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Executive Summary

Ku-ring-gai Council have commissioned Phillips Marler to prepare a Conservation Management Plan for the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion, located in Gordon Recreation Ground, which was officially opened in November 1922.

The gateway pavilion, constructed in 1923, has been assessed as being of high local significance for the following reasons:

1. The pavilion was designed by the architectural firm of Wilson Neave and Berry (designers of the 1928 Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers), of whom William Hardy Wilson is the most well-known of the partners. Unusually, the pavilion was procured through a design competition, organised by the Council for new structures in the park and won by Wilson Neave and Berry. Archival research has located the original competition drawing as well as the gateway pavilion construction drawings.

2. The pavilion is a rare example of a park entry structure designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style of architecture, of which William Hardy Wilson was the most influential advocate in the 1910’s and 1920’s.

The tennis pavilion, constructed in 1936, although probably designed by an architect within Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, clearly shows the influence of the earlier 1922 competition design by Wilson Neave and Berry for a larger(unbuilt) pavilion. The main external elevation of the tennis pavilion is assessed as being of high local significance because it is a rare example of a 1930’s sports amenities building designed in the Interwar Georgian style.

The fabric of both the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion is in reasonable condition and major conservation works will not be required.

The original drawings and investigations of the fabric provide an opportunity to restore the gateway pavilion to its original 1923 appearance, enhancing its cultural significance. The Conservation Management Plan sets out policies to achieve this.
Investigations of the fabric and available documentation also provide an opportunity to return the tennis pavilion to its 1936 appearance, enhancing the cultural significance of its main external elevation, with appropriate policies set out in this report.

This plan recommends adaptive re-use of the internal spaces of the tennis pavilion, while maintaining cultural significance and taking account of statutory requirements. Possible uses listed are enhanced changing facilities, community office, community meeting room and kiosk.

The plan also recommends providing universally accessible facilities in the form of new free-standing pavilion in an appropriate location, adjacent to the tennis pavilion.

The gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion together help define Gordon Recreation Ground as a heritage setting and their conservation, restoration and adaptive re-use will enhance that setting and contribute to the enjoyment of the park for many years to come.
Part One

Introduction
Figure 1.1
Location map - Gordon Recreation Reserve
Source: GoogleEarth 2015, Mapstack.stamen.com

Figure 1.2
Location plan - Gateway Pavilion and Tennis Pavilion in Gordon Recreation Reserve
Source: GoogleEarth 2015, Mapstack.stamen.com
1.1 Background

Ku-ring-gai Council has engaged Phillips Marler to prepare a Conservation Management Plan for two buildings, the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion, both located within the Gordon Recreation Ground, Gordon, which opened in the early 1920’s.

In addition to the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion, the Gordon Recreation Ground contains tennis courts, a playground and mature trees. It is bounded by Werona Avenue on the west and Rosedale Road on the east. The park is an amalgam of Deposited Plans DP 308363, DP 1094404 and DP 2367.

1.2 Objectives of Work

The brief is to undertake a Conservation Management Plan with the following objectives:

- Research and outline the history of the two buildings
- Document and assess the condition of the existing fabric
- Investigate the cultural significance in light of historical research and improved understanding of the two buildings
- Review constraints and opportunities, including re-use or development of the tennis pavilion
- Prepare conservation policy to guide future improvements and ongoing maintenance.

1.3 Authorship

This document has been prepared by Phillips Marler: Julie Marler, Principal Heritage Consultant and Landscape Architect and David Phillips, Principal Architect.

1.4 Acknowledgements

Ku-ring Council:
- Alison Walker, Principal Landscape Architect
- Marissa Gidall, Landscape Architect
- Michael Adams, Local Studies Librarian
1.5  Further Research

Research has not located the original drawing of the final design of the tennis pavilion. Assessments are based on the drawing of the first design and analysis of the built fabric. Future research may locate this drawing.
Part Two

History
A feature of interest at the opening of the Gordon recreation ground on Saturday afternoon was the display of eight competitive designs for a combined tennis and bowling pavilion, for gates, and for a children’s summerhouse, sent in by architects resident in Ku-ring-gai shire, at the request of the advisory committee. The first prize of £12/12/ was awarded to Mr. John Berry, of Gordon, for a Georgian design; the second, £7/7/, to Mr. Saunders, Gordon, and the third prize, £3/3/ to Mr. R. Richardson, Pymble.

The opening ceremony was performed by Councillor McIntosh, shire president.

The new ground has three tennis courts and a children’s playground. A bowling green will be added later.
2.1 The Gateway Pavilion 1922-1923

2.1.1 Gordon Recreation Ground

The development of the North Shore Railway Line in the 1880’s had begun a more accelerated development of the Ku-ring-gai area. By the early 1920’s, the era of urban reform and the distinctive form of “Garden City” suburban development popularised by English reformers such as Ebenezer Howard and that characterises the Ku-ring-gai area, was well underway. The urban reformers:

“...were extolling the suburban villa, set apart from its neighbours, allowing free circulation of air, surrounded by health-giving gardens, with access to parkland, and in the Australian context, bushland. It was thought that the railway would make this possible.”

Gordon Recreation Ground was part of this early wave of park and open space development in the new garden suburb. Ku-ring-gai Shire Council, which had been formed in 1906, confirmed the appointment of the ‘Gordon Recreation Ground Advisory Committee’ in June 1922.

The Sydney Morning Herald reported the official opening on 12 November 1922 of the Gordon Recreation Ground by the then Shire President, Councillor McIntosh. (Refer Fig. 2.1)

2.1.2 Gordon Recreation Ground Design Competition

The same Herald article noted that there was a:

“...display of eight competitive designs for a combined tennis and bowling pavilion, for gates and for a children’s summerhouse, sent in by architects resident in Ku-ring-gai Shire, at the request of the advisory committee. The first prize of 12 pounds, 12 shillings was awarded to Mr John Berry, of Gordon, for a Georgian design.”

John Berry was a partner in the architectural firm Wilson, Neave and Berry and had joined the firm two years earlier in 1920. Wilson, Neave and Berry designed a number of buildings in the Ku-ring-gai area, culminating in the Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers in 1928. (Refer Fig. 2.15)
Figure 2.3
Detail of the ‘gate features’ (gateway pavilions) from Wilson, Neave & Berry’s competition drawing
Gordon Recreation Ground 1922
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

Figure 2.4
Detail of the children’s summerhouse from Wilson, Neave & Berry’s competition drawing
Gordon Recreation Reserve 1922
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284 State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library
A copy of the original 1922 Wilson, Neave and Berry competition drawing for the Gordon Recreation Reserve is held by the Mitchell Library. (Refer Fig. 2.2) It shows:

- A double-sided, rendered brick pavilion building with tiled hip roofs and typical Georgian symmetrical main elevations with pilasters and twelve-pane windows. The building provides a tennis clubroom and verandah on one side and a bowlers club room and verandah on the other side, along with locker rooms, sports room, toilets and kitchen. An estimated cost of $725 pounds is noted on the drawing.

- A children’s summer house, with a tiled pyramidal roof and weather vane, open on three sides with seating. (Refer Fig.2.4)

- A ‘gate features’ (gateway pavilion) design with a hipped tiled roof, walls with engaged piers, concrete screens and double timber gates, in a Georgian style. (Refer Fig.2.3) Two gateway pavilions were proposed, one at the western entry from Werona Avenue and the other at the eastern entry from Rosedale Road.

At the time of the November 1922 opening three tennis courts and a children’s playground had already been constructed. It was intended that a bowling green as well as the tennis and bowling pavilion, the children’s summerhouse and the two gateway pavilions would be added later.

In the event, only the western gateway pavilion to Werona Avenue, which survives today, was constructed. The bowling green was not constructed. The Wilson, Neave and Berry designed tennis and bowling pavilion and children’s summerhouse were never realised. It would be another 13 years before the current tennis pavilion in the Gordon Recreation Ground would be built.

### 2.1.3 William Hardy Wilson and the Inter-War Georgian Revival Style

William Hardy Wilson, the most well-known and influential partner in the architectural firm Wilson, Neave and Berry, was primarily responsible for the revival of the Georgian Style of architecture in Australia in the 1920’s.
Early years

William Hardy Wilson (14 February 1881 – 16 December 1955) was an Australian architect, artist and author. He is regarded as one of the most outstanding architects of the twentieth century.

Wilson was born in Campbelltown, New South Wales in 1881, the second son of William and Jessie Wilson, younger brother of David Wilson KC (1870–1965). The architect designed mostly homes and small commercial buildings. Having been impressed by the Colonial Revival style in the US, he sought to do something similar in Australia. Nowadays he is particularly remembered for three of his homes, all of them on Sydney’s North Shore and all of them now heritage-listed. He is remembered for his interest in the American Colonial style of architecture. Wilson designed mainly homes and small commercial buildings. He is also remembered for his contribution to The Sydney Morning Herald. In 1924 he published a large book of his drawings undertaken between 1912 and 1922.

In 1920 he published Lapse of Civilization and The Dawn of a New Civilization, large books of his drawings. In 1929 he published an essay on several occasions. He blamed Jews for thwarting his professional advancement and published in 1939 a plan for a guarded settlement for Jewish refugees in the Dandenongs.

Wilson was an notorious anti-Semite and during the 1930s and 1940s an enthusiast for the cause of German and Italian Fascism which came to the notice of the security authorities on several occasions. He lived in Melbourne and then northwestern Tasmania. After the death of his first wife he married Elsie MacLean, and from 1940 they lived between a property at Wandin, near Mount Dandenong, and Kew in Melbourne. Wilson died in Richmond on 16 December 1955, survived by his wife and by the son of his first marriage.

Three years in London before returning to Australia to study at the Sydney Technical College. During the following year he was articled to the firm of Kent & Budge and attended Newington College (1893–1898). He was a secretary of the Chelsea Arts Club. Wilson travelled widely in Europe and the United States of America and became a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects. In 1923 his work was hung in the Exhibition of Australian Art at Burlington House, London. In 1927 he left his architectural partnership and lived for three years in London before returning to Australia to study art from Sydney Long.

In 1920 he published Lapse of Civilization and The Dawn of a New Civilization, large books of his drawings. In 1929 he published an essay on several occasions. He blamed Jews for thwarting his professional advancement and published in 1939 a plan for a guarded settlement for Jewish refugees in the Dandenongs.

The Cow Pasture Road, Purulia, Wahroonga, 1916

William Hardy Wilson, architect


Figure 2.5
William Hardy Wilson
Photograph by Harold Cazneaux
Source: PXA 703/738, State Library of NSW

Figure 2.6
Eryldene, Gordon 1914
William Hardy Wilson, architect

Figure 2.7
Purulia, Wahroonga, 1916
William Hardy Wilson, architect
Wilson travelled with Stacey Neave extensively in Europe and in the United States where he admired American Colonial architecture, both original and revived.

