

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

Approvals Committee



MINUTES OF MEETING

6 April 2009

Room G24, Department of Planning,
Bridge Street, Sydney

PRESENT: Peter Mould, Chris Johnson, Petula Samios, Julie Bindon, Diane Jones

APOLOGIES: David Logan

ALSO PRESENT: Heritage Branch: Vincent Sicari, Nikki Ward, Rajeev Maini, Gary Estcourt, Graeme King

For Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome: Richard Gates (Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome Committee Inc)

For Newcastle Ports Centre: John Carr (Dept. of Commerce), Ian Gill (Schrieber Hamilton Architecture), Bruce Cooper (Newcastle Port Corporation), Dean Birkett & Andrew Wood (Coffey Projects)

For Bathurst Rail Bridge over Macquarie River: Keith Denyer & Louise Collier (Cardno), Dean Daly (ARTC)

For St Johns at Morpeth: John Zavolokin (Providence Projects), Scott MacKay (RBD), Alan Croker (Design 5)

For Emanuel School: Allyson Wolff (Savills Project Management), Anthony Holman (Emanuel School), David Bell (Baker Kavanagh Architects), Ron Edgar (HBO & EMTB)

For 120 Pitt St, Sydney: Richard Johnson (JPW Architects), Megan Jones (Tanner Architects)

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 2:45 pm.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

Declarations of Interest

NIL

2. Confirmation of Minutes

2.1 Approvals Committee Meeting of 4 March 2009

Members had each received a copy of the minutes of the last meeting of the Approvals Committee.

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting of 4 March 2009 be adopted.

3. Action Report

Members each received a copy of the action report from the March 2009 meeting.

Resolved:

that the Action Report, noting actions undertaken since the meeting of 4 March 2009, be adopted.

4. Presentation – 120 Pitt Street, Sydney – Concept Proposals for Redevelopment

The proponent provided an update to the Approvals Committee regarding proposed renovations and extensions to the existing building at 120 Pitt Street, Sydney. The proponent sought feedback from the Committee on any issues or concerns they had prior to submission of a formal development application. Revision C of the Conservation Management Plan is currently with the Heritage Branch, Department of Planning for review. Floor plans with photomontages were shown and the Committee was provided with a CD showing a 'flyover' of various views from street level and some internal perspectives. The central light well would be reinstated, and the existing entry points, southern fire stairs and lifts from the banking chamber would be kept. A new structure for the tower extension would not impact on the older section of the building and would have a clear and frosted glass envelope. The applicant aimed to create a 6 green star building and attract premium tenants. Beams across ceilings would incorporate lighting, sprinklers, acoustics and chilled air, varying slightly in design between the original building space and the existing newer section of the building for the purpose of interpretation. The Grand Ball Room on level 8 may be converted to a public use space, with the main entry via the Pitt Street lift well.

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

5.1 Works Depot, Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome, Evans Head – S60

The proposed works involved removal of a number of buildings identified as being of little or no significance. Relevant parts of the Bellman Hangar, currently used as the Main Works Depot Workshop, will be re-used for repairs to the highly significant Bellman Hangar 160. The timber School Building will be relocated and repaired. It dates from the war but has been moved at least twice, once off the aerodrome, then to its current location.

Although the application deals only with removal of the extant structures it is acknowledged in the SOHI that soil remediation and the eventual rezoning of this portion of land for use as a residential Retirement Village and Nursing Home (if approved) will be the next stages of works.

Presentation

Mr Richard Gates, representing the Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome Committee Inc (EHMAC), supported demolition and relocation of non significant buildings at the Aerodrome. However the EHMAC maintained their objection to the Retirement Village proposed to be developed on the site, expressing concern that its operation could potentially lead to the discontinuation of the use of the site as an aerodrome. Further, concerns were expressed regarding flooding and drainage of water in the location of the proposed Retirement Village, soil contamination issues and lack of Council consultation regarding proposals for development of the site.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee supported the proposal for demolition and relocation of non-significant buildings on the aerodrome site, there being no heritage issues of concern. The Approvals Committee would like clarification of the use of parts of the Bellman Hangar to be used to repair the Bellman Hangar 160. Option 1 for relocation of the 'tuck-shop' was endorsed.

