

# HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

## Approvals Committee

### MINUTES OF MEETING

7 June 2006

Heritage Office, 3 Marist Place, Parramatta



---

**PRESENT:** Michael Collins (Chair), Susan Macdonald (Director), Peter Mould, Chris Johnson, David Logan, Julie Bindon, Janet Dore, Diane Jones.

**APOLOGIES:** Jacqui Goddard.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Heritage Office:

Vincent Sicari, Nikki Ward, Can Ercan.

For Prince Henry site:

Mark Percy (Stockland), John Rose, (Tanner Architects), Megan Jones (Tanner Architects), Luke Maloney (Tanner Architects).

For Warby's Barn:

Glorio De Angelis (De Angelis Taylor & Associates), Daniel Donai (De Angelis Taylor & Associates).

### **1. Opening – Welcome**

---

The Chair opened the meeting at 12:45 am.

### **1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda**

---

The agenda was confirmed.

### **Declarations of Interest**

---

#### **Pecuniary Interests**

NIL

#### **Non Pecuniary Interests**

David Logan

7.2 – Marsden Rehabilitation Centre – Pre-DA  
(wrote addendum to CMP)

#### **Conflicts of Interest**

David Logan

5.1 – Artisans' Cottages – Prince Henry Site – IDA  
(consultant for Prince Henry Site)

Peter Mould

7.2 – Marsden Rehabilitation Centre – Pre-DA  
(Department of Commerce is applicant)

---

## **2.0 Confirmation of Minutes**

---

### **2.1 Approvals Committee Meetings of 3 May 2006 and 16 May (Special Meeting) 2006**

---

Members received a copy of each of the minutes.

**Resolved:**

**that the Minutes of the meetings of 3 May 2006 and 16 May 2006 be adopted.**

## **3.0 Action Report**

---

Members received a copy of the action report.

**Resolved:**

**that the Action Report of the meetings of 3 May 2006 and 16 May 2006 be adopted.**

## **4 Presentations**

---

### **4.1 Artisans Cottages – (Former) Prince Henry Hospital site - IDA**

---

Megan Jones, of Tanner Architects, indicated that the Artisans Cottages (duplexes) are considered of high significance in the context of the (Former) Prince Henry Hospital site. Of the group of cottages, only 2 cottages now remain. This proposal seeks to do restoration and conservation works, as well as construct extensions to the rear of the existing cottages for residential purposes. Two additional cottages are also proposed for construction, similar in size, colour, form and character to the original cottages (in accordance with the SEPP), including their proposed extensions. Original and existing fabric of the cottages will be retained. Settings would be enhanced by individual gardens. Public views of the cottages (from the oval in front of them) will conceal visibility of the rear extensions.

John Rose, of Tanner Architects, pointed out that the roof forms of the new cottages will be made to match those of the original cottages as much as possible. Also, textures, colours and materials of the proposed extensions will aim to match the cottages, with the same colour palette running from the front to the rear of the buildings. Utilities to be installed (eg kitchens) would be where fabric has already been altered previously. While there is ample room for 3 bedrooms in the existing cottages, the drive behind adding additional space at the rear of the cottages was to accommodate contemporary sized master bedrooms, thereby creating 4 bedroom homes. The bedrooms in the existing cottages are small.

## **4.2 Warby's Barn – Variation to IDA**

---

The proponent outlined how they have met previous conditions of consent from the Approvals Committee resolutions for their meeting of 3 August 2005 (ie. Conditions 2(a), 2(c), 2(d) & 2(e)). This has been done through reducing the height of Block B, reducing the pitch and height of the roof on Block A, ensuring Block A relates to the form and mass of the barn through the use of copper, zinc and brick, and removing trees behind the barn from the plan. The articulated roof gives the appearance of extra height to the building. The space under the articulated roof will contain air conditioning vents etc. Reducing the pitch of the roof would have an adverse visual effect on neighbouring properties. Lowering of the basement car park would still leave 300mm above ground. For this reason the proponent saw no benefit in lowering the basement car park. Sandstone block walls are currently planned for use as a screen for the basement car park and a backdrop for vegetation.

## **5. Integrated Development Applications/Section 60 and 132 Applications/Section 140 Excavation permits**

---

### **5.1 Artisans Cottages – (Former) Prince Henry Hospital site - IDA**

The applicant seeks approval for alterations and additions to the existing cottages within Artisans' Cottages group of Prince Henry site, the construction of new cottages to the north and southern ends of Lot 26, relocation of existing heritage boundary wall on the northern end and general landscaping works.