Setting up practice with Neave in George Street Sydney in 1913, Hardy Wilson was determined to make Australians as aware of their colonial architectural heritage as Americans had become of theirs. He began to make drawings of early nineteenth century colonial buildings in New South Wales and Tasmania, which culminated in the publication of the highly influential *Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania* in 1924. (Refer Figs 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11)

The 1923 gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Reserve by Wilson Neave and Berry is designed in the Interwar Georgian style which recreates characteristics of old colonial Georgian style. This style is characterised by symmetry, simplicity, clarity, regular repetitive fenestration and multi-paned windows, reasonable proportions and a restrained classicism.

Wilson’s architectural commissions consisted almost entirely of houses. Two of his best-known works, *Eryldene*, Gordon, (refer Fig. 2.6) completed in 1914 for linguist and Camelia expert Professor E.G Waterhouse and his own home, *Purulia*, Wahroonga, (refer Fig. 2.7) completed in 1916, exemplify his admiration for early colonial Georgian architecture.

Wilson contributed to newspapers and to journals, such as *Art in Australia* and influenced many Australian architects in the 1920’s and 1930’s to practice in the Interwar Georgian Revival style, combining elements of early Australian colonial and British Georgian.

Wilson also travelled to China in 1921 and greatly admired traditional Pekinese architecture. He became interested in evolving a new style that combined the best of Western classical and Oriental influences. One of his last commissions was the small Chinese tea house, built at *Eryldene* in 1927. (Refer Fig. 2.14)
Figure 2.8
‘Wesleyan Chapel at Campbelltown in Tasmania’
Source: W. Hardy Wilson, *Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania*
Edition: Ure Smith in assoc. with National Trust of Australia 1975, Originally published 1924

Figure 2.9
‘Horsley near Smithfield in New South Wales’
Source: W. Hardy Wilson, *Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania*
Edition: Ure Smith in assoc. with National Trust of Australia 1975, Originally published 1924
Figure 2.10
‘Cottages in Albion Street, Surry Hills New South Wales’
Source: W. Hardy Wilson, Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania
Edition: Ure Smith in assoc. with National Trust of Australia 1975, Originally published 1924

Figure 2.11
‘Riverdale near Goulburn New South Wales’
Source: W. Hardy Wilson, Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania
Edition: Ure Smith in assoc. with National Trust of Australia 1975, Originally published 1924
Figure 2.12 - left above
Memorial to the Dead, Newington College
William Hardy Wilson, architect, 1922
Source: http://trove.nla.gov.au

Figure 2.13 - right above
Pepes Store, George Street Sydney
Wilson, Neave and Berry Architects 1923
A Georgian Revival exercise in a commercial building
Source: Richard Appleby, Robert Irving, Peter Reynolds, Identifying Australian Architecture
Angus and Robertson 1989

Figure 2.14
Chinese Teahouse/ Tennis Pavilion at Eryldene, Gordon
William Hardy Wilson, architect, 1927
Photo by Harold Cazneaux
A fusion of Georgian and oriental design
Source: PIC/8893#PIC/8893/393, National Library of Australia

Figure 2.15
Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers
Wilson, Neave and Berry, architects, 1928
Photo by Harold Cazneaux, at time of opening 1928
A fusion of Georgian and Mediterranean design
2.1.4 Wilson, Neave and Berry: a Timeline

1908 William Hardy Wilson and Stacey A. Neave travel to Europe and make measured architectural drawings.
1909 Wilson and Neave travel together in North America
1913 Wilson and Neave set up partnership in Sydney
1914 Eryldene at Gordon completed
1916 Purulia at Wahroonga completed
1916 Neave enlists for World War I and Wilson closes city office
1920 Office re-opened in Union House, George Street, joined by John L Berry. Practice becomes Wilson Neave and Berry
1921 Wilson travels to China
1922 Wilson’s Memorial to The Dead, Newington College, completed (Refer Fig. 2.12)
1922 Wilson sells Purulia, travels to Europe, seeking printers for his drawings of old colonial architecture
1922 Wilson, Neave and Berry win design competition for a tennis and bowling club pavilion, children’s summer house and gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground
1923 Gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground completed
1923 Pepes Store, a seven story building in the Georgian Revival style at George Street, Sydney completed (Refer Fig. 2.13)
1924 Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania published
1925 Wilson returns to Sydney
1927 Wilson’s Chinese tea house erected in the gardens of Eryldene (Refer Fig. 2.14)
1927 Wilson leaves partnership, travels to Europe. Practice becomes Neave and Berry
1928 Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers completed (Refer Fig. 2.15)
1930 Berry leaves the practice. Neave continues on his own until his death in 1941
Figure 2.16
Working drawing and specification of the gateway pavilion
Wilson, Neave & Berry, architects, 1923
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284 State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library
2.1.5 The Designer of the Gateway Pavilion

It is unlikely that the gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Reserve was designed by William Hardy Wilson. In 1922, at the time of the Gordon Recreation Reserve design competition, Wilson completed his drawings for *Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania* and travelled to Europe, seeking out the best printers, returning to Sydney in 1925, after the book’s publication.

Wilson’s partner, John Berry was almost certainly the direct designer of the gateway pavilion. Berry is reported in the Sydney Morning Herald as the winner of the design competition. Never the less, the Entry Gate, designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style, can be deduced to be strongly influenced by Wilson, to the extent that he influenced the design culture of the firm.

2.1.6 Drawings of the Gateway Pavilion

In addition to the design competition drawing, two copies of the main working drawing for the as-built gateway pavilion are kept in the Mitchell Library, one copy having a handwritten, unsigned declaration, agreeing to erect the entry gate for 58 pounds, dated 30 May 1923, from which we can deduce that construction occurred in the second half of 1923. (Refer Figs 2.16, 2.17)

In addition, there is a third drawing of an alternative simplified gateway pavilion design with only two piers, instead of the as-built design with two walls with engaged piers. The former, less expensive option was obviously investigated but never proceeded with.

The main working drawing clearly shows that there were no substantial changes to the design between the time of the 1922 design competition and the time of the gateway pavilion construction in 1923. The existing gateway pavilion has been precisely constructed in accordance with the drawings.
Figure 2.17
Working drawing and specification of the gateway pavilion
With unsigned declaration, Wilson Neave & Berry, architects, 1923
The unsigned declaration reads:
'I hereby agree to erect the gate feature as here shown and according to the specification hereunder
and to the satisfaction of the architects for the sum of fifty eight pounds….30th May 1923'
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284 State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

Figure 2.18
Gateway pavilion, circa 1983
Note the adjacent white picket fence and red clay shingles to roof
Source: Hardy Wilson, A Living Memory, a film by Louise Johnston, Polak Productions 1983
Screen shot by Alison Walker, Ku-ring-gai Council
2.1.7 **Fencing adjacent the Gateway Pavilion**

At around the time of the gateway pavilion’s construction an adjoining picket fence was constructed on the park boundary to what is now Werona Avenue. We know this because:
- The Ku-ring-gai Shire Council Minutes of 30 August 1923 record approval of a “Proposed picket fence at John Street frontage” of the Gordon Recreation Ground.\(^{10}\)
- A photograph of the gateway pavilion, as recently as 1983, shows a picket fence. (Refer Fig. 2.18)

The streets to both frontages of the park had different names in the 1920’s. The present day Werona Avenue was called John Street and the present day Rosedale Road was called Elizabeth Street.

---

**Figure 2.19**
Gateway pavilion, circa 1987
Note the white picket fence now removed and red clay roof shingles and half-round ridge tile
Inventory Sheet, Gordon Recreation Ground, Item: Map 23, No. 63
Figure 2.20
Working drawing of tennis pavilion, first design, with timber walls
Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department, circa June 1935
Source: Gordon Recreation Grounds Correspondence 1935-1939, File Box 1014,
Local Studies Collection, Ku-ring-gai Library
2.2 The Tennis Pavilion 1935-1936

2.2.1 Tennis Pavilion - First Design

1923-1935: Since the construction of the gateway pavilion in 1923, little progress had been made in the provision of adequate built facilities for the Gordon Recreation Ground. The proposed bowling green had not been constructed and Wilson Neave and Berry’s generous competition design of a combined tennis and bowling pavilion had not been implemented. The advent of the Great Depression would have put paid to such elaborate works. In the 1930’s two of the tennis courts had been re-constructed under the relief works scheme for the local area.\(^{11}\)

17 June 1935 letter and pavilion drawing: By 1935 the lack of facilities in the park had come to a head. A letter from the Council Building Surveyor to the Town, Clerk A. H. Hirst, reported:

“In addition to the lack of sanitary lavatory accommodation at the Gordon Recreation Ground the facilities for tennis players are appalling consisting of a very small galvanised shed, which is also used as a storage shed for the park equipment.

The cost of the erection of brick and tile public lavatory conveniences for both sexes, similar to the building in Turramurra Park, connected to the sewer, would be 275 pounds. Owing to this cost consideration has been given and plans prepared, which are attached hereto, of combined facilities for tennis players and public lavatory accommodation in wood and tile with brick foundations, the design of which will be in keeping with general surroundings, at an estimated cost of 465 pounds.

It is further pointed out that the lavatory conveniences at this park are of such a nature that immediate action is necessary, as female tennis players depend at present on the generosity of private owners...”\(^{12}\)

The letter went on to suggest that financing of the building could be arranged under the Governments Building Relief Committee Loan Scheme.

A copy of the plans of the building “in wood and tile with brick foundations”, which accompanied the letter, is in Council records. (Refer Fig. 2.20) It is possible that the design, in Georgian
EVOLUTION OF THE TENNIS PAVILION 1922 – 1935, PLANS

**Figure 2.21**
Drawing of floor plan, tennis and bowling club pavilion
Competition drawing, Gordon Recreation Ground
Wilson, Neave & Berry, architects, 1922
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284 State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

**Figure 2.22**
Drawing of floor plan, tennis pavilion - first design
Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department, circa June 1935
Source: Gordon Recreation Grounds Correspondence 1935-1939, File Box 1014,
Local Studies Collection, Ku-ring-gai Library

**Figure 2.23**
Drawing of existing floor plan, tennis pavilion - second design
Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department, circa September 1935
Source: Phillips Marler 2016
Revival style with its central verandah, symmetrical elevation and twelve pane windows, was influenced by the Wilson, Neave and Berry 1922 competition design for the tennis and bowling club pavilion. At the front of the 1935 design a central kitchen is flanked by mens and ladies dressing rooms, with toilets at the rear. The exterior walls are clad in vertical timber boards, an unusual feature.

The drawing has a Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department stamp and was probably prepared by a Council designer or architect within the Building Surveyors Department, identity unknown.

2.2.2 Tennis Pavilion - Second Design

4 July 1935 letter: The Town Clerk informs the Building Surveyor that the Council has requested the preparation of a less costly design and “that the ladies EC, at present enclosed with hessian, be enclosed with galvanised iron and painted pending a decision regarding a permanent structure”.

2 September 1935 letter: The Parks Officer (previously referred to as a Building Surveyor) informs the Town Clerk that an amended design has been prepared, reducing the estimated cost from 465 pounds to 398 pounds. He recommends that quotations be obtained from local builders and an application be made to the Building Relief Committee to finance the construction.