Resolved:

- A. That the Heritage Council reiterate their support for the re-use of parts of the hangar for the conservation of the historic Bellman Hangar;**
- B. That the Heritage Council endorse the Option 1 for the location of the tuck shop;**
- C. That the Heritage Council approve the application with the following conditions:**
 - 1. All work shall be carried out in accordance with the following documentation:**
 - a) Drawings M-E-9300-1000 dated 5th July 2005 and M-E-9300-1000b dated 5th July 2005, prepared by Richmond Valley Council;**
 - b) SOHI Works Depot Removal EHMA dated December 2008, prepared by Converge Consultants; and**
 - c) Options Report: Canteen Relocation dated February 2009, prepared by Converge Consultants.**

Nominated Heritage Consultant:

- 2. All heritage work shall be supervised by a qualified heritage consultant to ensure that the impact of the works on the heritage significance of the site is minimised and all work has been carried out in accordance with the approved documentation and the conditions of this consent.**
- 3. All work shall be carried out by suitably qualified tradesmen with practical experience in conservation and restoration of similar heritage items. The nominated heritage consultant in Condition 2 shall be consulted prior to the selection of appropriate tradesmen.**

Site Protection & Works:

4. The Applicant must ensure that if substantial intact archaeological deposits and/or State significant relics are discovered, work must cease in the affected area(s) and the Heritage Council of NSW must be notified. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery.

Archival Recording:

5. An archival photographic recording of the affected site aspects is undertaken prior to the commencement of works, in accordance with the Heritage Council document, *How to prepare archival Records of Heritage Items*. The original copy of the archival record shall be deposited with the Heritage Branch, an additional copy shall be provided to the Richmond Valley Council.
6. The Old School Building shall be relocated to the site indicated as Option 1 on page 10 of the *Options Report: Canteen Relocation* dated February 2009, prepared by Converge Consultants.
7. All suitable fabric from the Bellman Hangar to be removed shall be stored appropriately and be used for repairs and as replacement fabric for the significant Bellman Hangar 160.

Compliance:

8. This approval shall be void if the activity to which it refers is not physically commenced within five years after the date of the approval or within the period of consent specified in the relevant development consent granted under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, whichever occurs first.

5.2 Convict Lumber Yard, Newcastle - S60

The proposal was for subdivision of the block, construction of two new residences and refurbishment of Coutts Sailors Home and Superintendent's Residence. The Approvals Committee deferred consideration of this application at its 6 February 2009 meeting due to concerns over the bulk, form and setback of the proposed development on Lot 4 and its impact on the setting and heritage significance of the Convict Lumber Yard and Coutts Sailors Home. The applicant has submitted revised plans to address these concerns. Other concerns were raised over the reconstruction of a verandah on the cottage on Lot 2. The current proposal is concerned with two versions of plans for the proposed development on Lot 4 drawn up as a response to the Approvals Committee resolution made on the 6th February 2009 (Revisions B and C).

Consideration

The Approvals Committee recommended that opaque balustrades be used around the pool area on Lot 4 and suggested that Council landscape at the base of the proposed concrete wall facing the Convict Lumber Yard public space for aesthetic purposes as well as prevention from graffiti. It was also suggested that the extension to the level 1 master bedroom become a balcony rather to reduce bulk at the front of the property and visual impact on the Coutts Sailors Home. Determination of the application was deferred and delegated to the Director, Heritage Branch, Department of Planning.

