



Cardinal Freeman Village  
137 Victoria Street, Ashfield

## MP 08\_0245 Mod 2 Statement of Heritage Impact



August 2013

Issue	Description	Date	Issued By
A	Draft for Review	9/08/2013	GL
B	Revised draft	16/08/2013	GL
C	Report Finalised	16/08/2013	GL

Graham Brooks & Associates Pty Ltd  
 Incorporated in NSW  
 Architects, Planners & Heritage Consultants  
 71 York St, Level 1  
 Sydney 2000 Australia  
 Tel: (61) 2 9299 8600  
 Fax: (61) 2 9299 8711  
 Email: [gbamain@gbaheritage.com](mailto:gbamain@gbaheritage.com)  
[www.gbaheritage.com](http://www.gbaheritage.com)  
 ABN: 56 073 802 730  
 ACN: 073 802 730  
 Nominated Architect: Graham Leslie Brooks  
 NSW Architects Registration: 3836

# Contents

Introduction .....	4
1.1 Background .....	4
1.2 Report Objectives .....	5
1.3 Methodology and Structure .....	5
1.4 Site Identification .....	6
1.5 Heritage Management Framework .....	6
1.6 Authorship .....	7
1.7 Report Limitations .....	7
 Description of the Proposal .....	 8
 Assessment of Heritage Impact.....	 9
3.1 Introduction .....	9
3.2 Analysis of Heritage Impact on Items Within the Cardinal Freeman Village Site .....	10
3.3 Analysis of Heritage Impact on Items in the Vicinity of Cardinal Freeman Village .....	16
3.4 Mitigation Measures .....	23
 Conclusions and Recommendation.....	 24
4.1 Conclusions .....	24
4.2 Recommendation .....	24

# Introduction

# 1.0

## 1.1 Background

This report has been prepared to accompany a S75W application for proposed modifications to the approved development for Cardinal Freeman Village, at 137 Victoria Street, Ashfield.

Approval for the staged redevelopment of the Cardinal Freeman Village site was issued by the Planning and Assessment Commission in January 2011. The approved Concept Plan, Major Project No. 08\_0245, was for the comprehensive redevelopment of an existing retirement village over 5 stages including 12 residential buildings of 3 to 5 storeys in height and a residential aged care facility with associated landscaping, community facilities, internal road network and parking.

This approval was modified in April 2013 with the approval of MP 08\_0245 MOD 1, which included:

- amended construction staging from 5 stages to 2 stages;
- reduction in the total number of new buildings from 13 to 8 and increase in the size of the building envelopes/footprints of resulting 8 buildings;
- amendment of building heights and building separation between building envelopes;
- 15% increase in gross floor area (GFA) from 41,490m<sup>2</sup> to 48,106m<sup>2</sup>;
- an increase in the overall number of Independent Living Units within the site by 15 (from 340 to 355);
- demolition of the existing serviced apartment building (49 apartments) fronting Queen Street (previously to be retained, replaced with Building 1);
- straightening of the east-west link road through the site and increase the total number of car parking spaces by 42 (311 to 353); and
- modified landscape strategy.

The Project Approval, Major Project No. 08\_0260, issued in January 2011, was for the development of the first two stages of the Concept Plan approval. This approval was also modified in April 2013 with the approval of MP 08\_0260 MOD 1. It included:

- modifications to the internal layout and external treatment of the RACF with a relocated porte-cochere and entry;
- modified internal layout and external treatment of Buildings 2 and 3;
- consolidation of Buildings Q1, Q2 and Q3 (3 x 5 storeys) into a single 5 storey building (Building 4);
- change of use of the chapel undercroft from residential units to community facility use;

- consolidation of approved Stages 1 and 2 into one stage (Stage 1). Reorganisation of construction schedule, with the RACF and Building 2 and 3 being constructed first;
- an increase of one additional RACF bed space (from 132 to 133) and clarification of misdescription of approval for 160 beds;
- an increase in the number of ILUs within Stage 1 by 37 (from 104 to 141); and
- demolition of the existing serviced apartment building (49 serviced apartments) and construction of a new ILU building (Building 1).

The modifications to the approved scheme, proposed in this application, are in response to on-going discussions with residents and the Stockland design team.

## 1.2 Report Objectives

The main objective of this Statement of Heritage Impact is to analyse the heritage impact of the proposed changes in relation to the policies of the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Management Strategy* and the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan*, prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates in 2009, to accompany the Part 3A applications.

## 1.3 Methodology and Structure

This Statement of Heritage Impact has been prepared in accordance with guidelines outlined in the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 1999*, known as *The Burra Charter*, and the New South Wales Heritage Office (now the Heritage Branch of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage) publication, *NSW Heritage Manual*.