No drawing of this second design has been found in Council records. Again, the design was probably prepared by a Council designer or architect within the Building Surveyors Department, identity unknown.

13 September 1935 letter: The Town Clerk requests quotations from four local builders for the construction of “a brick pavilion and lavatory block within the Gordon Recreation Ground.”

This confirms that the second design was for the existing brick and tile tennis pavilion which stands on the site today. The layout is very similar to the first design with change rooms each side of a central kitchen, toilets at the rear and a hipped roof. It is a building in a simple Georgian Revival style with a...
Figure 2.24
Drawing of front elevation, tennis and bowling club pavilion
Competition drawing, Gordon Recreation Ground
Wilson, Neave & Berry, architects, 1922
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284 State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

Figure 2.25
Drawing of front elevation, tennis pavilion -first design, with timber walls
Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department, circa June 1935
Source: Gordon Recreation Grounds Correspondence 1935-1939, File Box 1014,
Local Studies Collection, Ku-ring-gai Library

Figure 2.26
Drawing of existing front elevation, tennis pavilion -second design, with brick walls
Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department, circa September 1935
Source: Phillips Marler 2016

EVOLUTION OF THE TENNIS PAVILION 1922 – 1935, ELEVATIONS
symmetrical main elevation. The tiled roof has been simplified with the previously projecting verandah roof in the first design, pulled back.

**14 March 1936 letter**: The Town Clerk accepts the tender of $403 pounds by builder De E. F Carden from Roseville.\(^6\)

4 August 1936 letter: The Town Clerk issues the final payment under the contract to the builder. The construction of the tennis pavilion is complete.\(^7\)

**END NOTES & REFERENCES**

8. Australian Dictionary of Biography, ibid
10. Ku-ring-gai Shire Council Minutes, 30 August 1923, Item 1398, Microfich No. 27, Local Studies Collection, Ku-ring-gai Library
12. Ibid
14. Letter 2 September 1935, Parks Officer to Town Clerk, Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, ibid
15. Letter 13 September 1935, Town Clerk to four builders, Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, ibid
16. Letter 14 March 1936, Town Clerk to Mr De B. F. Carden, builder, Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, ibid
17. Letter 4 August 1936, Town Clerk to Mr De B. F. Carden, builder, Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, ibid
Part Three

Physical Evidence and Condition of Fabric
Figure 3.1
Perspective of gateway pavilion from the south-west
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.2
Perspective of gateway pavilion from the south-east
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
3.1 The Gateway Pavilion

3.1.1 Description

The 1923 gateway pavilion is located on the western park boundary to Werona Avenue. It is open on the west and east elevations and enclosed on the north and south elevations. It is approximately 3150 x 2000 in plan dimensions, with approximate heights of 2500 to the eaves and 3500 to the roof ridge.

With its simple symmetrical form, engaged piers with capitals and hipped roof, it can be classified as being of the Interwar Georgian Revival style.

North and south elevations: The two side walls of the gateway pavilion are constructed in 110mm single skin brickwork with 230 x 230mm engaged brick piers at each end. Brickwork is bagged. The upper sections of the walls consist of cast concrete grilles with an open criss-cross pattern. Running above the top of the grilles are cast concrete lintel beams which support the roof.

West and east elevations: These elevations are open. Across the top of each opening are cast concrete lintel beams which support the roof. Fixed below the lintel beam on the west elevation facing Werona Avenue is a 200mm deep timber sign board.

Roof: The roof is timber-framed with a hipped form and is clad in French pattern terracotta roof tiles. It has timber fascias and the eaves and soffit are clad in asbestos cement sheeting with expressed timber battens. There are no eaves gutters.

Adjacent elements: There are 110mm rendered brick wing walls to planting beds facing Werona Avenue. The wing walls are not shown on the original Wilson Neave and Berry drawing and may have been added during the construction stage. The end of one of the wing walls has had its engaged pier removed. Two large Cypress Pines in the planting beds partially obscure the edge of the street elevation.

On the park side, there are 110mm rendered walls flanking sandstone steps.

The paving is sandstone flags in a random pattern.

There is a large eucalypt close to the northwest wing wall.
Figure 3.3
Gateway pavilion on Werona Avenue frontage
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.4
Gateway pavilion - west elevation
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
3.1.2 Condition

The gateway pavilion structure is in fair condition.

There is some lifting of paint and cracking in the render.

The large eucalypt close to the north-west wing wall is causing the wall to crack. The engaged pier is missing from the end of the north-west wing wall.

**Roof cladding:** The French pattern terracotta roof tiles are not original. The original tiles would have been clay shingles. The evidence for this is:

- The specification on the 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion nominates “shingle tiles with plain half-round ridging”. (Refer Fig. 2.16)

- A photograph taken circa 1983 shows red clay shingle tiles. (Refer Fig. 2.18)

- A photograph of the gateway pavilion on the inventory sheet from the 1987 Municipality of Ku-ring-gai Heritage Study shows shingle tiles. (Refer Fig 2.19)

**Eaves gutter:** There is no eaves gutter. It is probable that originally there was an eaves gutter. The evidence for this is:

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows and specifies an eaves gutter with a spitter downpipe. (Refer Fig 2.16)

- There is a separate Wilson, Neave and Berry original large scale eaves detail drawing; showing a gutter as well as a timber scotia trim beneath the gutter. (Refer Fig. 3.7)

**Sign Board:** There is an existing timber sign board without lettering on the west elevation.

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows “Gordon Recreation Ground” painted onto the sign board. (Refer Fig. 2.16)

- There is a separate Wilson, Neave and Berry original large scale sign board detail drawing setting out the lettering. (Refer Fig.3.8)
**Figure 3.5**
Gateway pavilion - east elevation
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

**Figure 3.6**
Gateway pavilion - south elevation
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
Figure 3.7
Detail drawing of eaves to gateway pavilion, showing gutter and timber scotia trim
Wilson Neave & Berry, architects, 1923
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

Figure 3.8
Detail drawing of sign board to gateway pavilion, showing set-out of painted letters
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library
Figure 3.9
Original hanging pins for gates, gateway pavilion
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.10
Detail of gates from working drawing of gateway pavilion
Wilson, Neave & Berry, architects, 1923
Source: Collection of architectural plans of Wilson, Neave & Berry 1909-1937
PXD 272-284, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library

Figure 3.11
Plans for gates ca 1928, William Hardy Wilson, architect
Source: Hardy Wilson Collection, National Library of Australia
PIC Drawer 10561/APIC 11872/6
Gates: There are no gates to the existing gateway pavilion. Originally gates would have been installed. The evidence for this is:

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows and specifies timber gates. (Refer Figs. 2.16, 3.10)

- The original steel hanging pins for the gates are still in the brick piers. (Refer Fig. 3.9)

Interestingly, there is another drawing of timber gates held in the William Hardy Wilson architectural drawing collection in the National Library of Australia. (Refer Fig. 3.11) The gate design on this drawing is identical to the gate design on the Wilson Neave and Berry drawing for the gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground. (Refer Fig. 3.10) Clearly Hardy Wilson had a decisive influence on the gate design for the gateway pavilion. This was an in-house gate style used by the firm.
Figure 3.12
Perspective of tennis pavilion from south-west
Source: Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.13
Perspective of tennis pavilion from north-east
Source: Phillips Marler 2016
3.2 The Tennis Pavilion

3.2.1 Description - External

The 1936 tennis pavilion is located within the park opposite the tennis courts. It is a single storey, single-skin brickwork building with a single hipped, tiled roof, with plan dimensions of 8500 x 5000. On the south side the building contains male and female dressing rooms, a central kitchen and a small verandah. On the north side there are male and female toilets and a shower room.

The construction of the external walls out of a single 110mm skin of brickwork is unusual. It was obviously done as a cost-saving measure, as part of the process of developing a second, less expensive design.

With the simple symmetry of its main south wall elevation, twelve-pane and six-pane windows and single hipped roof it can be classified as being of the Interwar Georgian Revival style. (Refer Fig. 3.15)

**Main South Elevation:** The main long elevation facing the tennis courts has a small central verandah, flanked by the walls to the male and female dressing rooms, each with its twelve-pane window. The windows to the kitchen, either side of a central door, are six-pane. The walls have a face brick plinth with stucco applied in a random swirl pattern above the plinth. There is a dado line running around the building at door and window head height. Windows are double-hung or fixed. Doors into the kitchen and dressing rooms are three panel.

**Secondary Elevations:** The north, east and west walls all have the face brick plinth with stucco finish and dado line above. There is 8-pane window and a three-panel door into the store room on the south elevation. Smaller windows into the toilets are fixed glass louvres.

All brick walls, windows and doors to the elevations are original.

**Roof:** The roof is timber-framed with a hipped form and is clad in French pattern terracotta roof tiles. It has timber fascias and the eaves and soffit are clad in asbestos cement sheeting with expressed timber battens.
Figure 3.14
Tennis pavilion, view from south-east
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.15
Tennis pavilion, south elevation
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.16
Tennis pavilion, north elevation
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
There is a chamfered timber beam with decorative timber brackets supporting the roof over the verandah. (Refer Fig. 3.18)

**Terracotta roof tiles:** It is probable these are original. The evidence for this is:

The original Council drawing of the first design for the tennis pavilion shows terracotta roof tiles. It is probable these were also specified for the final built design.

**Eaves gutters:** There are no eaves gutters. Originally the building probably had eaves gutters. The evidence for this is:

The original Council drawing of the first design for the tennis pavilion shows eaves gutters, with timber trims shown below the gutters. This indicates that the designer may have copied the eaves gutter detail from the gateway pavilion as the original Wilson, Neave and Berry eaves detail drawing for the gateway pavilion also shows a timber scotia trim below the gutter. Since the first tennis pavilion design had an eaves gutter, it is probable the second, final design also had one.

**Adjacent elements:** There are rendered screen walls to the stepped entries of the male and female toilets. These are not original and were later additions.

The paving around the building is sandstone flags in a random pattern.
Figure 3.17A
Plan of Tennis pavilion
Source: Phillips Marler 2016
### 3.2.2 Description - Internal Spaces Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber lockers, Original enamel sink top and timber cupboard, Original notice board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.19 &amp; 3.20)</td>
<td>boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timber quad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skirting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Change Room</strong></td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original clothes hook board, hooks missing, Laminated bench and sink, Trapdoor in floor with access to sub-floor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.21, 3.22, 3.23)</td>
<td>boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skirting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Change Room</strong></td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original clothes hook board, with hooks, Original enamel corner basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.24, 3.25)</td>
<td>boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timber quad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skirting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Toilets</strong></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber boarded door to toilet cubicle, Corner basin, Urinal, Toilet pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.28, 3.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Toilets</strong></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber boarded door to toilet cubicle, Corner basin, Toilet pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.26 3.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shower Room</strong></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>More recent fibre cement ceiling Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Concrete hob to original shower, Opening in ceiling with access to roof space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig. 3.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal timber floors, concrete floors, rendered walls and asbestos cement ceilings are all original.
Figure 3.18
Timber beam and bracket, Tennis pavilion,
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.19
Timber beam and bracket, Tennis pavilion,
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.20
Kitchen, tennis pavilion, original enamel sink & cupboard
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.21
Male change room, tennis pavilion, original timber floor, skirting, AC ceiling and cornice
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
3.2.3 Condition - External

**Brick walls**: The condition of the external rendered brick walls is good. There is some cracking in the face brick plinth and the stucco render. (Refer Fig 3.31) There appears to have been no alteration to the brick walls and layout of the building since it was constructed.

