







HAMILTON SOUTH-EAST CONSERVATION STUDY

(part of the A.A. Co's Garden Suburb, Hamilton)

for NEWCASTLE CITY COUNCIL Background Material Alle adiavisence house a studie

Local Hist-	Short Description
NEWCASTLE REGION	Short History
PUBLIC LIBRARY	The Release and Development
Don AUG 1986 4.	The Character of Sevel 00
Jaent	Changes Stare First Develo
Q711.51WAW	Chasges to dealgs from a

s 10069427 2

Meredith Walker, 4 Rayner Street, Lilyfield 2040; telephone: 02 818 1803

February 1986

CON	TT	2N'	TC
001	. * *	TTA .	TD

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. 0 INTRODUCTION

- 1. 1 Background
- 1. 2 Study Brief
- 1. 3 Study Area
- 1. 4 Limitations
- 1. 5 Methodology
- 1. 6 Consultations
- 1. 7 Acknowledgements
- 1. 8 Author Identification
- 1. 9 Additional Materials
- 1.10 Sources
- Books, Pamphlets, Records 1.10.1
- Photos, Maps and Plans 1.10.2
- 1.10.3 Background Material

HISTORY OF THE GARDEN SUBURB HAMILTON 2.0

- 2. 1 Short Description
- 2. 2 Short History
- 2. 3 The Release and Development of Land
- 2. 4 The Character of Development
- 2. 5 Changes Since First Development 2. 5.1
- Changes to design from that shown in the brochure and sale litho 2. 5.2
- Changes to the building fabric since first development 2. 5.3
- Resubdivision of allotments 2. 5.4
- Roads and other services 2. 5.5 Land uses
- 2. 5.6
- Community uses

3. 0 FIELD SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

- 3. 1 Aims
- 3. 2 Survey Process
- 3. 3 Changes to Houses

4. 0 COMPARISON WITH OTHER AREAS

- 4. 1 The Garden Suburb Idea in Australia
- 4. 2 Comparison with Other Areas in Australia 4. 3
- Comparison with Other Other Areas in Newcastle

Page

iii

iv

2

24

4

55555

6

6

9

9

9

28

28

		rage
Page	5. 0 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE	45
lii	 5.1 The Concept of Cultural Significance 5.2 Statement of Cultural Significance 5.2.1 Historical Value 5.2.2 Aesthetic Value 5.2.3 Social Value 5.2.4 Scientific Value 5.3 Areas of Significance, Buildings and 	45 45 46 46 46
1	Other Fabric of Significance	46
1 1	6. 0 CONSERVATION POLICY	49
2 2 4	 6.1 Purpose of a Conservation Policy 6.2 Matters Affecting the Conservation of the Garden Suburb 6.2.1 Requirements and Constraints Arising out of Cultural 	49 49
4 5 5	Significance 6. 2. 2 Experience Elsewhere 6. 2. 3 Needs and Wishes of the Newcastle City Council	49 50 51
5 5 5	 6. 2. 4 Dwelling Density and Development Code (DCP No.14) 6. 2. 5 Application of DCP No.14 to the Area of Significance 6. 2. 6 Advantages and Disadvantages of Designating the Garden 	52 53
6 6	6. 3 Draft Statement of Conservation Policy 6. 4 Guidelines for the Control of Development in the Area of	55 57
9	Significance 6.5 Implementing the Conservation Policy	59 60
9 9 17	APPENDICES	
20 21	A Study Brief	62
21	B Drainage Numbers at Half-Yearly Intervals from the Hunter District Water Board Drainage Register, June 1914 - December 1950	64
3 3 4	C Notes About Street Names in the Garden Suburb, Hamilton	67
4	D [•] Houses that May be Demolished in the Deferred Area	68
8	E Copy of Covenant in the Original Conveyance from the A.A. Co. in Respect of 131 Gordon Avenue (Lot 6, Section 6) Garden Suburb, Hamilton	69
8 7	F Key to HDWB 1:500 Map Series	70
2	G Standard Heritage Conservation Provisions for Inclusion in Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans. July 1985.	71
and the second		

2

223

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

6

1	Hamilton Suburb.	South/East	Deferral	Area	and	the AA	Company's	Garden
	oubui De							

Page

3

7

8

12

B-15

16

18

19

- Newcastle and the AA Company's Estate n.d. c.1910. 2
- AA Company's Railways and later development prepared by 3 AA Pulver, Surveyor n.d. c.1978.
 - Garden Suburb, Newcastle: Poster for First Subdivision Sale 4 May 30th 1914. Pargese of a Conservation Policy
- Advertisement Newcastle Morning Herald May 30th 1914. 5
 - Needs and Wishes of the Newcastle Extracts from AA Company's Brochure: 6.a Sketch of Street Intersection and sketch of Business Centre. Business Centre. Plan type of (a) house, Cost 1,000, p.15.
 - 6.b
 - Plans and Elevations of Types of Houses: 6.c (A) 500 and (B) 1,100.
- Implementing the Conservation Poly 7 Structures built by the AA Copany in 1914. Photographs 1985.
- Garden Suburb, Hamilton; Auction Sales of Land. 8 Compiled from Maps in NLHL.
- Garden Suburb, Hamilton: Poster for Sale, 15 September 1928. 9
- Aerial photo of Hamilton's South/East and nearby areas, 1946. 10 Adastra Airways.
- Garden Suburb, Hamilton: 11 1914 Poster Plan compared with 1968 map, 1:4000 series.
- The material of outer walls of buildings in the 12 Hamilton South/East Area.
- Changes to Buildings in the Hamilton South/East Deferral Table: Area. Survey: September 1985.

Key to Section Numbers in Table.

ge	 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferral Area: 13.a Few obvious changes (Category 1). 13.b Form and Character intact (Category 2). 13.c Form intact, changes to materials of outer walls, porches and other elements (Category 3). 	2–36
3	13.dForm changed.13.eSite redevelopment.	
7	14.aStreetscenes.14.bBusiness Centre and Open Space.	8-41
Š	14.c Fences. 14.d Windows and other details.	
L	15 Garden Suburb, Hamilton: Aspects of Significance and Area of Greatest Significance.	48
_	Table 2: Dwelling Density Controls in Standard Residential Areas.DCP 14, p.17	54
.5	nebul offnerseutstanding imatterso of contern candithe respective	
	and draftid Severage of simchargu of and a draftage of overload win how veverificewether; not include a shirong of rabie of optimus draft surg	
	tate the light had to asservation value of the 'AN' Estate his.	

Pa

1

12

16

8

9

5

6

7

)

len

te purpose of this study is to consider the herit

Betwets propries guidelines for the conservation of this area and for the conservation of this area and for the conservation of this area with a such shift area inder to be with any langes of the conservation of the second of

The study brief proposed by the Newcastle City Council is attached as any mention of another and above above in the Council is attached and mentions and the following mentions all the terms and all the study comprised the following mentions at the period term (couple) attached to be following mentions at the period term (couple) 's above. thistoric research of the Australian Agricelteral Couple) 's being at all of a set of the Suburb, Heatling and 'the development: could term at all of the Gorden Suburb, which the befored area being at all of the Gorden Suburb, which the befored area at all of the formed by the set of t

V

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The background to the study is described in the study brief, as follows:

"Newcastle City Council has recently revised its development control policies relating to residential dwelling density and development throughout the Newcastle Local Government Area.

These policies are expressed in <u>Development Control Plan</u> No.14 - Dwelling Density and Development Code, which was adopted by Council on 18 December 1984.

However, two areas have been excluded from the provisions of the Plan until outstanding matters of concern within these areas have been resolved.

The outstanding matters of concern and the respective deferral areas are:

- i) Sewerage surcharge and drainage overload in Merewether;
- ii) Heritage conservation value of the 'AA' Estate area in Hamilton South/East.

The purpose of this study is to consider the heritage conservation value of the Hamilton South-East area."

1.2 STUDY BRIEF

The aims of the study are:

- A to identify whether part or all of the Hamilton South/East area, and adjacent land, has heritage significance; and, ian area is found to be significant, then
- B to prepare guidelines for the conservation of this area and or the design of new structures within it; such guidelines to be supplementary to Development Control Plan No.14.

The study brief proposed by the Newcastle City Council is attache as Appendix A.

The study comprised the following:

- historic research of the Australian Agricultural Company's (AA Co's) Garden Suburb, Hamilton and its development;
- . field survey of the Garden Suburb, with the Deferral area being studied in detail;

. comparison of the Garden Suburb with other residential areas of the same period in Newcastle and elsewhere:

- identification of an area of significance and preparation of a statement of significance;
- collection of information from Newcastle City Council and discussions with the City Planning Department - particularly in relation to Development Control Plan No.14 and conservation controls in Newcastle;
- . preparation of draft controls for the guidance of change and development within the area of heritage significance.

1.3 STUDY AREA

f, as

lop-

ling

ocal

Plan Was

ions

thin

tive

in

area

tage

Fast

nd, ifan

and or

es to e

tache

any's

area

The study area comprises two parts, shown in Illustration 1.

- . the AA Co Garden Suburb area; and
- . the portion of Hamilton South/East that has been excluded from Development Control Plan No.14 ('The Deferral area').

The history, development and character of the Garden Suburb was studied in order to provide a context for detailed survey and analysis - which was restricted to the Deferral area, plus both sides of Gordon Avenue and Stewart Avenue, and the block bounded by Dumaresq Street, Parkway Avenue and Smith Street. The area wherein detailed survey work was undertaken contains more than 650 houses.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

The study fulfils the aims of the brief and provides a basis for conserving the character of the area of heritage significance, shown in Illustration 15.

The amount of money available for the study was \$5,000. This limited historical research and field survey, and also consultation with people knowledgeable about the area.

There is much primary source material about the AA Co's Garden Suburb. All the sources in Newcastle were consulted, but funds did not allow study of the records of the AA Co - held in the ANU Archives, in Canberra.

Further research will provide more information about the history of the Garden Suburb - for example about why it was subdivided the way it was, and why its development differed from the original 'Sulman plan' - as published in the subdivision brochure. Many Novocastrians have first-hand knowledge of the area and may be able to provide information not available elsewhere. Mr Astley Pulver - son of Worters R Pulver, the Chief Surveyor of the AA Co in the period 1913-31 (1) - may be able to supply much detailed information.



^{th/Eas} Deferr; ^{AA} Copany's

PARK

Although further research will reveal information of interest, it will not change the conclusions of this study. It would however provide detailed information about individual properties which might encourage more residents to take an interest in the conservation of their houses, and in the suburb as a whole.

Assessment of the townscape has been limited to built features - roads plus buildings; assessment of the gardens and tree planting requires further study.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

The method used to identify the area of heritage significance was based on Australia ICOMOS' <u>Guidelines to the Burra Charter:</u> <u>Cultural Significance</u>; and the method used to devise controls for conservation was based on Australia ICOMOS' <u>Guidelines to the Burra</u> <u>Charter:</u> <u>Conservation Policy</u>.

1.6 CONSULTATIONS

In addition to the information held by public authorities, information was sought from:

- . Creer and Berkely, Estate Agents (Mr R Henning) (about land sales and covenants)
- . Mr John Sara, Architect (about C A G Castleden, Architect)
- . Mr Dick Woodgate (about the memorial pillars and about covenants)
- . Mr Astley Pulver (about the history of the Garden Suburb)
- . Mr Keith Parsons (about the sale/release of land in the Garden Suburb area)
- . Ms Sheridan Burke (about subdivision and developments)

The help of these people is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks are due to Mr Keith Parsons who made available his research on the sale and release of land in the Garden Suburb area, this was of great benefit in checking research and in providing new information.

(1) J. Fryer Surveying the Hunter pp.24,26.

SuburtHamilto

East

Sout

1 Area

1.7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance of the staff of the City Planning Department and the Local History Library of the Newcastle City Council, and the staff of the Hunter District Water Board is gratefully acknowledged.

1.8 AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION

This report was written and prepared by Meredith Walker. Research of documentary evidence was undertaken by Hector Abrahams, Elaine van Kempen and Meredith Walker; field survey was undertaken by Hector Abrahams and Meredith Walker; and the analysis, including preparation of maps and photos, was undertaken by Meredith Walker.

1.9 ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

In addition to this report, the following materials were submitted as part of the study.

. <u>Study Area Maps</u>: HDWB 1:500 Maps annotated with information about date and period of houses and their intactness (i.e., degree of alteration from original). 1.10

1.1

- . photo negatives and prints; and
- <u>photo-reductions</u> (provided by NCC) of plan held in Newcastle Local History Library.