*The Burra Charter* provides definitions for terms used in heritage conservation and proposes conservation processes and principles for the conservation of an item. The terminology used, particularly the words *place*, *cultural significance*, *fabric*, and *conservation*, is as defined in Article 1 of *The Burra Charter*. The *NSW Heritage Manual* explains and promotes the standardisation of heritage investigation, assessment and management practices in NSW.

## 1.4 Site Identification

The Cardinal Freeman Village site is bounded by Victoria, Clissold, Queen and Seaview Streets, with the formal street address listed as 137 Victoria Street, Ashfield. It is identified by NSW of Land and Property Information (LPI):

- Lot 1 DP 1126717
- Lot 4 DP 717062
- Lots 6 and 7 DP 717644
- Lot 101 DP 702245

## 1.5 Heritage Management Framework

There are no elements of the Cardinal Freeman Village site listed as items of State significance on the State Heritage Register.

The overall site of the Cardinal Freeman Village is not listed on the Heritage Schedule of the *Ashfield Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 1985*. However, two buildings, namely Glentworth House and its adjoining Chapel building, are listed as items of local heritage significance in the *Ashfield LEP 1985*.

These are also identified in Schedule 5 of the *Draft Ashfield LEP 2013* as items 333 and 334, Chapel - "Cardinal Freeman Village" and House - "Glentworth" and stone and iron palisade boundary fencing – "Cardinal Freeman Village".

The Cardinal Freeman Village site is also in the vicinity of the following local heritage items, listed in Schedule 7 of the *Ashfield LEP 1985*, and proposed heritage items, identified by Ashfield Council:

### Heritage Items

- Victoria Square Conservation Area
- 85 Victoria Street
- 118 Victoria Street
- 120 Victoria Street
- 141 Victoria Street
- Victoria Street, street plantings
- 85 Queen Street
- 91 Queen Street
- 160 Queen Street

### Proposed Heritage Items

- 40 William Street
- Farleigh Estate Conservation Area
- Mountjoy Estate Conservation Area
- Murrell Estate Conservation Area
- Ambleside and Holwood Conservation Area



Figure 1.1  
Location map showing the subject site outlined in red  
Source: nearmap.com

## 1.6 Authorship

This report has been prepared by Gail Lynch, Associate Director, of Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd and has been reviewed by the Director, Graham Brooks. Unless otherwise noted all of the photographs and drawings in this report are by Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd.

## 1.7 Report Limitations

This report assesses the likely heritage impact of the proposed modifications. The detailed history and description of the site is contained in the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan*, prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates in 2009, to accompany the Part 3A applications.

The report is limited to the analysis of the European significance of the site. Recommendations have been made on the basis of documentary evidence viewed and inspection of the existing fabric.

Archaeological assessment of the subject site is outside the scope of this report.

This report only addresses the relevant heritage planning provisions and does not address general planning or environmental management considerations.

# Description of the Proposal

# 2.0

The modifications proposed to the approved Concept Plan include:

- Variations to the staging of construction to allow flexibility in construction including changes to the terms of the break in construction between Stages 1 and 2, the deferral of Building 1 and the concurrent construction of the RACF with Buildings 2 and 3
- Variation to condition regarding conservation of fencing to reflect the removal and storage of the gates to enable emergency vehicle access.

The modifications proposed to the approved Project Approval include:

- Minor changes to the internal and external design of ILU buildings 2,3 and 4;
- Changes to the staging of construction to allow flexibility in the order of priority of construction of buildings including the deferral of Building 1 and the flexibility in the construction of buildings 2, 3,4 and the RACF;
- Changes to the location of temporary services to allow for the provision of temporary buildings to house temporary administrative and community functions during construction;
- Changes to enable the removal and storage of the entry gates from Victoria Avenue as part of Stage 1 to enable emergency vehicles to access the site in accordance with NSW Fire Brigade requirements;
- Internal changes to the community facilities area in the chapel undercroft, and insertion of paired doors, instead of single doors, in the approved openings in the north elevation.



# Assessment of Heritage Impact

# 3.0

## 3.1 Introduction

In response to the DGR for MP 08\_0245, Graham Brooks and Associates prepared a *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Management Strategy* (2009) to guide the redevelopment of the subject site. Additionally, a *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan* was prepared to guide future changes to the listed heritage items, Glentworth House and the Chapel.

This Statement of Heritage Impact has been prepared in relation to the following impact assessment criteria, the policies of the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Management Strategy* and *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan*, prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates in 2009, and the New South Wales Heritage Office (now the Heritage Branch of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage) guidelines, *Altering Heritage Assets* and *Statements of Heritage Impact*.

