

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

Approvals Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING

2 March 2011

Heritage Branch,
3 Marist Place, Parramatta



PRESENT: Peter Mould (Chair), Julie Bindon, David Logan, Colin Rockliff, Petula Samios (Heritage Branch), Giovanni Cirillo (Department of Planning)

APOLOGIES: Diane Jones

ALSO PRESENT: Vincent Sicari (Heritage Branch)
Graham Williams (Heritage Branch - Minutes)
Rajeev Maini (Heritage Branch – Items 7.2 & 7.3)
Claudine Loffi (Heritage Branch – Item 5.1)

Campbell's Stores Presentation Nick Turner & Kevin Driver (Turner + Associates), Graham Brookes (Graham Brookes & Associates), Christopher Drivas & Philip Beauchamp (Dockside Group), Alfred Lai (Memule P/L) James Markham (Markham Corporation)

Commonwealth Bank Presentation Paul van Ratigen, Richard Johnson & Matthew Morel (JPW Architects) Elizabeth Crotty & Teri Esra (Commonwealth Bank) Michael Taylor & Carlo Laba (TSA Management) Megan Jones & George Phillips (Tanner Architects)

Graythwaite, Applicant's Presentation George Phillips (Tanner Architects) Dr Timothy Wright (Shore School)
Graythwaite, Community Presentation Susan Nash & Julie Bindon

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 12:05pm.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

Declarations of Interest

Ms Julie Bindon declared her interest in the property "Graythwaite" at North Sydney and advised that she would take part in a community presentation to the Committee at this meeting and absent herself from consideration of the matter.

Mr David Logan advised the Committee of his firm's interest in Campbell's Stores (agenda item 7.2) and absented himself from consideration of the matter. His firm is preparing a CMP for the property for SHFA, which owns the property, but is not the current applicant. His firm has not been involved in the current application.

Mr Logan also advised the Committee that subsequent to the 2nd February 2011 meeting he had become aware of a potential conflict of interest due to his firm's involvement with the provision of advice to the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority (SHFA) on the Lawson Menzies building. He advised that he was unaware of his firm's involvement with SHFA regarding the issue at the time of the February meeting and was (and still is) not aware of the nature of any advice given. The Committee was advised that the Heritage Branch would seek advice from the Department of Planning's Legal Branch on whether there is any need for the Approvals Committee to reconsider the issue in these circumstances.

2. Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of 2 February 2011

Members had each received a copy of the minutes of the last meeting of the Approvals Committee, held on 2 February 2011. It was noted that the minutes of the meeting of 1st December 2010 had incorrectly recorded the Committee Chair as being Mr David Logan instead of correctly Mr Peter Mould.

Mr Logan acted as Chair, in Mr Mould's absence, for the meeting of 2nd February 2011.

Meeting minutes have been corrected in accordance with the Committee's advice.

Resolved:

The Committee resolved that the Minutes of the meeting of 2 February 2011 be adopted.

3. Action Report

Members each received a copy of the action report detailing actions since the last meeting of the Approvals Committee.

Resolved:

That the Action Report, noting actions undertaken since the meeting of 2 February 2011, be adopted.

4. Presentations

4.1 Currawong State Heritage Register listed item No. 00557 – Provision of additional information

A presentation on this issue had been proposed and was included as an item in the agenda provided to the Committee in the week before this meeting. Prior to the meeting being held the matter was deferred for the consideration of the full Heritage Council on 6th April 2011.

4.2 Campbell's Stores, Circular Quay, Sydney. State Heritage Register listed item No. 01536 – Pre DA Presentation

A presentation on this proposal preceded the Approvals Committee's discussion of the proposal (see item 7.2)

4.3 Bloomfield Hospital, Ronald McDonald House SHR item No. 1745 - Pre DA

A presentation on this issue had been proposed and included as an item in the agenda provided to the Committee in the week before this meeting. Prior to the meeting the applicants decided not to make a presentation to the Committee.