**Windows**: Their overall condition is fair. Some double-hung windows may require adjustment or new sash cords.

**Kitchen windows**: There are some broken panes. Windows have been boarded over. (Refer Fig.3.19)

**Male and Female Change Room Windows**: Some sashes have been altered so they have less than the original six-panels of glass. (Refer Fig’s 3.23 & 3.25)

**Male and Female Toilet windows**: Some of the fixed glass louvres are broken or missing. (Refer Fig. 3.28)

**Doors**: Their overall condition is fair

**Male Change Room door**: This is hung in the wrong direction

**Female Change Room door**: The mounting (vertical frame) is damaged

There appears to be no visible evidence of substantial damage or deterioration to the timber doors and windows. There may be hidden termite damage.

**Roof**: The condition of the roof is fair. There appears to be no visible evidence of roof framing sag or movement. There may be hidden termite damage. Roof tiling appears to be substantially intact.
Figure 3.22
Male change room, tennis pavilion, damaged timber floor
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.23
Male change room, tennis pavilion, double-hung window, originally 12-pane, altered
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.24
Female change room, tennis pavilion, original enamel sink, original timber floor, skirting, AC ceiling and cornice, original hook board
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.25
Female change room, tennis pavilion, double-hung window, originally 12-pane, altered
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
Figure 3.26
Female toilets, tennis pavilion, original glass louvre window
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.27
Female toilets, tennis pavilion, original timber boarded toilet cubicle door
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.28
Male toilets, tennis pavilion, original glass louvre window, damaged
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.29
Male toilets, tennis pavilion, original timber boarded toilet cubicle door
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
Figure 3.30
Shower room, tennis pavilion, damaged ceiling (not original) and render, original 8-pane window
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016

Figure 3.31
Cracking to existing brick plinth of tennis pavilion
Source: Photo, Phillips Marler 2016
3.2.4 Condition - Internal

**Timber floors**: Their overall condition is fair.

*Male Change Room timber floor*: Some boards are rotting. (Refer Fig. 3.22)

**Concrete floors**: Their overall condition is fair.

**Rendered internal walls**: Their overall condition is fair.

*Shower Room*: Some render is cracking and discoloured from water damage and/or movement. (Refer Fig. 3.30)

**Asbestos cement ceilings**: Their overall condition is fair.

*Female Toilets*: Evidence of water damage to part of ceiling.

**Fibre cement ceiling (Shower Room)**: Evidence of water damage to part of ceiling. (Refer Fig. 3.30)
Part Four

ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE
4.1 Guiding Documents

To assess the cultural significance of the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion, the following documents have been referred to:

The Burra Charter  
Heritage Act 1977  
Assessing Heritage Significance - NSW Heritage Office  
Heritage Curtilages – NSW Heritage Office  
Conservation Plan (5th addition) - National Trust

4.2 Cultural Assessment Criteria

4.2.1 The Burra Charter

The preamble to the Burra Charter provides a rationale for the need to conserve:

“Places of cultural significance enrich peoples’ lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences.

They are historical records, that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural diversity reflect diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are, the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape.”

Article One Definitions of the Burra Charter defines many aspects of conservation, all of which have resonance on heritage sites. The ones which have the most relevance to the Gateway Pavilion and the Tennis Pavilion are:

Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use associations and meanings, record, related places and objects.

Fabric means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents and objects.
Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction.

Preservation means maintaining the fabric of the place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric.

Adaption means modifying a place to suit the existing use or proposed use.

Compatible use means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place.

Meanings denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses.

Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.

4.2.2 Heritage Listings


The tennis pavilion is not listed in any current documents, local or state.
4.2.3 Cultural Significance - NSW State Heritage Office Assessment
Criteria - Gateway Pavilion

The cultural significance of the gateway pavilion is discussed in relation to the criteria adopted by the NSW Heritage Office in Assessing Heritage Significance 2001.

The gateway pavilion is assessed as being locally significant in accordance with Criterion B, Criterion C and Criterion F.

Criterion B: An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person or group of persons, of importance in NSW cultural or natural history or the cultural or natural history of the local area.

Assessment: The gateway pavilion is locally significant for its association with the architectural firm of Wilson Neave and Berry, of whom William Hardy Wilson is the most well-known practitioner. The gateway pavilion was part of the firms winning entry into a 1922 design competition for new buildings at Gordon Recreation Ground, an unusual means of procuring park structures by a local Council. Of these park buildings, only the gatehouse was built. Wilson, Neave and Berry were responsible for a number of new houses in the local area in the 1910’s and 1920’s as well the landmark Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers (1928). The gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Reserve is the only known example of a built park entry structure designed by Wilson, Neave and Berry.

Criterion C: An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW or the local area.

Assessment: The gateway pavilion is locally significant in demonstrating the aesthetic characteristics of the Interwar Georgian Revival style of architecture, of which William Hardy Wilson, of Wilson, Neave and Berry, was the most important advocate. Two houses in the local area designed by Wilson, Eryldene, Gordon (1914) and his own home, Purulia, Wahroonga (1916), exemplify the style. With its simple symmetrical form, hipped roof and engaged piers with capitals, the gateway pavilion is a fine example of a park entry structure designed in the Georgian Revival style.
Criterion F: An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the areas cultural or natural history.

Assessment: The Gateway Pavilion is assessed to have rarity value. Research of Wilson, Neave and Berry’s architectural projects has not revealed a similar or identical built structure designed by them for a park setting. In addition, there are no other park entry structures designed in the Georgian Revival Style in the Ku-ring-gai area.

4.2.4 Summary Statement of Cultural Significance – The Gateway Pavilion

The 1923 gateway pavilion has high local significance for its association with the architectural firm of Wilson, Neave and Berry, and with William Hardy Wilson in particular, and because it is the only known local example of a park entry designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style. Aside from the substitution of original roof shingles with terracotta tiles, and altered paint finishes, the original fabric is largely intact.

4.2.5 Cultural Significance - NSW State Heritage Office Assessment Criteria - Tennis Pavilion

The cultural significance of the tennis pavilion is discussed in relation to the criteria adopted by the NSW Heritage Office in Assessing Heritage Significance 2001.

The tennis pavilion is assessed as being locally significant in accordance with Criterion C, Criterion D and Criterion F.

Criterion C: An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW or the local area.

Assessment: The tennis pavilion is locally significant in demonstrating the aesthetic characteristics of the Interwar Georgian Revival style of architecture. Although the 1936 tennis pavilion was not designed by Wilson, Neave and Berry, its design has clearly been influenced by the 1922 Wilson, Neave and Berry competition design of the tennis and bowling club pavilion. With its strong, simple, symmetrical elevation, hipped roof and multi-paned windows, the tennis pavilion is a fine example of a small 1930’s sports amenities building in the Georgian Revival style.
Criterion D: An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW (and or the local area) for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.

Assessment: The tennis pavilion is locally significant through having an 80 year association with the playing of tennis in the Gordon Recreation Ground. Local people have been playing tennis in The Gordon Recreation Ground since 1922. The building has a strong symbolic and historic association with the amateur sporting community in the Ku-ring-gai area.

Criterion F: An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the areas cultural or natural history.

Assessment: The Tennis Pavilion is assessed to have rarity value. There are no other sports amenities buildings designed in the Georgian Revival Style in the Ku-ring-gai area.

4.2.6 Summary Statement of Cultural Significance: - The Tennis Pavilion

The 1936 tennis pavilion has high local significance because it is a rare example of a 1930’s sports amenities building designed in the Georgian Revival style, demonstrates the influence of architects Wilson, Neave and Berry and has a long association with tennis in the local sporting community. The fabric of the tennis pavilion is largely unaltered since the building was constructed and aside from altered paint finishes most other features are intact.
Figure 4.1
Plan of Tennis pavilion - Significance Ratings
Source: Phillips Marler 2016

Legend:
- Exceptional
- High
- Moderate
- Little
4.2.7 Rankings of Cultural Significance - NSW Heritage Office Guidelines

These rankings are based on the NSW Heritage Office guidelines for the following:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Rare or outstanding element directly contributing to an item’s local and State significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High degree of original fabric. Demonstrates a key element of the item’s significance. Alterations do not detract from significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Altered or modified elements. Elements with little heritage value, but which contribute to the overall significance of the item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Alterations detract from significance. Difficult to interpret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive</td>
<td>Damaging to the item's heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.8 Rankings of Cultural Significance – Gateway Pavilion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Pavilion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The Gateway Pavilion is of high local significance and should be maintained and have reconstruction works to enhance its significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing walls</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The bagged brick wing walls should be maintained and have restoration/reconstruction works to enhance their significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2.9 Rankings of Cultural Significance – Tennis Pavilion

#### External Elevations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South, East and West Elevations</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The south, east and west elevations are of high local significance. They are the most prominent, constituting the symmetrical Georgian style façade which demonstrates aesthetic significance. To maintain significance, these elevations should not be substantially altered or obscured. The existing opening to toilets on the east elevation could be enlarged and gates or doors fitted without affecting cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Elevation</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The north elevation is the least prominent, least demonstrative of aesthetic significance. Some alteration or obscuration would not substantially affect the overall significance of the building. The existing opening to toilets could be enlarged and gates or doors fitted without affecting cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External steps to toilets and shower room</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>These steps could be modified without substantially affecting the overall significance of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Screen Walls to Toilets</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>These walls are a later addition and could be removed without affecting the overall significance of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Internal Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The kitchen has high local significance as an intact 1930’s kitchen interior with original finishes, timber lockers, sinktop and bench. To maintain significance, these features should not be substantially altered or obscured. Modern services and small fittings such as taps and boiling water units could be installed without affecting significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Change Room</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>This space has original finishes but is not of high aesthetic significance and does not have high rarity value. Alterations to finishes for adaptive re-use of the space would not affect its significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Change Room</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>This space has original finishes but is not of high aesthetic significance and does not have high rarity value. Alterations to finishes for adaptive re-use of the space would not affect its significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Toilets</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>This space is of little cultural significance. New finishes and fittings could be installed and the internal division wall could be demolished to provide a better planned space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Toilet</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>This space is of little cultural significance. New finishes and fittings could be installed and the internal division wall could be demolished to provide a better planned space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower Room</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>This space is of little cultural significance. New finishes and fittings could be installed and the existing shower hob could be demolished to provide a better planned space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Curtilage

4.3.1 Definition of Curtilage - NSW Heritage Office Guidelines

NSW Heritage Office Guidelines define heritage curtilage as either

- Land which is integral to the heritage significance of items of the built heritage, or
- A precinct which includes buildings, works, relics, trees or places and their setting

The four types of heritage curtilage are:

- Lot boundary heritage curtilage
- Reduced heritage curtilage
- Expanded heritage curtilage
- Composite heritage curtilage

4.3.2 Heritage Curtilage to the Gateway Pavilion and the Tennis Pavilion

The gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion are located within the boundaries of Gordon Recreation Ground. These boundaries were established at the time of the parks foundation and are still intact. The heritage curtilage to the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion is defined by the boundaries of Gordon Recreation Ground and their curtilage may be defined as ‘Lot Boundary Curtilage’. This curtilage is integral to the heritage significance of both buildings. In order to maintain heritage significance the existing park boundaries must be maintained.
4.3.3 View Lines to and from the Gateway Pavilion and the Tennis Pavilion

Within the heritage curtilage of the park, there are key view lines which need to be maintained in order to retain heritage significance of the buildings. These are:

For the gateway pavilion:

- The eastern view line from the gateway pavilion along the main path to the tennis pavilion and through to the eastern boundary of the park
- The western view line along the path from the eastern boundary to the gateway pavilion on the western boundary of the park

For the tennis pavilion:

- The southern view line from the tennis pavilion to the tennis courts and vice-versa
- The view line of the east, south and west elevations of the tennis pavilion when approaching along the path from both directions.

