

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW Approvals Committee



MINUTES OF MEETING

2 May 2007

Heritage Office, 3 Marist Place, Parramatta

PRESENT: Michael Collins, Susan Macdonald, Peter Mould, David Logan, Diane Jones

APOLOGIES: Chris Johnson, Julie Bindon, Janet Dore

ALSO PRESENT: Heritage Office: Vincent Sicari, Nikki Ward, Rajeev Maini, Murat Gul, Stuart Read

For Centennial & Moore Park: Steve Corbett (Executive Director Centennial & Moore Park Trust), Margaret Ogston (Assistant Director Strategic Planning & Projects), Geoff Reinhard (Planner)

For St John's, Morpeth: John Zavolokin (Providence Projects), Alan Croker (Design 5), Glynn Evans (Allen Jack & Cottier)

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 9:30 am.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

Declarations of Interest

Pecuniary Interests

David Logan

Item 5.2 (Lidcombe Hospital) – Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd is heritage consultant to Australand on this project

Michael Collins

Items 4.1 & 5.1 (Centennial & Moore Parks), Items 7.1 & 7.2 (University of Western Sydney, Rydalmere Campus) – Michael Collins works as a consultant to the applicant on a range of matters, including the item which is the subject of the meeting

Non Pecuniary Interests

NIL

Conflicts of Interest

Michael Collins

Items 4.1 & 5.1 (Centennial & Moore Parks), Items 7.1 & 7.2 (University of Western Sydney, Rydalmere Campus) – Michael Collins works as a consultant to the applicant on a range of matters, including the item which is the subject of the meeting

The Approvals Committee also noted that, with regard to items 4.1 and 5.1, Peter Mould is on the Centennial Park Design Review Panel. As the Panel last met on 19 December 2006 there was no conflict of interest in regard to matters raised in the current meeting of the Approvals Committee.

Due to the Chair's declarations of interest, items 4.1, 5.1, 7.1 and 7.2 were chaired by David Logan.

2. Confirmation of Minutes

2.1 Approvals Committee Meeting of 4 April 2007

Members received a copy of the minutes.

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting of 4 April 2007 be adopted.

3. Action Report

Members received a copy of the action report.

Resolved:

that the Action Report of the meeting of 4 April 2007 be adopted with with an additional comment for the Roxy Theatre: Subcommittee has met to discuss a brief to the architect regarding design and a letter has been drafted.

4. Presentations

4.1 Centennial Park and Moore Park – S60

The proponent gave a presentation to the Approvals Committee outlining the main features of the proposed development, also showing photomontage views to the building. The Centennial and Moore Park Trust has aimed to minimise the footprint of development, while also preserving historic pathways and vistas. Historical interpretation of the site will also be provided through the Visitor Centre. Incorporation of a visitor centre in the complex will negate the need for later construction of a separate visitor information centre on the site. A glass exterior to the new building area will facilitate unobstructed views to the original Vernon fireplace. The size of new building space reflects the increasing use of the parklands, particularly in this central area. No additional parking space is proposed and public transport to and from the site will be encouraged.

4.2 St John's Morpeth – Pre-DA

As part of a Master Plan proposal the proponent made a presentation to the Approvals Committee outlining a possible footprint layout for an 80 bed high care residential facility in Morpeth, within the curtilage of Closebourne House (SHR 00375). The Closebourne precinct was selected for the facility as it would offer integration with the proposed retirement village while remaining physically separated. Further, the local community and Department of Health and Aging have indicated a need for such a facility in the area. The proposal would involve construction of 1-2 storey accommodation buildings with landscaped courtyards to the south arranged as radial fingers, with the northern ends linked for ease of staff access and to ensure views are retained at the southern end. The roof plane along these buildings could be sectioned so as not to allow these structures to dominate over Closebourne House. It would also include conservation of Closebourne House, adaptive re-use of some existing buildings in the precinct (grade 1 and 2 significant elements) and removal of other buildings and the swimming pool. The Brush Box Avenue leading toward St James Church is to remain and be conserved. Closebourne House, itself, will become the 'front door' to the site, being used for offices and reception, and public access via museum and meeting rooms. The commercial kitchen would also support the wider community, including use by 'Meals on Wheels'. The proponent put forward that most of the proposed development would be screened by existing trees and ridge views.