It considers the impact of the proposed modifications to the approved development on listed heritage items within the Cardinal Freeman Village and those in the immediate locality.

Graham Brooks and Associates prepared Statements of Heritage Impact to accompany the applications for Major Project No. 08\_0245, Concept Plan, and Major Project No. 08\_0260, Project Application, and the MOD 1 applications, for redevelopment of the Cardinal Freeman Village. The analysis in this section analyses the likely heritage impact of the proposed modifications, relative to that which has been approved.

The Cardinal Freeman Village site contains two buildings identified as locally listed heritage items, Glentworth House and the Chapel, in the *Ashfield LEP 1985* and the *Draft Ashfield LEP 2013*.

No physical changes are proposed to Glentworth House as part of this modification. Changes are proposed to the internal layout of the approved cafe and associated facilities in the Chapel undercroft and to the staging of the approved relocation of the historic gates.

## 3.2 Analysis of Heritage Impact on Items Within the Cardinal Freeman Village Site

### 3.2.1 Established Significance of the Subject Site

The following Statement of Significance for the Cardinal Freeman Retirement Village has been sourced from the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan (CMP)*, prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates in 2009:

*The subject property is a heritage precinct containing a heritage listed footprint; the historic Glentworth House (and additions) and Chapel, as well as ancillary historic items of curtilage. These various built elements are of significant historic, aesthetic, social and technical value. They present in a generally high state of repair. The historic Glentworth House is a rare and fine example of a late nineteenth century two storey grand Italianate towered villa with numerous decorative features, in a meticulous, delicate and subtle combination. The additions have replicated key aspects this general form, quality and colouration. Its interior presentation is in a relatively high state of integrity. The 1941 Chapel in its overall style is representative of high quality interwar Catholic architecture and is unusual for the geometry of its interior layout. The listed footprint also has an important association with its immediate curtilage, which includes such historic elements as the entrance gates and pilasters, palisade and masonry fencing, and the established arboreal features.*

*It is further appreciated that the heritage footprint and its ancillary historic elements are situated within a larger property context, delineated by its four boundary streets. This larger context points to early Ashfield street patterns and was the well-established estate of the prominent Frederick Clissold and family, with various outbuildings.*

*After 1913, and for over 60 years the built elements that comprise the subject heritage precinct operated as the cloistered Convent, the Offices and the Chapel for the Good Shepherd Sisters. They were an important focus in the religious life and social work of the Catholic Church as it undertook the institutional care for many hundreds of girls and women considered at that time to be in irregular or poor social circumstances. The larger property context circumscribed the lives of many of these girls and women for some years. This larger property context proceeded through evolutionary phases typical of such institutions, and its present use for residential aged care has now been established for almost 30 years.*

### 3.2.2 Overview of the Potential Heritage Impacts

The following table provides an overview of the aspects of the proposed modification that may have potential heritage impacts. The staged relocation of the entry gates and the temporary buildings on the site of demolished Building E are addressed in detail below.

Minor changes to the internal and external design of the ILU buildings 2, 3 and 4.	<p>The modification proposes minor changes to the approved internal and external design of the ILU buildings 2, 3 and 4. As the footprints and envelopes of these buildings are unchanged from those approved and Buildings 2 and 3 are well removed from the listed heritage items within, and adjacent to, site it is considered that there will be no additional heritage impact as a result of the proposed amendments.</p> <p>The visual relationship between Building 4 and the Chapel remains essentially unchanged as there are no variations from the approved height and setbacks, and the roof top plant is set well back from the east.</p>
Change to the internal layout of the approved cafe, and associated facilities, in the Chapel undercroft.	<p>The grading of significant elements in the <i>Cardinal Freeman Village 137 Victoria Street, Ashfield Conservation Management Plan</i> (Graham Brooks &amp; Associates, September 2009) ranks the rooms and spaces beneath the Chapel as being of little significance. As such, the proposed internal changes will have no adverse impact on the established heritage significance of the Chapel.</p>
Staged relocation of the entry gates currently at Gate 1	<p>The potential impacts of changes to the staging of the approved works to allow the entry gates, and gate posts, to be removed and stored for reinstatement at a later date has been carefully considered, and is addressed in detail below.</p>
Provision of temporary resident facilities in demountable buildings.	<p>It is proposed to erect approximately six demountable buildings on the site of demolished Building E to provide temporary meeting rooms and associated community facilities during the construction works. It is envisaged that these buildings will be required for a period of approximately nine months.</p> <p>Although the detailed design of these facilities is yet to be determined it is understood that they will be single storey, removable units, accessed by timber ramps.</p> <p>These facilities will be seen in views to and from the Chapel.</p>

### 3.2.3 Staged Relocation of the Gate 1 Gate Posts and Gates

The current Concept Plan approval allows for the gates and gate posts at the Victoria Street Gate 1 entrance to be relocated to a new ceremonial vehicle entry in the location of Gate 2, which is currently a pedestrian entrance, as part of Stage 2 of the works. The modification proposes to undertake this relocation in two stages:

- the removal and storage of gates and gate posts as part of Stage 1
- re-erection of the gate posts and gates as part of Stage 2.

