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1 PROPOSAL DETAILS

Address: 49 Lugg street, Bardon QLD
RPD  138 SL1131; 889 SL1899; 1RP46439; 2 RP46439; 3 RP49597; A RP46439
Owner  Department of Education
Local Govt.  Brisbane City Council
QHR  650022  
Proposal  New Learning Centre
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2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This report addresses the impact of proposed works at Ithaca Creek State School in Bardon, Brisbane. The school is entered in the Queensland Heritage Register, site no. 650022.

Figure 1. Aerial view of Ithaca Creek State School and building locations. Source: Google maps.
2.2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
It is proposed to construct a new learning centre adjacent to Block A, on the lower tennis court. This site was identified as one of two sites suitable for new development during the master planning process carried out by Biscoe Wilson Architects. Refer to documentation by DM2 Architecture for details of proposal.

2.3 METHODOLOGY
This report was prepared by Peta Dennis, Registered Architect and member of Australia ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), according to principles set out in the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Burra Charter) and the Guidelines to the Burra Charter.

This report addresses the requirements of the State code 14: Queensland Heritage of the State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP), which is prescribed in the Planning Act 2016 and Planning Regulation 2017.

3 PRE-LODGMENT ADVICE – QHC
An initial presentation was made to the Queensland Heritage Council (QHC) on 20 September 2019 regarding the proposed development. The QHC provided written advice, ‘QHC resolution no. 327.6’ dated 30 September 2019 – refer to letter in Appendix 1. As the proposed development will have a level of detrimental impact, the Council requested a statement that addresses why there is no prudent or feasible alternative to carrying out the development. The QHC provided the following advice regarding the design of the new learning centre:

- It should employ a materiality that compliments the nearby depression-era brick school building without mimicking it.
- It should be sited and scaled in deference to the depression-era building and its notable presence on Lugg Street, and should not confuse it being understood as the school’s main building and formal entrance.
- It should reference the tennis court removed in some way, which might include how the ground level, undercroft play space is detailed or fitted out.
- It should improve the functioning of the school as a whole by connecting efficiently and effectively into its existing parts.

4 CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE
Ithaca Creek State School is entered in the Queensland heritage register (QHR) ID no. 650022. The whole of the school site is contained within the QHR boundary shown in Figure 3. The QHR citation outlines cultural significance of Ithaca State School and Convent as follows:
Criterion A

Ithaca Creek State School (established 1885) is important in demonstrating the evolution of state education and its associated architecture in Queensland. The place retains an excellent example of a government designed Depression-era Brick School Building (1934-36), which was an architectural response to prevailing government educational philosophies, set in landscaped grounds with retaining walls, sporting facilities and mature trees.

The Depression-era Brick School Building and landscaping of the school grounds are the result of the State Government’s building and relief work programmes during the 1930s that stimulated the economy and provided work for men unemployed as a result of the Great Depression.

A World War II (WWII) Honour Board (1947) located in the foyer of the Depression-era Brick School Building and a WWII Memorial commemorating the Rats of Tobruk (post-1954) sited in front of the school building are important in demonstrating the school community’s involvement in WWII. War memorials, including honour boards, are a tribute to those who served, and those who died, from a particular community. They are an important element of Queensland’s towns and cities and are also important in demonstrating a common pattern of commemoration across Queensland and Australia.

Criterion D

Ithaca Creek State School is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a Queensland state school. The school comprises a Depression-era Brick School Building constructed to a government design and a parade ground used as an assembly and play area. These elements are set within a generous, landscaped site that retains mature shade trees, Depression-era terraced retaining walls, and sporting facilities including a playing field and tennis courts with a Tennis Shed.