The proposed rear additions are contemporary structures and impact on the heritage character of the cottages to a certain degree largely due to the fact they are 2 storey. Despite the bulk proposed for the introduced additions, a methodology has been followed by the applicant to mitigate these adverse impacts, which include reducing the scale as far as possible, use of timber cladding to refer to the heritage fabric, appropriate siting of the bulk behind the existing cottages and below existing ridge levels for visual impacts and provision of pitched roofs over the middle sections between the existing cottage and proposed addition. The bulk and size of the rear additions has been reduced from the initial application.

The proposal also includes landscaping works that provide appropriate setting for the cottages. The works involve new perimeter boundary walls, soft landscaping, driveways, planting of trees and conservation and restoration of sandstone kerbing.

**Resolved:**

**That the Heritage Council approve the application with the following conditions:**

- 1. All work shall comply with the following documentation:**
  - a) Architectural Drawings: AR/DA/00/C, AR/DA/01/C, AR/DA/02/C, AR/DA/03/C, AR/DA/04/C, AR/DA/05/C, AR/DA/06/C, AR/DA/07/C, AR/DA/08/C, AR/DA/09/C, AR/DA/10/C, AR/DA/11/C, AR/DA/12/C, AR/DA/13/C, AR/DA/14/C prepared by Tanner Architects dated 30/1/2006; B45-1, B45-2, B46-1 and B46-2 prepared by GML dated December 2004;**
  - b) Landscape Concept Drawings: DA01C, DA02C, DA03C and DA04C prepared by PSB dated 7/2/2006;**
  - c) Survey Drawings C470-0002 and C470-003 dated 5/5/2005 prepared by Whelans Pty Ltd;**
  - d) Statement of environmental effects prepared by Helen Mulcahy Urban Planning Pty Ltd dated February 2006;**
  - e) Heritage impact statement prepared by Tanner Architects dated November 2005;**
  - f) Draft Specific Elements Conservation Plan prepared by Tanner Architects dated 1/7/2005;**
  - g) Geotechnical report prepared by Douglas Partners dated May 2005;**
  - h) Sustainability building report rev.C prepared by Cundall dated 1/2/2006;**
  - i) Stormwater concept plans: C1/01/B and C1/02/A prepared by Acor Consultants Pty Ltd dated 7/2/2006;**
  - j) Draft Building Services Brief prepared by Acor Consultants Pty Ltd dated 27/1/2006;**
  - k) Structural/Civil Engineer's Certificate prepared by TTW Pty Ltd dated 31/1/2006;**
  - l) BCA Report prepared by Hendry Group Pty Ltd dated 1/12/2005;**
  - m) DCP Compliance Table.**

**Nominated Heritage Consultant**

- 2. A heritage consultant shall be nominated for the works. The consultant shall have appropriate qualifications and experience commensurate with the scope of the works. The name and experience of this consultant shall be submitted to the Heritage Office for approval with the section 60 application.**
- 3. The consultant shall advise on the detail design resolution of new elements, undertake on site heritage inductions, inspect removal works, construction of new elements, design and installation of services (to minimise impacts on significant fabric and views) and manage the implementation of the conditions of approval).**
- 4. A report by the consultant (illustrated by works' photographs) shall be submitted to the Heritage Office for approval within 3 months of the completion of the works which describes the work, any impacts/damage and corrective works carried out.**

### **Design Revisions & Further Information**

- 5. The proposed driveway of Cottage 9 shall be relocated away from the significant retaining wall and access stair (L-34) to mitigate any future damage. The revised design shall be submitted for approval with the section 60 application.**
- 6. A schedule of the proposed external colours and finishes is to be submitted to Randwick City Council for approval prior to the release of the construction certificate. To ensure that the rear extensions do not stand out, the palette of external colours and finishes should be muted.**

### **Conservation Works**

- 7. Information scheduling and describing the proposed conservation works is to be submitted to the Heritage Office for approval prior to the release of the construction certificate:**
  - a) The conservation works are to be implemented in accordance with the Artisans' Cottages Group Specific Element Conservation Policy (SECP) dated July 2005;**
  - b) The conservation works documents are to be prepared by a qualified practitioner and the work inspected by the nominated heritage consultant;**
  - c) The conservation works are to include proposed painting schedules guided by the historic colour scheme analysis and paint scapes prepared in consultation with the nominated heritage consultant;**
  - d) The works are to be undertaken by qualified contractors in accordance with the conditions of approval; and**
  - e) The conservation works are to be completed by practical completion of the construction works.**