It is important that these view lines are not obscured by future plantings and possible future structures or buildings.

4.3.4 Recovering Views of the Gateway Pavilion

The west elevation of the gateway pavilion is obscured by Cypress trees planted on both sides.

The current view of the northern elevation of the gateway pavilion, when approaching along the footpath to Werona Avenue is obscured by plantings.

These views could be recovered by the removal or thinning of existing plantings, enabling the gateway pavilion to be viewed “in the round.”
Part Five

Opportunities and Constraints
5.1 Current Statutory Constraints

5.1.1 Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015

Aims

Under the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015, Gordon Recreation Ground is zoned as RE1 – Public Recreation. The objectives of this zoning are:

- To enable land to be used for public open space or recreational purposes.
- To provide a range of recreational settings and activities and compatible land uses.
- To protect and enhance the natural environment for recreational purposes.
- To protect, manage and restore areas of high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values.

In any conservation or reconstruction proposals for the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion, Council should aim “to protect, manage and restore areas of high...cultural or aesthetic values.”

Permitted Activities

The following activities are permitted with consent under LEP 2015:

Animal boarding or training establishments; Bee keeping; Camping grounds; Car parks; Caravan parks; Child care centres; Community facilities; Emergency services facilities; Flood mitigation works; Food and drink premises; Forestry; Information and education facilities; Kiosks; Markets; Plant nurseries; Recreation areas; Recreation facilities (indoor); Recreation facilities (major); Recreation facilities (outdoor); Registered clubs; Respite day care centres; Roadside stalls; Signage; Water recycling facilities; Water supply systems.

Any proposals for adaptive re-use of the tennis pavilion would need to take account of these permitted activities.
Heritage assessment
The consent authority may, before granting consent to any development:

(a) on land on which a heritage item is located, or
(b) on land that is within a heritage conservation area, or
(c) on land that is within the vicinity of land referred to in paragraph (a) or (b), (author emphasis)

require a heritage management document to be prepared that assesses the extent to which the carrying out of the proposed development would affect the heritage significance of the heritage item or heritage conservation area concerned.

Gordon Recreation Ground is within the vicinity of:

- Roberts Grant Heritage Conservation Area C13
- Gordon and Park Estate, McIntosh and Ansell Heritage Conservation Area C15
- No. 1 Nelson Street, Gordon Heritage Item I204
- Gordon Railway Station, Heritage item 6 (Under LEP 2012)

Council may require preparation of a heritage management document that assesses the effect of proposals for the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion on the heritage significance of those heritage items or conservation areas in the vicinity of Gordon Recreation Reserve.

5.2 Potential Statutory Constraints

If Council were to list the gateway pavilion or the tennis pavilion as an item of local significance, the following planning documents would apply.

5.2.1 Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015

*Part 5.10 Heritage Conservation sets out:*

- when a development consent is required for work on or changes to a heritage item
- when a heritage management document is required and,
- when a heritage conservation management plan is required.
5.2.2 Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan 2016

This provides detailed guidelines and compliments the LEP 2015

*Part 19 - Heritage Items and Heritage Conservation Areas includes controls for:*

- external alterations and additions to a heritage item
- internal alterations and additions to a heritage item
- adaptive re-use

All developments involving adaptive re-use of a heritage item require the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan under the DCP 2016. The preparation of this Conservation Management plan for the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion anticipates this requirement.

5.2.3 Heritage Act 1977 (amended 2010)

The NSW Heritage Act 1977 provides the statutory protection that is required for an item of local significance. There are therefore obligations on Council to protect and conserve heritage items and to manage and protect them to maintain cultural significance.

5.3 Non-Statutory Constraints

5.3.1 Municipality of Ku-ring-gai Heritage Study 1987

This study provides important background information on the historical context to the Gordon Recreation Reserve, the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion.

It includes an inventory sheet on the gateway pavilion. (Map 23, Item No. 63)

5.3.2 The Burra Charter

The Burra Charter provides a set of conservation principles, (articles 2 to 13) conservation processes (articles 14 to 25) and conservation practices (articles 26 to 34). Those who have responsibilities for the management and maintenance of places of cultural heritage significance should familiarise themselves
with the provisions and guidelines of the Charter. Article 16 of the Charter states that, 'maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that significance'.

5.3.3 The National Trust of Australia (NSW)

The gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion are not listed on the register of the Trust.

5.4 Physical Constraints - The Gateway Pavilion

The following physical constraints arise from the Statement of Significance:

1. The existing function as a park entry should be retained
2. The existing significant fabric should be retained
3. The existing sightlines to and from the pavilion should be retained.
4. Any new development, structures, or landscaping in the park should not obscure the pavilion or detract from its setting or scale.

5.5 Physical Constraints - The Tennis Pavilion

The following physical constraints arise from the Statement of Significance:

1. The existing function as a community building should be retained
2. The existing significant fabric should be retained
3. The existing spatial relationship with the tennis courts should be retained
4. The existing sightlines to and from the pavilion should be retained.
5. Any new development, structures, or landscaping in the park should not obscure the pavilion or detract from its setting or scale.
6. The key south elevation should not be obscured or substantially altered
5.6 Opportunities - The Gateway Pavilion

The original drawings and physical investigations of the fabric provide an opportunity to restore the gateway pavilion to its original 1923 appearance, enhancing its status as a rare example of a park entry structure in the Interwar Georgian Revival style.

The opportunity exists to enhance the setting of the gateway pavilion by removal of obscuring plantings.

Information obtained from research on the background and designer of the gateway pavilion provides the opportunity for interpretation.

5.7 Opportunities - The Tennis Pavilion

Drawings of earlier designs and physical investigations of the fabric provide an opportunity to restore the primary elevations of the tennis pavilion to its original 1936 appearance.

The existing internal spaces provide an opportunity for adaptive re-use, either to enhance original functions or to provide new uses.

The north elevation and setting provides the opportunity for new built work adjacent the pavilion to provide universal access facilities without compromising the overall significance of the pavilion. (Refer Fig. 4.1)
Part Six

Conservation Policy
6.1 Vision Statement – the Gateway Pavilion

To conserve and manage the fabric of the gateway pavilion as a rare example of a park entry structure, designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style by architects Wilson, Neave and Berry, while maintaining public access and its ongoing function as a park entry.

6.2 Vision Statement – the Tennis Pavilion

To conserve and manage the fabric of the tennis pavilion as a rare example of a 1930’s park amenities building, designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style, while allowing appropriate adaptive re-use and its ongoing function as a public building.

6.3 Joint Polices – the Gateway Pavilion and the Tennis Pavilion

Policy 1: Managing cultural significance
The gateway pavilion and the primary elevations of the tennis pavilion are assessed to be of high cultural significance at a local level. This cultural significance is to be managed so that it is retained and enhanced according to the guidelines and principles set out in the Burra Charter, the NSW Heritage Office assessment criteria and the conservation policies set out in this Conservation Management Plan.

Policy 2: Best Practice
Ku-ring-gai Council is to engage suitably qualified persons to provide advice on conservation, restoration, reconstruction, interpretation and any new works. All activities should be carried out with due consideration to the Burra Charter.

Policy 3: Statutory Obligations
Ensure all activities are in accordance with current legislation including the Heritage Act 1977, the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, and the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015.
Policy 4: Compliance with the Burra Charter
To retain cultural significance, actions will need to be taken to conserve heritage items and the following key principles should be followed:-

Article 16: Maintenance - Maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that cultural significance.

Article 21: Adaptation
21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place

Article 22: New Work
22.1 New work such as additions to the place may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.
22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such.

Article 25: Interpretation
The cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment and be culturally appropriate.

6.4 Policies – the Gateway Pavilion

Policy 5 – Public Access
The main access path running east-west should remain connected to the gateway pavilion, maintaining its significance as the main entry into the park.

Policy 6- Viewlines
The following viewlines should not be obscured by future planting or structures:

- The viewlines between the gateway pavilion and the park entry on Rosedale Avenue.
- The viewlines between the gateway pavilion and the tennis pavilion.

These viewlines constitute historic visual connections within the park and contribute to the significance of both buildings.
Policy 7 – Conservation
Works can be undertaken to conserve the existing fabric of the gateway pavilion, preceded by a structural investigation of the walls.

Policy 8 – Restoration and Reconstruction
Works can be undertaken to return the gateway pavilion to the original design shown in the 1923 architect’s drawings, to include:

- Removal of terracotta roof tiles and replacement with terracotta shingles
- Installation of eaves gutters with timber trim
- Painting on of the park name to the sign board
- Painting in original colours, based on paint scrape analysis (Refer to Appendix 2)
- Reconstruction of the original timber gates
- Repair/reconstruction of the wing walls

Policy 9 - Planting
The two adjacent Cypress trees and the eucalypt can be removed to:

- Avoid future damage and/or foundational movement.
- Remove obscuration and allow the gateway pavilion to be made fully visible and able to be viewed ‘in the round’.

Planting to the north of the pavilion can also be removed or replaced with lower groundcovers to improve visibility of the pavilion.

Policy 10 – Adjacent Elements
The original flagged sandstone paving can be kept and maintained. The timber picket fence which originally ran along the Werona Avenue boundary to the park can be reconstructed.

Policy 11 – Interpretation
Consider providing low-key interpretation adjacent the pavilion to include the following information:

- Procurement of the design by a design competition in 1922
- Designed by architects Wilson, Neave and Berry
Policy 12 – Lighting
Lighting of the gateway pavilion can be considered, in accordance with Council policy, to improve presentation of the restored structure and enhance its cultural significance.

6.5 Policies – the Tennis Pavilion

Policy 13 – Public Access
Public access and use of the building can be enhanced, maintaining its significance as a public amenities building, in use since 1936.

Policy 14 - Viewlines
The viewline between the tennis pavilion and the tennis courts should not be obscured by future planting or structures. This viewline is a historic visual connection within the park and contributes to the significance of the building.