4.4 Commonwealth Bank at 48-50 Martin Place, Sydney. State Heritage Register item No. 01427 - Pre DA (Upper Office Floors)

A presentation on this proposal preceded the Approvals Committee's discussion of the proposal (see item 7.3)

**4.5 Graythwaite, Union Street, North Sydney
State Heritage Register item No. 01617
- Part 3A Application**

Two presentations on this proposal preceded the Approvals Committee's discussion of the proposal (see item 6.1)

**5.0 Integrated Development Applications/Section 60 and 132
Applications/Section 140 Excavation permits**

5.1 The Bogey Hole, Shortland Esplanade, Newcastle - Section 60

The issue is whether the contemporary design of a proposed safety upgrade, including new stairs, netting and platforms, will have an acceptable impact on The Bogey Hole, a 19th Century ocean pool, hewn from a rock platform.

The Committee was advised that the proposal had been placed on public exhibition, for three weeks, with a closing date for submissions of 9th March 2011. Several submissions had been received to date, all objecting to the proposal.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee's direction was sought on this matter for a delegated decision to be made following the 9th March closure of the public exhibition period.

Some difficulties were experienced by the Committee in the interpretation of details in the submitted diagrams and plans. It was clarified to the Committee that the material proposed for stair balustrades is a wire mesh, as this detail was not able to be interpreted from the proposal diagrams.

The Committee did not object to the overall concept for the proposed safety upgrade, however, it agreed that clearer drawings were required from the applicant to better inform the making of a delegated decision.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council:

- 1. Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that it considers a contemporary approach to the design of the stair and viewing platform to be acceptable;**
- 2. Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that it considers the design as currently proposed has a potential to impact adversely on the significance of the item;**
- 3. Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that it considers the design should be as simple as possible and more restrained. In this regard it is considered the size of the platforms should be reconsidered;**
- 4. Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that the applicant should develop the detail of the design drawings and review the assessment of impacts of the works. This information is to be submitted for approval by the Heritage Branch before work commences;**
- 5. Delegate this application and decision to the Heritage Branch after considering the public submissions received up until the closing date.**

5.2 Windsor Railway Station – Upgrade – Section 60

The application concerns a major upgrade of Windsor Station aimed to improve public and staff facilities and amenities.

The proposal includes changing the original function of the Station building from ticketing and waiting rooms to RailCorp staff offices and leased commercial facilities. New ticket office, station canopies, public facilities and access routes are also proposed.

The station's platform is of lower height than current standards. The application includes raising the height of the platform, to match that of the entrance vestibule floor-level of suburban railway carriages to comply with safety standards.

As the proposed changes were considered to have a major impact on the heritage significance of the Station Group, the proposal had, accordingly, been publicly advertised. The submission period closes on 9th March.

The Heritage Council was asked to provide comment on the application and to give delegation of approval to the Director, Heritage Branch.

The Committee considered that further detail was required on adaptation works to the original station building.

The Committee did not object to the overall concept for the proposed safety upgrade. It agreed that clearer drawings were required from the applicant to better inform the making of a delegated decision.

Resolved

That the Heritage Council:

- 1. Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that it supports 'in principle' the proposed design of the new station building subject to due consideration being given to public submissions once they have been received;**

2. **Advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that further detail should be submitted especially in relation to works that could have an impact on the original fabric of Windsor Station. This information is to be submitted for approval by the Heritage Branch before work commences.**
3. **The detailed drawings mentioned in the above advice should include;**
 - a) **Comprehensive plans outlining the changes to external and internal fabric of the original station building and its proposed use;**
 - b) **The methodology of the treatment of original fabric from the station building which will enable them to maintain their integrity and intactness under the new surfaces and finishes.**
 - c) **A reconsideration of the proposed palettes of colours and finishes to the new building to be more sympathetic and to better tie in to the overall station setting;**
 - d) **An Interpretation strategy undertaken by a qualified Interpretation Consultant and an agreement to implement it within one year of works being completed.**
 - e) **A Conservation Management Strategy which outlines policies guiding major works to the precinct regarding adaptive reuse of the station building, signage, fencing, new finishes and fabric, demolition needs to be provided.**
4. **Delegate this application and decision to the Heritage Branch after considering the public submissions received up until the closing date.**

6. Development Application Referrals and Major Project Application Referrals under Part 3A of EP&A Act

6.1 "Graythwaite", Union Street, North Sydney – Comments on Part 3A

The Committee received two presentations, firstly from the applicant and secondly from a community group, on the proposal for the Sydney Church of England Grammar School (SCEGS) "Shore" to redevelop portions of the site and adaptively restore "Graythwaite" house for school administration.