The substantial Depression-era Brick School Building is a highly-intact, excellent example of its type and retains a high degree of integrity. The building demonstrates the principal characteristics of its type, including: its two storey form, with an undercroft; symmetrical, high-quality design that features classical detailing; loadbearing face brick construction; hipped roof; and prominent and central roof fleche. The building has a linear layout, with rooms accessed by verandahs and corridors, and an undercroft used as an open play space. Typical of this building type, the Depression-era Brick School Building was located in a growing suburban area at the time of its construction.

Criterion E

Through its substantial size, high quality materials, face brick exterior, elegant formal composition and decorative treatment, the Depression-era Brick School Building at Ithaca Creek State School has aesthetic significance due to its expressive attributes, which evoke the sense of progress and permanence that the Queensland Government sought to embody in new public buildings in that era.

The building’s assertive massing, classically-influenced design, and elegant composition contribute to its dignified streetscape presence, and contrast with the surrounding small-scale residences.
**Criterion G**

Schools have always played an important part in Queensland communities. They typically retain significant and enduring connections with former pupils, parents, and teachers; provide a venue for social interaction and volunteer work; and are a source of pride, symbolising local progress and aspirations.

Ithaca Creek State School has a strong and ongoing association with the surrounding community. It was established in 1885 through the fundraising efforts of the local community and generations of children have been taught there. The place is important for its contribution to the educational development of the community and is a prominent community focal point and gathering place for social and commemorative events with widespread community support.

---

**Figure 2. QHR boundary map for Ithaca Creek State School. Source: DES**
5 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

A conservation management plan (CMP) was prepared by pdarchitect in association with Niche in May 2017. The following policies contained in the CMP are relevant to the proposed development.

Master plans for the school should address cultural heritage significance as a core matter in the planning process. Existing master plans should be updated to note that the school has heritage values and that the school has been entered in the QHR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 4.</th>
<th>Master planning</th>
<th>Master plans for the school should be updated to reflect its heritage status and should address heritage significance as a core matter in the planning process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The master planning process should explore different options which conserve the settings around significant buildings and conservation of buildings of cultural heritage significance.

| Policy 5. | Master planning options | Master planning options should include –  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° A temporary new building, where demand is uncertain in the short-term;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° A permanent new building where demand is certain in the long-term; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° Internal alterations to buildings of little or no significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes and additions should be carried out in a way that respects significant planning arrangements. Block A is oldest building on the school site and views to its front façade from Lugg Street are highly significant. As Block A is the “front door” of the school housing the administrative offices, its setting is important. Views to Block A should not be further compromised by new development or unsympathetic fencing or landscaping.

| Policy 6. | Retain significant settings and views | When planning new buildings or additions, retain the significant views to Block A:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain significant settings and views</td>
<td>° Do not position new buildings, additions or playground equipment which will block these views; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° Use of Block A for as the “front door” of the school as administrative offices is a compatible use and should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The history of the school may be read in the hierarchy of the buildings and their relationship in the school grounds. All key components of the school should be retained where they survive in a meaningful relationship – Block A, parade ground, depression-era retaining walls, oval. The Tennis Shed (formerly part of the original timber school) is now located adjacent to the tennis courts. As it has been in this position since before 1946, it should stay in this location.

| Policy 7. | Do not move or relocate significant elements. | Retain the historic relationship between significant elements in the school grounds, including:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not move or relocate significant elements.</td>
<td>° Parade ground to the rear of Block A;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° Tennis shed and tennis courts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>° The open space of the playing fields behind the buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Buildings and extensions

Where it is decided to introduce a new permanent or temporary building or additions to an existing non-significant building, the cultural heritage significance of the place should be taken into account. It is appropriate to site additional new buildings in the area near the oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy .8 New buildings and extensions</th>
<th>New buildings should follow these principles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° Be well clear of existing heritage structures and the total area of significance (refer to plan showing total area of significance);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° Their form and scale should be similar and compatible with nearby existing structures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° No period detailing or decorative elements should be applied to the new building;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° Materials, finishes and colour schemes should not mimic historic themes but should be compatible;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° The location and points of access for new structures should not impact on the points of access to the heritage structures; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>° “Landmark” and streetscape qualities of heritage structures should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The proposed site of the new learning centre is close to the front of the school facing Lugg Street. The site is adjacent to Block A, the depression era brick building, which is of primary heritage significance.