1.10 SOURCES

In preparing this report the following sources were consulted:

1.10.1 Books, Pamphlets, Records

Hunter District Water Board Rates Book Nos.46,67 and 68 (NLHL).

Hunter District Water Board and Drainage Register of 1914-1960 (HDWB Offices).

NLHL files (containing photos, newspaper clippings, extracts from other sources).

Garden Suburb (Brochure) Australian Agricultural Company, Newcastle N.D. (before May 1914).

Hamilton Municipal Council Books (1913 onwards - Held in Newcastle Local History Library [NLHL]).

[NB: The Hamilton Municipal Council Rates Books were being transferred to the Local History Library at the time of this study and were not available for detailed inspection.] Merchant and Traders Association Ltd. Country Trades Register 1933.

Newcastle, Maitland, Cessnock Districts Street Directory 1938.

Hamilton Council Agenda of the Last Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 31st March 1938. LHQ 352 PAM BOX.

Reports to Meetings of the Newcastle City Council and its Committees Concerning the Draft Development Control Plan No.14: Amended Draft Dwelling Density and Development Code for the City of Newcastle, dated 13 March, 3 April, 26 June, 20 September 1984.

Northumberland Local Environmental Plan: As amended in respect of Local Environmental Plans in the City of Newcastle. Amendments current to 19/4/1985.

1.10.2 Photos, Maps and Plans

Adastra Airways <u>Aerial Photos of Newcastle, Run 6, 1940</u>, held by Newcastle Office, NSW Department of Environment and Planning.

HDWB 1:5000 Map Series Newcastle and Districts, n.d. (1980 plus updating).

Northumberland County District Eight Chain Series Scale 1:6336, State Planning Authority of NSW October 1972.

Central Mapping Authority, New South Wales <u>1:4000 Map Series</u> (Cadastral) Department of Lands, February 1968.

Newcastle Local History Library Architectural Plans.

Newcastle Local History Library. Local History Plans (more than 50 plans).

1.10.3 Background Material

J. Armstrong (ed) <u>Shaping the Hunter: The Engineering Heritage</u>. Newcastle Division of Institution of Engineers, Australia, Newcastle 1983.

J.C. Docherty <u>Newcastle: The Making of an Australian City</u>, Hale and Iremonger, Sydney 1983.

J. Fryer (ed) <u>Surveying the Hunter</u>. Hunter-Manning Group of the Institute of Surveyors, Australia, Newcastle 1980.

<u>Newcastle 150 Years 1797 - 1947</u>, Council of the City of Greater Newcastle, Newcastle 1947.

Sheridan Burke. The Garden Suburb Idea in New South Wales and the conservation of Haberfield. Unpublished thesis (MSc(Arch)(Cons) 1985).





2.1 SHORT DESCRIPTION

The Garden Suburb, Hamilton, was developed by the Australian Agricultural Company in the period 1914 - 1935. The generally flat land of the subdivision covers 300 acres (121.5 hectares) and contains approximately 1,300 residential allotments, most of which are occupied by single storey detatched houses built in the period 1914 - 1950. The pattern of roads and allotments is similar to the rectangular pattern of government subdivisions, and is a skillful continuation of the pre-existing roads adjoining to the east, west and north. The allotments vary in size from around 420 square metres to 820 square metres, with most lots around 520 - 620 square metres in area. Typical lots were 50 ft (15.24 m) or 44 ft (13.41 m) wide, and 130 ft (39.6 m) deep.

The Garden Suburb is approximately 2.5 kms south east from the Newcastle Post Office, and occupies the land between Cooks Hill to the east, Hamilton to the west, and Merewether to the south - each of these places pre-dating the suburb. The Garden Suburb - which is now called Hamilton South/East - is transected by three major roads: Stewart Avenue, the Pacific Highway; Gordon Avenue, the first main street of the suburb; and Parkway Avenue, which was intended to provide a major access from the northern and western suburbs to the beaches - but the widening required at the northern end was not undertaken by the Hamilton Council.

Much of the development in the Hamilton South/East area is contemporary with the development of Bar Beach - the adjoining suburb to the east, also developed by the AA Company after mining ceased. Together these areas virtually completed the urbanization of Inner Newcastle.

2.2 SHORT HISTORY

The land developed as the Garden Suburb was part of a grant of 2,000 acres made to the AA Co in 1829. The grant, which adjoined the town of Newcastle (surveyed by Henry Dangar in 1823), was part of an agreement between the Colonial Government and the AA Co whereby the Company took control of the government coal mines, and had a monopoly on coal mining at Newcastle - until it was broken by other commercial interests in the 1880s.

The AA Co mined the area from underground workings from 1831 to 1916. There were several pit heads, with associated railways at the surface (Illus.2 and 3) and parts of the grant were leased or sold to provide space for townships - Cooks Hill, The Junction, and Pit Town (Hamilton), and open space for the community including a cricket ground and a racecourse.

However, by 1910, when the end of mining was in sight, a substantial portion of the original grant extending from the shore to Borehole 2 Pit, remained undeveloped. It was partly sandunes, and partly low-

lying swampy land, and needed considerable drainage and earth works to make it suitable for urban development.

With the decline in coal mining, the focus of the AA Co's interests were its rural properties at Stroud, Goonoo Goonoo, and Warrah, and not the development of their land at Newcastle. Many matters required consent from the head office in England and the company was somewhat bureaucratic (2). From time to time portions of the grant were subdivided and sold for residential use, as the demand arose. At this time, c.1910, Worters Pulver was a surveyor for the AA Co in Newcastle under Arnold Elliot, the chief surveyor (2). Pulver had a great interest in town planning and in 1913 (the year he became chief surveyor) he pursuaded the company to engage the Sydney architects and planners Sulman and Hennessey to prepare a plan for the development of the area (3).

John Sulman had retired from active practice as an architect in 1908 and was spending much of his time on town planning matters in which he was very influential - becoming the first president of the Town Planning Association formed in 1913. John Sulman and John F Hennessy colaborated on a number of projects including the design of the Roseberry Industrial Estate, for Richard Stanton the developer of the model suburb at Haberfield (4).

The Garden Suburb was promoted in the brochure and the litho for the first sale as 'a triumph of town planning' with 'ample public recreation grounds, gardens, bathing beaches, imposing tree planted avenues' and with 'all roads made, gas, water and sewerage available'. In an advertisement in the Newcastle Herald on the day of the first sale (Sat. 30th May) (Illus.5) it was stated 'No expense has been spared by the company in the creation of this model suburb' ... 'Messrs Sulman & Hennessy, the well known authorities on town planning, have given of their best in the laying out of this area'.

The 'triumph' was an exaggeration and so probably was the description of the work of Sulman & Hennessy, but the other matters were largely correct, except that the recreation grounds and gardens had not been created and in the case of the major park (now called National Park) it was low lying land to be developed at Council's expense and not by the AA Co.

The brochure promoting the Garden Suburb was released in 1914. It included a short history of Newcastle, extolling its virtues and its coming-of-age as a city with facilities and attributes of which to be proud: its transformation from a coal town to a steel city.

The brochure included plans for houses to be built by the AA Co for sale, and which could be ordered (Illus.6b,6c) (The houses were designed by a notable Newcastle architect, F.G. Castleden.). Two of the houses shown in illustration 6.b (p.14) were built in Gordon Avenue on the western side at the corners of Kemp and Dumaresq Street (Illus.7 page 16) in time for the first sale in May 1914.

⁽²⁾ Astley Pulver. Personal comment.

⁽³⁾ John Fryer Surveying the Hunter p.24.

⁽⁴⁾ S Burke. Thesis. p.52.



L1.2T. 1

24

Å:

1.1.14 16 t.

Rest



- 6 Extracts from AA Company's Brochure:
- 6.a Sketch of Street Intersection and sketch c Business Centre.

c h a r acteristic

Right: the urban vision splendid. Hamilton's garden suburb as promoted by its planners in 1914. The addition of cars to the scene added, at the time, a futuristic touch Below: park and shopping centre envisaged for Hamilton's garden centre, 1914. The features shown were never built

1



Sketch Dusiness Centre GARDEN SUBURD Subdivided a Planned New CASTLE by John Surnan, Inica a John Filennessy



4



STLE

c h a r acteristic feature to Garden S u b u r b. Stewart, Gordon and Parkway Avenues, and Turnbull Streets are also lined with trees. etch

0

5

O

Plan type of Cost∠1,000,

p.a

house, 15. 0

Extracts Brochure

from

AA

Company 's

50

The ends of the Main Avenues will be marked by architectural pillars of characteristic design, the æsthetic effect of which cannot be over estimated.

The promoters are pursuing the spirited policy of providing for the planting of the trees and shrubberies and caring for them in the earlier stages of their growth, so that all that is needed to make Garden Suburb a source of pride and pleasure to the city and district is the intelligent sympathy and cooperation of its prospective inhabitants.

The A. A. Coy. are leaving nothing to chance, nor do they seek to give the public no guaranty beyond that of specious advertisement. They have instructed their achitect to design dwellings of special types, and by the time the ground is offered to the public these dwellings will be built and ready for the inspection of prospective buyers. Every information regarding cost or variation of designs will be readily supplied, so intending home-makers will have concrete examples of how and at what cost to best build,

15



6 Extracts from AA Compar Brochure:

Ū

Company



Cordon



.Co. House (1914) S.E. corner of don Ave & Dumaresq St. , page 14.





Structures built by the AA Company in 1914.

7

A.A. Co. House (1914) N.E. corner of Gordon Ave & Kemp St. Plan, page 14.



One of the pillars that stood in the Gordon Ave median strip; now in Learmonth Park.





Debil of house, N.W. corner Gordon Ave & Glebe Rd. Two Type A houses shown in Illus.6c (p.15) were also built opposite one another at the intersection of Gordon Avenue and Glebe Road, marking the entrance to the Garden Suburb from the south. These houses, a mirror pair, were built in weatherboard and remain today with the one on the western corner showing relatively few changes. 5

4

U

3

(1)

ZI

STREET

The value and benefits of the gardens were stressed in the brochure. The Garden Suburb was described as "A suburb where the Garden is the prominant feature, and the home but the gem made all the richer for the setting ..." and further

"Experience has proved that, wherever the opportunity is given and incentive provided, the scientifically planned suburb has always resulted in a collection of gardens. Asuming a sufficient area of effective frontage and depth, the owner cannot help cultiv ating his spare ground to whatever extent his inclination or his purse can afford."

The transformation of the natural features of the land - the swamp and sand dunes - to form drained and level building block was regarded at the time as a substantial engineering achievement. The drainage and preparation of the land was undertaken in conjunction with the adjoining company land at Bar Beach, sold in the 1920s and 30s. All the work was undertaken by one contractor who lived nearby. A small tramway was used to move sand and other materials from one part of the site to another (5). The construction of the Garden Suburb is described in <u>Surveying the Hunter</u>, pp.24-26.

2.3 THE RELEASE AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND

At the first auction of land in the Garden Suburb, on 30th May 1914, eighty-five allotments were offered for sale and of these forty-nine sold on the day, a further five were sold during June and July, and there were other isolated sales from September to the following May.

In most cases the lots were bought individually, with only a few people buying two lots, usually adjoining. Reginald Varley, the Mayor of Hamilton at the time, was one such buyer. He bought lots 88 and 105 in Section 4 for $\not \leq 121$ and $\not \leq 115/10/-$ respectively. Prices at the first auction were higher overall than those paid even a short time before for similar lots in adjoining streets. Lots sold in Hamilton South in 1913 and 1914 averaged around $\not \leq 100$.

Interest and confidence in the Garden Suburb appears to have been high. The two brick houses in Gordon Avenue were also put to auction but did not sell and were still owned by the Company in 1919 when the sewer was connected.

Land at the Garden Suburb was sold primarily by auction, for a period of 21 years from May 1914 to 1935. Allotments not bought at auction were sold later by private treaty, or occasionally reauctioned. Except for the war years, when there were virtually no

(5) Astley Pulver. Personal comment to M Walker.





sales, auctions were held every few months, as drainage and preparation progressed and according to demand. In this way, demand was always relatively high, building was always underway and the suburb achieved and retained high prestige throughout its development.

The release of land was researched for this study by reference to the sale lithos in the Newcastle Local History Library. A map showing the date of first auction of much of the land is shown in Illus.8 (p.18). Information from the posters and from the HDWB Register has been used to determine the approximate time of release of other land for which there were no posters.

There is no easily discernable pattern in the release of land. In general, the higher land west of Gordon Avenue (which was relatively easy to prepare) was sold first, then the land near Gordon and Stewart Avenues, and lastly the land alongside the open storm water drain, in Jenner Parade.