The applicant's presentation provided a "Powerpoint" display of recent and some period photographs of the property, artist's impressions of proposed new buildings in their settings and diagrams of the site and proposed new buildings and landscaping proposals.

In regard to building issues the presenters advised the Committee that the restored Graythwaite house would be used for the administration of the school, that the ward building is proposed for demolition for the construction new school buildings whilst a new building of four levels, overall, is proposed to the west of Graythwaite house in a previously undeveloped site. This building is proposed to, in part cut into the topography in this area to place parts of the building below the natural ground levels. The Committee was advised that the Tom O'Neill building is proposed for adaptation, in the short term, as music rooms. In the longer term it is proposed to replace this building with a purpose-built structure of the same building footprint.

On groundworks the Committee was advised that the proposal aims to retain or reinstate, by selective undergrowth and plant removal, the sight-lines to and from

Graythwaite house. A new "period-style" fence and gateway to the present drive is proposed on the Union Street frontage.

The community presentation focused on community concerns regarding the removal or survival of trees and other plantings, on site archaeology, views to the property, community access and building heights. It was stated to the Committee that eighty trees are proposed for removal with six palms, located at the front of the house, to be relocated, although a new location has not been specified. Concerns were expressed to the Committee on the survival of a sizable planting of bamboo near the area proposed for the new western building.

The Committee was shown photographs of a largely overgrown water cistern which it was stated is not detailed in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP).

Concerns for possible effects on the water table and subsequent possible effects on the health significant trees were also mentioned.

Following the community presentation Ms Bindon left the Committee room whilst the Committee discussed the issue.

The Committee agreed that it had no objection to the proposals for the restoration of Graythwaite house and the former coach house. The Committee further agreed that the views into the property from Union Street are important and that the design and materials of new fencing and gates should allow views to be retained. The Committee considered that the current CMP is not adequate and that an appropriate interpretation of the site is required. The Committee's agreed position that further information is required is detailed in the following resolution.

Resolved:

That, in relation to the received Part 3A Concept Plan and Project Application for the Graythwaite House site, the Heritage Council provides the following advice to the Department of Planning:

- 1. In relation to the works on Graythwaite House, the Heritage Council supports the Part 3A Stage 1 Project Application in principle. Further detail is required on the proposed site levelling and landscaping works for approval prior to works commencing on site.**
- 2. The Heritage Council is not prepared to endorse the Statement of Commitments as it currently stands as there is insufficient information for the appropriate assessment of heritage impacts. Specifically, the Heritage Council considers that:**
 - a) The Conservation Management Plan should be reviewed and amended to fully reflect the heritage significance of the site. In particular the significance of the cultural landscape of the upper terrace and the Tom O'Neil Building should be reviewed.**
 - b) The landscape plan should identify the exceptional and highly significant plantings of all phases of development.**
 - c) A full assessment of the archaeological significance of the site should be undertaken and submitted for further review.**
 - d) Insufficient information has been provided to allow the Heritage Council to appropriately assess the adequacy of the Planning Parameters.**
 - e) Specifically, insufficient information has been received to appropriately assess the impact on Graythwaite House and its**

setting from the proposed new buildings in terms of direct impacts on the landscape significance of the site and on the views to and from Graythwaite House itself.

- f) The Gates in Union Street should be detailed so as to not impede significant views to the Graythwaite site.**
 - g) The east building may be acceptable provided it is no closer to Graythwaite House than existing ward building and no higher than the eaves of Graythwaite House itself.**
 - h) The general location of the west building may be acceptable, but the building itself is considered to be too bulky and too close to the coach house.**
 - i) As currently shown, the west building is considered to potentially impact on the significant landscape of the site. It appears that significant trees may be impacted by the building itself while the manner in which the building is connected to the Tom O'Neil Building has the potential of impacting on the significant landscape in the vicinity of Graythwaite House.**
 - j) Views to the site from the west and the setting of Graythwaite House may be unduly impacted by the height of the proposed west building which appears to be of a total 5 storeys in height on the western side.**
 - k) There does not appear to be sufficient substantiation for the removal of the Tom O'Neil Building in the Stage 3 works.**
 - l) There is insufficient information to allow the Heritage Council to appropriately assess the impact of the proposed development in the lower terrace as noted in the Planning Parameters.**
 - m) The Statement of Heritage Impact should be reviewed once the Conservation Management Plan has been amended in accordance with the above advice.**
- 3. The Heritage Council would be pleased to review any application amended in accordance with the above advice.**

