



PRESERVING AUSTRALIA'S OLDEST GARDEN SUBURB

P.O. BOX 85, HUNTERS HILL, N.S.W. 2110

DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN NO. 27 HUNTER'S HILL VILLAGE

1. The Hunters Hill Trust understands that the architectural and design objective for the Hunters Hill Village is defined by the:

- Arterial shops that set the scale and pattern of subsequent development;
- Retention of the original two storey scale;
- Retention of the subdivision pattern based on the width of original shop fronts;
- Retention of the vertical proportion of the building elevations of these shops;
- Hunters Hill Hotel should remain the major landmark building within Hunters Hill Village, and;
- Any new development should not compete for equivalent landmark status.

2. The revision of the DCP allows an opportunity for Council to consider reducing the area covered by the DCP; in particular the Trust would urge that a reduction of the Ryde Road precinct would protect the transition from the commercial, multi use, higher density of the village core to the surrounding residential area. The particular benefits would be:

- Protection of the Avenue Road heritage items;
- Greater retention of the low scale, formal pattern that forms the entrance to the village from the west;
- Greater retention of the historic subdivision pattern.



3. The Trust would urge that the consistent use, throughout the DCP, of the word “present” with reference to the number of storeys cited, be deleted. To “present”, for example, a two storey façade to the street, inevitably assumes from a development potential that a third storey is permissible. (See page 2-5, 3rd paragraph; page 3-2, objective vii; and others.)


4. The draft contains references to and recommendations of morphologies / types / elements / materials that are not typical of and inappropriate for Hunters Hill. In particular we would delete reference to the following:

- Front courtyards – Core A North (page 2-5)
- Townhouse, terrace house – Ryde Road (page 2-6; page 3-20)
- Colonnades, arcades - Core A North & B South (page 3-4; page 3-5)
- Green roofs and walls where such elements obtain “Feature” status (page 3-16)
- Granite paving (page 3-17)

5. The Trust believes that uniform ground floor build-to lines would achieve a more consistent footprint and relationship to the street edge for four of the proposed five (A to D) variants identified. The overall intention is to retain and enhance the existing architectural and design qualities of the arterial shops. Needless to say, special setback provisions would apply to sites adjoining heritage items, notably 62 Gladesville Road and 1 & 3 Ryde Road. (See Section 3.1.3)



6. Furthermore the Trust does not believe that there should be cantilevered buildings over the right of way proposed along Howard Place. The height does not permit this and the concept would create an unreceptive, tunnel sense of space.



7. Minor editing:

Section 3.1.7, page 3-11

*Whilst the LEP promotes redevelopment of the precinct, this requires skilful sensitive design to ensure new development in a conservation area or next to a heritage item maintains and enhances the distinctive identity and sense of place. This may mean that achieving maximum FSR's, densities, setbacks or heights may **not (delete)** need to be compromised when having regard to these constraints.*

8. Facadism is not an acceptable heritage practice and should not be encouraged in any way in the document. In particular, Section 3.1.7, item ii, page 3-12 should be deleted.

ii. If retention of the whole building is not practicable, the street front façade(s) shall be retained and incorporated in the new development.

9. A consistency of awning heights to 3 metres would achieve a better street elevation than that proposed. The Trust recommends amending Section 3.1.8, section d, page 3-13 to accord with this.

10. The intention of the DCP is clearly to restrict the number of driveways across the pedestrian footpath in the Core A – North. The proposed solution, however, to provide egress via the rear of heritage item at no. 62 Gladesville Road is too proscriptive. While this method may eventuate with time, it is also desirable to retain the deep soil planting at the rear of no.62 to maintain the present tree cover within the village area. See Section 3.2.1, section c, item ii.

11. The Trust does not believe that the provision of a significant public art sculpture at Mapledorams corner will necessarily be an embellishment to the village core. A well presented outdoor café in this

location would achieve the required community benefit and embellishment, without an inevitably subjective choice of public sculpture about which it would be difficult to achieve community consensus. See Section 3.3.2, section f.

12. The whole paragraph under Section 3.3.3, page 3-19, should be deleted as it has the potential to lead to inappropriate architectural and design solutions for the village character.

The apparent height is to be reduced by means of recessing the top storey and expressing each level clearly in terms of human proportions, with a base, middle and top. This is to be achieved by careful selection and variation in materials, colours and textures.

13. The Trust questions the encouragement of the consolidation of allotments as the only cited mechanism for providing medium density housing along Ryde Road (Objectives in Section 3.4.1). Dual occupancy might provide for a more appropriate form and scale of density within this area and should not be discouraged by way of omission. (page 3-21)

14. In line with this, the Trust questions the promotion of site amalgamation in the Objectives and Controls in Section 3.4.5. The retention of original frontage widths, and hence the pattern of individual houses, will also retain the essential character of the village.

15. Minor editing:

6.5 metres is indicated as the front setback for the Ryde Road precinct in the plan on page 3-24. In Section 3.4.7, page 3-30, however, it is incorrectly stated as 6 metres in section e and section f.

The Trust hopes that Council will regard the above comments favourably and looks forward to seeing their consideration and inclusion in the final form of the DCP for Hunters Hill Village. Please do not hesitate to contact myself or Tony Coote, the Vice President, for any further discussion.

Robyn Christie
President
Hunter's Hill Trust