The timing and distribution of the release of land suggests that the AA Co sought to keep demand for blocks high and to avoid large areas of the subdivision being left undeveloped or kept for investment purposes. Dating of houses in the area shows that the time between the sale of land and the completion of a house varied from six months to around ten years. From each release of land there was usually one or two allotments developed fairly quickly with the majority of the lots built on within the next five years. In comparison with other contemporary subdivisions in Newcastle, the Garden Suburb Hamilton was very popular.

Some of the sale lithos bear the title 'Garden Suburb' but some do not, and without research of the AA Co papers in Canberra, or title research it is difficult to be certain about the extent of the Garden Suburb. The 'boundary' line shown in Illus.1 (p.3) is approximate only.

Research of the titles of select individual allotments could be undertaken to reveal

- . the extent of land called the Garden Suburb;
- . the date of release;
 - . the variations in covenant requirements for siting and design of houses and resubdivision.

2.4 THE CHARACTER OF DEVELOPMENT

Hamilto e, 15

D.m.

60

The AA Co promoted the Garden Suburb as a place where a high standard of building was appropriate, and virtually all the houses built in and near Gordon Avenue in the northern part of the suburb are of brick and are more substantial than houses built in that part of Hamilton, west of Gordon Avenue, beyond Lawson Street.

The allotments were sold with covenants which were intended to ensure that a high standard was maintained. In the course of the field survey, members of the study team met several owners who claimed that the survey area was 'all brick', and that this was a requirement of the subdivider. The schedule of covenants to a lot in Gordon Avenue (Appendix E) do not include any provision for the material of outer walls, and as it is likely that most of the covenants would have been identical, the 'all brick' claim appears doubtful. Research of the AA Co's papers in the ANU Archives would reveal further information.

Whatever the cause - fashion or controls - a high degree of continuity has occurred in the design of houses in the Garden Suburb. In the heart of the area, the overwhelming majority of the houses are single storey and of brick construction (Illus.12). The houses are set back approximately 18 ft (5.9 m) from the front boundary and, in most places the area between is grassed with beds along the edges and a low brick fence (11 - 13 courses of brickwork)

The houses built in the areas first released are more diverse in scale, form, and detail than those built in later areas and decades. The older areas also contain more houses of architectural interest, whereas the later houses are more uniform, and generally smaller in scale.

Most of the earlier houses - built before 1925 - have gabled roofs clad in marseille or other red tiles, whereas most of the later houses of the 1930s and 1940s have hipped roofs and mottled red brown bricks and roof tiles. Almost every house has a verandah or porch - the latter frequently with unadorned columns supporting the roof (Illus.14c).

The claim in the brochure about the suitability of the soil and the location for gardening appears to have been optimistic. Whilst many gardens appear to have their original layout and have mature plants, there are relatively few which to have been lovingly maintained since first established. The gardens which retain their original form and planting should be retained if possible.

2.5 CHANGES SINCE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE GARDEN SUBURB

2.5.1 Changes to design from that shown in the brochure and sale litho

Illustration 11 shows the plan of the Garden Suburb, as shown on the sale litho and a 1968 plan at the same scale. Comparison between them, plus field survey, shows various changes.

In general, the Garden Suburb developed very much as indicated in the brochure and subdivision poster. The road pattern remained basically the same and met the requirements of the Local Government Act, proclaimed in 1919, under which Council consent was required prior to subdivision.

The most major change was the introduction of a large open stormwater channel, designed as a feature in the centre of Learmonth Street. The route was altered to suit the drainage needs, and which was named Jenner Parade, after George G Jenner, coach builder and entrepreneur and Mayor of Hamilton Municipal Council in 1920, 1924 and 1932. Other changes to the road pattern shown in the brochure included:

- . Corona Street was continued across Parkway Avenue to Silsoe Street, rather than 'running' parallel to Hebburn Street, to Skelton Street;
- . Darling Street (and not Pulver Street) was extended across Gordon Avenue to Stewart Avenue;
 - . Ravenshaw Street, a street developed prior to the Garden Suburb plan, was extended to Jenner Parade;
 - . a short street, Cross Street, was introduced to link Thomas Street to Glebe Road;
- . a new street, Park Street, was inserted parallel to and between Alexander Street and Jenner Parade, west of Learmonth Park.

The treatment and built character of the Garden Suburb was also changed from that indicated in the brochure:

- . the splay corners and round-abouts, designed to emphasise intersections in Lawson Street, Porcher Street and Smith Street, were eliminated;
 - . the small reserves in Glebe Road and Minola Street (now Everton Street) were eliminated;
- . the small 'lakes' at Elliott and Thomas Streets were not constructed. The land at Elliot Street was used for allotments, and the land at Thomas Street, which was high and rocky, was left as undeveloped open space. The inappropriateness of the Thomas Street lake suggests that the designers were not very familiar with the site.

The elimination of these features was a significant loss. The round-abouts and splay corners were typical design features in the UK models, and would have contributed much to the local townscape in such flat terrain and would have differentiated the Garden Suburb from the adjoining areas which its grid was designed to fit.

The most major aspect of the plan which did not eventuate was the Business Centre and Park proposed for a point midway along Stewart Street (Oetween Jenner Parade and Parkway Avenue) and at the approximate centre of the Garden Suburb. Some of the lots on the east side of Stewart Street in this location were sold for business use in 1929, but the land opposite was not sold until the 1950s and there was no broadening of the road reservation to make a park as shown in the brochure (Illus.6a p.13). The business centre designed as a single unit did not eventuate and Stewart Street retained the same width throughout its length.

Although the business centre did not develop as intended, the younger age of the houses built in the 1950s give a hint that this land was being kept for another purpose when land adjoining was already used for housing. requirement of the subdivider. The schedule of covenants to a lot in Gordon Avenue (Appendix E) do not include any provision for the material of outer walls, and as it is likely that most of the covenants would have been identical, the 'all brick' claim appears doubtful. Research of the AA Co's papers in the ANU Archives would reveal further information.

Whatever the cause - fashion or controls - a high degree of continuity has occurred in the design of houses in the Garden Suburb. In the heart of the area, the overwhelming majority of the houses are single storey and of brick construction (Illus.12). The houses are set back approximately 18 ft (5.9 m) from the front boundary and, in most places the area between is grassed with beds along the edges and a low brick fence (11 - 13 courses of brickwork)

The houses built in the areas first released are more diverse in scale, form, and detail than those built in later areas and decades. The older areas also contain more houses of architectural interest, whereas the later houses are more uniform, and generally smaller in scale.

Most of the earlier houses - built before 1925 - have gabled roofs clad in marseille or other red tiles, whereas most of the later houses of the 1930s and 1940s have hipped roofs and mottled red brown bricks and roof tiles. Almost every house has a verandah or porch - the latter frequently with unadorned columns supporting the roof (Illus.14c).

The claim in the brochure about the suitability of the soil and the location for gardening appears to have been optimistic. Whilst many gardens appear to have their original layout and have mature plants, there are relatively few which to have been lovingly maintained since first established. The gardens which retain their original form and planting should be retained if possible.

2.5 CHANGES SINCE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE GARDEN SUBURB

2.5.1 Changes to design from that shown in the brochure and sale litho

Illustration 11 shows the plan of the Garden Suburb, as shown on the sale litho and a 1968 plan at the same scale. Comparison between them, plus field survey, shows various changes.

In general, the Garden Suburb developed very much as indicated in the brochure and subdivision poster. The road pattern remained basically the same and met the requirements of the Local Government Act, proclaimed in 1919, under which Council consent was required prior to subdivision.

The most major change was the introduction of a large open stormwater channel, designed as a feature in the centre of Learmonth Street. The route was altered to suit the drainage needs, and which was named Jenner Parade, after George G Jenner, coach builder and entrepreneur and Mayor of Hamilton Municipal Council in 1920, 1924 and 1932. Other changes to the road pattern shown in the brochure included:

d

e

e

k)

S.

n

e

9

ny

s,

- . Corona Street was continued across Parkway Avenue to Silsoe Street, rather than 'running' parallel to Hebburn Street, to Skelton Street;
- . Darling Street (and not Pulver Street) was extended across Gordon Avenue to Stewart Avenue;
- . Ravenshaw Street, a street developed prior to the Garden Suburb plan, was extended to Jenner Parade;
- . a short street, Cross Street, was introduced to link Thomas Street to Glebe Road;
- . a new street, Park Street, was inserted parallel to and between Alexander Street and Jenner Parade, west of Learmonth Park.

The treatment and built character of the Garden Suburb was also changed from that indicated in the brochure:

- . the splay corners and round-abouts, designed to emphasise intersections in Lawson Street, Porcher Street and Smith Street, were eliminated;
- . the small reserves in Glebe Road and Minola Street (now Everton Street) were eliminated;
- . the small 'lakes' at Elliott and Thomas Streets were not constructed. The land at Elliot Street was used for allotments, and the land at Thomas Street, which was high and rocky, was left as undeveloped open space. The inappropriateness of the Thomas Street lake suggests that the designers were not very familiar with the site.

The elimination of these features was a significant loss. The round-abouts and splay corners were typical design features in the UK models, and would have contributed much to the local townscape in such flat terrain and would have differentiated the Garden Suburb from the adjoining areas which its grid was designed to fit.

The most major aspect of the plan which did not eventuate was the Business Centre and Park proposed for a point midway along Stewart Street (Oetween Jenner Parade and Parkway Avenue) and at the approximate centre of the Garden Suburb. Some of the lots on the east side of Stewart Street in this location were sold for business use in 1929, but the land opposite was not sold until the 1950s and there was no broadening of the road reservation to make a park as shown in the brochure (Illus.6a p.13). The business centre designed as a single unit did not eventuate and Stewart Street retained the same width throughout its length.

Although the business centre did not develop as intended, the younger age of the houses built in the 1950s give a hint that this land was being kept for another purpose when land adjoining was already used for housing. Astley Pulver recalls that Mr Stone, an entrepreneur/developer approached the AA Co to buy the undeveloped land in the business centre, and when successful built the four houses that now stand there, including his own home, number 82 - which now has a second storey (Illus.13d p.35).

2.5.2 Changes to the building fabric since first development

The Garden Suburb was developed over a period of forty years. In the 1950s when the last of the vacant lots were being developed, some of the earlier houses were undergoing major repairs and renovation, and some had been converted to flats, and many minor changes had taken place in the meantime.

From field survey, the most significant changes to the Garden Suburb were to individual buildings - to upgrade kitchens and bathrooms, to add new rooms at the rear. From the street, the most obvious changes were the addition of garages, carports and sheds; the enclosure of porches and the replacement of lead lights by plain glass, and the replacement/repair of other features. Roof tiles, verandah columns, front fences, doors and window hoods were the most frequently altered features. The degree of change to houses was analysed from the information collected by field survey, see 3.2 p.28, and 3.3 p.37.

2.5.3 Resubdivision of Allotments

There were several instances of two corner lots being combined and re-subdivided to form three smaller lots, for example: at the north-east corner Stewart and Cram Streets, and the north-west corner Kenrick and Smith Streets. This practice was within the terms of the covenants - which required a minimum frontage of 40ft; but, combined with the AA Co's apparent desire to get the most number of lots in every block, this action destroyed the continuity of houses fronting the streets oriented north-east/ south-west.

2.5.4 Roads and other services

The Garden Suburb was promoted as having all roads made and gas, water and sewerage available. At this time, and up till the introduction of the Local Government Act in 1919, there was no requirement for subdividers to construct roads at their expense as part of the subdivision process; so in this respect the AA Co was ahead of the times. Some of the roads were gravel and others macadam. At the time of the last ordinary meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Council, prior to the amalgamation to form Greater Newcastle, the great majority of the roads in the Garden Suburb were tar macadam with concrete kerbing and concrete and brick paved footpaths on both sides. A couple of roads were macadam or gravel.

In the early years of the Garden Suburb, during WWI, sewerage was not immediately available to each property. For example, two brick houses built by the AA Co in Gordon Avenue and promoted for auction at the first subdivision sale in May 1914, were not connected to the sewer until 1919. A random comparison of other houses near the northern end of Gordon Avenue showed that some owners applied for sewer connection in 1916 but were not connected till 1919. It appears that that portion of the first subdivision east of Gordon Avenue was not connected to the sewer until 1919, and therefore the connection numbers from the HDWB Register cannot be solely relied upon as the date of construction, but should be read in conjunction with the Hamilton Council Rates Books.

The connection to water and gas appears to have proceeded as intended, with both services available at the time of sale. Electricity was provided to the area c.1919 and street lighting in 1923.