7.0 Matters for Consideration

At this point Ms Bindon returned to the meeting and resumed her role as a member of the Approvals Committee

7.1 "Currawong", provision of additional information

It was noted that this matter had been withdrawn from the Approvals Committee agenda for referral to the consideration of the full Heritage Council at its meeting of 6th April 2011. It was further noted that the sub-committee would meet at 9.00 am, on Tuesday, 15th March, at Mr Peter Mould's Office, the McKell Building, Sydney.

7.2 Campbell's Stores, Circular Quay West, Sydney - Pre DA

Campbell's Stores, dating from the early 19th Century, comprises a terrace of eleven gable-fronted, three-storey high bays. The former storehouses, now in use as restaurants are located in a significant heritage site at west Circular Quay, adjacent to the Overseas Passenger Terminal.

The redevelopment scheme for Campbell's Stores, referred to the Committee for comment prior to the lodgment of a Development Application, proposed the construction of a two-storey steel and glass verandah along the full eastern façade of Campbell's Stores, a new steel and glass façaded building at the northern end, glass elements at the southern end and a steel and glass canopy on the Hickson Road frontage.

The Applicant provided a "powerpoint" display of diagrams, period and recent photographs and photomontages of the aspects of the proposal.

In its discussion, following the presentation, the Committee agreed that it had no objections to the removal of several items dating from the late 1980s refurbishment of the stores and west Circular Quay area. These being the removal of the raised "podium" on the harbour frontage, returning the ground level to the original, the removal of the simulated "ships' masts", the ground floor marquees and the disguised exhaust ducting on the southern wall of the last store.

The Committee considered that the application of a glass and steel frame terrace canopy for the length of the harbour-side façade would render it harder to discern the rhythm of the stores building. The Committee further agreed that the architecture and rhythm could be better appreciated if the canopy were not continuous. A suggested solution is recorded in the resolution below, point 3.

The Committee also considered that the use of glass panelling at the stores terrace southern end is excessive. Similarly the proposed new north-end structure was also considered to be excessive in the use of some glass elements in its design. These concerns are reflected in points 5 and 6 of the resolution.

Resolved

That the Heritage Council advise the Applicant and the Heritage Branch that:

- 1. With the information currently available, it considers that the proposal has some merit;**
- 2. Nevertheless, it is considered that the proposed terrace canopy should respond more strongly to the rhythm of the Stores building and should not be continuous.**
- 3. It is considered that the horizontality of the proposal should be broken by way of the possible deletion of some of the canopy bays.**
- 4. A solution should be investigated which deletes the end bays and each third bay of the canopy structure.**
- 5. The proposed new building at the north end of the site may be acceptable in principle but its design should be reconsidered to respond better to the adjacent heritage building, especially in relation to the rhythm of its façade and the excessive amount of glass being used.**
- 6. The proposed new entry structure at the south end of the site should be reduced in scale and simplified, with the area of glass reduced.**
- 7. The Heritage Council notes that the proposal will be advertised by the Heritage Branch in due course and all submissions and other information available at the time of assessment will be appropriately considered.**

**7.3 Commonwealth Bank at 48-50 Martin Place, Sydney.
State Heritage Register item No. 01427
- Pre DA (Upper Office Floors)**

The Committee received a presentation on proposals for the internal remodelling of the buildings upper floors for future use as "high-end" office accommodation.

Using a display of historic and recent photographs, photo-montages and building layout diagrams the Applicant advised the Committee of the general refurbishment scheme to remove or modify a number of internal changes made in the 1980s. These primarily concerned the replacement of air-conditioning equipment and lowered ceilings, reopening the original stairwells and improved lighting in the upper floors and the reversal of several modifications on the main banking chamber.