The proposed new building's location is adjacent to the central circulation spine, which includes two depression era concrete stairs and retaining walls. It is close to the drop-off zone in Lugg Street, the entrance that leads directly to the central circulation spine. It is proposed to remove the lower tennis court for the construction of the new learning centre. The new building will be adjacent to the battered, sloping, cinderblock retaining wall and the mature fig tree.

Figure 3. Portico and front entrance to Block A.  Figure 4. Carparking area and forecourt to Block A.
Figure 5. Looking south across parking area.  

Figure 6. South facade of Block A, central circulation spine at right.

Figure 7. Stair on Lugg Street near drop off zone.  

Figure 8. View down from Lugg St. stair.

Figure 9. Area between Block A forecourt and upper tennis court.  

Figure 10. View to upper tennis court.
Figure 11. Upper tennis court. Figure 12. Tennis shed, currently fenced off from upper tennis court.

Figure 13. Tennis shed. Figure 14. Verandah and original seating in tennis shed.

Figure 15. View down ‘upper’ heritage stair beside Block A. Figure 16. Playground beside Block A.
Figure 17. Lower tennis court.

Figure 18. View from lower tennis court to upper court.

Figure 19. View towards ‘upper’ heritage stair and Block A.

Figure 20. Battered depression era retaining wall, lower tennis court above at right.

Figure 21. Damage to retaining wall beside lower tennis court.

Figure 22. Significant fig tree and jungle.
7 MASTER PLAN

7.1 MASTER PLAN
In 2018, a master plan for the school was developed between representatives from DoE, Ithaca Creek State School community and Biscoe Wilson Architects. The master plan was based around the delivery of two main general learning blocks with associated works. There were two sites proposed for development. The first was the upper development lot which built on the lower of the two tennis courts. The second site was located on the site on the existing demountable classroom blocks. The master plan assessed the concerns of the school with regard to future capacity. It was also based around the existing central circulation spine and setting up precincts based on student groups.

7.2 NO PRUDENT OR FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO CHOSEN SITE
As noted, there were two sites for new development nominated in the master plan by Biscoe Wilson Architects. The lower building site, where the demountable buildings are currently sited,
was not considered as the optimum location for stage 1 works. This was based on the following issues:

- Cost to relocate the demountable buildings would need to be included in project scope and undertaken as part of the initial building phase
- Development on the lower site does not address the existing DDA issues to Block A
- Additional staff facilities and amenities would be needed to incorporate in any future development in this area of the campus as it is dislocated from the existing facilities
- Due to its adjacency to the creek, overland flow issues have been noted
- Relative age of the prefabricated stock.

The following statement from DoE provides further clarity on why there is no prudent or feasible alternative to the upper building site at this time:

*During the Building Future Schools Master Planning Process undertaken last year between the School, School Community, the Department of Education and Biscoe Wilson Architects the whole School site was appraised for potential building platforms. After significant input in the master planning process from all the proponents the preferred site for the new building was generated.*

**Tennis Court 2 Site**

The Tennis Court 2 platform provides a flat site with relatively easy construction access.

Apart from the tennis court structure, the site is unencumbered which will provide immediate site possession by the contractor and does not necessitate the relocation of four number existing building structures, Block F, Block I (Relocatable buildings) and two new prefabricated hire buildings, and the related building services to these buildings. Prior to relocation these buildings will need to be decanted.

The site is adjacent to the main school entry (Lugg Street) and the Quadrangle (which will be developed to form the community hub of the school). The students will be able to access the Quadrangle and Block A via a covered link.

Development of this site can be kept behind the Lugg Street façade and largely below the eaves gutter line of the Administration Building (Block A) which is important in preserving the heritage values of this building.