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

5.1 Centennial Park and Moore Park – S60

It was noted that the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item.

A kiosk/café/restaurant facility in the main public meeting point of Centennial Park is proposed to be adaptively reused and extended. The existing facility is a 1988 rebuilding and extension of an original 1892 Arts & Crafts pavilion designed by Walter Liberty Vernon. Greater space and workability is sought in response to increased public demand for provision of fine dining, outdoor dining and large functions.

The Approvals Committee supported the flat design of the roof of the proposed new buildings with no external supports which could obstruct views. Members believed the sloping roof of the outdoor café space would compete with the rest of the roof as a separate element and, therefore, would prefer this section of roof to be horizontal, in keeping with the rest of the new roof design. Further detail of roof design should be submitted to the Approvals Committee for approval.

As the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item, the members of the Committee recommended that the Heritage Office determine the proposal under delegation on the advice of the Committee members present. The following comments were made:

That the Heritage Office consider the proposal as described in Drawing A001 Site Plan, revision 3; A101 Basement plan, revision 3; A102 Floor plan, revision 3; A105 Plan at 3300mm height, revision 2; A106 Roof plan, revision 3; A201 North & West elevations, revision 3; A202 South & East elevations, revision 3; A203 Sections 1, revision 3; A204 Sections 2, revision 2; all dated 8 December 2006; view of forecourt, café entry & kiosk dated 8/12/06; southern view of kiosk & restaurant entry; view of restaurant & café; aerial photo 1:200 existing plan; aerial photo-montage 1:200 proposed plan; north west photomontage of café entrance; south west photomontage of kiosk; northern photomontage of restaurant; north-eastern photomontage of restaurant; eastern photomontage of restaurant; 1:100 southern elevation and photo of restaurant; all prepared by McConnell, Smith & Johnson P/L and the following comments:

- 1. The facility should include appropriate interpretation of the original 1892 Vernon kiosk and its evolution in a prominent, publicly accessible position. Details of the proposed interpretation shall be provided for the approval of the Executive-Director of the Heritage Office or his nominee before commencement of construction;**
- 2. All works should be in accordance with the recommendations made in the Arborist's report dated 1/07 prepared by Garry Clubley to ensure appropriate tree protection measures are taken to minimise adverse impacts during and after construction on the two significant fig trees on site. Tree protection measures should be prepared by a qualified arborist and submitted for the approval of the Executive-**

Director of the Heritage Office or his nominee prior to commencement of construction.

3. **The detailed design roof to the restaurant should be submitted to the HO for approval and the thin light nature of the roof be maintained in the detailed design.**
4. **The two shade structures shown on the terrace should be redesigned to retain views to the chimney of existing kiosk roof and be consistent with the horizontal forms of the new buildings.**
5. **Construction drawings of the proposal should be provided to the Heritage Office for approval prior to construction commencing.**

5.2 Lidcombe Hospital - IDA

It was noted that the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item.

The Integrated Development Application for this site proposes subdivision of the Lidcombe Hospital Precinct which includes building demolition, civil works and car parking. The applicant gave a presentation to the Approvals Committee at its meeting on 7 March 2007 to outline the proposal. The applicant has modified the parking requirements around the Village Green by reducing car park spaces from 39 to 21 including redesigned landscaped blisters. It was confirmed that the straight sections of road in the central heritage core of the site will retain the same width. However the central park area will be narrowed by half a metre at the curved end – reinstating previous conditions of the road – with parking spaces to be provided on the current bitumen area. The long term management of the site will comprise a layered system using a combination of community, strata and Torrens title schemes with formulated management statements providing regulatory powers to the overriding scheme. A new building envelop is proposed behind building B72 and demolition of four buildings, viz: 95A, 95B, 69, 75 is also proposed.