Resolved:

The Heritage Council:

1. **Acknowledges that the applicants have considered the previous comments of the Heritage Council and submitted a design that is generally consistent with these comments.**
2. **Notes that there are noise, amenity and other planning issues that will be considered by Newcastle City Council.**
3. **Agrees that Revision C for development on Lot 4 is generally acceptable, on heritage grounds, and that the application can be delegated to the Director of the Heritage Branch for determination subject to the following:**
 - a. **Drawings, photographs and/or plans showing the presence, location and detail of the verandah on the Superintendent's Residence; and**
 - b. **New opaque materials for the balustrade surrounding the pool area;**
 - c. **The northern extension of the master bedroom on level 1 shall be modified to read as an open balcony as in previously submitted schemes;**
 - d. **Appropriate conditions are imposed to ensure that the modifications will not adversely impact on the significance of Coutts Sailors Home or Superintendent's Residence;**
 - e. **Appropriate conditions are imposed to ensure that mitigation measures are put in place for the protection of the highly significant archaeological resources.**
4. **Advises Newcastle City Council that if it decides to approve the proposal it could consider entering into a voluntary planning agreement to ensure the conservation of the Coutts Sailors Home.**
5. **Advises Newcastle City Council that if it decides to approve the proposal it could consider conditioning the consent to ensure that suitable landscaping is put in place at the base of the concrete wall facing the Convict Lumber Yard site.**

5.3 St John's at Morpeth Master Plan (concept plan) – IDA

The application was to assess a Master Plan to develop the site as a retirement village, residential community and high care nursing home, incorporating a large development in the vicinity of the Closebourne House in the form of an 80 bed High care nursing home. This was previously considered as having unacceptable level of impact both by the Heritage Branch and the Heritage Council.

Presentation

The proponent affirmed that the layout of the nursing home had not yet been resolved and that they would work in consultation with Council regarding plans for the site. In response to recommendation 6 of the report to the Approvals Committee the proponent stated that 2 – 2½ storeys for new buildings would work on the site within the context of the site. The proponent was also working toward creating a Heritage Agreement for Closeborne House.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee noted that the Master Plan stated an 80 bed aged care facility would be allowed within the Closebourne House area. The Approvals Committee supported the use of the site as an aged care facility, but did not agree to a specific number of beds for the facility as evidence presented before them, to date, has not demonstrated the capacity for such a facility in this area. It was recommended that development along the road fronting the Village Green close to Robinson House should be in line with or behind the north face of Burgmann House where the building currently stands. All buildings should be in line with CMP requirements along this stretch of road and should face the Village Green with the road separating the dwellings from the Village Green to avoid fences and other structures on this side. Plans showing critical dimensions and lines of alignment would need to be submitted prior to approval. Development should be subject to a Heritage Agreement.

Determination of this application was delegated by the Approvals Committee to the Director, Heritage Branch, Department of Planning.

Resolved:

- A. **That the Heritage Council defer the application and request further information to be submitted to the Director of the Heritage Branch.**
- B. **That the Heritage Council delegate the determination to the Director of the Heritage Branch once the information is received.**
- C. **That the Heritage Council provide the following advice to the Director of the Heritage Branch:**
 1. **the approval should generally be in accordance with the following documents:**
 - 1.1. **Morpeth House Concept Plan dated November 2008 prepared by Antoniadis Architects;**
 - 1.2. **Statement of Environmental Effects Volume 1 and Volume 2 and its annexures dated November 2008 prepared by HDB Consultants;**
 - 1.3. **Conservation Management Plan endorsed by the Heritage Council on 5 October 2005.**
 2. **This approval is for the Master Plan only and does not constitute any approval or acceptance of the built form concepts presented within the documentation submitted with this application. Separate application/s will need to be submitted for individual buildings being proposed as part of this development.**
 3. **Detailed design guidelines must be prepared for endorsement of the Heritage Council to guide any new buildings on this site. Upon endorsement of these design guidelines the Heritage Council may consider recommending to the Minister that individual buildings on this site proposed in accordance with these guidelines be exempt from the need to get an approval under the Heritage Act;**
 4. **The proposed use in the Closebourne House area is considered acceptable. However, the information submitted does not demonstrate that a viable 80 bed high care nursing home can**

be designed in the vicinity of Closebourne House without an unacceptable impact on the significance of the subject site. The actual number of beds accommodated in this area is therefore not approved, but will be considered as part of a detailed application.