The topography of this site will enable a three storied development to be accommodated on this site, with only two stories of the new building visible from the street/in the streetscape.

The new building height will be largely below the Administration Building (Block A) gutter line and this also enables the first level to be contiguous with the Tennis Court 1 platform and Lugg Street entry.

The ground floor will be an open undercroft initially for covered play but available for future development.

The proposed development will require inclusion of a lift which will form an integral component to a longer-term project to provide equitable access to the Hall from the front of the school.
Compliant access to the new building can also be achieved from the main carpark/entry to the school from Lugg Street.

A secondary path of travel can be established from the ground floor around the southern side of the hall to the oval and nature play areas improving general and emergency access.

The full development of the tennis court site, through the fitting out of the undercroft, is likely to provide for future enrolment increases, however the Reference Group confirmed that this site should be noted for future requirements.

In summary, Tennis Court 2 is the school’s preferred initial development site.

**Development on Block F & I Site**

This site is currently occupied by Block F, Block I (two Relocatable buildings) and two new prefabricated hire buildings is also noted as a potential future development site though the school community’s preference would be for this to be returned to open space.

This site is remote from the main School campus and does not assist in connecting the various levels of the School or the aim to provide equitable access to the Hall from the existing school buildings.

Development of this site would require the relocating of the 6 GLAs (4 buildings) to somewhere else on the School Site, probably the School oval.

Oval location would also require compliant access to the oval as well as being further away from amenities.

Relocating the 6 GLAs is very expensive which would need to come out of the budget allocated for this project. The relocation is also time consuming and tight timeframes would need to prevail to ensure buildings would be available for occupancy in their new location at the start of a term. Such timelines if unmet would result in accommodation issues for the school.

A quote of $1,034,943.00 Excl. GST has been received to relocate the 4 buildings.

This site is not preferred by the School or DoE.

There is an overland flow path through this part of the site and may mean that the new building will require an undercroft to receive water in extreme weather events. This will increase the height of the building. Extensive drainage works and elevated walkways may be required to ensure the means of safe egress from the building in a flood situation.

The area contains significant council underground infrastructure which may have to be re-routed away from the building zone or built over. This will add cost to the building construction.

This area of the site is not currently connected by covered walkway and a significant distance would need to be addressed.

This area may require compliant access to the front of the School.

There would be the loss of oval use for duration of building construction.
8 DETAILS OF PROPOSED WORK

Based on 2019 Day 8 figures, Ithaca Creek State School has 582 students enrolled with a student enrolment capacity for 592 students. There has been significant year to year fluctuations in the prep intake, ranging from 55 to 94 between 2006 and 2018. It is anticipated that there will be 600 students enrolled at the school by 2023. The school accommodates a large number of students in demountable classroom buildings located adjacent to the school oval. It was decided that a three storey building on the upper development site would enable the school to house the projected number of students into the 2020s.

Please refer to the design drawings by DM2 Architecture. The architects have identified the following benefits of the new learning centre:

- The location aligns with the school's master plan to create a precinct for younger class groups
- Addresses school DDA access issues and contributes to the circulation spine
- Provides future proofing in that it doesn’t land lock any future construction
- Building can be located further back from the street edge than Block A
- Building provides links between jungle and learning areas which aligns with the school’s pedagogies
- Building will facilitate the structure of a direct access spine across the campus and can connect to the side of Block A
- Building will be able to access the upper tennis court and provide further use opportunities
- Rejuvenate an underutilized part of the site.

The new learning centre will mass the building in line with the master plan and is planned around the following principles:

- Building is set back from the front alignment of heritage listed Block A
- Building is massed in such a way as to be largely under the gutter line of Block A
- Building provides access to the existing jungle space and natural environment in general
- Planned around improving DDA access
- Constructed from materials with are sympathetic to its context.