As the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item, the members of the Committee recommended that the Heritage Office determine the proposal under delegation on the advice of the Committee members present. The following comments were made:

That the Heritage Council approves this application with the following conditions:

1. **All works should be carried out in accordance with the following documentation:**
 - a) **Drawings A-0000 Q, A-1000 Q, A-1001 Q, A-1002 Q, A-1003 Q, A-1004 Q (Project 05-032) dated 12/01/07, Allen Jack+Cottier; Drawings Nos. L01 of L03 DA REV 1; L03 of L03 DA REV 6, L02 of L03 DA REV 6 (Job No. 050625), Mather & Associates.**
 - b) **Lidcombe Hospital Site Stage 1 Conservation Plan prepared for Australand, June 2002;**
 - c) **Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Godden Mackay Logan dated January 2007 as varied by the addendum prepared by Godden Mackay Logan dated 27 March 2007**

- d) Statement of Environmental Effects prepared by McKenzie Land Planning Services Pty Ltd dated May 2006 as varied by the addendum prepared by McKenzie Land Planning Services Pty Ltd dated January 2007.
 - e) Proposed Heritage Precinct Management System prepared by Australand dated December 2006
2. The following documentation/information should be submitted for approval together with a Section 60 application:
- a) A detailed design of services plan be developed which includes the potential impacts on the historic core area;
 - b) A detailed design of the blisters including their edge (kerb) detail and junction with the Village Green and the impact, if any, on adjacent significant trees;
 - c) A detailed interpretation plan be prepared in accordance with Lidcombe Hospital Site Stage 1, Conservation Plan;
 - d) A photographic archival recording of the buildings to be demolished be prepared in accordance with the relevant Heritage Office's guidelines;
 - e) A detailed management plan based on the principles contained within the 'Proposed Heritage Precinct Management System' prepared by Australind dated December 2006.
 - f) A detailed archaeological works plan be undertaken to record and salvage archaeological information from the sites and areas of archaeological significance.
 - g) An archaeological research design.
3. The design of the proposed new building envelopes should be submitted for approval as a separate application.

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

NIL

7.0 Matters for Consideration

7.1 University of Western Sydney – Rydalmere CMP

It was noted that the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item.

Rydalmere Campus is a popular campus and the University is seeking to plan for its future growth. The Conservation Management Plan (CMP) has been prepared in response to requests from the Heritage Council & the Heritage Office. It is

expected to be a key document that would play an important role in the future development of this site. The CMP identifies various issues related to the conservation of a number of individual heritage items located on this site and also to the site as a whole.

The Approvals Committee emphasised that CMP policies should include: regulation regarding historically significant views; compliance with archaeological guidelines; clarity on development between the Female Orphan precinct and the river; and Section 60 application requirement for State Heritage Register listed items on the site. The Approvals Committee also requested that historical interpretation be integrated across the site to enable visitors/students to understand the history and layering of development on the site.

Members of the Heritage Council Approvals Committee provided the following comments to the University of Western Sydney in relation to the draft Conservation Management Plan:

1. The Committee members considers that the Director of the Heritage Office should determine the endorsement of the CMP once it is satisfied that the matters outlined below in 2(a-f) have been addressed.
2. The Heritage Office should conduct further negotiation with the University prior to endorsement of the CMP with particular regard to:
 - a) Figure 3.1 (Landscape Types and Significant Views) identifies a number of historically significant views on the site. It is considered that retention of these views is critical to the overall heritage significance of the site. Although this issue is addressed to some extent within the Guidelines for design criteria for siting *Preserve existing views of the original building and its setting (6.6.4 – Infill and New Works)*, it is considered that this issue requires a separate policy heading to ensure the importance of significant views is understood by the future managers of the site. This policy should clearly refer to significant views identified by Figure 3.1 in the CMP.
 - b) An archaeological strategy being prepared for the whole site and relevant policies incorporated within the CMP;
 - c) Policy 2.19 being amended to refer to an approval under section 57(1) of the Heritage Act in place of an *Excavation permit* that is required under section 139 of the Heritage Act.
 - d) Identification of important views that should be retained from Victoria Rd, James Rouse Drive and the Parramatta River, as well as a rationale and policy for retention of those views.
 - e) Policies are required to identify whether new development may be sited along the river frontage and, if so, what scale and footprint this could have.
 - f) The lines of Ha-Ha should be identified and interpreted and their influence on development discussed as policies.