### **Works & Site Protection**

- 8. The construction works and installation of services are to be undertaken in accordance with Draft Artisans' Cottages Specific Element Conservation Policies (SECPs) dated July 2005. In addition:**
  - a) Significant building elements, features and fragile materials shall be adequately protected during the works from potential damage;**
  - b) The demolition and removal of materials is to be carried out in such a manner as to prevent runoff, damage to or removal of significant heritage fabric;**
  - c) Significant fabric and features in the vicinity of the development and wherever construction vehicles are used are to be protected during the works;**
  - d) A methodology describing the protection of significant built and landscape elements during the work is to be prepared in consultation with and to the approval of the nominated heritage consultant. The methodology is to be included in a Master Program and Site Co-ordination Plan (or Work Plan) and submitted to Randwick Council for approval with the Construction Certificate;**
  - e) The installation of services shall be carried out in such a manner as to minimise damage to or removal of historic fabric and shall not obscure historic features;**

- f) Service runs should be grouped and concealed within the new work; and**
- g) Proposed service reticulation is to minimise interface with retained significant fabric. Penetrations through heritage fabric should be minimised.**

#### **Interpretation**

- 9. Any site specific interpretation (proposed themes and media), proposed way signage and street furniture at the Artisans' Cottages Group site are to be in accordance with the Prince Henry site Interpretation Strategy dated October 2005 prepared by Musecape and submitted to Randwick City Council for approval prior to works commencing.**

#### **Aboriginal Archaeology**

- 10. Any ground disturbance and excavation undertaken as part of the proposed works is to be undertaken in consultation with the La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council (LPLALC) and, where requested, be subject to LPLALC and archaeological monitoring.**
- 11. Should Aboriginal objects be found, the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) is to be informed (as required by the provisions of the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974). Subject to an assessment of the extent, integrity and significance of any exposed objects, applications under either Section 87 or Section 90 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act may be required before work resumes.**
- 12. Prior to the commencement of the proposed works, all contractors and relevant personnel involved are to be made aware of the existence of Aboriginal archaeological remains at the Prince Henry site by way of an induction process undertaken by the nominated heritage consultant, and of the possibility that more as yet undiscovered Aboriginal cultural material may exist there.**
- 13. Site contractors are to be advised of their obligations under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NSW) and notification procedures in the event that any Aboriginal cultural material is disturbed or exposed during site works.**

#### **Historical Archaeology**

- 14. If any relics of state significance are uncovered, further excavation must stop and the Heritage Office notified immediately. Further approval will need to be obtained from the NSW Heritage Council as changes to the design and scope of the proposed works may be required depending upon the significance of the relics found.**
- 15. Suitable clauses are to be included in all contractor and subcontractor contracts to ensure that on-site personnel are aware of their obligations and requirements in relation to the relics provisions of the Heritage Act.**
- 16. Prior to the commencement of the proposed works, all those involved are to be made aware by way of an induction of the existence of historical archaeological remains at the Prince Henry site.**

## **Landscape**

- 17. Disturbance to existing indigenous vegetation and subsurface deposits should be limited by appropriate protection measures and all efforts should be made to define a specific development impact footprint that should be adhered to throughout the course of the site works.**
- 18. Seed stock indigenous to the site and/or locality (the Prince Henry site, being weed affected, may not be able to provide sufficient stock) should also be used to generate the proposed new landscaping. Written confirmation of this requirement is to be submitted to the Heritage Office for approval prior to the release of the construction certificate.**
- 19. Sandstone Kerbing (L-35) along the historic road shall be retained, repaired and missing sections reinstated using removed parts on site. Appropriate protection shall be established during construction to avoid any further damage to the existing sandstone kerbing.**
- 20. New retaining walls on the eastern boundary shall be built over the existing brick retaining walls (L-34) with similar details. Appropriate reinforcement of existing footings shall be made where required.**

## **Archival Recording**

- 21. An archival record for existing cottages shall be made in accordance with Heritage Office guidelines. The record shall include photographs and measured drawings of all significant fabric affected by the works.**
- 22. The original copy of the archival record shall be deposited with the Heritage Office. Additional copies shall be made and deposited with the NSW State Library and the owner.**

## **S60 application**

- 23. An application under section 60 of the NSW Heritage Act is to be submitted and approved by the NSW Heritage Council prior to work commencing.**

## **5.2 Warby's Barn – Variation to IDA**

The Campbelltown City Council originally referred the integrated development application to the Heritage Office in December 2004. The application involved the construction of two new four and six storey 51 multi unit residential apartment buildings and underground car parking and refurbishment of Warby's Barn as residential units. The Approvals Committee at its meeting on 3 August 2005 approved the application subject to further design revisions included in Condition 2 of conditions of approval.