2.5.5 Land Uses

ld

as

r

S

IT

In the few years preceding the planning of the Garden Suburb the AA Co had given - at the request of the Newcastle and Hamilton Councils - parts of the estate for open space. Gregson Park in Tudor Street, Hamilton, was flood prone and the Council had requested further land for sporting facilities. In response, the AA Co gave the Council Learmonth Park (named after the then Superintendent of the AA Co). For many years the Newcastle Racecourse occupied a substantial part of the Garden Suburb (Illus.2) and there were market gardens, worked by Chinese, around the north-eastern side up to Newcastle colliery railway and the Newcastle Cricket Club (leased from the AA Co). The market garden allotments were low lying, and the AA Co gave much of this area to the Council as a major park - named Sheddon Park on the plan in the brochure, but later named National Park. The Council spent many years and substantial effort and cost filling this land to make it suitable for for active recreation use.

2.5.6 Community Uses

During the development of the Garden Suburb, several community uses were established. In 1925, a site was secured for a primary school in Parkway Avenue, between National Park Street and Smith Street, but it was developed as The Newcastle Girls High School, and another nearby site was found for the Primary School in 1927.

Other community uses established in the Garden Suburb include:

- . Marist Brothers High School in Parkway Avenue;
- . Presbyterian Church;
- . Catholic Church;
- . Anglican Church, in Stewart Avenue.

In 1970s several houses in Kemp Street, beside the grassed 'reserve', were progressively demolished to allow the establishment and growth of the Greek Orthodox Church and School. The present church opened in 1977. 10 Aerial photo of Hamilton's South/East and nearby areas, 1946. Adastra Airways.




3.0 FIELD SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

3.1 AIMS

The aims of the field survey were:

- . to gain an appreciation of the character of the Garden Suburb and the buildings within it;
- to compare the Garden Suburb, and the Deferral Area within it, with other residential areas of Newcastle and particularly with those subdivided and developed in the same period (1914 - 1950); and
- . to assess the degree of change to buildings in the Deferral Area, and hence the heritage value of these buildings; and also to assess which buildings may be demolished.

The information gained in the survey was to be used to determine whether or not any part of the Deferral Area is of cultural significance and worthy of conservation, and to identify features of heritage value within such an area.

Prior to undertaking this work, information was collected about the history of the Garden Suburb, including the release of land and the building of houses and also including the recent involvement of its residents in the discussions about DCP No.14.

3.2 SURVEY PROCESS

The field work was undertaken in three parts, each related to one of the aims.

- 3.2.1 The first part involved a street by street inspection of the Garden Suburb area, comparing the original plan and old photos with the present day development, noting the changes to the area, looking at the house types and styles, and devising the form of the detailed survey to follow.
- 3.2.2 The second part involved visiting other suburbs of Newcastle, and other planned suburbs in Sydney. The Newcastle suburbs visited included:

Mayfield (late nineteenth century and early twentieth century);

Stockton North - a government subdivision built upon after
1914;

Bar Beach/Shepherds Hill - Subdivided by the AA Co at the same time as the Garden Suburb;

Hamilton, west of Beaumont Street and south of Bedford Street - also subdivided by the AA Co.

Waratah;

Lambton (Jesmond Park) and New Lambton;

Kotara - sold at auction in 1925 but not substantially developed until after WWII;

Merewether;

Birmingham Gardens - sold at auction in 1922 but mostly developed after 1947.

In Sydney, the suburban developments of Haberfield Garden Suburb, Dacey Garden Suburb, Rosebery Model Industrial Suburb and Harcourt Model Suburb (Marrickville) were visited.

3.2.3 The third part of the survey concentrated on the Deferral Area and involved an assessment of the extent of change to the exterior of each house in the area and including also the houses on both sides of Gordon and Stewart Avenues, which were assessed as significant during the first part of the survey. Following this work, a windscreen survey was made of the intactness of houses in the remainder of the Garden Suburb.

The material of the outer walls of each house was noted and the house was rated according to its degree of change (its intactness) as follows:

- Category 1: <u>Few obvious changes</u>: all major elements intact (including building facade, roof form and materials) with minor changes only such as addition of fly wire doors or removal of leadlights.
- Category 2: Form and Character Intact but with some changes, notably the enclosure of verandahs and porches, removal or replacement of window awnings, or verandah columns, new fences.
- Category 3: Form Intact but with changes to the materials of outer wall, porches and other elements, e.g., removal of balustrading to porch, rendering of brickwork, changes to position and shape of windows and doors, replacement of red roof tiles with tiles of a different texture and colour, and addition of new features, such as aluminium 'lace'.
- Category 4: Form Changed: major changes to shape of the building, including changes to roof form, and erection of an additional storey.
- Category 5: <u>Site Redeveloped</u>: the original building on the site has been demolished and a new building erected.

Examples of houses in each category are shown in Illustrations 13.a - 13.e, and the results of the survey are compiled in the table on p.30.

Table: CHANGES TO BUILDINGS IN THE HAMILTON/SOUTH-EAST DEFERRED AREA. Survey: September 1985

SECTION	ND. LOTS	ND. HOUSES	OTHER USES	1914-18	1919-29	- 39	1940-49	1950 +	1980 +	PREDOMIN- ANT PERIOD	BRICK	TIMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSES IN EACH INTACTNESS CATEGORY				
						1930-39							1	2	3	4	5
** HA HB	25 26	25 26		16 18	7 7	71 -	MU	1	011 	1918 1917–9	12 21	13 5	10 4	6 9	7 6	2 6	-
2A 2B	30 30	25 30	5	1 -	22 20	1 10	-	1 -	-	1921–3 1924–5 1936	24 30	1 -	14 14	9 16	2	- -	-
3	39	38	1	2	25	3	3	5	-	1921-3 1950	36	2	17	13	5	2	1
4	25	23	2	-	9	9	2	3	-	none	20	3	10	7	3	2	
5A	29	30	1		4	26	-	-	-	1930 1936–8	18	12	10	17	3	-	-
5B	21	22	-	-	14	8	-	-	-	1929 1936-7	13	9	8	9	5	-	-
50	10	8	2	-	3	2	-	- 3	-	*	8	-	4	3	1	-	-
7 Part 8 Part 9	4 7 6	4 7 6	1 1 1	-	2 4 1	1 2 5	1 - -		-	- 1929 1935	3 - 4	1 7 2	- 2 1	3 4 4	1 1 1		
11A 11B 11C	34 36 20	26 35 20	8 1 -	-	- 1 -	24 29 19	1 5 -	1 - 1		- - 1936-8	24 24 17	2 11 3	13 14 5	12 19 14	- 2 1	1 - -	
12A 12B	36 39	36 39	1 1	-	10 25	23 12	1	2 -	- 1	? 1928– 1930	36 33	- 6	30 17	3 16	3 5	-	- 1
120	33	33	-	-	8	23	1	-	1	-	25	8	9	22	1	-	1
13A 13B	34 17	34 17		-	21 -	13 13	- 3	- 1	-	1925-7	34 17	-	16 8	9 9	6 -	3 -	-
14A 14B 14C 14D	17 32 32 33	17 32 33 33	1 1 1 1		17 28 28 23	- 2 4 9	- 1 - 1		- 1 -	1925 1925–6 – 1927	17 31 28 30	- 1 4 3	3 8 12 12	13 18 12 13	- 4 7 8	1 1 1 -	- 1 -
fotals				37 6.27	279 46.78	239 40 .1 6	20 3.39	16 2 . 71	3 0.50		505 84.4	93 15.6	241 40.16	260 43.38	72 12.03	19 3.22	4 0.68

one house not assessed for intactness dates for three houses not known for location of sections see attached map

> Total number of allotments: 615 Total number of hourse: 598

Most intact houses: Category 1, 241 houses) Category 2, 260 houses) 501 houses, 84%

Least intact/most altered houses (including second-generation houses): Category 3, 72 houses) Category 4, 19 houses)

95 houses, 16%

Category 5, 4 houses)

30



- 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferred Area:
- 13.a Few obvious changes (Category 1)





ò

SPESTS CO.

PARK







- 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferred Area:
- 13.b Form and Character intact (Category 2).









- 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferred Area:
- 13.c Form intact, changes to materials of outer walls porches and other elements (Category 3).









Ghanges to the Exterior Houses in the Sciencel Area:

1.0 Form intact, Changes to materials of Outer walls perches and other elements (Category 31. 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferred Area:

13.d Form changed.









- 13 Changes to the Exterior of Houses in the Deferred Area:
- 13.e Major new building or site redevelopment.







3.3 CHANGES TO HOUSES

The majority of houses were assessed as either category 1 (40%) or category 2 (43%), and in many category 2 houses the changes - particularly porch enclosures - were so well done, or so similar in age to the original building, that they were difficult to discern.

The number of houses whose form and character had been greatly altered were relatively few and were generally evenly distributed throughout the survey area, with the exception of the houses in the streets west of Gordon Avenue, many of which were assessed as category 3 or 4.

Most of the houses in the area surveyed are of brick construction, 84.5% (Illus.12). In the sections west of Gordon Avenue and south of Jenner Parade there are a significant number of timber houses; the number of timber houses in the surveyed area being 93, 15.6%.

The great majority (99.3%) of all buildings in the survey area were the original and first buildings on their respective allotments and that 84% of all the houses had few obvious changes to their exterior since first constructed or were relatively intact; and that a further 12% retained their form and as such still contributed positively to the predominant character of the area despite changes in colour and materials which in some cases disrupted the continuity of streetscape. Thus, a total of 96% of all houses contribute positively to the character of the area, and only 3,22% (19 houses) were so greatly altered in form and character (usually by an additional storey) that demolition would not adversely affect the significance of the area. Four houses (0.68%) were second generation houses, and their demolition would not adversely affect significance - although it should be noted that two of these houses were generally compatible in scale, form and character with nearby development.

The general conclusions for this data are that:

- i) the majority of buildings in the survey area are worthy of retention and that the area itself is of heritage value due in part to its continuity and relative lack of adverse changes.
- ii) consent for demolition should not be given except where it can be shown that it would not adversely affect the significance of the area (this would apply to houses in Categories 4 and 5, and to a small number of buildings in Category 3, subject to detailed assessment at the time, and the merits of the application.
- iii) that in consequence of the large number of buildings worthy of retention, the opportunities for infill development are few, except at the rear of existing dwellings.

14 Hamilton South/East in 1985:

14.a Streetscenes.



e d or

s .ty

;)

es

of due

it

.n and











- 14 Hamilton South/East in 1985:
- 14.b Business Centre and Open Space.





PUSINERS CENTRE: STEWART AVENUE.



(PEN SPACE: Of Corona & Hobburn Sts. OPEN SPACE: Wilson Place.





OPEN SPACE: Parkway Avenue.



CONCRETE PAVING: Stewart Avenue.

14 Hamilton South/East in 1985:

14.c Fences.



New brick fence in keeping with style & charader of the house & the locality.



Original brick fence retained & brush fence added to provide privacy from National Park opposite.



Orginal timber Fence, matching the house.



New peoble-dash & baluster fonce, increasing privacy but out-of-character with materials, form & scale of nearby fences.



Yew brick side tence. Brick type & last panels reminiscent of Victorian poriod recoration, \$ at of character with architectural macter of Garden Schurb. 40



Addition of side fence to increase privacy similar in construction & detail to original fence.

- 14 Hamilton South/East in 1985:
- 14.d Windows and other details.



What house with Fence & pergola of the same period.



leadlight windows with floral motifs.



The column details in this corner porch occur in several houses in the courden Suburb.



Unusual semi-circular windows with hexagonal patterned badlights.



Cadoled roofs are typical of houses in the older parts of the Garden Suburb. 41



Simple diamond patterned lead lights.

4.0 COMPARISON WITH OTHER AREAS

4.1 THE GARDEN SUBURB IDEA IN AUSTRALIA

The garden city movement of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century 'sought to comprehensively reconcile [the problems of] growing towns with pressured countryside, through co-ordinated systems of financial, industrial, agricultural, social and amenity planning and management. Improved environmental conditions would determine the quality of a non-industrial society.' (6)

These notions, which were promoted by architects, industrialists and philosophers, were taken up in Australia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Although the notions relating to economic and social well-being were no doubt understood, the effect of the Garden City movement in Australia was more related to the design and character of the component parts of a suburb than to a concept for social reform.

Two major features of the Garden City concept, as expounded by Ebenezer Howard - namely communal land ownership and separation of town from country - played little part in the adoption of the Garden City idea in Australia - Canberra being the notable exception.