Policy 15 – Conservation
Works can be undertaken to conserve the existing fabric of the tennis pavilion, preceded by a structural investigation of the walls and roof framing and a termite investigation of the subfloor and roof space.

Policy 16 – Asbestos Management
A hazardous materials investigation should be carried out to confirm whether the existing eaves and internal ceilings are asbestos and to provide recommendations for management during adaptive re-use works.

Policy 17 – Restoration and Reconstruction to South, East and West External Elevations
Works can be undertaken to return the tennis pavilion to the original design on its highly significant south, east and west elevations, to include:

- Installation of eaves gutters with timber trim
- Installation of downpipes
- Restoration of timber windows to the change rooms as twelve pane windows
- Uncovering the six-pane timber windows to the kitchen and
replacing damaged or missing glass panes
- Painting in original colours, based on paint scrape analysis
  (Refer to Appendix 2)
- Re-hanging of timber door to male change room

The existing opening to female toilets on the east elevation can be enlarged and a security gate installed without affecting significance.

**Policy 18 – Restoration and Reconstruction to North Elevation**
Works can be undertaken to the moderately significant north elevation to include:

- Installation of eaves gutters with timber trim
- Repairs to existing six-pane window
- Repairs to existing glass louvre windows
- Painting in original colours, based on paint scrape analysis
  (Refer to Appendix 2)

The existing opening to the male toilets on the north elevation can be enlarged and a security gate installed without affecting significance.

**Policy 19 – Screen walls**
The screen walls to the male and female toilets, which were not part of the original design, can be removed.

**Policy 20 – Adaptive Re-use of the Kitchen**
The original finishes and internal joinery of the highly significant 1930’s kitchen interior should be maintained and conserved, while providing modern fittings and services, to maximise convenience and encourage ongoing use of the space as a kitchen.

**Policy 21 – Adaptive Re-use of the Change Rooms**
The moderately significant interiors of the change rooms can be modified as required for their adaptive re-use, including the following uses:

- Upgraded change rooms with showers, storage, mechanical ventilation, natural light, tiled finishes where needed, to encourage new usage as changing facilities
- Community meeting room
- Community office
- Kiosk
Where possible, original finishes are to be kept.

Mechanical or natural ventilation and natural light, if required, are to be provided by skylights or outlets located in the north-facing roof, part of the less significant north elevation of the building.

**Policy 22 – Adaptive Re-use of the Toilets**
The low significance interiors of the male and female toilets can be modified as required with upgraded finishes and fittings to provide hygienic, durable spaces.

Modifications can include demolition of the existing brick division wall to the toilet cubicle in each space to provide a more functional layout.

**Policy 23 – Adaptive Re-use of Shower Room**
The low significance interior of the shower room can be modified and the existing hob demolished and the space used for storage or plant.

**Policy 24 - Universally Accessible Facilities**
A unisex accessible toilet and shower can be provided in a separate pavilion on the north side of the building, adjacent the less significant north elevation.

**Policy 25 – Adjacent Elements**
The original flagged sandstone paving can be kept and maintained

**Policy 26 – Lighting**
External lighting of the tennis pavilion can be considered, in accordance with Council policy, to improve presentation of the restored building and enhance its cultural significance.
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Appendix 1 – Drawings of the Gateway Pavilion and the Tennis Pavilion
Tennis Pavilion Plan

Scale 1:100 At A3
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Appendix 2 - Paint Analysis
Gordon Recreation Ground Paint Analysis

Phillips Marler

November 10 2016
Version 1

OHM Consultants
Brief
The brief was to carry out paint scrapes of the Gordon Recreational Ground buildings exterior and the central interior room of the Tennis Pavilion fabric only.

Descriptions
The following information is displayed from paint scrapes carried out on the exterior of the gateway pavilion and the exterior and interior of the tennis pavilion. The earliest layer is numbered 1 and follows through to the latest exposed layer.

- colour continues into the next scheme
AS – Australian Standard Colour AS 2700
D – Dulux Heritage Range
S- Solver Heritage Range
B- Bristol
P – Pascol Heritage Range
L - Lime wash

The tables are laid out so that the earliest finish is listed as 1 and then subsequent layers are listed in order with the last number being the exposed finish when analysis was carried out.

Testing Method & Results
The testing method is carried out on site and outlined in the table below. Using a scalpel cutting through the decorative paint layers tests each element of the significant structures and using a microscope onsite the paint layers colours are recorded. The earliest layer is listed on the table as number 1 and works through to the exposed painted finish. The results if possible are expressed in Australian Standard Colour AS 2700.

Testing was carried out and the results were tabulated for the original parts of the buildings. Where it was found that a structure had been renewed it has been recommended that the ESB010 colour schemes be used and is attached as an appendix.

Authors
Dave McBeath
Oliver McBeath

Photographs
Dave McBeath
Oliver McBeath
Gordon Recreation Reserve
Gateway Pavilion & Tennis Pavilion

NOTES

Externally the following fabric has been renewed;
- Fascia

*Original decorative layer on the gateway pavilion is not a true paint and a nominated colour has been used. Archival records show this as "Brickwork and concrete bagged over with cement and sand and coloured two coats lime and tallow.
**Terracotta tile with no paint.
***Brick with no paint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample no.</th>
<th>Layer 1</th>
<th>Layer 2</th>
<th>Layer 3</th>
<th>Layer 4</th>
<th>Layer 5</th>
<th>Layer 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pier dado</td>
<td>Terra cotta**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS G 55 Lichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Soffit</td>
<td>AS B 51 Periwinkle</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS G 55 Lichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fascia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pink primer</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS G 55 Lichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS G 12 Holly</td>
<td>AS G 12 Holly</td>
<td>AS Y 34 Cream</td>
<td>AS G 53 Banksia</td>
<td>AS Y 34 Cream</td>
<td>AS Y 44 Sand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manufacturers of:
- Metal Primers 210
- Air Dry Enamels 300 / 390 / 420
- Hammerfinishes 350
- One Coat Primer / Topcoat 215
- Etch Primer 280
- Spraycans 405

- Iso Free Two-Pack Primers 722
- Iso Free Two-Pack Topcoat 720 / 820
- Hi Build Primers 724 / 221
- Wood Primers 291
- Hi Temperature Coatings 360 / 252
- Thinners

Sunset Pink  P21  Ribbon Pink  P33  Lilac  P23  Powder Blue  B32  Pale Blue  B25  Mist Blue  B33  Smoke Blue  T33
Rose Pink  R25  Jacaranda  P34  Winteria  PK3  Bluebell  B32  Aqua  B35  Sky Blue  B45  Huac-Green  T32
Mulberry  P42  Cyclamen  P32  Ultramarine  B31  Purple Blue  B42  Paradise Blue  B34  Light Grey Blue  B44  Oriented Blue  T22
Ruby  R53  Violet  P13  Royal Blue  B32  Sapphire  B54  Bright Blue  B23  Charcoal  B64  Mountain Blue  T51
Crimson  R55  Mason  R65  Coral Sea  B61  Navy Blue  B33  Mid Blue  B15  Midnight Blue  B62  Teal  T63

Glacier  G42  Surf Green  G43  Lily Green  Y31  Linen  G35  Barknla  G13
Green Ivy  T35  Opaline  G22  Crystal Green  G47  Fern Green  G47  Chartreuse  G45  Oyster  N41  Green Grey  N32
Storm Grey  N42  Coastundra  T45  Serpentine  G25  Lettuce  G31  Citronella  G45  Avocado  G34  Mist Green  G34
Blue Gum  T44  Verdipis  G31  Bluetsk  G37  Apple Green  G26  Ki-Boy  G16  Sage Green  G16  Eucalyptus  C22

Blue Jade  T42  Spruce  C51  Lawn Green  G41  Shennock  G33  Lime Green  C35  Ti-Tree  G65  Rivurnum  G62

Turquoise  T15  Mint Green  G17  Hydrushesh Green  G17  Fern Green  G24  Olive  G25  Bronze Olive  Y51  Slate  C14
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Appendix 3 – NSW Heritage Data Forms
## Heritage Data Form

**ITEM DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Item</th>
<th>Gateway Pavilion, Gordon Recreation Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Name/s Former Name/s</td>
<td>Gateway Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item type (if known)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item group (if known)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item category (if known)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, Group, or Collection Name</td>
<td>Public Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street number</td>
<td>63a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street name</td>
<td>Werona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb/town</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Areas</td>
<td>Ku-ring-gai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property description</td>
<td>Gordon Recreation Ground is an amalgam of Deposited Plans DP 308363, DP 1094404 and DP 2367.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location - Lat/long</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location - AMG (if no street address)</td>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Public Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>Public Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of significance</td>
<td>The 1923 gateway pavilion has high local significance for its association with the architectural firm of Wilson, Neave and Berry, and with William Hardy Wilson in particular, and because it is the only known local example of a park entry designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style. Aside from the substitution of original roof shingles with terracotta tiles, and altered paint finishes, the original fabric is largely intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>State [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Data Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Wilson, Neave and Berry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builder/ maker</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Physical Description | The 1923 gateway pavilion is located on the western park boundary to Werona Avenue. It is open on the west and east elevations and enclosed on the north and south elevations. It is approximately 3150 x 2000 in plan dimensions, with approximate heights of 2500 to the eaves and 3500 to the roof ridge. With its simple symmetrical form, engaged piers with capitals and hipped roof, it can be classified as being of the Interwar Georgian Revival style. North and south elevations: The two side walls of the gateway pavilion are constructed in 110mm single skin brickwork with 230 x 230mm engaged brick piers at each end. Brickwork is bagged. The upper sections of the walls consist of cast concrete grilles with an open criss-cross pattern. Running above the top of the grilles are cast concrete lintel beams which support the roof. West and east elevations: These elevations are open. Across the top of each opening are cast concrete lintel beams which support the roof. Fixed below the lintel beam on the west elevation facing Werona Avenue is a 200mm deep timber sign board. Roof: The roof is timber-framed with a hipped form and is clad in French pattern terracotta roof tiles. It has timber fascias and the eaves and soffit are clad in asbestos cement sheeting with expressed timber battens. There are no eaves gutters. Adjacent elements: There are 110mm rendered brick wing walls to planting beds facing Werona Avenue. The wing walls are not shown on the original Wilson, Neave and Berry drawing and may have been added during the construction stage. The end of one of the wing walls has had its engaged pier removed. Two large Cypress pines in the planting beds partially obscure the edge of the street elevation. On the park side, there are 110mm rendered walls flanking sandstone steps. The paving is sandstone flags in a random pattern. There is a large eucalypt close to the northwest wing wall. | 3.1.2 Condition | The gateway pavilion structure is in fair condition. There is some lifting of paint and cracking in the render. The large eucalypt close to the north-west wing wall is causing the wall to crack. The engaged pier is missing from the end of the north-west wing wall. Roof cladding: The French pattern terracotta roof tiles are not original. The original tiles would have been clay shingles. The evidence for this is:  
- The specification on the 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion nominates “shingle tiles with plain half-round ridging”. (Refer Fig. 2.16)  
- A photograph taken circa 1983 shows red clay shingle tiles. (Refer Fig. 2.18)  
- A photograph of the gateway pavilion on the inventory sheet from the 1987 Municipality of Ku-ring-gai Heritage Study shows shingle tiles. (Refer Fig 2.19) |
Eaves gutter: There is no eaves gutter. It is probable that originally there was an eaves gutter. The evidence for this is:

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows and specifies an eaves gutter with a spitter downpipe. (Refer Fig. 2.16)
- There is a separate Wilson, Neave and Berry original large scale eaves detail drawing; showing a gutter as well as a timber scotia trim beneath the gutter. (Refer Fig. 3.7)

Sign Board: There is an existing timber sign board without lettering on the west elevation.