The primary reason for the staged relocation approach is to provide the required emergency vehicle access to the site. However, this approach also ensures there will be no inadvertent damage to the gates or gate posts during the construction period.

Completion of the relocation as part of the Stage 1 works is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the residents in this part of the site.

The impact of the proposed staging of the approved change has been minimised by the preparation of the *Report Regarding Removal & Reinstatement of Sandstone Gate Piers and Wrought Iron Gates* (Jasper Swann Pty Ltd, August 2013) and drawings prepared by Oculus to accompany this application.

The *Report Regarding Removal & Reinstatement of Sandstone Gate Piers and Wrought Iron Gates* includes detailed methodology for the removal of the wrought iron gates, dismantling of the piers (gate posts), transport and storage of the gates and piers, re-assembly in the new location and recommended repairs.

The drawings detail the new location and show the extent of the original fencing that is required to be removed to accommodate the gates. The *Report Regarding Removal & Reinstatement of Sandstone Gate Piers and Wrought Iron Gates* also includes methodology for the removal and salvage of materials required to widen the opening.

It is recommended that the potential for heritage impact is further mitigated by the inclusion of the following conditions of approval:

- The relocation of the gates and gate posts is to be completed prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate for Building 4
- Both stages of the relocation works are to be undertaken in accordance with the methodology prepared by Jasper Swann Pty Ltd, and by suitably qualified professionals with commensurate experience with those who prepared the methodology.

Subject to the recommended mitigation measures, it is considered

that the revised staging will have no additional heritage impact.

### **3.2.4 Temporary Buildings Adjacent to the Chapel**

The proposed temporary accommodation of administrative and community functions in demountable buildings adjacent to the Chapel will have a visual impact.

In the context of the approved development for the wider site, and given the reversible and temporary nature of the impact, this is considered to be an acceptable impact from a heritage perspective.

### **3.2.5 Heritage Division Impact Assessment Guidelines**

The NSW Heritage Office (now the Heritage Division of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage) has published a series of criteria for the assessment of heritage impact as relevant 'questions to be answered' in the *NSW Heritage Manual* 'Statements of Heritage Impact'. The following questions have been considered in the preparation of the preceding commentary.

#### **Landscape works and features**

- *How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the existing landscape been minimised?*
- *Has evidence (archival and physical) of previous landscape work been investigated? Are previous works being reinstated?*
- *Has the advice of a consultant skilled in the conservation of heritage landscapes been sought? If so, have their recommendations been implemented?*
- *Are any known or potential archaeological deposits affected by the landscape works? If so, what alternatives have been considered?*
- *How does the work impact on views to, and from, adjacent heritage items?*

#### **New Development Adjacent to a Heritage Item**

- *How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?*
- *Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?*
- *How does the curtilage allowed around the heritage item contribute to the retention of its heritage significance?*
- *How does the new development affect views to, and from, the heritage item? What has been done to minimise negative effects?*
- *Is the development sited on any known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits? If so, have alternative sites been considered? Why were they rejected?*
- *Is the new development sympathetic to the heritage item? In what way (e.g. form, siting, proportions, design)?*
- *Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? How has this been minimised?*
- *Will the public, and users of the item, still be able to view and appreciate its significance?*

### 3.2.6 Evaluation Against the Guidelines of the Heritage Management Strategy

The following commentary analyses the impact of the proposed modifications using the guidelines of the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Management Strategy*.

