

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

Approvals Committee



MINUTES OF MEETING

7 November 2007

Heritage Office, 3 Marist Place, Parramatta

PRESENT: Michael Collins (Chair), Murray Brown (A/Director), Peter Mould, David Logan, Julie Bindon, Diane Jones, Janet Dore

APOLOGIES: Chris Johnson

ALSO PRESENT: Heritage Office: Vincent Sicari, Nikki Ward, Angela So, Brad Vale, Alice Brandjes, Siobhan Lavelle

For Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator: Sheridan Burke (Godden Mackay Logan), Adam Haddow & Richard Briggs (SJB Architects), David Di Biase (Willoughby City Council)

For White Horse Inn, Berrima: Alan Terrell (Berrima Residents Association), Jim Allman (Architect/Applicant)

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 12:20 pm.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

Declarations of Interest

Pecuniary Interests

David Logan

Items 4.1 & 7.1 – Godden Mackay Logan are the Heritage Consultants to Willoughby City Council on this project

Non Pecuniary Interests

NIL

Conflicts of Interest

Michael Collins

Items 4.1 & 7.1 – Michael Collins & Associates carried out land economics assessment of the Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator at Willoughby on behalf of Willoughby City Council

2. Confirmation of Minutes

2.1 Approvals Committee Meeting of 3 October 2007

Members received a copy of the minutes.

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting of 3 October 2007 be adopted.

3. Action Report

Members received a copy of the action report.

Resolved:

that the Action Report of the meeting of 3 October 2007 be adopted

4. Presentations

4.1 Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator, Willoughby – Pre-DA

Ms Sheridan Burke, of Godden Mackay Logan, outlined the heritage value of the Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator and the proposal to open the site for community use by converting the incinerator building into a café with two art exhibition spaces and an artist's studio.

Mr Adam Hadow, of SJB Architects, outlined the proposed conservation, internal modifications, use and interpretation of spaces within the building. The need to deal with water penetration and meet BCA requirements was also highlighted. The proposal aims to remove 1980s additions, incorporated when the building was converted into a restaurant, including removal of rendering over sandstone and removal of non-original fabric. Various methods of interpretation would be used to indicate the previous use of spaces and items within the building. Some sandstone walls to the base of the building and some smaller openings would be reinstated as well as the top of the chimney. Various location options for lift access were outlined. The preferred option was to locate a liftwell slightly south west of the building, having an external entry point and connecting to the main building via tunnels to the two lower levels. It was suggested that Council may choose to run a competition to design the exterior of the liftwell in context with new use of the site. This may necessitate the removal of one Angophora tree in the vicinity of the site of the liftwell. Some other trees may be cleared to provide views to the incinerator from the neighbouring leisure centre and from Small Street. 90° angle street parking would be made available.

4.2 White Horse Inn, Berrima (Berrima Residents Association) – IDA

Mr Alan Terrell, of the Berrima Residents Association, expressed concern that the proposal for the new motel at the rear of the White Horse Inn would not meet the requirements of the Heritage Council or Wingecaribee Council's Development Control Plan or Local Environmental Plan. Mr Terrell stated that the new motel would be too large in terms of bulk and scale and would be clearly visible from the Market Place, Berrima Bridge and Olbury Street. Also, the Berrima Residents Association had concerns that the proposal suggests the new building is being designed for strata subdivision as units rather than for tourist accommodation.

The Berrima Residents Association recognise that the owners of the White Horse Inn need to raise funds to maintain the inn and agree with Wingecaribee Council's recommendation that the owners be required to make repairs to the heritage item before commencing other proposed works. Mr Terrell suggested that conservation works should have been incorporated into the proposal, but have not been. Mr Terrell also suggested that geotechnical testing should take place to investigate the possibility of subsidence at the proposed location for the new building. Street parking is proposed for those using the accommodation in the new building. In the view of the Berrima Residents Association this would detract from the ambiance of the village. Further, finishes to the building have not been defined and could be contrary to the DCP. The Berrima Residents Association urged the Heritage Council to reject the application and that the proponent design more suitable motel accommodation, of 2 storeys, containing 8-10 units with motel facilities, with the possibility of further developing the coach house for two additional units.