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows “Gordon Recreation Ground” painted onto the sign board. (Refer Fig. 2.16)
- There is a separate Wilson, Neave and Berry original large scale sign board detail drawing setting out the lettering. (Refer Fig. 3.8)

Gates: There are no gates to the existing gateway pavilion. Originally gates would have been installed. The evidence for this is:

- The 1923 Wilson, Neave and Berry main original working drawing of the gateway pavilion shows and specifies timber gates. (Refer Fig. 2.16)
- The original steel hanging pins for the gates are still in the brick piers. (Refer Fig. 3.9)

Interestingly, there is another drawing of timber gates held in the William Hardy Wilson architectural drawing collection in the National Library of Australia. (Refer Fig. 3.11) The gate design on this drawing is identical to the gate design on the Wilson, Neave and Berry drawing for the gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground. (Refer Fig. 3.10) Clearly Hardy Wilson had a decisive influence on the gate design for the gateway pavilion. This was an in-house gate style used by the firm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction years</th>
<th>Start year</th>
<th>Finish year</th>
<th>Circa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modifications and dates</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The French pattern terracotta roof tiles are not original. The original tiles would have been clay shingles and were replaced in 1987.
The original timber gates have been removed, date unknown.
The original eaves gutters have been removed, date unknown.

Further comments
Gordon Recreation Ground was part of this early wave of park and open space development in the new garden suburb.

Ku-ring-gai Shire Council, which had been formed in 1906, confirmed the appointment of the ‘Gordon Recreation Ground Advisory Committee’ in June 1922.\(^3\) The Sydney Morning Herald reported the official opening on 12 November 1922 of the Gordon Recreation Ground by the then Shire President, Councillor McIntosh. (Refer Fig.2.1)

### 2.1.2 Gordon Recreation Ground Design Competition

The same Herald article noted that there was a:

“...display of eight competitive designs for a combined tennis and bowling pavilion, for gates and for a children's summerhouse, sent in by architects resident in Ku-ring-gai Shire, at the request of the advisory committee. The first prize of 12 ponds, 12 shillings was awarded to Mr John Berry, of Gordon, for a Georgian design..”

John Berry was a partner in the architectural firm Wilson, Neave and Berry and had joined the firm two years earlier in 1920. Wilson Neave and Berry designed a number of buildings in the Ku-ring-gai area, culminating in the Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers in 1928.

A copy of the original 1922 Wilson Neave and Berry competition drawing for the Gordon Recreation Reserve is held by the Mitchell Library. (Refer Fig. 2.2) It shows:

- A double-sided, rendered brick pavilion building with tiled hip roofs and typical Georgian symmetrical main elevations with pilasters and twelve-pane windows. The building provides a tennis clubroom and verandah on one side and a bowlers club room and verandah on the other side, along with locker rooms, sports room, toilets and kitchen. An estimated cost of $725 pounds is noted on the drawing.

- A children's summer house, with a tiled pyramidal roof and weather vane, open on three sides with seating. (Refer Fig.2.4)

- A ‘gate features’ (gateway pavilion) design with a hipped tiled roof, walls with engaged piers, concrete screens and double timber gates, in a Georgian style. (Refer Fig.2.3) Two gateway pavilions were proposed, one at the western entry from Werona Avenue and the other at the eastern entry from Rosedale Road.

### William Hardy Wilson and the Inter-War Georgian Revival Style

William Hardy Wilson, the most well-known and influential partner in the architectural firm Wilson, Neave and Berry, was primarily responsible for the revival of the Georgian Style of architecture in Australia in the 1920’s.

Wilson travelled with Stacey Neave extensively in Europe and in the United States where he admired American Colonial architecture, both original and revived.

Setting up practice with Neave in George Street Sydney in 1913, Hardy Wilson was determined to make Australians as aware of their colonial architectural heritage as Americans had become of theirs.
He began to make drawings of early nineteenth century colonial buildings in New South Wales and Tasmania, which culminated in the publication of the highly influential *Old Colonial Architecture in New South Wales and Tasmania* in 1924. (Refer Figs 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11)

The 1923 gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Reserve by Wilson, Neave and Berry is designed in the Interwar Georgian style which recreates characteristics of old colonial Georgian style. This style is characterised by symmetry, simplicity, clarity, regular repetitive fenestration and multi-paned windows, reasonable proportions and a restrained classicism.

Wilson’s architectural commissions consisted almost entirely of houses. Two of his best-known works, *Eryldene*, Gordon, (refer Fig. 2.6) completed in 1914 for linguist and Camelia expert Professor E.G Waterhouse and his own home, *Purulia*, Wahroonga, (refer Fig. 2.7) completed in 1916, exemplify his admiration for early colonial Georgian architecture.  

Wilson contributed to newspapers and to journals, such as *Art in Australia* and influenced many Australian architects in the 1920’s and 1930’s to practice in the Interwar Georgian Revival style, combining elements of early Australian colonial and British Georgian. Wilson also travelled to China in 1921 and greatly admired traditional Pekinese architecture. He became interested in evolving a new style that combined the best of Western classical and Oriental influences. One of his last commissions was the small Chinese tea house, built at *Eryldene* in 1927. (Refer Fig. 2.14)

Wilson’s partner, John Berry was almost certainly the direct designer of the gateway pavilion. Berry is reported in the Sydney Morning Herald as the winner of the design competition. Never the less, the Entry Gate, designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival style, can be deduced to be strongly influenced by Wilson, to the extent that he influenced the design culture of the firm.

---

**THEMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National historical theme</th>
<th>Developing Australia’s cultural life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State historical theme</td>
<td>Activities associated with recreation and relaxation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICATION OF CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical significance SHR criteria (a)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical association</td>
<td>The gateway pavilion is locally significant for its association with the architectural firm of Wilson, Neave and Berry, of whom William Hardy Wilson is the most well-known practitioner. The gateway pavilion was part of the firms winning entry into a 1922 design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Heritage Data Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition for new buildings at Gordon Recreation Ground, an unusual means of procuring park structures by a local Council. Of these park buildings, only the gatehouse was built. Wilson, Neave and Berry were responsible for a number of new houses in the local area in the 1910's and 1920's as well the landmark Ku-ring-gai Council Chambers (1928). The gateway pavilion at Gordon Recreation Reserve is the only known example of a park entry structure designed by Wilson, Neave and Berry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic Significance</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The gateway pavilion is locally significant in demonstrating the aesthetic characteristics of the Interwar Georgian Revival style of architecture, of which William Hardy Wilson, of Wilson Neave and Berry, was the most important advocate. Two houses in the local area designed by Wilson, <em>Eryldene</em>, Gordon (1914) and his own home, <em>Purulia</em>, Wahroonga (1916), exemplify the style. With its simple symmetrical form, hipped roof and engaged piers with capitals, the gateway pavilion is a fine example of a park entry structure designed in the Georgian Revival style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Significance</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional information provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical/Research Significance</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional information provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarity</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Gateway Pavilion is assessed to have rarity value. Research of Wilson, Neave and Berry’s architectural projects has not revealed a similar or identical built structure designed by them for a park setting. In addition, there are no other park entry structures designed in the Interwar Georgian Revival Style in the Ku-ring-gai area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>SHR Criteria (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional information provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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## HERITAGE LISTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage listing/s</th>
<th>The Gateway Pavilion has no listing at local or state level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INFORMATION SOURCES

Include conservation and/or management plans and other heritage studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author/Client</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Study</td>
<td>Robert Moore, Penelope Pike Helen Proudfoot, and Lester Tropman and Associates</td>
<td>Municipality of Ku-ring-gai Heritage Study</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Ku-ring gai Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## SOURCE OF THIS INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of study or report</th>
<th>Gateway Pavilion and Tennis Pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground</th>
<th>Year of study or report</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item number in study or report</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of study or report</td>
<td>Phillips Marler Landscape Architecture, Architecture and Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspected by</td>
<td>Alison Walker, Principal Landscape Architect Ku-ring-gai Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Heritage Manual guidelines used?</td>
<td>Yes ✅</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| This form completed by | Julie Marler, Co-Partner Phillips Marler | Date | 9/12/16 |
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IMAGES - 1 per page

Please supply images of each elevation, the interior and the setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image caption</th>
<th>Gateway Pavilion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image year</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image by</td>
<td>Phillips Marler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image copyright holder</td>
<td>Phillips Marler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Gateway Pavilion Image]
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## ITEM DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Item</th>
<th>Tennis Pavilion, Gordon Recreation Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Name/s</td>
<td>Tennis Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Name/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item type</td>
<td>(if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item group</td>
<td>(if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item category</td>
<td>(if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, Group, or Collection Name</td>
<td>Public Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street number</td>
<td>63a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street name</td>
<td>Werona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb/town</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Area/s</td>
<td>Ku-ring-gai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property description</td>
<td>The park is an amalgam of Deposited Plans DP 308363, DP 1094404 and DP 2387.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location - Lat/long</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location - AMG (if no street address)</td>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Public Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>Public Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of significance</td>
<td>The 1936 tennis pavilion has high local significance because it is a rare example of a 1930’s sports amenities building designed in the Georgian Revival style, demonstrates the influence of architects Wilson, Neave and Berry and has a long association with tennis in the local sporting community. The fabric of the tennis pavilion is largely unaltered since the building was constructed and aside from altered paint finishes most other features are intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>State ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Data Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1936 tennis pavilion is located within the park opposite the tennis courts. It is a single storey, single-skin brickwork building with a single hipped, tiled roof, with plan dimensions of 8500 x 5000. On the south side the building contains male and female dressing rooms, a central kitchen and a small verandah. On the north side there are male and female toilets and a shower room. The construction of the external walls out of a single 110mm skin of brickwork is unusual. It was obviously done as a cost-saving measure, as part of the process of developing a second, less expensive design. With the simple symmetry of its main south wall elevation, twelve-pane and six-pane windows and single hipped roof it can be classified as being of the Interwar Georgian Revival style. (Refer Fig. 3.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main South Elevation:** The main long elevation facing the tennis courts has a small central verandah, flanked by the walls to the male and female dressing rooms, each with its twelve-pane window. The windows to the kitchen, either side of a central door, are six-pane. The walls have a face brick plinth with stucco applied in a random swirl pattern above the plinth. There is a dado line running around the building at door and window head height. Windows are double-hung or fixed. Doors into the kitchen and dressing rooms are three panel.

