning proposal for the project, there was an agreement by the Council that the minor buildings on the site, the north-eastern two stages of early additions to the boatshed and the original engineers’ lean to on the south-eastern side could be demolished. The heritage impact statement was written on the same understanding. Council’s representatives maintain that this is not the case. This view appears to be inconsistent with the terms of amendment...
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No 7 to Ryde LEP 2104 (Gazetted 22 April 2106) to give effect to the planning proposal for development of 20 Waterview Street, Putney. The LEP amendment permits use of the land as follows:

“Development for the purposes of attached dwellings, business premises, food and drink premises, kiosks, marinas, multi dwelling housing, residential flat buildings and shops is permitted with development consent if:

(a) no more than 70 dwellings will be erected on the land to which this clause applies, and
(b) no more than 19 dwellings will be erected on the land identified as “Area 1” on the Key Sites Map, and
(c) a site-specific development control plan is prepared and provides for the retention of trees on Waterview Street, the impact on, and improvements to, the public domain, including the foreshore, and appropriate building setbacks from the foreshore.”

To implement the planning proposal, a substantial portion of the site is required to accommodate the uses identified. The key sites map shows the footprint of the main boatshed only (see extract below – the site is outlined in blue line).

If necessary, the CMP and Heritage Impact Statement can be supplemented or amended to give more detailed consideration to all built elements on the site.

The other structures on the site were rated as having little significance because they would not meet any of the inclusion guidelines under the listing criteria as they do not provide any important information about the historic activities and associations with the site. This is consistent with the findings of the Heritage Assessment Report by Architectural Projects 7 August 2014, which considered the levels of significance of the other structures on the site, at page 14, as having Significance level D - Little Significance, which does not qualify for local or State listing.

The Architectural Projects Heritage Assessment report was a matter of consideration of the JRPP in endorsing the amendments to the LEP and Council in its assessment of the planning proposal where its focus on any potential inclusion of the site within the LEP was to be to the Halverson building and the timber wharf below the high mean watermark to be protected by Council existing foreshore building line. Pages 14 and 15 of the Heritage Assessment report by Architectural Projects are appended to this report.

The south-eastern lean-to Section of the boatshed and the north-eastern addition, while rated as having moderate significance, are only rated as such for their association with the Halvorsens historic period. These elements have no technical or aesthetic values and do not demonstrate the boat building processes in the same way as the main boatshed.
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RELATIONSHIP OF NORTHERN PLAZA TO THE BOATSHED

During the Section 34 Conference comments were made about the “alleged” adverse impact of the northern plaza level abutting the boatshed. The following response confirms the response given at the time. A copy of the original drawings signed by Harold Halvorsen in January 1941 extracted from the CMP shows the lower part of the original north, or Waterview Street facing, wall as blank. The lower parts of this wall were substantially altered and opened up when the first skillion roofed addition was built, shortly after another skillion roofed addition was added creating saw tooth roof effect. It is contended that these early additions, although associated with the Halvorsen period, do not have any characteristics that demonstrate the boat building activities, they have no aesthetic or technical merit and their construction methods and materials are unexceptional. In these circumstances the impact of abutting the car park and plaza to lower part of the north-eastern wall is considered to be low and acceptable. The upper part of the main boatshed will be revealed anew and treated in manner that interprets its original appearance. Overall the impact of this aspect of the proposal is assessed as positive.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ISSUES

The matters raised regarding indigenous heritage and the potential for archaeological resources on the site will be addressed by the archaeological consultant for the project.

CURTILAGE

It is not agreed that the CMP and Heritage Impact Statement do not sufficiently address the curtilage of the boatshed and the site’s setting. Section 5.2.3 of the Heritage Impact Statement provides a description of the significant components of the curtilage and important parts of the setting, as well as the key views and vistas to and from the site, in the description of the proposed development.
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STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY OF THE BOATSHED

Concern was raised by Lisa Trueman about the structural integrity of the Halvorsen building. The boatshed was inspected on 19 July 2019 by Simon Wiltshire, a structural engineer with extensive heritage experience, in the company of Brian McDonald, heritage consultant for the project. His initial Structural Report dated 25 July 2019 concludes that,

Based on my site inspection and my examination of the drawings, I am satisfied that this project is feasible without excessive impact on the heritage significance of the structure, subject to reasonable assurance that a suitable solution regarding fire protection can be confirmed.