4.3 White Horse Inn, Berrima (Applicant) – IDA

Mr Jim Allman stated that he believes the proposed development is not overdevelopment of the site and that the works are within the constraints of the site. The latest design submitted to the Heritage Office reduces the impact on the neighbouring Magistrate's House and Rose Cottage. The new roof would be 1.8 metres above the existing motel roof and 5 metres lower than the ridge height of the inn. The roof structure has been designed to break up the building's bulk. The building will be 26 metres away from the heritage item, outside of the curtilage of the inn, which is an increased distance away from the inn and a roof height lower than that of the inn. Mr Allman stated that new building would not be visible from the nearby bridge and surrounding public spaces, mainly due to trees surrounding the site screening views.

If the proposal were to be refused, an alternative use of the current motel building would be to convert it into office spaces. This, however, may restrict the current public access to all areas of the site. Such a use would also not bring in the required income to provide for the maintenance needs of the inn. The proponent, however, would still like to keep dialogue open with the Heritage Office & Heritage Council to come to an agreeable solution.

In light of the Heritage Office's recommendation to the Approvals Committee to refuse the application, the owner has proposed a further modification to reduce the size of the new building by 1/3 by deleting one apartment, leaving 10 motel rooms instead of 14. This would result in the footprint being reduced from 398.5 m² to 267.5 m² and a greater setback from the inn to 30.5 metres. The roof

design could also be simplified, as requested by the Heritage Office. Also, it would provide a landscaping zone for a carpark to the west.

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

5.1 White Horse Inn, Berrima – IDA

In December 2004 Wingecarribee Shire Council referred a development application proposing demolition of four existing motel units and the construction of a Georgian style motel and long stay strata titled units at the White Horse Inn, Market Place, Berrima to the Heritage Office for comment. An Integrated Development Application for the proposal was lodged in late March 2005. The initial proposal was amended by the applicant on two occasions in response to concerns expressed by the Heritage Office about the impact of the proposal on the heritage significance of the White Horse Inn and Berrima and its setting. The current proposal seeks approval for demolition of the existing motel and construction of a motel and self contained tourist accommodation suites at the rear of the White Horse Inn, Market Place, Berrima. The report to the Approvals Committee recommended that the proposal be refused on the basis that it would be overdevelopment of the site and would adversely affect the heritage significance of the White Horse Inn.

In the light of the proponent's proposal during the presentation to the Approvals Committee to reduce the bulk of the new building by 1/3, the Approvals Committee suggested involvement of an independent heritage architect & discussion with the sub-committee to finalise the design and size of the new building. The matter was therefore deferred for decision in one month for final design options to be resolved.

Resolved:

To defer consideration of this matter for one month to allow discussions regarding final design options for the proposal to be developed in response to the proponent's presentation. The Heritage Council considers that a meeting with the proponent and the Approvals Committee sub-committee be held as soon as possible at the Heritage Office and strongly recommends that the applicant engage the services of an independent and experienced heritage architect to assist in the finalisation of an appropriate design.

5.2 34 Argyle Place, Millers Point – IDA

The applicant sought to conserve most of the house with new structures containing contemporary services. A new studio pavilion was proposed over the site of a former stable, linked back to the house, and an enclosed veranda would wrap around the rear façade of the house. There are two areas of major concern: the changes to the original roof that contains timber shingles under a later corrugated steel roof, and the massing of the link structure and 'veranda' along the rear of the house. The extended enclosed 'veranda' could obscure the rear façade and impact on interpretation of the rear form of the property.

The Approvals Committee resolved that a veranda at the rear of the building must be a lightweight structure and adopt architecture sympathetic to the original building. The Committee noted that the proposed veranda width would be similar to the neighbouring veranda.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council recommend to the City of Sydney that the application be approved in accordance with drawings SK.205 Issue A, SK.201 Issue A, SK.202 Issue A, SK.203 Issue A, SK.204 Issue A, SK.205 Issue A, SK.206 Issue A, SK.207 Issue A, SK.208 Issue A, dated September 2007 by Tropman & Tropman Architects, as amended by the following conditions:

Design Revision

1. The dormers proposed for the southern (front) roof plane are not approved but may be replaced by operable skylights, detailed to minimise their impact on the roofing timbers, with the detail subject to the approval of the Executive Director of the Heritage Office.
2. The fenestration to the northern façade of the bedroom pavilion over the former stables is to be adjusted to a more traditional form in order to interpret the former stables and to minimise precedence for this kind of opening in a conservation area.
3. The kitchen fit-out is to be carefully detailed to minimise impacts from the works and on-going use on the joinery in this room, to the satisfaction of the Executive Director of the Heritage Office.
4. The wardrobe to be inserted in the ground floor door opening is to be detailed to the Executive Director's satisfaction having minimal impact on early joinery and the placement of suitable reconstructed joinery.
5. The articulation of the proposed facades of the extended veranda are to be completed with materials and detailing that fit comfortably into this conservation area, while being contemporary on close inspection. The veranda structure is to be detailed with a visible structural system so that it has the character of a lightweight contemporary addition.