**Secondary Elevations:** The north, east and west walls all have the face brick plinth with stucco finish and dado line above. There is 8-pane window and a three-panel door into the store room on the south elevation. Smaller windows into the toilets are fixed glass louvres. All brick walls, windows and doors to the elevations are original.

**Roof:** The roof is timber-framed with a hipped form and is clad in French pattern terracotta roof tiles. It has timber fascias and the eaves and soffit are clad in asbestos cement sheeting with expressed timber battens. There is a chamfered timber beam and decorative timber brackets supporting the roof over the verandah. (Refer Fig. 3.18)

**Terracotta roof tiles:** It is probable these are original. The evidence for this is: The original Council drawing of the first design for the tennis pavilion shows terracotta roof tiles. It is probable these were also specified for the final built design.

**Eaves gutters:** There are no eaves gutters. Originally the building probably had eaves gutters. The evidence for this is: The original Council drawing of the first design for the tennis pavilion shows eaves gutters, with timber trims shown below the gutters. This indicates that the designer may have copied the eaves gutter detail from the gateway pavilion as the original Wilson Neave and Berry eaves detail drawing for the gateway pavilion shows a timber scotia trim below the gutter. Since the first tennis pavilion design had an eaves gutter, it is probable the second, final design also had one.

**Adjacent elements:** There are rendered screen walls to the stepped entries of the male and female toilets. These are not original and were later additions. The paving around the building is sandstone flags in a random pattern.
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#### 3.2.2 Description - Internal Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Timber boards</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber lockers, Original enamel sink top and Original notice board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.19 &amp; 3.20)</td>
<td>Timber quad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Change Room</td>
<td>Timber boards</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original clothes hook board, Laminated bench and sink Trapdoor in floor with access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.21, 3.22, 3.23)</td>
<td>Timber rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Change Room</td>
<td>Timber boards</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original clothes hook board, Original enamel corner basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.24, 3.25)</td>
<td>Timber quad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Toilets</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber boarded door to toilet cubicle Corner basin Urinal Toilet pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.28, 3.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Toilets</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>Asbestos cement with timber battens Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Original timber boarded door to toilet cubicle Corner basin Toilet pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig’s 3.26, 3.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower Room</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Render</td>
<td>More recent fibre cement ceiling Scotia cornice</td>
<td>Concrete hob to original shower Opening in ceiling with access to roof space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fig. 3.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal timber floors, concrete floors, rendered walls and asbestos cement ceilings are all original.

#### Condition – External

**Brick walls:** The condition of the external rendered brick walls is good. There is some cracking in the face brick plinth and the stucco render. (Refer Fig 3.31) There appears to have been no alteration to the brick walls and layout of the building since it was constructed.

**Windows:** Their overall condition is fair. Some double-hung windows may require adjustment or new sash cords.

**Kitchen windows:** There are some broken panes. Windows have been boarded over. (Refer Fig.3.19)

**Male and Female Change Room Windows:** Some sashes have been altered so they have less than the original six-panels of glass. (Refer Fig’s 3.23 & 3.25)

**Male and Female Toilet windows:** Some of the fixed glass louvres are broken or missing. (Refer Fig. 3.28)

**Doors:** Their overall condition is fair

**Male Change Room door:** This is hung in the wrong direction
**Female Change Room door:** The mounting (vertical frame) is damaged

There appears to be no visible evidence of substantial damage or deterioration to the timber doors and...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction years</th>
<th>Start year</th>
<th>Finish year</th>
<th>Circa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modifications and dates</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Circa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- windows. There may be hidden termite damage.

**Roof:** The condition of the roof is fair. There appears to be no visible evidence of roof framing sag or movement. There may be hidden termite damage. Roof tiling appears to be substantially intact.

**3.2.4 Condition - Internal**

- **Timber floors:** Their overall condition is fair. 
  *Male Change Room timber floor:* Some boards are rotting. (Refer Fig. 3.22)
- **Concrete floors:** Their overall condition is fair.
- **Rendered internal walls:** Their overall condition is fair. 
  *Shower Room:* Some render is cracking and dis-coloured from water damage and/or movement. (Refer Fig. 3.30)
- **Asbestos cement ceilings:** Their overall condition is fair.
- **Female Toilets:** Evidence of water damage to part of ceiling. 
  *Fibre cement ceiling (Shower Room):* Evidence of water damage to part of ceiling. (Refer Fig. 3.30)

**Further comments**
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### Historical notes

Gordon Recreation Ground was part of this early wave of park and open space development in the new garden suburb. Ku-ring-gai Shire Council, which had been formed in 1906, confirmed the appointment of the ‘Gordon Recreation Ground Advisory Committee’ in June 1922. The Sydney Morning Herald reported the official opening on 12 November 1922 of the Gordon Recreation Ground by the then Shire President, Councillor McIntosh. (Refer Fig. 2.2)

#### The Tennis Pavilion 1935-1936

**Tennis Pavilion - First Design**

1923 - 1935: Since the construction of the gateway pavilion in 1923, little progress had been made in the provision of adequate built facilities for the Gordon Recreation Ground. The proposed bowling green had not been constructed and Wilson, Neave and Berry’s generous competition design of a combined tennis and bowling pavilion had not been implemented. The advent of the Great Depression would have put paid to such elaborate works. In the 1930’s, two of the tennis courts had been re-constructed under the relief works scheme for the local area.

**17 June 1935 letter and pavilion drawing:** By 1935, the lack of facilities in the park had come to a head. A letter from the Council Building Surveyor to the Town Clerk A. H. Hirst, reported: “In addition to the lack of sanitary lavatory accommodation at the Gordon Recreation Ground the facilities for tennis players are appalling consisting of a very small galvanised shed, which is also used as a storage shed for the park equipment.

The cost of the erection of brick and tile public lavatory conveniences for both sexes, similar to the building in Turramurra Park, connected to the sewer, would be 275 pounds. Owing to this cost consideration has been given and plans prepared, which are attached hereto, of combined facilities for tennis players and public lavatory accommodation in wood and tile with brick foundations, the design of which will be in keeping with general surroundings, at an estimated cost of 465 pounds. It is further pointed out that the lavatory conveniences at this park are of such a nature that immediate action is necessary, as female tennis players depend at present on the generosity of private owners...

The letter went on to suggest that financing of the building could be arranged under the Governments Building Relief Committee Loan Scheme.

A copy of the plans of the building “in wood and tile with brick foundations”, which accompanied the letter, is in Council records. (Refer Fig. 2.20) It is possible that the design, in Georgian Revival style with its central verandah, symmetrical elevation and twelve pane windows, was influenced by the Wilson Neave and Berry 1922 competition design for the tennis and bowling club pavilion. At the front of the 1935 design a central kitchen is flanked by mens and ladies dressing rooms, with toilets at the rear. The exterior walls are clad in vertical timber boards, an unusual feature.

The drawing has a Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council, Building Surveyors Department stamp and was probably prepared by a Council designer or architect within the Building Surveyors Department, identity unknown.

#### 2.2.2 Tennis Pavilion – Second Design

**4 July 1935 letter:** The Town Clerk informs the Building Surveyor that the Council has requested the preparation of a less costly design and “that the ladies EC, at present enclosed with hessian, be enclosed with galvanised iron and painted pending a decision regarding a permanent structure.

**2 September 1935 letter:** The Parks Officer (previously referred to as a Building Surveyor) informs...
the Town Clerk that an amended design has been prepared, reducing the estimated cost from 465 pounds to 398 pounds. He recommends that quotations be obtained from local builders and an application be made to the Building Relief Committee to finance the construction.\textsuperscript{14} No drawing of this second design has been found in Council records. Again, the design was probably prepared by a Council designer or architect within the Building Surveyors Department, identity unknown.

\textbf{13 September 1935 letter}: The Town Clerk requests quotations from four local builders for the construction of "a brick pavilion and lavatory block within the Gordon Recreation Ground."\textsuperscript{15} This confirms that the second design was for the existing brick and tile tennis pavilion which stands on the site today. The layout is very similar to the first design with change rooms each side of a central kitchen, toilets at the rear and a hipped roof. It is a building in a simple Georgian Revival style with a symmetrical main elevation. The tiled roof has been simplified with the previously projecting verandah roof in the first design, pulled back.

\textbf{14 March 1936 letter}: The Town Clerk accepts the tender of $403 pounds by builder De E. F Carden from Roseville.

\textbf{4 August 1936 letter}: The Town Clerk issues the final payment under the contract to the builder. The construction of the tennis pavilion is complete.

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|p{10cm}|}
\hline
\textbf{National historical theme} & Developing Australia’s cultural life \\
\hline
\textbf{State historical theme} & Activities associated with recreation and relaxation \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|p{10cm}|}
\hline
\textbf{Historical significance} & \\
SHR criteria (a) & \\
\hline
\textbf{Historical association significance} & \\
SHR criteria (b) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
### Aesthetic significance

**SHR criteria (c)**

The tennis pavilion is locally significant in demonstrating the aesthetic characteristics of the Interwar Georgian Revival style of architecture. Although the 1936 tennis pavilion was not designed by Wilson, Neave and Berry, its design has clearly been influenced by the 1922 Wilson, Neave and Berry competition design of the tennis and bowling club pavilion. With its strong, simple, symmetrical elevation, hipped roof and multi-paned windows, the tennis pavilion is a fine example of a small 1930’s sports amenities building in the Interwar Georgian Revival style.

### Social significance

**SHR criteria (d)**

The tennis pavilion is locally significant through having an 80 year association with the playing of tennis in the Gordon Recreation Ground. Local people have been playing tennis in The Gordon Recreation Ground since 1922. The building has a strong symbolic and historic association with the amateur sporting community in the Ku-ring-gai area.

### Technical/Research significance

**SHR criteria (e)**

### Rarity

**SHR criteria (f)**

The Tennis Pavilion is assessed to have rarity value. There are no other sports amenity buildings designed in the Georgian Revival Style in the Ku-ring-gai area.

### Representativeness

**SHR criteria (g)**

### Integrity
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### Heritage Listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage listing/s</th>
<th>The entry Pavilion has no listing at local or state level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Information Sources

Include conservation and/or management plans and other heritage studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author/Client</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Study</td>
<td>Robert Moore, Penelope Pike Helen Proudfoot, and Lester Tropman and Associates</td>
<td>Municipality of Ku-ring-gai Heritage Study</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Ku-ring gai Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Source of This Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of study or report</th>
<th>Entry Pavilion and Tennis Pavilion at Gordon Recreation Ground Conservation Management</th>
<th>Year of study or report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item number in study or report</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of study or report</td>
<td>Phillips Marler Landscape Architecture, Architecture and Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspected by</td>
<td>Alison Walker, Principal Landscape Architect, Ku-ring-gai Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Heritage Manual guidelines used?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ❌</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This form completed by</td>
<td>Julie Marler, Co Partner Phillips Marler</td>
<td>Date 9/12/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image caption</th>
<th>Tennis Pavilion - South Elevation and South-East view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image year</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image by</td>
<td>Phillips Marler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image copyright holder</td>
<td>Phillips Marler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>