The most obvious and enduring expression of the Garden City idea in Australia was in the subdivision and layout of residential areas of the major cities. Curvilinear road patterns created to enliven the townscape with vistas and incidental open spaces. Examples of such layouts include Dacey Garden Suburb (1912) in Sydney, Mitcham Garden Suburb (1919) in Adelaide, and Yallourn (1921) - a town in Victoria developed to serve a major electrical power station, and many less well known places.

One of the major features of the garden suburb in the UK was the predominance of semi-deta ched and deta ched houses on their own allotment, but such development had been the basis of government subdivisions in Australia since the 1820s, and the standard lots in typical 'garden suburbs' offered little that was new and were generally smaller than the typical 66 ft x 165 ft (1 x 2 1/2 chains) lot that characterized Australian towns in the nineteenth century. The subdivisions were a major change from the terrace houses of the city and inner suburbs with frontages 12 - 25 ft (3.6 - 7.6 m), and the developers were keen to promote the differences.

4.2 COMPARISON WITH OTHER AREAS IN AUSTRALIA

Compared with proposals for Dacey Garden Suburb and Mitcham Garden Suburb, the Garden Suburb Hamilton was a small development. Daceyville (as it became known) and Mitcham were designed as easily

⁶ Sheri Burke, <u>The Garden Suburb Idea in New South Wales and the</u> Conservation of Haberfield, p.14.

recognisable entities in the urban fabric, whereas the roads in the Garden Suburb, Hamilton were continuous with those in the adjoining areas and the subdivision was not easily recognised as an entity except through the character of its houses, and the form and planting of its major avenues.

In the Garden Suburb Hamilton, the notions of the Garden Suburb were more in the title and the promotion than on the ground. But, as Jim Docherty has observed in <u>Newcastle: the Making of an Australian</u> <u>City</u>, the notions of the Garden Suburb were favoured by developers because they aided sales.

The most notable features of the design of the Garden Suburb which may be attributed to the Garden City idea are:

- . the major tree-lined avenues, particularly Parkway Avenue (named after The Parkway, the main street in Welwyn Garden City and one of the first of the Garden Suburb in the UK);
- . the building of Architect designed houses as an example for others to follow and as an offer to prospective owners;
- . the Business Centre and park; and
- . the landscape treatment of intersections.

The latter two features did not eventuate, but the avenues and the architect designed houses were accomplished, and it is unfortunate that the medians in Stewart Avenue have been removed to aid the flow of motor traffic.

The continuity in streetscape character, combined with the better-than-average quality of the houses, and the attention to street landscaping, makes the Garden Suburb Hamilton not noteworthy in the history of 20th century residential subdivision in New South Wales.

4.3 COMPARISON WITH OTHER SUBURBS IN NEWCASTLE

Whilst the overall layout and character of the Garden Suburb, Hamilton is not remarkable when compared with other subdivisions in Australia using the term 'garden suburb', its occurrence in Newcastle is remarkable, as most of the other garden suburbs occurred in the capital cities or were government sponsored developments, such as Yallourn.

In the nineteenth century, Newcastle was a collection of townships developed largely to serve adjacent mines. Large areas of land were in the ownership of a few, but with the decline in coal production and the industrial growth these large estates were subdivided for residential purposes. This process, which filled in the gaps between the townships and produced the form of the city as it now is, is described in detail in Docherty pp.77-104.

Of the subdivisions that occurred in the first decades of the twentieth century, the Garden Suburb was the most significant. It filled-in a major undeveloped area of the city, an area whose swamp lands were generally considered unattractive; it provided a major road access and entrance to the city centre; it engendered a high standard of private housing for the increasing middle class population; and in comparison with many other subdivisions it developed steadily and retained high popularity - in short it was successful.

Its success in terms of profits to the AA Co were not able to be investigated. Certainly the prices paid for the land were good, but the costs of preparing the land and providing services may have been significantly higher than for other subdivisions.

The proximity to the city, the beach and the tramlines were very real advantages for the Garden Suburb; matched only at Bar Beach and Merewether. Although several of the contemporary subdivisions, such as Kotara (1925) and Birmingham Gardens were attractive sites in terms of landscape, their distance from the industrial workplaces and from the city made them less attractive as places to live. In addition, the method of sale (at a single auction) may have slowed development, whereas the regular release of land in the Garden Suburb kept demand high and presented the reality of a developing suburb, with houses always under construction.

The urban form of Newcastle, with coal mining townships and in-fill estates, is one of the major features and interests in the townscape of Newcastle. Of the in-fill estates, the Garden Suburb and Bar Beach are amongst the most noteworthy because of their size, the prominance of their location, and because of the easily perceived contrast between their character and that of the adjoining areas. This contrast, and those in other parts of Newcastle are worthy of recognition and retention, for example, in the planning and maintenance policies of the Council.

In addition to these matters, the most obvious and remarkable aspect of the Garden Suburb, and particularly the Deferral Area, is the predominance of brick construction (Illus.12 p.27). Although houses similar to those in the Garden Suburb and Bar Beach occur in other areas of Newcastle they do not occur in such large numbers, nor do they dominate the townscape or create the continuity in scale, form and materials so readily apparent in the Garden Suburb. In this respect, the Garden Suburb is very similar to suburbs in the capital cities such as Concord in Sydney and Burwood in Melbourne.

in

ere n

44

5.0 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

5.1 THE CONCEPT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural Significance means aesthetic, historic, social and scientific value for past, present and future generations (7).

The concept of cultural significance helps in identifying the value of a place, beyond its utilitarian value.

The Burra Charter definition, used in this analysis, encompasses the cultural values included in the definition of environmental heritage in the Heritage Act, 1977 (as amended), namely, historic, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, or aesthetic values.

A statement of cultural significance provides a basis for decisions about the future of a place. The overall objective in conserving a place of significance is to retain all the aspects of significance, and all the fabric (characteristics) which contribute to that significance.

5.2 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

The Garden Suburb Hamilton is outstanding amongst Newcastle's suburbs for its cultural significance and particularly for its evidence of early twentieth century town planning and development practice in Australia; for its evidence of the growth of Newcastle and its character and diversification following the establishment of the BHP steel smelter in 1915; and for its contribution to the present day townscape.

5.2.1 Historical Value

The Garden Suburb is of historical value:

- as a major part of the A.A. Co's Newcastle grant for coal mining, and its use as such spawned some of the adjacent older settlements including Cooks Hill and Hamilton;
- b) as evidence of the transmission of major town planning concepts from the UK to Australia, and their adaptation to the circumstances and standards in Newcastle;
- c) as evidence of the major growth and diversification of employment in Newcastle engendered by the establishment of the BHP Steelworks, and the consequent development of a higher standard of housing;

⁷ Australia ICOMOS, <u>Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural</u> Significance (The Burra Charter).

- d) as the major part of a major land drainage and subdivision project which (together with Bar Beach Subdivisions) virtually completed the urban development of inner Newcastle;
- e) for its evidence of the contribution of A.A. Company to the development of Newcastle, particularly in relation to open space facilities, via the donation (but not development) of Learmonth Park and the National Park; the creation - in the form of Parkway Avenue - of a major new access to the southern Beaches, and the creation of a major new access (Stewart Avenue) to the city;
- f) for its evidence of standards and achievements in suburban house and building construction particularly in the period between the Wars;
- g) as the most homogeneous areas of late Federation housing (1914-28), and between the Wars housing erected in predominantly brick construction in Newcastle.

5.2.2 Aesthetic Value

The Garden Suburb is of aesthetic value:

- a) for its major avenues, Gordon Avenue, Stewart Avenue and Parkway Avenue, and their associated landscaping and their contribution to the character of Newcastle, and particularly the approach to the city centre from the south;
- b) for its continuity in layout and for the homogenity of its housing - in design, in form and in the use of materials;

5.2.3 Social Value

The Garden Suburb is of social value for its real and potential educational value as a place from which major aspects of the history of its citizens can be explained in a tangible way.

5.2.4 Scientific Value

10

10

The Garden Suburb is of scientific value because its relatively unchanged character, combined with the wealth of records - in Newcastle and the ANU Archives and the recollections of residents and others - provide outstanding opportunities for the study of a suburb in a major Australian provincial city.

5.3 AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE, BUILDINGS AND OTHER FABRIC OF SIGNIFICANCE

The AA Co's Garden Suburb, Hamilton can be divided into two parts according to the nature of their significance.

Virtually the whole of the Garden Suburb is of historical significance for the reasons outlined in the statement of significance (5.3.1.a,b,c,d and f) - namely as part of the A.A. Co's grant; as one of the last major subdivisions of land in Inner Newcastle; as evidence of the growth of Newcastle between the Wars; and for its educational and research value.

Parts of the Garden Suburb have additional significance because of their aesthetic value (5.3.2.a and b) because they contain development which exemplify late Federation and between the Wars housing in Newcastle (5.3.1.g); and because they exemplify the major aspects of the subdivision, as executed; namely, the major avenues and their remaining planting, the 'demonstration' housing, and the grid layout, and the monumental pillars (5.3.1.c, 5.3.1.e and 5.3.3).

The area of the Garden Suburb, Hamilton, the parts of additional significance, and the components that together comprise that significance are shown in Illustration 15. Houses of significance are not shown but comprise those in categories 1, 2 and 3 of the field survey - with houses in categories 1 and 2 (the least altered categories) being of the greatest value (see 3.3). [No detailed assessment was made of the curtiledge of buildings, but it was noted that many places retained original features particularly front fences, and the form and character of planting in the front garden. There was also a notable intrusion of gardens comprising a predominance of Australian natives planted in an informal arrangement and often obscuring the view of the house from the street.]

Atea work study for inclusion i

- 15 Garden Suburb, Hamilton: Aspects of Significance and Area of Greatest Significance.
- KEY
 Garden Suburb, Hamilton
 Hamilton South/East Deferral Area
 Area of Significance
 Area for further study to



6.0 CONSERVATION POLICY

6.1 PURPOSE OF A CONSERVATION POLICY

The development of a conservation policy, embodied in a report, is an essential pre-requisite to making decisions about the future of a place (8).

The purpose of the policy is to state how the conservation of a place may best be achieved having regard to:

- . its significance, and the components that contribute to its significance; and
- . the circumstances pertaining to the place and its future.

In relation to the Garden Suburb, Hamilton, the principal issues to be covered by the policy include;

- care of the fabric particularly houses and gardens in private ownership, and roads, footpaths, street planting and parks in the care/custodianship of the Newcastle Council;
- use of land and buildings now and in the future, and particularly the nature of controls relating to multiple dwellings - dual occupancy, flats, town houses, etc;
- interpretation, that is, the most appropriate way of making its significance understood (by treatment of the fabric, by signage and/or by publications, etc);
- <u>implementation</u> of the conservation policy and review of the policy.

The matters affecting each of these issues are described briefly in the following sub-section 6.2.

6.2 MATTERS AFFECTING THE CONSERVATION OF THE GARDEN SUBURB

6.2.1 Requirements and Constraints Arising out of Cultural Significance

The Cultural Significance of a place is embodied in its fabric in the associated records, in the recollections of people familiar with it, and in its relationships with other places of significance (9).

(8) Australia ICOMOS <u>Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation</u> Policy para 1.3.

(9) Walker, M. and others, "Understanding the Burra Charter", in Australia ICOMOS Newsletter, November 1984. The fabric of significance is described in 5.3. To conserve the significance of the place it is desirable to:

- retain and conserve the fabric of significance (buildings and their curtiledge, roads, trees, etc);
- minimise changes which would destroy that fabric or which might threaten to destroy the fabric in the future; and
- retain the built form and character of the area, particularly the predominance of single storey dwelling houses;
 - minimise changes to roads, such as the replacement of grass verges with concrete paving, road-widenings and road closures

 with the exception of works to reconstruct 'lost' features
 such as the median strip in Stewart Avenue.

Much of the fabric appears to be in fair to good condition and retention of it is unlikely to present financial or technical difficulties.

6.2.2 Experience Elsewhere

There has been considerable experience in New South Wales and elsewhere in Australia in devising ways and means to conserve urban areas of significance.

In general the ways and means available to Local Government authorities can be divided into four categories:

. controls (via Local Environmental Plans, and Development Control Plans) which identify the area on a map and clauses which require Council consent prior to demolition and prior to additions and other works. The standard clauses devised by the DEP are attached as Appendix G.

. promotion/education

preparing and distributing materials - pamphlets, reports, booklets, etc, which explain the history and significance of the places and how to approach caring for property of significance; collecting documents and other materials about the history of the area and making them available for research.

. technical and financial aid

providing technical advice about building conservation and comment on building and development applications via a staff specialist or heritage advisor on retainer; and financial aid in extreme or rare circumstances where the place is of outstanding significance and the costs of conserving the fabric are high.

conservation and reconstruction works

 undertaking studies of Council property of significance, preparing policies about maintenance and works, and undertaking works - such as rehabilitation of buildings and reconstruct-ion of 'lost' features such as fencing, landscaping.