The design approach of the learning centre includes:

- Masonry façade to Lugg Street and adjoining residences to provide an acoustic barrier between the learning spaces and the external spaces. The masonry is detailed to make reference to Block A
- Outdoor learning spaces connect to the upper levels of the fig tree and jungle spaces
- Building will activate the existing tennis court by appropriating the space with student circulation paths, but will still be able to be used as a tennis court
• North-eastern elevations are highly transparent to bring light into the central core of the proposed building
• Building is planned around providing circulation routes from the tennis court level to the lower jungle. It also addresses existing DDA access issues to do with circulating from the upper campus levels to the Dacca St levels
• Building has a simple roof form in keeping with the scale of Block A.

9 ANALYSIS OF IMPACT

This section analyses the impact of the proposed work and addresses the requirements of the State Code 14: Queensland Heritage of the State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP), which is prescribed in the Planning Act 2016 and Planning Regulation 2017.

9.1 PO1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO1</th>
<th>The proposed work will have some level of detrimental impact on the cultural heritage significance of Ithaca Creek State School, as it involves demolition of the lower tennis court and removal of two sections of the retaining wall.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, it will be demonstrated below that the work has been designed so that it minimises and mitigates this unavoidable impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development will provide opportunities not previously available for students and the school community to appreciate previously underutilised areas of the grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refer below for further detail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.1 Impact on significant fabric and mitigating factors

Lower tennis court and retaining wall

The construction of the new learning centre will entail the removal of the lower tennis court and the removal of a small part of each end of the battered, depression era retaining wall. The CMP contains the following history of the tennis courts and retaining wall (described as the cinderblock batter):

The Ithaca Creek State School Committee in March 1936 was raising money for improvement of the sports oval and the laying down of two tennis courts, two basketball courts and other improvements to the 7.5 acres (3.04 ha) of school grounds. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs (E M Hanlon) opened a tennis court at Ithaca Creek State School on 3 June 1939, commending the school committee for buying adjoining land to provide a cricket and football oval for the boys; and ‘congratulated the relief workers who had done much to improve the school...
By 1935 the parade ground behind A Block was retained by a concrete wall with two sets of stairs, while on the southern side of the building concrete retaining walls and cinderblock batters stabilised the steeply sloping ground in this area.

The main impact of the proposed development will be the removal of the lower tennis court. There is also a small amount of demolition proposed for the ends of the retaining wall (the cinderblock batter) for the insertion of services and tiered seating near the fig tree.

It has been demonstrated previously that the site for the new learning centre has been chosen through a master planning process and will lead to long term benefits for the school. As a mitigating measure to compensate for the loss of the lower tennis court, it is proposed to interpret the former location of the tennis court in the undercroft of the new learning centre. The outline of the tennis court will be painted on the floor of the undercroft in green ‘synpave’ paint, a long wearing paint used for marking playing courts.

**Fig Tree**

The fig tree, which is located near the site of the new learning centre, has been identified as a significant element in the QHR entry and CMP. To minimise the impact of the proposed development of the fig tree, arborists advice has been obtained.

The arborist has identified a tree protection zone that has been respected by the architects when designing the footprint of the new learning centre. During pre-lodgment discussions, Ben Carson (DES) supplied the details of BCC arborist who undertakes ground penetrating radar to identify the location of the tree roots of the fig tree. This will be undertaken before construction to minimise the impact of the footings of the building on the tree roots. The edge of the new building aligns with the tree protection zone and thus a construction zone of up to 2m may be required in some areas inside the tree protection zone.

The structural engineer has provided a preliminary report which specifies different types of footings for the new building in the zone of the fig tree roots. The footing system inside the tree protection zone will be localized bored piers under columns and walls. Bored piers are proposed to minimise the plan area of the footings to minimise excavation and the impact on tree roots. The bored pier locations will be able to be altered on site to avoid the tree roots.