Approvals Committee members discussed the height and bulk of the articulated roof on Block A, suggesting its visual impact could be reduced by reducing the overhang at the front of the building or flattening the roof. The Committee acknowledge that the roof height had been lowered significantly in comparison to the original plans. It was agreed that if the roof bulk could be reduced then this would allow for a raised basement car park.

**Recommendation:**

**That the Heritage Council:**

- 1. Advise the applicant that it considers that the revised plans satisfy conditions 2 (a), 2(d), and 2(e).**
- 2. Advise the applicant that following an examination of the revised plans the previous condition 2(b) is no longer necessary, subject to appropriate finalisation of condition 2(c).**
- 3. In relation to condition 2(c) advise the applicant that it be required to give further consideration to the roof form of block A with a view to reducing apparent bulk and height of the building to the satisfaction of the Heritage Office.**

**6. Development Application Referrals**

---

NIL

**7.0 Matters for Consideration**

---

**7.1 Queen Victoria Building – Pre-DA**

The applicant has developed an alternative design to address concerns raised by the Heritage Office and Sydney City Council about the previous schemes, and requested the Approvals Committee to review the current design. It is noted that the new scheme has also been lodged with the Court and Council.

In the new scheme the previously proposed descending escalators between the ground floor and first floor at the northern and southern parts of the building have been deleted and the whole escalator set has been relocated to the western side (York Street side) of the voids. This scheme also eliminates the upper level cross bridges which were part of the previous layouts. However as was initially proposed the escalators will be suspended by structural elements that will be fixed to the upper level columns.

Members of the Approvals Committee acknowledged that the current design is better than the previous proposal. Although asymmetrical, the building voids of this design would maintain some of the views through the existing voids in the building – allowing appreciation of the grandeur of the building. It was noted that the applicant prefers this current proposal. It was suggested that a time limit, similar to the Heritage Council's recommendation for approval for the previous scheme, could be attached to the approval of this development application.

**Recommendation:**

**That the Heritage Council provide the following comments to IPOH Limited Pty Ltd:**

- 1. It is considered that the proposed escalators, as shown in drawings "SK-120 E, SK-121 E, SK-122 E, SK-39 A and SK-40A" prepared by Ancher Mortlock Woolley dated 8 June 2005 and 21 March 2006, can be supported by the Heritage Council.**

2. **The most appropriate, sympathetic escalator manufacturer and model type for the building in terms of their profiles, massing bulk, materials, details and colours should be investigated and the details should be submitted for further review should the proposed escalators proceed.**
3. **As with the previous Heritage Council resolution of 8 September, 2004, any new escalator system should have an approval time limit of 10 years.**

## **7.2 Marsden Rehabilitation Centre – Pre-DA**

The Approvals Committee met at a special meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2006. It was considered at the meeting that the guidelines could be further simplified. The sub-committee has met since the Special meeting and has agreed on a revised version of the guidelines.

Parramatta Council has expressed interest in the former dining hall for adaptive re-use as an arts/cultural centre as part of a potential arts/cultural precinct in North Parramatta and potential management of the oval. However, the applicant does not want to lock out potential institutional use of the whole site, including the oval. The Committee suggested that tenders for the site be advised of its potential for use for such purposes.

The current guidelines are supported by all parties involved in putting together the Masterplan guidelines.

### **Recommendation:**

#### **That the Heritage Council:**

1. **Endorses the revised Guidelines, prepared by Tanner Architects, dated 30 May 2006, prepared in accordance with the Approvals Committee directions from its meeting of 16 May 2006.**
2. **Notes the information provided by Parramatta City Council and Council's interest in the potential to adaptively reuse the former Dining Hall within the site as an Arts Centre. It is understood that the Council may also have an interest in the use and management of the Oval.**
3. **Encourages the Department of Commerce to include and recognise this interest, which may assist in developing a sustainable long term solution for the site.**
4. **Notes that such a use would be complementary to the existing cultural precinct of Parramatta encompassing the Riverside Theatre, The Heritage Centre, The Heritage Office, Parramatta Park and the Cathedral precinct.**

## **8.0 Matters for Information**

---

NIL

## **9.0 General Business**

---

Peter Mould met with Richard Johnson (Johnson Pilton Walker) regarding Heritage Council concerns relating to the proposed extension to the Parks-Farmer Wing of the Australian Museum. Mr Johnson appreciated considerations raised by the Approvals Committee and is re-examining at the façade design of the new research centre.

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 4:15 pm.

<b>Michael Collins</b> <b>Chair</b> <b>Approvals Committee</b> <b>Heritage Council of NSW</b> <b>Date:</b>	<b>Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee</b> 5 July 2006 Heritage Office 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	--