The Committee noted the presenters advice that original ceiling panelling and detailing (as displayed in 1920s photographs) to the ceilings of the upper floors accommodation had been totally removed in the 1980s refurbishment and that there was no plan to reinstate these features. Instead the new lighting and air-conditioning beams are intended to enable the original ceiling height to be recreated and to reflect the overall pattern of the lost original ceilings in a modern interpretation. The Committee was advised that the removal of the lowered ceilings in this scheme would also serve to restore the original glass area of the original windows.

The Committee was further advised that with removal of the 1980s air-conditioning plant it has been proposed to create a new roof-top plant-room. Photo-montages of the proposed plant room were displayed to illustrate the visual effect of this from several vantage points on the ground and on the roof.

In their discussion, following the presentation, the Committee recorded their appreciation of the presentation and that the general refurbishment concept appears acceptable. The Committee, however, noted that the presentation had displayed concepts and that there was as yet no detailed information or plans which the Committee could assess and make definitive comment.

The Committee concurred that further detailed information is required on the height and layout of the proposed plant room and of the glass bridge and that the applicant should have further discussions with the Heritage Branch on these details.

Resolved

That the Heritage Council:

- 1. Thank the applicant for the excellent presentation.**
- 2. Request the applicant to liaise with the Heritage Branch during the design development of this important project.**
- 3. Advise the applicant that it looks forward to receiving an application in due course.**

**7.4 Bloomfield Hospital, (Orange Base Hospital) Ronald McDonald House
SHR item No. 1745
- Pre DA**

The applicant, Ronald McDonald House (RMH), has sought to construct 20 family accommodation units, in two stages, to provide low cost accommodation for the

families of seriously ill children being treated at Orange Base Hospital. A development application was referred by Orange City Council for pre-lodgement advice. An IDA has now been lodged.

Although the applicant had requested the opportunity to make a presentation, it was agreed that this was unnecessary.

The design of the units consists of simple, single storey units, in groups of four, joined by covered walkways. A common kitchen/living/entertainment block forms the largest component of this development proposal. The development will require the relocation of an existing tennis court and the removal of 26 trees of various significance grading.

Bloomfield Hospital was built in the 1920s as a purpose-built mental hospital complex. Each building for patients had an associated formal garden with views over the institutions northern parklands. The Orange Base Hospital was subsequently constructed near the Bloomfield Hospital on a portion of the parklands

The subject site is located within the Bloomfield Hospital SHR curtilage in an area previously used as Institutional Parkland. The Conservation Management Plan states that built forms in this area should be avoided however if necessary should be "low scale, well spaced and articulated". The applicant considers that the proposed design addresses these criteria.

The Committee was advised that the Heritage Branch considers that the proposed development will impact on the heritage significance of the site and the character of the Institutional Parkland, however, a precedent has been set for substantial redevelopment of this Parkland area through the 2006 Part 3A approval for the expansion of Orange Base Hospital. It was also recognised that the location of this facility is determined by the need to be near to the Base Hospital.

The Committee concurred that it gives "in principle" support to the proposal and agreed to the following resolution.

Resolved

That the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

- 1. Provide 'in principle' support for the proposed development.**
- 2. Provide delegation to the Heritage Branch for determination of any IDA submitted by Ronald McDonald House for development described in this report.**
- 3. Endorse the preparation of letters to NSW Health Central and Regional Directors reiterating the Committee's prior resolution and the Part 3A condition of consent for the preparation of a Management Strategy.**
- 4. Advise the Department of Health that to enable further applications to be considered a management strategy must be submitted to, and approved by, the Heritage Council.**

8.0 Matters for Information

Nil

9.0 General Business -

Protocols

In view of the increasing number of proposal presentations being requested by applicants and the number of applicant attendees at presentations the Committee reviewed the protocols for presentations.

The Committee agreed that there should be a maximum of four people present in any one presentation group and of this group there would be a maximum of two presenters.

A maximum of 15 minutes would be available for the presentation.

The Committee agreed that only in exceptional circumstances would a pre-DA be included in the agenda and only if appropriate information were available to the Branch for the writing of an advisory paper. A presentation on a pre-DA would need to be agreed to by the Chair.

The briefing of the Committee Chair of proposed agenda items, prior to the setting of the meeting agenda, was also agreed.

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 5:50pm.

Peter Mould Chair Approvals Committee Heritage Council of NSW	Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee 6th April 2011 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	--