Guidelines	Comment Proposed Modification to the Approval
<p><b>6.2 Guidelines for Future Use of the Site</b>  <i>The overall guiding objective is that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cardinal Freeman Village should retain its long-term use as providing for the needs of aged-care residents and be periodically upgraded to meet contemporary requirements and standards</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed modification to the current approvals refines the approved development to respond to resident feedback and improve site and building efficiency.</p> <p>The modification is consistent with this guideline.</p>
<p><b>6.3 Process Guidelines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The advice of a Heritage Consultant should be sought as the planned staged development of the site moves forward. This will ensure the essential features of the site landscape are retained and managed during further evolution.</li> </ul>	<p>Graham Brooks and Associates continues to provide Heritage Consultancy advice to the Cardinal Freeman Village site managers.</p>
<p><b>6.4 Guidelines for Conserving Fabric of Different Grades of Significance</b>  <i>The landscape, building and infrastructure elements of Cardinal Freeman Retirement Village have been graded to determine their relative levels of significance. In general, future changes should be focussed on areas or components, which provide a lesser contribution to the overall significance and are therefore less sensitive to change.</i>  <i>Those elements with a High assessed heritage value should be retained. Their form should be subject to minimal change necessary to support their on-going use or adaptive re-use. These include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glentworth House</li> <li>The Chapel</li> <li>Selected landscape elements including remnant fencing, palisade and gates</li> </ul> <p><i>In relation to elements of Moderate significance the principles of the Burra Charter should be followed. Work involving the reduction (or potentially the removal) of a particular element may be an acceptable option, where it is necessary for the proper function of the place and is beneficial to, or does not reduce, the overall significance of the place. These elements include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parlours Annex</li> <li>Modified rear wings of Glentworth House</li> <li>Modified convent extensions to Glentworth House</li> <li>Remnant convent wall</li> </ul> <p><i>The site elements with a Little assessed heritage value are of slight significance and do not intrude on the place in a way that reduces significance. Both retention and removal are acceptable options. Intrusive elements that are deemed to detract from the areas or components of significance should be removed where possible, to allow for the preferred long-term option of recapturing the original garden setting and drive of Glentworth House.</i></p>	<p>The gates and pilasters at Gate 1 that are to be relocated to an enlarged opening at Gate 2 are elements of high significance, as is the fencing in this location.</p> <p>As noted above, subject to the recommended mitigation measures, it is considered that the revised staging for the approved relocation will have no additional heritage impact.</p> <p>The grading of significant elements in the <i>Cardinal Freeman Village 137 Victoria Street, Ashfield Conservation Management Plan</i> ranks the rooms and spaces beneath the Chapel as being of little significance. As such, the proposed internal changes will have no adverse impact on the established heritage significance of the Chapel.</p> <p>The modification is consistent with these guidelines.</p>

<p><b>6.11 Guidelines for Perimeter Fencing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Iron and sandstone fencing elements should be retained and conserved as part of a landscape design.</i></li> <li>• <i>New pedestrian gates in the fence along Victoria Street should be introduced to encourage activation of the street and improve pedestrian convenience.</i></li> <li>• <i>The existing pedestrian entrance gateway to the villas at the southern end of Victoria Street should be redesigned to reflect the heritage values of the new Glentworth Garden.</i></li> <li>• <i>This Victoria Street gateway may be relocated to give improved access to the heritage gardens and to reveal views of the house.</i></li> <li>• <i>Front gardens should be fenced along the street boundaries by the existing stone and wrought iron fence along Victoria Street/Clissold Street; the existing stone wall along Clissold Street/Queen Street, and the cement rendered wall along Seaview Street.</i></li> <li>• <i>Fence heights must be consistent along each street interface and consistent with the interpretation of heritage requirements.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Undertaking the approved relocation of the gates and pilasters from Gate 1 to Gate 2 in a staged manner is consistent with these guidelines.</p>
---	---

### 3.2.7 Evaluation Against the Guidelines of the Conservation Management Plan

In addition to the guidelines of the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Management Strategy*, the *Cardinal Freeman Village Heritage Precinct Conservation Management Plan (CMP)* contains policies to guide the conservation of the listed heritage items within the site. The following policies, considered relevant to the proposed amendment, are addressed below:

*The visual setting around the heritage footprint within Cardinal Freeman Village should be retained and enhanced in any future use of the buildings or the site.*

*If any new structures are required on the site their design and siting must be planned to maintain the visual presence of the heritage buildings.*

#### Comment

The temporary impact on the visual setting of the Chapel, in order to retain the amenity of the site's residents, is considered to be an acceptable heritage impact.

The temporary, demountable buildings proposed will not challenge the visual presence of Glentworth House and the Chapel.



### 3.3 Analysis of Heritage Impact on Items in the Vicinity of Cardinal Freeman Village

#### 3.3.1 Established Significance of the Heritage Items in the Vicinity of the Subject Site

There are a number of listed Heritage Items in the vicinity of the subject site, as shown in Figure 3.9.



Figure 3.9  
Aerial photograph showing the location of the heritage items in the vicinity of the subject site  
Source: [www.sixviewer.com](http://www.sixviewer.com)



The following information for these items has been sourced from the Ashfield Council website as the NSW Heritage Inventory data base provides no statements of significance or descriptive information.