I would recommend however that the Client engage in further investigations of structural condition, geotechnical issues and fire protection, not only to provide assurance to the approving authority, but also to ensure that they have adequately costed the works needed to maintain the heritage significance of the building.

Given that the application is Stage 1 development application, the further investigations recommended would be conducted as the normal procedure.

Holmes Fire Engineering issued Fire Engineering Advice on 3 September 2019. A main requirement of the brief was to advise whether the primary hardwood structure can be retained in an exposed state. Their advice is that, provided a sprinkler system is installed, the primary hardwood structure does not require any intervention except where it passes through apartments in which case it may remain visible if treated with intumescent paint.

The report advises that smoke vents may be required at the top of the atrium. The design has already anticipated this requirement.

A further concern has been raised about the likely impacts of excavation for the car parking levels of the development adjacent to the boatshed’s north-eastern corner. This matter has been addressed by a structural report by Simon Wiltshier of Mott McDonald dated 9 October 2019. The report determined that the depth of excavation would not be lower than RL 1.70, whereas the footings of the boatshed have been estimated to be founded at RL 1.55. The report concludes:

“Subject to due consideration in detailed design, appropriate methodologies, and suitable site supervision during the works, I do not consider that the Boat Shed is at any significant risk from the works required to demolish the extensions, excavate for the carpark, and construct the carpark.”
APPENDIX 1
Pages 14 and 15 of Architectural Projects Heritage Assessment Report
Halvorsen
20 Waterview Street Putney

Schedule of significant fabric:
The schedule of existing fabric notes the relevant area and its level of significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>GRADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1939 Building 1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exterior</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Façade</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Façade</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Façade</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Façade</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Interior</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roof structure</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wall structure</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wall cladding</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wall opening</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timber fenestration treatment</td>
<td>B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring - concrete slab</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring - timber</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Additions</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 2 F C Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3 F C Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 4 F C Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 5 Concrete Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6 Log Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 7 F C Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 8 F C Garage</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 9 F C Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 10 Shed</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 11 Shed</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 12 Shadecloth Garage</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 13 Concrete Block Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 14 Concrete Block Building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 15 F C Building Winch Housing</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Apron</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1530-45 remnant jetty</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Squares Wharf</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The slipways within Building 1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The slipways beyond Building 1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.10. DISCUSSION OF THE GRADING OF SIGNIFICANCE
The significance of the original structural timber and the original structural timber of fenestration treatment of Building 1 warrants retention.
The significance of the remaining buildings on the site does not warrant retention.
The significance of the remnants of the site does not warrant retention and its condition is deteriorated to a point that it is not feasible to retain it.
Retention of the slipways, beyond the building 1 footprint, that are still in use warrant retention.

4.11. SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
The site has low significance for its potential to reveal information relating to occupation of the area by the Woronora Clan.

The site is significant for its associations with James Squire, an important early settler of the Ryde district and pioneer of Australia’s brewing industry. The site also has some significance in its association with the Devlin and Farnell families, who were important early settlers.
The site has considerable significance as the site of the first hops brewery in Australia, which operated from 1797 to 1880.
The site has potential to yield archaeological information about the early brewing practices in the Colony of New South Wales.

The site is significant as the site of Lars Halvorsen Sons. The production shed Building 1 has high significance. The post 1930’s Timber Wharf has moderate significance but has a low level of integrity. Lars Halvorsen Sons was an important foreunner in the development of industry in the Ryde Area. Lars Halvorsen Sons was important in the development of marine industry on the Parramatta River and generally. Their period of boat production continues from 1925 and 1940 on the site. The hire service continued at Bobbin Head. They were responsible for the construction of the mast of the Katharine Gillette now housed in the Maritime Museum. Lars Halvorsen Sons were the only marine producers who operated before and after the war to provide production of service boats for war effort in both World Wars. Their production rated a high priority status during wartime. Halvorsen and Sons were prominent in Sydney society. Their involvement with the Norwegian community was recognised by a special visit by the King of Norway and a knighthood to Carl Halvorsen. The original timber structure and elevated timberwork platforms have significance as evidence of earlier boat construction techniques.