**9.1.2 Opportunities for public appreciation**

The upper tennis court is located at the entrance of the school near the main drop-off area in Lugg Street. This area leads directly to the central circulation spine of the school. The proposed development will allow greater appreciation of the upper tennis court and the tennis shed, which are currently fenced off from public access. A new gathering area for parents and students is proposed on the upper tennis court which acts as a forecourt to the new building. Seating areas and greenery will enhance this area and the tennis shed will be accessible for the first time in years. The tennis court will still be able to used as a playing court with the introduction of removable sections of fencing.

The new learning centre has been designed with open learning areas located directly adjacent to the fig tree. The OLAs will be enhanced by leafy green views to the fig tree and at the ground
level, tiered seating near the base of the tree. These measures will aid in student, teacher and parent’s appreciation of the historic tennis court and the significant fig tree.

9.1.3 Ongoing conservation management

An arborist has been engaged for the ongoing care of the fig tree, both during the next detailed design stage and during the construction work, to ensure that the health of the fig tree is not compromised by the proposed development.

Repairs to the battered concrete retain wall are proposed as part of the development works.
There are currently holes in the wall that require patching and repairs to reinstate the wall to its original condition.

Conservation works are proposed to the historic tennis shed, which is currently fenced off, inaccessible and falling into disrepair. DoE are investigating the costing of repairs to the tennis court hut and have applied for funding approval internally. The CMP recommended the following conservation works to the tennis shed –

- Re-stump building using round timber stumps and steel antcaps
- Roof sheeting and guttering repaired or replaced with like materials
- Repairs to timber weatherboard walls and front verandah
- Painting of shed in original colour scheme.

9.2 PO2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where open space, or the relationship between built and open spaces at a state heritage place is identified as forming part of its cultural heritage significance, development:</td>
<td>The significant setting and views of Block A from Lugg Street will be largely conserved as the new learning centre is set back from the front alignment of Block A and is smaller in bulk and scale, to be visually subservient to the heritage building. Access to the front entrance of Block A will be maintained as the main entrance to the school. Access through the school site via the traditional spatial pattern of the central spine will be maintained and enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. maintains or enhances the significance of the setting, including significant views, circulation, access, spatial patterns and layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. maintains a lot size and layout which permits viable adaptive reuse or conservation of significant heritage buildings and open spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Views and setting of Block A

The setting and aesthetic qualities of Block A are of exceptional significance and have been identified as such in the QHR entry –

Criteria e:

Through its substantial size, high quality materials, face brick exterior, elegant formal composition and decorative treatment, the Depression-era Brick School Building at Ithaca Creek State School has aesthetic significance due to its expressive attributes, which evoke the sense of progress and permanence that the Queensland Government sought to embody in new public buildings in that era.
The building’s assertive massing, classically-influenced design, and elegant composition contribute to its dignified streetscape presence, and contrast with the surrounding small-scale residences.

The new learning centre will be located adjacent to Block A on the site identified in the master planning exercise as the preferred first development site. This proposed location will enhance circulation within the school, aid in DDA access and will not impede further expansion of the school.

A sensitive approach has been taken by the architects of the new learning centre that has been informed by an understanding of the predominant character of the setting. The impact of the new building on the setting of Block A has been minimised by the following design approaches:

- The height of the new learning centre has been largely kept below the gutter line of Block A – although a small part of the roof of the building is higher than the gutter line, it was considered important that the new roof form reflects the roof form of Block A. Therefore, the front section of the new building contains a 30-degree roof pitch and at the rear, the roof pitch has been reduced to 7.5 degrees to lower the overall height of the building.
- The new building utilizes a materiality that is complementary to Block A but does not replicate the material of the historic building. A palette of brown and pearl grey bricks are proposed, with bronze and aluminum perforated screens.
- The new learning centre will enhance the use of the upper tennis court by increasing the use of this area. The tennis court will become part of the forecourt of the new building and a gathering space for parents and students with improved seating and vegetated planter boxes. The fence around the tennis court will be removed, but new removable fencing will be installed so that the tennis court may still be used to play tennis and other games. The historic tennis shed, previously inaccessible, will be conserved and able to be used by students and parents.