### **Victoria Square Conservation Area**

The western edge of the Victoria Square Conservation Area is directly opposite the subject site in Victoria Street. Ashfield Council documents note the following for this conservation area:

#### *Statement of Significance*

*One of the number of subdivisions which collectively demonstrate the evolution and variety of suburban development in Ashfield, and one of the few examples of development pitched at the upper end of the residential market. The Square, with its symmetrical layout, central reserve incorporating remnant native trees and specimens from the Royal Botanic Gardens, and central access pathways, is an early example in Sydney of an attempt to create a London residential square and appears to have been influential in the layout of other residential subdivisions nearby.*

The contribution each property in the conservation area makes to its significance is identified in the *Ashfield DCP 2007*. Properties are ranked as follows:

- 1 - Buildings with a high degree of intactness which significantly contribute to the heritage significance and character of the Area.*
- 2 - Buildings which contribute to the heritage significance and character of the Area but whose significance has been reduced by loss of original materials/detail, unsympathetic additions or inappropriate decorative detail.*
- 3 - Buildings whose impact on the heritage of the Area is neutral.*
- 4 - Buildings which have an adverse impact on the Area because of their scale, design, assertiveness, materials or because their original qualities have been mutilated.*

Although there are only three Victorian villas (at 118, 120 and 128 Victoria Street) on the Victoria Street frontage of the Victoria Square Conservation Area all but the two properties, at the corner of Seaview Street, are ranked as contributory buildings (Ranking 1 or 2).

The Distinctive Qualities ascribed to the Victoria Square Conservation Area in the *Ashfield DCP 2007* are:

- a) Central reserve informally planted with mature trees including remnant natural vegetation and 1889 plantings from the Botanic Gardens.*
- b) The pattern of development – single building per generous suburban allotment, separated from street and from side and rear neighbours by green garden space.*
- c) Rear lane access only to garages, with the result that there is a continuous gutter along the street edge in Prospect Street and on the east side of Victoria Square with a few recent breaks on other street edges.*

d) Rear service lane for night-soil collection and access to stables and coach houses.

e) The informality of the tree planting and the variety in the scale, shape, style materials and fences of the houses is unified by the symmetry of the subdivision, the reserve and the central pathways.

f) A number of tall and decorative chimneys still remain to the houses

### **Victoria Street - Street Plantings**

Victoria Street is also characterised by the double row of Canary Island Date Palms, *Phoenix canariensis*, between Norton and Seaview Streets. These are a major defining component of the streetscape and setting of the two Victorian Villas at 118 and 120 Victoria Street and the edge of the Victoria Square Conservation Area as it fronts the subject site. Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>1</sup> provides the following information for these trees which were thought to have been planted in the 1920s.

#### *Statement of Significance*

*Colonnade of trunks gives strong vertical definition to street  
Representative of a type of street planting no longer undertaken  
Unique in street plantings within the Municipality*

### **House and Pavilion at 85 Victoria Street**

Mountjoy House and Pavilion at 85 Victoria Street is a large historic residential property that has been incorporated into a health and rehabilitation complex. The core of the historic property is located to the north of the subject site and effectively separated from it by Clissold Road and the four modern residential buildings at its southern end. Although these dwellings at 87 and 89 Victoria Street and 38 and 40 William Street are shown as part of the heritage item on the Ashfield LEP map they are not considered to be of heritage value. It is understood that the single storey modern house at 40 William Street has been proposed for listing as a local heritage item as it is the only residential building in Ashfield employing passive solar design techniques in timber post and beam mud brick construction.

Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>2</sup> provides the following information for this item:

#### *Statement of Significance*

*A pleasant informal bungalow in a splendid garden setting and having some unique detailing  
Now part of an important private institution*

#### *Historical Notes*

*The original function and date of construction of this pavilion are not known. It is shown, however, on the 1890 Water Board Plan, and it was given its Federation detailing by Thomas Peters after 1907.*

<sup>1</sup> Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 284

<sup>2</sup> Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 272

#### *Description*

*A simple single storey building of residential scale and informal character. Its slate roof has mitred hips and the verandah has paired timber posts. There are faceted bay windows, some with architraves and some with joinery projecting from the face to the wall, with bracketed sills. The most interesting detail is a set of wide French windows opening on to the verandah. Each is a single glazed door, with a triple-light top panel each of which is divided into small panes, and main panels of chamfered plate glass. Each also has entablature.*

As this heritage item is physically separated from the Cardinal Freeman Village site by the roadway and the intervening houses constructed within its own heritage curtilage it is considered any development of the subject site will not have an adverse impact on its established heritage significance.

#### **Houses at 118 and 120 Victoria Street**

118 and 120 Victoria Street are both large two storey Victorian Italianate Villas, located opposite the Cardinal Freeman Village.

Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>3</sup> provides the following information for these items:

#### *Statement of Significance*

*One of a mirror image pair of substantial houses designed by an important local architect.*

#### *Historical Notes*

*The architect Alexander Leckie Elphinstone Jr purchased ten lots from the Victoria Square subdivision, and on this and the adjoining lot he build two mirror image two storey villa, both purchased by Hugh Dixon in 1890. In 1920 the house was sold by the Dixon Property Trust to William James Edwards.*

#### *Description*

*One of a matching reflected pair of fine dwellings of standard asymmetrical form with some very unusual Gothic style stucco detailing, concentrated on the window bay, the lower storey of which is broader than the upper. The windows have depressed pointed arches. Those at lower level have angled buttress mullions with stumpy shafts, having foliated capitals, growing out of the buttress caps. The upper mullions have recessed shafts without capitals. The bargeboarded roof gables have collars and finials. Chimneys and window bay are heavily moulded and chimneys have semi-circular flue tops. Garden layout possible original.*

---

3 Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 275 and 276

### House at 141 Victoria Street

141 Victoria Street is a grand residence located south of the subject site in Victoria Street with driveway access to the rear of the property from Seaview Street. Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>4</sup> provides the following information for this property:

#### *Statement of Significance*

*A survivor of a series of grand Victorian mansions built on the heights of Victoria Street in the late 19th Century boom years  
An interesting variation of the Free Classical style applied to domestic architecture  
A good case history in the use of the NSW Heritage Act to save a historic building*

#### *Historical notes*

*Built in 1886 for Harold Thompson and owned by the family until 1921. During the 1890s a proposal to demolish the house, listed on the Heritage Schedule of the Ashfield LEP, was accompanied by the eviction of the tenants, the opening of the house to vandalism and theft, and a series of internal fires. Saved by the combined action of Ashfield Council, the Heritage council and then Minister for Heritage, in late 1991 the house was purchased by owners who intend reconstructing it to re-create its former grandeur.*

#### *Description*

*A fine mansion comprising a verandahed main double storey rectangle, single storey billiard room (slightly later), later two storey extensions at rear, and a separate former coach house/stables block. Notable architectural elements include robust modillioned eaves, segmental-arched porch above which is a pedimented and balustraded classical belvedere, fine French doors at ground floor, stuccoed quoins, and some Art Nouveau leaded glass. The house is impressively set on the rise of its site, well back from the street.*

### Houses at 85 and 91 Queen Street

85 and 91 Queen Street are two originally identical houses, formerly known as 'Sherbrook' and 'Glenbrook', located opposite the subject site. Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>5</sup> provides the following information for these properties.

#### *Statement of Significance*

*Two rare survivors of the work of this well known architect.  
Identical houses with potentially fine facades featuring some most unusual modelled stucco decoration*

#### *Historical notes*

*A L Elphinstone Jnr purchased three lots in Queen Street in 1880/81. Ashfield Council Rate Books indicate in 1882 that the two houses were unfinished. Both houses were quickly sold, 'Sherbrook' to Louis Sweet, and 'Glenbrook' to Elphinstone's brother-in-law Thomas Blundell. The third lot, between the two houses, was not built on until much later, after much "juggling" of the boundaries of the land by the two adjacent owners.*

<sup>4</sup> Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 275 and 276

<sup>5</sup> Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 275 and 276

#### *Description*

*Each is an L-shaped building with a projecting bay from which projects a rather flat looking faceted window bay having a roof also faceted. A two level verandah occupies the balance of the facade. The ground floor bay windows are stilted segmentally arched, while the upper ones are round arched. The general treatment is as expected for an Italianate design but some of the detailing is unusually innovative. For instance the chimneys of No. 91 have moulded tops capped by handsome antefixae motifs. Above the ground floor windows there is a curious entablature featuring a central semi-circular panel containing Scotch thistle decoration. The gardens include a large Camphor Laurel and Phoenix Palm.*

### **House at 160 Queen Street**

160 Queen Street is a two storey residence located south west of the subject site. Ashfield Council's Heritage Study<sup>6</sup> provides the following information for this property.

#### *Statement of Significance*

*An important house associated with a historic family  
An unusual as well as important example of a style of architecture more commonly found in non-domestic buildings  
A vital streetscape feature*

#### *Historical notes*

*In 1880, John Balfour Clement Miles, accountant, acquired eleven acres of land between Queen and Victoria Streets south of Seaview Street, formerly owned by Frederick Clissold. Miles, living in "Rothley", Henson Street, Summer Hill, sold this house and built the large mansion "Holwood" (demolished in the 1920s) in Victoria Street. North of "Holwood", also fronting Victoria Street, Miles built two identical villas, "Kenilworth" (demolished) and "Kamarai", later "Coniston", both standing in one acre grounds. In 1886, on his land fronting Queen Street, Miles erected "Ambleside", to which he moved, leasing all his Victoria Street properties. Following his death in 1907 his estate was sold, and in 1956 it became Our Lady of the Snows Home for the Elderly, and later the headquarters of "Vasilelas", St Basil's Homes in Australia.*