7.2 University of Western Sydney - Rydalmere Master Plan

It was noted that the Approvals Committee was not quorate for this item.

In addition to the CMP, a Master Plan was also submitted for comment. It is expected to be a key document that would play an important role in the future development of this site. Heritage Council has previously provided comments on a SEPP56 Master Plan that has subsequently been endorsed by Parramatta Council. A Master plan report has now been submitted as Phase 1 of the Master Plan Study and entails study of existing documentation on the site and previous efforts. Although the applicant has stated that this document is not connected with the SEPP56 master plan, it is anticipated that once finalised it will guide the revision of the SEPP56 master plan. Therefore, it is important that Heritage Council provide comment on this master plan.

The Approvals Committee commented that building SB9 could be further set back, allowing it to be a 2 storey building. Buildings SB10 and SB11 are within a significant area (SEPP 56). These buildings could be smaller in order to minimise their visual impact in relation to the river. All development on site should be consistent with the CMP and, where relevant, new buildings should be set back from the line of Ha-Ha.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee members provided the following comments to the University of Western Sydney in relation to the draft Master Plan:

- 1. It was noted that the Master Plan is a non-statutory document that will be used internally for planning future growth of the campus and does not require formal endorsement from the Heritage Council;**
- 2. It was noted that this Master plan report is Phase 1 of the Master Plan Study and further study to evaluate various configurations & detailed uses for the site will be undertaken in future phases of this study;**
- 3. It was noted that SEPP56 Master Plan prepared by Tanner Architects for this site will continue to be the formal document for consideration of any development proposal until this master plan formally replaces it.**
- 4. Building sites SB 12 and SB 13 do not comply with SEPP56 master plan in relation to their southern edges. It is considered desirable to limit these buildings to the building location zone identified by SEPP56 Master Plan to avoid an unacceptable visual impact on a precinct of high significance. Four storey buildings within the area of high significance will also be contrary to the draft CMP that requires building heights to be limited to single and two storeys in this area.**

The prominence of the Arthur's Hill will also be enhanced by providing a foreground and a vista leading up to the historic buildings on the Hill along the axis through the Female Orphans School and the School of Nursing Building;

5. It is desirable to retain and interpret the line of Ha-Ha as a notable feature along Arthur's hill. The line of Ha-Ha was used by SEPP56 Master Plan to define the extent of curtilage of an area of high significance (containing the former Female Orphan School (c1814-1818), Drillmaster's House (c1854-1909) and the School of Nursing (c1870 – 1907);
6. It is desirable to limit the footprint of the proposed single storey building (part of SB4) as shown in the SEPP56 Master Plan to reduce impact on the Vernon group of buildings. The rear four storey section should also be setback to avoid an impact on the skyline.
7. Similarly it is desirable to setback the four storey building identified as SB5 to avoid impact on the Vernon group of buildings. This will also provide an opportunity to retain the verandah at the back of the building EH (School of marketing).
8. It is considered desirable to re-establish the historic connection of the site with the river if possible. The SEPP56 master plan identifies this area as heritage area curtilage and does not allow any new building activity in this area. In view of the high significance of this area it is desirable not to have any additional new structures within the open spaces directly connected with the Female Orphan School near the river. The proposed single storey buildings SB10 and SB 11 will limit this opportunity.

The proposed building SB 9 is outside this sensitive zone and may be acceptable as a two storey building set back in line with the southern wall of the adjoining library building. A higher building as proposed has the potential to diminish the prominence of Female Orphan School buildings on Arthur's Hill.