Access and spatial patterns

The formal entrance to the school is across the Lugg Street forecourt via the front door of Block A. This is a significant spatial pattern of how people enter the school, connect with the school administration and flow through to the rest of the school. The pattern of movement through the school also utilizes the central spine of stairs, retaining walls and pathways that were built as part of the depression era works. The master plan identified this spatial pattern as an important circulation route through the school (see Appendix 2) and the new learning centre has been sited so as not to disrupt these significant spatial patterns.

The ‘front door’ to Ithaca Creek State School, across the forecourt and through the portico of Block A, will be retained and the administrative services areas inside Block A improved in planned future works.
The traditional circulation pattern of the central spine will be enhanced by the addition of the new learning centre. The depression era stairs and pathways on the spine will be retained and new sets of stairs to access the new building are placed adjacent to the heritage stairs.

It is considered that the design of the new learning centre has been designed in a sensitive manner which mitigates and minimises the impact on the setting of Block A and the traditional spatial patterns throughout the school.

9.3 PO3

| PO3 | Development on a state heritage place with identified archaeological potential avoids or appropriately manages detrimental impacts on artefacts. | No areas of archaeological potential have been identified within Ithaca State School. |

9.4 PO4

| PO4 | Development destroying or substantially reducing the cultural heritage significance of a state heritage place must: | The cultural heritage significance of Ithaca State School will not be destroyed by the proposed development. The lower tennis court will be demolished for the new learning centre; however, evidence has been provided that there is no prudent or feasible alternative to the chosen site. |
| | 1. demonstrate that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to carrying out the development due to: | The site was identified through a master planning process in which many alternatives were explored. |
| | a. an extraordinary economic cost to the state, all or part of a community, or an individual; or | Of the two sites identified in the master plan, DoE has provided evidence that it is more economically feasible to build on the chosen site first because of the large cost of removing the existing demountable buildings. |
| | b. an extraordinary environmental or social disadvantage; or | Refer to Sections 7.1 and 7.2. |
| | c. a risk to public health or safety; or | |
| | d. another extraordinary or unique circumstance | |
| | 2. interpret and incorporate the place's history and significance into any development of the site. | |

Section 7.1 contains details of the master planning process that resulted in the choice of the proposed development site. Please refer also to the separate master plan documentation by Biscoe Wilson Architects.

Section 7.2 contains a written statement from DoE, which provides further clarity on why there is no prudent or feasible alternative to the development of the lower tennis court.
9.5 PO5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO5</th>
<th>Development on land adjoining a state heritage place:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. is located, designed and scaled so that its form, bulk and proximity does not have a detrimental impact on the cultural heritage significance of the state heritage place; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. where it is demonstrated that 1 is not reasonably achievable, the development minimises and mitigates unavoidable detrimental impacts on cultural heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Conclusion

In its letter of 30 September 2019 regarding the proposed development, the QHC provided the following advice regarding the new learning centre:

- **It should employ a materiality that compliments the nearby depression-era brick school building without mimicking it.**
- **It should be sited and scaled in deference to the depression-era building and its notable presence on Lugg Street, and should not confuse it being understood as the school’s main building and formal entrance.**
- **It should reference the tennis court removed in some way, which might include how the ground level, undercroft play space is detailed or fitted out.**
- **It should improve the functioning of the school as a whole by connecting efficiently and effectively into its existing parts.**

It has been demonstrated that the new learning centre employs a materiality that complements but does not replicate the detailing of the nearby Block A building. The site of the new building is set back from the front alignment of Block A, and the bulk and scale of the learning centre does not dominate Block A. The front entrance of Block A remains the formal entrance to the school from Lugg Street. Although the lower tennis court will be removed, it will be interpreted in the undercroft of the new learning centre by the incorporation of coloured ‘synpave’ paving which reflects the footprint of the former tennis court. The traditional spatial patterns of movement through the school via the central spine will be retained and enhanced by the proposed development and will facilitate DDA access.