#### *Description*

*An impressive two storey residence exhibiting unusual architectural qualities and combining Classical and late Gothic forms. Upon a 7-bay Classical base, the design features a range of Tudor or perpendicular motifs including parapetted gables, crenellations, Tudor arcades and traceried openings. The entrance is a fine Tuscan portico surrounded by a balustraded parapet with urns. The street alignment is graced by a splendid gateway with stone Tudor pylons and four iron gates.*

<sup>6</sup> Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, *Ashfield Heritage Study*, Inventory reference 234

### Draft Conservation Areas

Additionally Ashfield Council has identified the following draft conservation areas in the vicinity of the site:

- Farleigh Estate Conservation Area
- Mountjoy Estate Conservation Area
- Murrell Estate Conservation Area
- Ambleside and Holwood Conservation Area

The draft Farleigh Estate Conservation Area is separated from the subject site by Queen Street and the draft Mountjoy Estate Conservation Area is separated by Clissold Street. The draft Murrell Estate Conservation Area is separated by both Victoria Street and Clissold Street and the draft Ambleside and Holwood Conservation Area by Seaview Street.

These draft conservation areas illustrate the origins, subdivision, development and re-development of Ashfield. As Cardinal Freeman Village is a self contained urban block with its own distinct form and character it is considered the proposed development will have no impact on the potential heritage significance of the proposed conservation areas in its vicinity.

### 3.3.2 Heritage Branch Impact Assessment Guidelines

The Cardinal Freeman Village site is in the vicinity of a number of individually listed properties, and is in the vicinity of a conservation area and four draft conservation areas. The following 'questions to be answered' in the *NSW Heritage Manual* 'Statements of Heritage Impact' guidelines relating to development adjacent to a heritage item have been considered in relation to the proposed modification.

- *How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?*
- *Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?*
- *How does the curtilage allowed around the heritage item contribute to the retention of its heritage significance?*
- *How does the new development affect views to, and from, the heritage item? What has been done to minimise negative effects?*
- *Is the development sited on any known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits? If so, have alternative sites been considered? Why were they rejected?*
- *Is the new development sympathetic to the heritage item? In what way (e.g. form, siting, proportions, design)?*
- *Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? How has this been minimised?*
- *Will the public, and users of the item, still be able to view and appreciate its significance?*

The changes proposed as part of this modification will have no effect on the established heritage significance of the listed items and conservation areas in the vicinity of the Cardinal Freeman Village site.

### 3.4 Mitigation Measures

It is recommended that the potential for heritage impact is mitigated by the inclusion of the following conditions of approval:

- The relocation of the gates and gate posts is to be completed prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate for Building 4
- Both stages of the relocation works are to be undertaken in accordance with the methodology prepared by Jasper Swann Pty Ltd, and by suitably qualified professionals with commensurate experience with those who prepared the methodology.

# Conclusions and Recommendation

# 4.0

## 4.1 Conclusions

- The Cardinal Freeman Village site is a self contained urban block with its own distinct form and character. It is bounded by Victoria, Seaview, Queen and Clissold Streets.
- The site contains two buildings identified as locally listed heritage items in Schedule 7 of the *Ashfield LEP 1985* and Schedule 5 of the *Draft Ashfield LEP 2013*, and is in the vicinity of a number of individually listed properties, and is adjacent to a conservation area and four draft conservation areas.
- The listed items within the site, Glentworth House and the Chapel, have been identified as having significant historic, aesthetic, social and technical heritage value.
- The modifications to the approved development are proposed following further detailed review and design development that has been undertaken to respond to resident feedback and improved site and building efficiency.
- The proposed design changes will have no adverse impact on the established heritage significance of Glenworth House or the Chapel.
- The proposed staging of the approved relocation of the gates and gate posts from the Gate 1 entrance is supported subject to the recommended mitigation measures.
- As the heritage items in the vicinity of the site are separated by the width of the street and are largely screened from the site by the existing and proposed vegetation, there will be no adverse impacts on these items.
- The adjacent conservation area and draft conservation areas illustrate the origins, subdivision, development and re-development of Ashfield. There will be no adverse impact on the identified significance of these areas as a result of the proposed modification.
- In terms of Clause 37 of *Ashfield LEP 1985*, there are no unacceptable or adverse heritage impacts on the heritage items, conservation areas and proposed conservation areas in the vicinity, arising from the proposed modification to the approved development.

## 4.2 Recommendation

- Having examined the Cardinal Freeman Village site in some detail, and reviewed and considered the proposed modifications, Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd recommends the current S75W application be approved, subject to the recommended mitigation measures in Section 3.4 of this report.