Also this area may be critical in future in achieving a river transport service. It is considered that although this opportunity may not exist at present, the master plan should consider the possibility of augmenting public transport availability through the river.

9. Opportunities exist on site to reduce dependency on cars by linking with public transport as one boundary of the site abuts a railway line and the other abuts Parramatta River. It is noted that the overall circulation strategy (6.3.1) strategy assumes that *the station configuration and level of service will remain as currently provided*. Also the strategy makes no reference to river transport and its future augmentation.

Although it may be valid for the Master Plan to plan with current levels of service, it should provide for the potential future improvements in public transport - rail and river.

10. This master plan proposes a four storey building replacing an existing single storey building at the rear of the new Whitlam Library. Although it is contrary to the SEPP56 Master Plan, no objection is raised to Building SB7 on heritage grounds. It is considered that opportunity exists on this edge to increase the number of floors along this edge without any unacceptable heritage impact.

11. Proposed building sites SB1, SB15 and SB14 represent substantial buildings of 3-4 storeys along the periphery of the subject site. In principle this approach to have taller buildings on the periphery is desirable while retaining single storey heritage buildings in the centre. Although it is noted that these building sites do not represent actual buildings of that footprint and bulk, it is important to include guidelines within the master plan to allow through views to and from the heritage buildings and spaces and to ensure they do not close-in the site or dominate the heritage buildings.
12. Although it is noted that the footprint shown on this master plan along James Ruse Drive does not represent an actual building and is indicative of an overall building envelope, it represents potentially a very large building on that edge. Such a long building on James Ruse drive frontage has a potential to diminish the prominence of the historic buildings located on Arthur's Hill. It is considered desirable that SB13 be broken up in smaller buildings and pulled back to allow better views of the historic buildings.
13. SEPP56 Master Plan identifies the possibility of a two storey building adjoining the Boiler House and stack in the Union Square. It may be possible to have a detached small building with a link to the Boiler House that would allow adaptive reuse of the Boiler House. However, it is considered desirable to avoid a building filling up the whole of the building site as shown in the Master Plan to avoid adverse impact on a building of high significance. This building could address the open space bounded by the Vernon group of buildings.

7.3 St John's, Morpeth – Pre-DA

The current proposal is to construct an aged care community village with two major components: a 327 dwelling retirement village; and a residential high care nursing home facility within the Closebourne House precinct with a commercial kitchen to address wider community needs.

The Approvals Committee found the new accommodation building footprints to be unacceptably large, competing with Closebourne House. However the Approvals Committee was not against some form of development within this precinct which would enable Closebourne House to be conserved and maintained. Any large scale development would be subject to a heritage agreement being executed in accordance with the Heritage Act.

Resolved:

The Heritage Council resolved to advise the applicant as follows:

1. The Heritage Council is concerned to ensure the policies within the endorsed CMP continue to guide development of the area.
2. The Heritage Council notes that the policies provide for some development within the Closebourne House precinct.

3. However, the overall size of the proposed 80 bed high care residential facility within the Closebourne House precinct creates an unacceptable impact on the heritage qualities of the precinct and is inconsistent with the policies in the CMP (Policy 2.2.1).
4. The Heritage Council supports the applicant's desire to locate a facility for older persons on the property but believes that opportunities exist elsewhere within the developable area of the property for such a facility to be developed.
5. The Heritage Council wishes to reinforce that in previously endorsing development of the zones in the south-western area of the site that an important opportunity was created to preserve the cultural heritage significance of the Closebourne precinct through low intensity development.
6. Note that any development applications will require a heritage agreement being entered into, in conformity to previous heritage council decisions, prior to any development being approved.

8.0 Matters for Information

NIL

9.0 General Business

NIL

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 1:30 pm.

Michael Collins Chair Approvals Committee Heritage Council of NSW Date:	Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee 6 June, 2007 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	--