In summary, although the new learning centre at Ithaca Creek State School will have some level of detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the place, this impact has been mitigated and minimised where possible. It is considered that the overall benefits of the proposed development will outweigh any negative impacts. It is concluded that the design of the new learning centre is of a very high quality that will complement the nearby significant Block A and is compatible with the ongoing conservation of the heritage significance of Ithaca Creek State School.
11 APPENDIX 1 – LETTER FROM QHC

QHC resolution no. 327.6 | QHR place ID: 650922

30 September 2019

Ms Kim Sheather  
Senior Project Coordinator, Portfolio Delivery  
Department of Education  
Email: Kim.SHEATHER@qed.qld.gov.au

cc: Mr William Evans  
Associate Director  
DM2 Architecture  
Email: info@dm2architecture.com.au

Dear Ms Sheather

Re: Proposed development at Ithaca Creek State School, Bardon

I write on behalf of the Queensland Heritage Council (Heritage Council) regarding the presentation given at its 20 September 2019 meeting regarding a proposed new Prep building at Ithaca Creek State School. This is a place entered in the Queensland heritage register (QHR) in February 2016. As the presentation explained, this new building is needed to accommodate increases being experienced and anticipated in enrolments at the school.

Firstly, I would like to thank you and the Department of Education’s consultants—Mr William Evans, Associate Director, DM2 Architecture and Ms Peta Dennis, Principal Architect, pd Architect—for presenting to the Heritage Council and proactively seeking its advice before a report under section 71 of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Heritage Act) is given in the future.

The proposal includes the siting a new building on the easternmost of the two 1939 tennis courts, which were specifically referenced in the listing in the QHR as having particular cultural heritage significance. The proposal will have a level of detrimental impact on the cultural heritage significance of the Ithaca Creek State School, which will likely require a report to be given under section 71 of the Heritage Act. Such a report must include a heritage impact statement that addresses why there is no prudent and feasible alternative to carrying out the development. This heritage impact statement must provide evidence of why another location at the school is not suitable for the new building.

When a report is given under section 71 of the Heritage Act, it will also be necessary for the Heritage Council to publish a public notice about the development, in response to which written submissions may be given. The Heritage Council must then consider the report and all submissions about the development, and make a recommendation to the Honourable Grace Grace MP, Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations.
In the event that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to the carrying out of the development and the location as proposed remains, the Heritage Council provides the following advice as to the ways in which the new building’s design might better respond to the heritage listing and the detrimental impact caused by destruction of one of the significant tennis courts, and be compatible with other aspects of the place’s cultural heritage significance:

- It should employ a materiality that compliments the nearby depression-era brick school building without mimicking it.
- It should be sited and scaled in deference to the depression-era building and its notable presence on Lugg Street, and should not confuse it being understood as the school’s main building and formal entrance.
- It should reference the tennis court removed in some way, which might include how the ground level, undercroft play space is detailed or fitted out.
- It should improve the functioning of the school as a whole by connecting efficiently and effectively into its existing parts.

The Heritage Council also takes this opportunity to emphasise that removal of one of the 1939 tennis courts would serve to increase the level of cultural heritage significance of the one remaining, along with its associated tennis pavilion.

If you would like to discuss this advice further, please contact Mr Ben Carson, Principal Heritage Officer with the Department of Environment and Science on telephone (07) 3330 5835 or via email to benjamin.carson@des.qld.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

George Seymour
Acting Chair
12 APPENDIX 2 – MASTER PLAN CIRCULATION PLAN

Master Plan circulation drawing prepared by Biscoe Wilson Architects
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