[Some councils have undertaken works such as paving of footpaths and installation of street furniture in the name of heritage conservation, but many of these have destroyed some of the character and fabric of significance of the place concerned. In general, any new works should be designed to blend with the existing character and be subservient to it.]

The ways and means mentioned above will be familiar to Newcastle Council though its experience with Newcastle East, The Hill, and Cooks Hill. None of these approaches are adequate on their own they need to be used in combination, having regard to the needs and circumstances of both the Newcastle Council and the local community.

Controls via LEPs and DCPs are generally considered a first step in conservation action. However, while such controls have been in existence for some time, and variations of them (usually with substantially fewer words than the current standard provisions) have been included in LEPs, their use has not been fully accepted either by the public, or by the administrators - including town planners, building inspectors, and elected Council members. The administrators appear to require a very very high level of popular support before controls are actually implemented or interpreted to their fullest.

The acceptance of controls has been made easier in some places by the availability of technical advice (such as engaging an architect to be available for consultation on a regular basis say once a fortnight) (10), and preparing guidelines about typical changes to houses such as adding extra rooms, upgrading facilities in kitchens and bathrooms and building a garage.

But this experience is not directly applicable to the Garden Suburb Hamilton. Most of the areas where such means have been adopted were developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century and contain buildings popularly acknowledged as significant and worthy of conservation. In contrast, most of the buildings in the Garden Suburb were built after 1919. They are plentiful in Sydney as well as Newcastle and are not generally recognised as having heritage value. In consequence, promotion and education must be of high priority in order to increase understanding and gain further support for conservation. An expression of Council interest and concern via a review of Council policies, and support for locally undertaken research will be an important first step in conserving the area.

6.2.3 Needs and Wishes of the Newcastle City Council

The needs and wishes of the Newcastle City Council in relation to the conservation of the most significant parts of the Garden Suburb, Hamilton relate to the following:

⁽¹⁰⁾ This has been followed by Hawkesbury Shire, Maitland City, and Mudgee Shire in NSW and six Councils outside the Melbourne region, and several in the Melbourne metropolitan area.

- the need to finalise the Dwelling Density and Development Code (Development Control Plan No.14) and how it should apply to the study area; (this is discussed further in 6.2.4 and 6.2.5);
- . the wish to have a single code (DCP No.14) applying to all residential areas in the city of Newcastle and to meet the goals discussed in the various reports about DCP No.14;
- the desirability of having any 'new' conservation controls easy to understand and administer and similar in approach to those applying (or likely to be applied) in Inner Newcastle. (Cooks Hill, Newcastle East and the Hill);
 - the desire to minimise effects on other planning policies (to avoid conflict and administrative complications), eg., in relation to the Hamilton North area (for which a detailed planning study has been undertaken [LEP 46 GG 9/8/85]) and which includes that part of the Garden Suburb north of Dumaresq Street and west of Stewart Avenue;
 - the need (at least in the short term) to avoid major new expenditure in relation to conservation action - controls, promotion, and conservation works;
- the need to consider other needs and issues relating to the future of the Hamilton South East area together with conservation needs - such matters include control of traffic, needs for open space, etc;
- the need to comply with the objectives/concerns of State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) and directions under Section 117(2) of the EPA Act, particularly direction 9.21 (Circular No.84) Conservation of Environmental Heritage and Ecologically Significant Items and Areas, which requires the inclusion of heritage controls for items of the environmental heritage in all LEPs.

These matters have been taken into account - as far as practicable within the terms of this study - in the discussion and recommendations that follow.

6.2.4 Dwelling Density and Development Code (DCP No.14)

The Development Control Plan 14, the Dwelling Density and Development Code for the City of Newcastle is a major initiative of the City Planning Department and provides a comprehensive approach to housing development in Newcastle.

Its purpose is to encourage a range of dwelling types and to redress problems associated with population decline, changes in household size and structure, concentrations of residential flat buildings, and related matters outlined in the Code and discussed in detail in the reports preceding its adoption by Council.

DCP No.14 sets out the matters which shall be taken into consideration in the determining applications for consent (2.3), namely, the matters listed in Section 90 of the EPA Act (2.3.1) and their elaboration in DEP Technical Bulletin 16 (2.3.2); and in the case of demonstrating the value of existing dwellings and their contribution to the locality (2.3.3).

Urban Conservation Areas - Newcastle East, The Hill, and Cooks Hill, are the subject of additional clauses which provide that:

"In these areas Council shall not consent to the erection of a building under this Plan unless:

- in the opinion of Council, the building is generally sympathetic with the character, scale and external architecture of buildings in the vicinity thereof;
 - ii) it is consistent with the guidelines and policies of any relevant Conservation Plan adopted by Council; and
 - iii) it is consistent with the requirements of the Heritage and Conservation Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning."

In effect, these clauses underline the need, in Urban Conservation Areas, for new development to be sympathetic with the character of buildings in the vicinity.

Whilst very different in character, the most significant part of the Garden Suburb, Hamilton is worthy of designation as an urban conservation area, in a manner similar to the Inner Newcastle areas.

6.2.5 Application DCP No.14 to the Area of Significance

All the residential areas within the Deferral Area, and within the Garden Suburb, Hamilton, are within Residential Precinct A (Standard Residential). This is the designation that applies to the majority of Newcastle's residential access in which dwelling houses predominate. In DCP 14, the dwelling density controls for this precinct are shown on the following page.

Despite the uniformity in the character of the streets in the Deferral area, allotments vary in size from 428 square metres approximately (eg., in Kemp Street, south side, between Smith Street and Stewart Street) to 820 square metres approximately (eg., in Parkway Avenue, between National Part Street and Stewart Avenue). The majority of lots are between 500 square metres and 640 square metres, with many lots around 520 square metres and 620 square metres.

Applying the code requirements, every lot would probably be able to accommodate at least two dwellings of any size and meet the other provisions of the code; and most lots would meet the area requirements for three small dwellings but may have difficulty in meeting the other requirements, particularly those relating to scale and character. For narrow lots, it will be difficult to design dwellings which do not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining properties. Table 2: DWELLING DENSITY CONTROLS FOR STANDARD RESIDENTIAL AREAS DCP 14, p.17.

the second	DWBLLING	DENSITY CONTRO	DLS	
RESIDENTIAL PRECINCT	DWELLING TYPES PERMISSIBLE UNDER THIS PLAN 	SISB OF	MINIMUM SITE Area per Dwelling SQ. Metres	MININON LANDSCAPED AREA PER DWELLING SQ. METRES
Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
A	Attached dwellings	}		
(Standard	(including	}		In an internet and the second
Residential)	semi-detached	} Large	232	70
	dwellings, town houses	} Medium	200	55
	and villa homes), dual) Small	175	45
	occupancy conversions	1) 010 1		diear stat
	(see appendix E for)		elsigned a
	C1.15 of the Model	Det statel		Iven it. the
	Provisions)	I		2
in the second	duplex residential	1		1
	buildings, residential	1		I DEED TUDE
aseley og	flat conversions.	1000 03001		an Catter the
	1 TVO SEL DE RÉCORDER :	1 20 Month		The second
	Housing for aged and)		ret beerfo
	disabled persons (see	} -	125	50
	appendix F).)		

There are several clauses that require matters such as scale and character and existing features to be considered when assessing applications: in S.90 (c),(e),(f),(h); in the clauses elaborating on S.90 (i),(ii),(iii),(iv),(v); and Clause 2.3.3 Demolition of Housing. And therefore in theory, the code as it stands has the capacity to ensure that any new development does not adversely affect the existing character of the area, and more importantly, conforms in scale, form, height and materials with adjoining and nearby development.

However, some of these matters can be the subject of differing opinions, and the strength of these clauses - and hence their suitability for conserving the character of the area of significance - may only be known through experience. Having regard to the current market value of houses in Hamilton, redevelopment is unlikely, except on lots where the houses are very run down. The principal threat is the addition of first storeys to existing dwellings (Illus.13.e).

Whilst ensuring the compatibility of any new development with existing development is obviously an issue, the most obvious difficulty with the application of DCP 14 to the Hamilton South East area is the height limit.

In the townscape of Hamilton South East, almost any new building, no matter what its floor area, built to the maximum height of 6.5 metres, would be out of scale and character with the development on adjoining land, unless it was alongside a building of similar or greater height. But such buildings are so few that almost any new two storey building would be inconsistent with the dominant features of the street and the locality as a whole. [New buildings of two storeys would also be inconsistent with the character of existing development in the generally flat areas adjoining the Deferral Area, and to other areas in Newcastle such as Stockton and parts of Mayfield.]

In Hamilton South East there are several buildings which demonstrate the inconsistency and visual incongruity of two storey structures; for example, the building at the north west corner of Hebburn and National Park Streets, which is totally out of character with the scale, form, colour and features of adjoining development. There are other examples also, and there are a couple of examples where the designer has attempted to minimize the apparent bulk of a first floor addition, for example, 181 Kemp Street, near Gordon Avenue, but despite such care the result is disruptive in the streetscape.

Without a clear statement along the lines that 'single storey development is preferred in areas where single storey buildings predominate', it may be preferrable to designate the area as an Urban Conservation Area and provide supplementary controls for the Hamilton South East area either within DCP 14 and/or in the form of separate Guidelines - similar to those for Inner Newcastle, or similar to those in the Heritage Council Standard Provisions (Appendix G).

6.2.6 Advantages and Disadvantages of designating the Garden Suburb an Urban Conservation Area

To designate the area as an Urban Conservation Area, in a similar way to the other areas of Inner Newcastle, is the most obvious planning solution: it has the advantage of being known to Council and is acceptable to the DEP.

But there are disadvantages:

- . it will create planning anomalies in that other areas of comparable significance have not been recognised; and
- . it may be the cause of undue concern to some residents and opposition to controls.

Community Support for Conservation

Although there is clearly some support for conservation it is difficult to gauge the likely extent of support for controls. Whilst the Newcastle community appears to have accepted the controls for Inner Newcastle, which is perceived as a scarce resource, people may have difficulty appreciating the significance of the Garden Suburb particularly having regard to the age and uniformity of its houses, and their occurrence elsewhere. Furthermore, experience in other places suggests that promotion and understanding are more effective means of conserving areas than improving controls, and should start before the introduction of such controls.

Discussions with the local community were not undertaken as part of this study because of time constraints and the need to have substantial data about the suburb available as a basis for such discussion. After discussion with representatives of the City Planning Department the consultant was of the opinion that it would be preferable to complete the report prior to any further discussions with the residents.

In Newcastle, like most places, there are a variety of opinions about the value of conserving buildings and areas; many people who do not support conservation are unaware of the history of the place and the special value of the buildings and other features.

It is appropriate therefore, that the value of the Garden Suburb and its history be promoted prior to the introduction of controls and guidelines.

Other areas of heritage value and the S.117(2) direction

When comparing the Hamilton South/East area with other suburbs of Newcastle, several areas of likely heritage significance were noted. Some of these places - such as Wallsend and Carrington has been recognised in planning studies, but the character and value of several other worthy places has not yet been formally recognised.

As a first stage in meeting the requirements of the S.117(2) direction, it is recommended that research be undertaken to indentify the predominant subdivisions in Newcastle, that is, the subdivisions that produced the current road pattern and form. This is a straightforward task for which there is readily accessible information in theses and in the Newcastle Local History Library. The work could be prepared on maps with notation describing pertinent facts - the date, the surveyor, the developer/company, the original need - eg., to serve a mine.

In a second stage, the dates/period of the housing in these settlements/subdivisions could be obtained by field inspection and by reference to records. This would require research of Council rates books, HDWB records (as in this study) plus the use of old plans and photos for areas developed pre-sewerage, ie., in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century.

The whole task would be of great interest to residents of Newcastle and to visitors, and could form the basis of a poster with the road map on one side - with colour overprint showing boundaries, dates, and names of subdivisions - plus a key referring to notes printed on the reverse.

Much of this task could be undertaken by people relatively inexperienced in heritage matters but they would require some training, supervision and coordination.

From this data a framework for identifying places of significance could be prepared together with priorities for further study and and research by local people, priorities for Council action, and priorities for compliance with the S.117(2) direction. The work could then be the subject of a discussion paper prepared by Council. Such an initiative, involving local people, is the type of project likely to qualify for funds from the Australian Heritage Grants Program administered by the Australian Heritage Commission (these grants are separate from the National Estate Program).