Nominated Heritage Consultants

6. A built heritage consultant and an archaeologist are to be nominated for the project. The consultants shall have appropriate qualifications and experience commensurate with the scope of the works. The names and experience of the consultants shall be submitted to the Heritage Office for approval prior to the release of the construction certificate;
7. The consultants shall advise on detail design resolution of new elements, inspect the demolition and removal to ensure no loss of significant fabric and elements, reuse of salvageable material,

construction of new elements, partitions, reticulation and impact of services (to minimise impacts on significant fabric, openings and views) and conformity to the conditions of approval;

8. A report by the consultants shall be submitted to the Executive Director of the Heritage Office for approval within 1 month of the completion of the works which describes the work, any impacts/damage and remedial works carried out;

Archaeology

9. Prior to the commencement of the proposed works, all contractors and relevant personnel involved are to be made aware of the existence of historical archaeological remains at the site by way of an induction process undertaken by the consultant archaeologist;
10. Suitable clauses, prepared in consultation with the nominated consultant archaeologist, are to be included in all contractor and subcontractor contracts to ensure that on-site personnel are aware of their statutory obligations in relation to the relics provisions of the *NSW Heritage Act 1977* in the event that any relics are disturbed or exposed during site works;
11. If any unidentified historical archaeological remains or deposits are exposed during the works, excavation is to cease immediately in the affected areas and the nominated consultant archaeologist is to be notified to undertake an evaluation of the potential extent and significance of such relics. The Heritage Office is to be notified in accordance with Section 146 of the *NSW Heritage Act*. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery;
12. A work method statement is to be submitted to the Executive Director of the Heritage Office to be approved prior to the commencement of the works to describe the proposed ground and landscaping works and provision of any subsurface service reticulation;

Works

13. Significant building elements, fixtures, fittings and fragile materials shall be adequately protected from potential damage during the works. Protection systems must ensure historic fabric is not damaged or removed;
14. 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. Service runs should be grouped and concealed within the new work. Any penetrations through heritage fabric for supply and waste pipes and mechanical ducts should be subject to approval and minimised. New services should avoid significant spaces, views and fabric;

15. The conservation of the house should be substantially complete before an occupation certificate is granted for any new structures on the site.

Archival Record

16. An archival record of the house, prepared in accordance with Heritage Office guidelines, is to be submitted to the Executive Director of the Heritage Office for approval within 3 months of the completion of the works. Copies of the archival record shall be deposited with the Heritage Office and the City of Sydney Council's local studies collection.

Section 60

17. An application under section 60 of the *NSW Heritage Act 1977* must be submitted and approved by the Heritage Council prior to work commencing.

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

NIL

7.0 Matters for Consideration

7.1 Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator, Willoughby – Pre-DA

In early 2006 Willoughby City Council received funding from the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Heritage for the conservation, interpretation and adaptive re-use of the Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator. Willoughby City Council intends to carry out the restoration and adaptive re-use in two stages.

Stage 1 consists of removing all intrusive fabric so that the original building fabric can be exposed and conservation works to stabilise the fabric and structure as well as making the building watertight. Stage 2 consists of the restoration of the external appearance of the building and adaptive re-use of the interior in order to accommodate new community facilities. In addition to building restoration, associated landscape design 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:

1. The members of the Heritage Council's Approvals Committee consider the proposed conservation, adaptive re-use and restoration of the Walter Burley Griffin Incinerator will have a neutral impact on its heritage significance;

2. The Approvals Committee members recommend that determination of the IDA be delegated to the Heritage Office Executive Director.

8.0 Matters for Information

NIL

9.0 General Business

NIL

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting 2:30 pm.

Michael Collins Chair Approvals Committee Heritage Council of NSW Date:	Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee 5 December, 2007 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	--