In summary, the making of a further Urban conservation area in Newcastle at this time has two major disadvantages which together outweigh the advantages.

Accordingly, a staged procedure is recommended whereby action is taken to minimize likely problems before the area is designated a conservation area (6.5).

6.3 DRAFT STATEMENT OF CONSERVATION POLICY

Having regard to the matters discussed in 6.2, a draft statement of conservation policy has been prepared.

Draft General Policy Statement:

The Newcastle City Council recognises the environmental heritage significance of that portion of the Garden Suburb, Hamilton as described in the statement of significance and plan attached (i.e., 5.2.1 - 5.2.4 and Illus.15) and has adopted the following objectives:

- Objective 1: to encourage the retention and conservation of the features and fabric of significance identified in the attached plan:
 - a) by providing information about the history of the Garden Suburb and its significance for residents and other interested people;
 - b) by preparing guidelines for the control of demolition and development (see 6.4);
 - c) by providing technical advice to owners about changes to their property;
 - d) by nominating the four dwellings constructed by the AA Co for the Register of the National Estate; and requesting the Heritage Council of NSW to make Section 130 orders under the NSW Heritage Act (i.e., the same protection that has been given to most of the buildings of heritage significance in central Newcastle).

Objective 2: to encourage the retention of the pattern of land use in the area

- a) by the zoning controls generally; and
- b) by the application of the Dwelling Density and Development Code DCP No.14.

- Objective 3: to retain and enhance the pattern and character of the streets
- a) by careful design and location of any road traffic management controls that might be considered necessary in the future;
- b) by encouraging the retention and care of grass verges, particularly the strips immediately alongside the front property boundaries;
 - by examining the possible reconstruction of c) medians in Stewart Street, and other landscape features.

Objective 4: to retain and enhance the local open space

- a) by preparing plans of management for Leamonth Park and the small incidental areas of open space; and
- b) by involving local residents in preparation of these plans.
- Objective 5: to encourage the research of documentary evidence about the Garden Suburb
 - by engaging an historian/planner to further a) investigate the source material and provide specialist advice and direction about further study;
 - b) by providing financial assistance to local researchers interested in undertaking such research including oral history of residents and others.
- Objective 6: to encourage interest in the Garden Suburb, and other areas of Newcastle
 - a) by holding a half-day workshop about the Garden Suburb involving residents, local historians, architects and Council staff and aldermen;
 - b) by undertaking a brief study of the principal subdivisions which make up the urban fabric of Newcastle and publishing the material prepared (6.2.6);
 - c) by identifying other areas of likely significance in Newcastle (in accord with the S.117(2) direction);
 - d) by involving residents of the Garden Suburb and other interested persons in the above processes; and by applying for funds from Heritage Conservation organisations, particularly the Heritage Council of NSW and the Australian Heritage Commission;

e) by republishing the subdivision brochure and sale litho.

Whilst these objectives and actions are within the scope of the Council's responsibilities, consideration could be given to seeking financial support rom other organisations, such as the Australian Heritage Commission and the Heritage Council of NSW, but none of these actions should be considered as being dependent upon outside funding.

6.4 GUIDELINES FOR THE CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE

It is anticipated that an integrated set of guidelines or controls relating to heritage conservation within the Whole of the City of Newcastle will be developed for all areas of significance as soon as practicable. The draft 'Consolidation' Local Environmental Plan currently being finalised by the Planning Department makes provision for the conservation of items of the Environmental heritage.

Having regard to the character of the area and the issues raised in 6.2, the principal components of any supplementary controls or guidelines should be:

- i) Control of demolition
 - . an affirmation of the value of the majority of the existing buildings and the need to conserve them; and
 - confirmation that consent will be required prior to demolition of part or whole of any building in the area (designation of the area as a conservation area with demolition controls would achieve this objective).
- Control of Development including changes to existing dwellings, including maintenance, alterations, additions and conversions to flats:
- . The matters which require particular attention include the retention in form and materials, of roofs, verandahs/ porches, openings to street facade and the front portion of side walls; retention of low front fences, and major elements of garden form in the area between the front boundary and the front facade of the building.
 - . Major changes to the exterior finish of outer walls such as painting brickwork, or recladding weatherboards should be strenuously discouraged.
- . Rooms may be accommodated in roofspaces provided the windows do not face the street and do not project in such a way that they dominate the roof form.

Changes to existing buildings should comply with the following:

- the facade should remain intact, with the exception that the balcony/porch may be enclosed provided that glass is the principal material with mullions and transoms minimized;
- . additions to be at the rear only, in single storey construction with the material of outer walls similar in character, form, colour and texture to that in the existing building; the roof form should be compatible with the form of the roof of the existing building;
- . no new construction in the front setback, except for light frame carports plus driveways, footpaths and fences.
- iii) Guidelines for new Development (on sites listed in Appendix
 D):
 - new development to be restricted to single storey construction, with a limited amount of accommodation within the roof space;
 - . the portion of any new building nearest the street, to address the street and be similar in form, scale, use of materials and presence major features to other buildings in the area, but not necessarily imitative of the details in such buildings;
 - . front fences to be low brick fences, similar in height to those in the near vicinity and/or designed to match the new building;
 - . the setback from the front boundary to be landscaped, with the exception of the vehicular entrance and driveway.

The detail in the notes above was limited by the resources available to this study. However, the principal characteristics of buildings in the area are relatively easily perceived - and much more uniform than are the buildings in the urban conservation areas of Inner Newcastle. The experience of the City Planning Department should be adequate for the task of conserving the major aspects of the area, but having regard to its current commitments it may be preferable to engage a local architect to provide advice on a regular basis.

6.5 IMPLEMENTING THE DRAFT CONSERVATION POLICY

To implement the Draft Conservation Policy in 6.3, it is recommended that the following strategy and sequence of action be adopted:

1 Include the Deferral Area in DCP No.14 subject to the provisions that apply to other parts of the Residential A precinct. It being noted that section 2.3.2 of DCP No.14 requires adherence to the design guidelines for medium density housing as expressed in Technical Bulletin No.16 (prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning.)

- 2 Implement the policy actions in 6.3.6 including the publication of public education material, the half-day workshop, and action to facilitate the identification of other areas of heritage significance in Newcastle;
- 3 Commission and support research about the Garden Suburb, as outlined in Objective 5;
- 4 When further information is available about other areas of likely significance (item 2 above and Objectives 6b and 6c), discuss the implications of conservation area status (particularly controls on dwellings and alterations to them) and consider alternative means of achieving conservation - such as increased public education and modifications to DCP No.14;
- 5 Prepare draft guidelines for the control of development (based on notes in 6.4 and outcome of 4 above);
- 6 Adopt final controls and guidelines;
- 7 Implement other policies as appropriate, such as the reconstruction of a median in Stewart Avenue and other landscaping measures.
Appendix A

STUDY BRIEF

HAMILTON SOUTH/EAST DEFERRED AREA CONSERVATION STUDY

BACKGROUND.

Newcastle City Council has recently revised its development control policies relating to residential dwelling density and development throughout the Newcastle Local Government Area.

These policies are expressed in Development Control Plan No. 14 - Dwelling Density and Development Code No. 14 which was adopted by Council on 18th December, 1984.

However two areas have been excluded from the provisions of the Plan until outstanding matters of concenrn with these areas have been resolved.

The outstanding matters of concern and the respective deferral areas are:

(i) Sewerage surcharge and drainage overload in Merewether;

(ii) Heritage conservation value of the "AA" Estate area in Hamilton South/East.

CONSERVATION STUDY.

A study is required to determine the heritage conservation value of the area of Hamilton South/East as delineated by the map to clause 1.5 (c) of Development Control Plan No. 14. It should be noted that the area delineated by the map does not necessarily have significant heritage conservation value, nor does it necessarily indicate the maximum area of potential conservation value. The study team would be expected to determine these matters.

It should be noted that land to the north of the delineated 'Deferral Area' is affected by draft Local Environmental Plan No. 46 which proposes certain dwelling density provisions over that land. Should this land contain certain dwellings of heritage conservation value, any course of action should recognise the existence of this draft statutory planning instrument and suggest any appropriate modifications.

AIMS.

A. To identify whether part or all of the area delineated as the 'Hamilton South/East Deferred Area' by clause 1.5 (c) of Development Control Plan No. 14, and adjacent land has heritage conservation significance.

- B. If an area is of heritage conservation significance:-
- 1. To provide guidelines for the conservation of this heritage character and for the design of new structures compatible with the character of the area.
- 2. To supplement the development controls stated in Development Control Plan No. 14 - Dwelling Density and

Cont ... /2.

pevelopment Code - in the form of the abovementioned guidelines.

It is expected that fulfillment of Aim B would:

- provide an indepth assessment and inventory with full documentation, including description and photographs of all significant heritage items within the delineated area, and adjacent land, with particular attention being paid to residential structures;
- 2. Identify all heritage items which warrant permanent conservation;
- Identify buildings which could be replaced without loss to the environmental heritage of the study area and identify any sites suited to redevelopment or buildings suited to restoration;
- Provide infill, redevelopment and development guidelines which include information with respect to:-
 - (a) building envelopes, siting, scale, form;
 - (b) external detailing, materials and colour schemes for new and existing developments;
 - (c) streetscape elements;
 - (d) appropriate landscaping in relation to individual developments, street closures, and open space generally
- 5. Identify streetscapes of significance within the study area.

Consultation will be required, as appropriate, with the City Planning Department of Newcastle City Council, the Department of Environment and Planning, the National Trust and other groups and organisations.

WORK PROGRAMME

It is expected that the Conservation Study will be conducted according to the following work programme:-

- 1. Historic overview and heritage assessment.
- 2. Townscape analysis, including individual sites.
- 3. Recommended course of action and development guidelines.

TIMESCALE

It is expected that the Conservation Study will be completed by late September, 1985.

BUDGET

Not more than \$5000 is allocated to the work.

Appendix B

DRAINAGE NUMBERS AT HALF-YEARLY INTERVALS

FROM THE HUNTER DISTRICT WATER BOARD DRAINAGE REGISTER

June 1914 – December 1950

Date	Connection Number	No of new connections in preceding 6 month period
30. 6. 1914	5838	304
31.12.1914	6142	
30. 6.1915	6554	412
31.12.1915	7126	572
30. 6.1916	7759	633
31.12.1916	8200	441
		654
30. 6.1917	8854	464
31.12.1917	9321	515
30. 6.1918	9836	568
31.12.1918	10404	423 6 monthly average 30.6.1914 - 31.12.1916
31. 6.1919	10827	is 474 connections
31.12.1919	11384	557
30. 6.1920	12183	799
		1219
31.12.1920	12603	451
30. 6.1921	13054	588
31.12.1921	13640	376
30. 6.1922	14016	403
31.12.1922	14419	
30. 6.1923	15124	705
31.12.1923	15720	596
		592
30. 6.1924	16312	648

C Date	onnection Number	No of new connections in preceding 6 month period	<u>sthrengs</u> metioned
31.12.1924	16960	623	
30. 6.1925	17583	558	10 pul:
31.12.1925	18141	529	paid ta
30. 6.1926	18670	625	uretellar.
31.12.1926	19295	435	
30. 6.1927	19730	418	
31.12.1927	20148	349	31.12.191
30. 6.1928	20497	297	107.18.700
31.12.1928	20794	286	31.12.191
30. 6.1929	21080	319	1611a ^e :6e
31.12.1929	21399	250	6 monthly average 536 connections
30. 6.1930	21644	148	Note:
31.12.1930	21797		Slow
30. 6.1931	21817	20	down during
31.12.1931	21824	7	Depression
30. 6.1932	21888	64	31. 6.191
31.12.1932	21966	36	31.12.191
30. 6.1933	21966		261.3 .6:
31.12.1933	22046		31.12,1920
30. 6.1934	22200	154	30, 6,1921
31.12.1934	22421		31,12,1921
30. 6.1935	22686	265	30, 6,1927
31.12.1935	23000	314	31.12.1922
30. 6.1936	23355	355	30. 6.1923
31.12.1936	24194	839	31.12.1923
30. 6.1937	24801	607	30. 6,1924
		668	

Date	Connection Number	No of new connections in preceding 6 month period	Andrea C
31.12.1937	25469	558	
30. 6.1938	26027	559	
31.12.1938	26586		
30. 6.1939	27065	479	
31.12.1939	27461	396	- 6 monthly average 303
30. 6.1940	27847	386	connections
31.12.1940	28488	641	
30. 6.1941	29762	1274	Very few in Hamilton.
31.12.1941	30991	1229	Major growth in Belmont, Wallsend and other outer
30. 6.1942	31224	237	areas
31.12.1942	31478	254	
30. 6.1943	31762	284	
31.12.1943	32234	472	
30. 6.1944	32529	295	
31.12.1944	32759	230	
30, 6,1945	33005	246	
31.12.1945	33506	501	
30. 6.1946	34001	495	
31.12.1946	34468	467	
30. 6.1947	34781	313	
31.12.1947	35533	752	
	36180	647	
30. 6.1948		529	
31.12.1948	36709	524	
30. 6.1949	37233	491	
31.12.1949	37724	548	— 6 monthly average 494 connections
30. 6.1950	38272	562	
31.12.1950	38834		

erage 536

Appendix C

NOTES ABOUT STREET NAMES IN GARDEN SUBURB, HAMILTON

1 CHANGE OF STREET NAMES

Original name

Ranclaud Street	changed	to:	Cram Street
Porcher Street	changed	to:	National Park Street
Learmonth Street	changed	to:	Jenner Parade
Martin Street	changed	to:	Jenner Parade
Beckett (next to Gordon Aven	changed ue)	to:	Kemp Street
Minola Street	changed	to:	Everton Street
Veda Street	changed	to:	Skelton Street
Hamilton Road	changed	to:	Denison Street
Melville Street	changed	to:	Union Street
Hooke Street	changed	to:	Young Street

Melville Street: after Charles G Melville, Storekeeper, Denison Street, and Mayor 1891, 1894, 1903, 1913, 1924, 1934. (changed to Union Street in recognition of the establishment of the Trades Hall at the northern end) Cram Street: after John M L Cram, builder/constructor, Swan Street. Mayor 1906. Alexander Street: after William K Alexander, Auctioneer and Registrar, Beaumont Street. Mayor 1899, 1911, 1920. Jenner Street: after George G Jenner, Coachbuilder and Mayor 1920, 1925, 1932. Skelton Street: after Gordon K Skelton, Mayor 1928. Wilson Place: after Edwin Wilson, Contractor, Mayor 1907, 1918. Minolta (now called Everton Street): continued use of names of existing Veda (now called Skelton Street) streets in similar, continuing alignment.

Porcher) Ranclaud) Learmonth) Pulver) Harle) Darling) Dumaresq) Lawson) Martin)

were named after superintendents and employees of the Australian Agricultural Co.

Appendix D

HOUSES THAT MAY BE DEMOLISHED IN THE DEFERRAL AREA

These comprise the houses in categories 4 or 5 in the survey of intactness. A small number of category 3 houses whose character has been greatly altered might also be demolished depending upon the circumstances, but subject to consent.

8	Alexander	010010	Parade*
48	Alexander	Cant S	Parade
35	Dumaresq		Street
77	Gordon		Avenue
88	Gordon		Avenue
25	Hebburn		Street
64	Jenner		Parade
90	Jenner		Parade
106	Kemp		Street*
149	Kemp		Street
181	Kemp		Street
183	Kemp		Street
159	Lawson		Street
161	Lawson		Street
171	Lawson	•	Street
173	Lawson		Street
48	National	Park	Street*
98	National	Park	Street
153	Parkway		Avenue
202	Parkway		Avenue
218	Parkway		Avenue
23	Stewart		Avenue
12	Warrah		Street

* Category 5, ie, houses that have replaced the original house on that allotment.

Appendix E

Copy of covenant in the original conveyance from the A A Company in respect of 131 Gordon Avenue (Lot 6, Section 6, Garden Suburb, Hamilton)

> Pa 3

> > DIXON

0

VEDA

ce

2

5

58

ewethe School

S.

Beau

(Courtesy: R S Woodgate)

Payment of balance of purchase money (Clause 1). elf insppropriate delete and substitute agreed terms

"In cash on completion

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

Essements, restrictive covenants, etc. (Clause 7). Exception of all mines and minerals lying and being in and under the la Covenant -

(a) That purchaser assumes liability for all damage to the surface of

the land and improvements occasioned by mining. (b) No building shall be erected within 20 feet of the building line of Gordon Avenue or within 15 feet of any other street in the subdivision. (c) Only one house shall be erected on each 40 feet to frontage. (d) Any house erected shall be constructed in a proper and workmanlike manner.

(e) No building shall be used as a public house, hotel or for the sale of liquor or any other noxious or offensive trade which shall be a nuisance or annoyance.

(f) No hoarding shall be erected on the land nor shall any part of the building project over the prescribed line. (g) No stables shall be ereded on the land nor shall the land be used

as a horse yard. (h) Any building erected THAT THAP SCHEP US hall at all times be used as a

private dwollongpied Tenant's Name Nature of Occupancy Rental

Tenancles Occupancies (Clause 13).

"NIL"

APPENDIX F. KEY TO H.D.W.B. 1:500 MAP SERJES.



Appendix G

STANDARD HERITAGE CONSERVATION PROVISIONS FOR INCLUSION IN LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANS. JULY 1985.

This set of standard heritage conservation provisions has been prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning for use by local government authorities for incorporation in local environmental plans and development control plans pursuant to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.

The main provisions: aims, definitions, controls, heads of consideration, notices, advertising and development in the vicinity of items should be included in the local environmental plan, selecting provisions for conservation areas and/or individual items as each case requires. For example, some Councils wish to control the external painting of heritage items or buildings in conservation areas. Others prefer to delete painting control from the definition of 'renovation'. Note that the provisions do not apply to maintenance work which does not change the fabric or appearance of the building or work. Development control plans may set out guidelines (e.g. more detailed heads of consideration) to be followed by councils in determining applications, or include additional heritage items which were not recognised when the original local environmental plan schedule was prepared.

Items which are the subject of interim conservation orders, permanent conservation orders or section 130 orders made under the Heritage Act, 1977 should be included in the schedules of the local environmental plan or development control plan. It must be noted that pursuant to Sections 66-69 of the Heritage Act, the Heritage Council must determine applications affecting items covered by Orders <u>before</u> they are determined in the usual way by the local council pursuant to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, and any other relevant legislation.

The standardised heritage conservation provisions which follow have been developed over a number of years having regard to experience in the operation of existing conservation provisions in planning instruments and the development of conservation practice generally. They will be subject to further evolution and discussion, and comment is welcomed before they are incorporated into Model Provisions.

For further information regarding the application and use of these provisions, please contact the Heritage and Conservation Branch of the Department.

(NAME OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA)

ENVIRONMENTAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION

LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN PROVISIONS

This clause should contain, at a minimum, the following provision:

() to conserve and enhance the environmental heritage cf the (name of the local government area)

Definitions (to be inserted in interpretation clause):

- "conservation area": means the land edged blue (or heavy black) and marked "conservation area" on the map;
- "demolition" in relation to a building or work means the damaging, defacing, destruction, pulling down or removal of that buildng or work, in whole or in part;
- "item of the environmental heritage" means those buildings, works, relics or places of historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance to (the name of the local government area):
- (a) situated on land coloured orange (or edged heavy black) on the map marked "Heritage Conservation" (sometimes shown as an inset on main map);
- (b) described in Schedule X; or entredied w (c) the second state of the second state o
 - (c) identified as an item of environmental heritage in a development control plan;

"relic" means any deposit, object or material evidence relating to the settlement (including aboriginal habitation) prior to 1 January 1900, of the area of (Name of local government area);

"renovation" in relation to a building or work means:

(a) the making of structural changes to the inside or outside of the building or work; or

(b) the making of non-structural changes to the fabric or appearance of the outside of the building or work, including changes that involve the repair or the painting, plastering or other decoration of the outside of the building or work. Items of the environmental heritage

1. (1) A person shall not, in respect of a building, work, relic or place that is an item of the environmental heritage:

- (a) demolish, renovate or extend that building or work;
- (b) damage or despoil that relic or place any part of that relic or place;
- (c) excavate any land for the purpose of exposing or removing that relic;
 - (d) erect a building on the land on which that building, work or relic is situated or the land which comprises that place; or
- (e) subdivide the land on which that building, work or relic is situated or the land which comprises that place,

except with the consent of the council.

(2) The council shall not grant consent to a development application made in pursuance of subclause (1) unless it has made an assessment of:

- (a) the significance of the item as an item of the environmental heritage of the (name of local government area);
 - (b) the extent to which the carrying out of the development in accordance with the consent would affect the historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance of the item and its site;
 - (c) whether the setting of the item, and in particular, whether any stylistic, horticultural or archaeological features of the setting should be retained; and
 - (d) whether the item constitutes a danger to the users or occupiers of that item or to the public.

Development in the vicinity of an item of the environmental heritage

2. The council shall not grant consent to a development application to carry out development in the vicinity of an item of the environmental heritage unless it has made an assessment of the effect which the carrying out of that development will have on the historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or sesthetic significance of the item of environmental heritage and its setting.

Conservation area

- 3. (1) A person shall not, in respect of a conservation area:
- (a) demolish, extend or change the outside of a building or work within that area, including changes to the outside of a building or work that involve the repair or the painting, plastering or other decoration of the outside of the building or work;
- (b) damage or despoil a relic or part of a relic within that area;
 - (c) excavate any land for the purpose of exposing or removing a relic within that area;
 - (d) erect a building within that area; or
- (e) subdivide land within that area,

except with the consent of the council.

The council shall not grant consent to a development (2)application made in pursuance of subclause (1) unless it has made an assessment of:

- (a) the extent to which the carrying out of the development in accordance with the consent would affect the historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance of the conservation area; and
- (b) whether a refusal to grant consent would constitute a danger to the users or occupiers of that land or the public.

(3) The council shall not grant consent to an application made in pursuance of subclause (1), being an application to erect a new building or to alter the exterior of an existing building, unless the council has made an assessment of:

- (a) the pitch and form of the roof;
 - (b) the style, size, proportion and position of the openings for windows and doors; and
- (c) whether the colour, texture, style, size and type of finish of the materials to be used on the exterior of the building are compatible with the materials used in the existing buildings in the conservation area.

Heritage Council to be given prior notice of demoltion consent

4. Where a person makes a development application to demolish a building or work that is an item of the environmental heritage the council shall not grant consent to that application until 28 days after the council has notified the Secretary of the Heritage Council of its intention to do so.

Advertising of Heritage applications

5. (1) Subject to subclause (2), the provisions of sections 84, 85, 86, 87(1) and 90 of the Act apply to and in respect of:

- (a) the demolition of a building or work-within a conservation area;
- (b) the demolition of a building or work that is an item of the environmental heritage; and
- (c) the use of a building or land referred to in clause 6(1) for a purpose which, but for that clause would be prohibited under this plan;

in the same way as those provisions apply to and in respect of designated development.

(2) Subclause (1) does not apply to the partial demolition of a building or work where, in the opinion of the council, the partial demolition is of a minor nature and does not adversely affect the significance of the building or work as part of the environmental heritage of the (name of local government area).

(3) For the purposes of subclause (1), section 84(4)(a) of the Act shall be construed as if the words "the Department" (where the Minister or the Director is not the consent authority) were omitted therefrom.

Conservation incentives relating to Heritage items

6. (1) Nothing in this plan prevents the council from granting consent to:

- (a) the use for any purpose of a building within a conservation area or of the land on which that building is erected; or
- (b) the use for any purpose of a building that is an item of the environmental heritage or of the land on which that building is erected,

where the council is satisfied that:

- (c) the use would have little or no adverse effect on the amenity of the area; and
- (d) conservation of the building depends on the council granting consent in pursuance of this subclause.

(2) The council, when considering an application to erect a building on land upon which there is a building which is an item of the environmental heritage, may exclude from its calculation of the floor space of the buildings erected on the land the floor space of the item of the environmental heritage:

- (a) for the purposes of determining the floor space ratio; and
- (b) for the purposes of determining the number of parking spaces to be provided on the site,

but only if the council is satisfied that the conservation of the building depends upon the council granting consent in pursuance of this subclause.

SCHEDULE X

Items of the Environmental Heritage

(Note, this schedule should be supported by a map marked heritage conservation held by Council showing the whole of the sites on which these items are situated or appropriately identified.)

ANNEXURE C(ii)

STANDARD HERITAGE CONSERVATION PROVISIONS TO BE INSERTED IN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN

If after making the LEP council discovers that it has omitted some items of the environmental heritage and wishes to protect them by inclusion in the heritage schedule; or requires additional heads of consideration on which to administer conservation, these can be quickly added by a DCP.

Clauses 19 to 25 of the <u>Environmental Planning and Assessment</u> <u>Regulations, 1980</u> sets out the procedure for making and amending development control plans.



as a doith and a share that and and and a four bast which a share as



LOCAL HISTONY AND ARCHIVES DEPARTMENT

LHQ711.5/WAL