5. Any development in the Closebourne House area shall be in accordance with the policies of the CMP and specifically figure 5.4. of the CMP;
6. This approval is deferred commencement and shall be operational only after a Heritage Agreement (in accordance with the provisions of the Heritage Act) is signed between the Minister administering the Heritage Act and the owner of the subject site;
7. The proposed Retirement Village related uses adjoining the oval are approved in general without prejudice to any resultant built form and density of buildings in this area. It may or may not be possible to accommodate all the proposed community facilities within this area without an unacceptable impact on the significance of the subject site. The actual buildings in this area shall be subject to separate approval;
8. The proposed RV medium density development south and north of Robinson House, as shown on the Concept Plan dated November 2008, should be in accordance with Policy 3.5.2 and figure 5.15 of the CMP. The Heritage Council considers that the information submitted for the development of this part of the site is not sufficiently clear for a determination to be made at this stage. Further details shall be submitted indicating dimensions of any construction element from the Heritage buildings to enable an assessment of this part of the proposal;
9. The dwellings in this area should face the village green (no rear fences shall present to the village green) and should be a mix of single and two storey buildings, with a maximum of two storeys, in order to minimise impact on the setting of Morpeth House and Robinson House.
10. The boundary of the proposed RV medium density development to the south of Robinson House, except for any proposed access roadway, shall be amended to be in line with or behind the north face of the existing Burgmann House building;
11. The proposed garden/orchard to the south of Closebourne House may be acceptable subject to further detail being submitted to enable the assessment of the impact on the overall setting and significant views & vistas. Any fences around the garden/orchard should be carefully designed so as to not obstruct views to and from the Closebourne House precinct;
12. The Principal's Residence must be retained as a single dwelling as required by Policy 2.4.17 of the endorsed CMP;

- 13. The Bishop's Tank is to be retained. Any additional water storage that may be required as part of the project must be undertaken with minimum impact on the Bishop's Tank and also the overall rural setting of the subject site;**
- 14. This development is considered the maximum development possible on this site without making the adverse impacts unacceptable in heritage terms. Therefore, no further development is expected upon completion of this development;**
- 15. An additional vehicular entry from Tank Street is contrary to the policies of the CMP. However, the construction entry from Tank Street is acceptable on the basis that it will not continue for more than a maximum of three years from the date of its construction. The construction path must be redesigned to ensure this entry is not required for more than that period. This entry must be removed upon completion of three years and prior to occupation certificate being issued for parts of the development being served by this temporary construction path.**
- 16. The applicant must ensure that the kerb and guttering on Tank Street is not damaged during the construction and use of this temporary road;**
- 17. Removal of relics of state significance is not approved. Proposed individual dwellings in archaeologically sensitive locations may need design changes or even deletion, if required, to avoid removal of archaeological relics of state significance.**
- 18. All workers on the site must be informed of possible Aboriginal occupation and if in the process of land preparation artefacts are found, the work must cease immediately and the Local Aboriginal Land Council & NPWS be informed in order to obtain the necessary permits to carry out further work.**
- 19. An interpretation Plan must be prepared by the applicant and approved by the Director, Heritage Branch prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate beyond Stage Two of the proposed development on site. The Plan must also incorporate an acknowledgement of the contributions of Aboriginal occupants of the area in pre and post European contact periods.**
- 20. This Interpretation Plan must be implemented to the satisfaction of the Director, Heritage Branch, prior to the issue of construction certificate beyond Stage Five of the proposed development on the site.**

5.4 Former Head Office Sydney Water, Sydney – IDA

The 1939 Building IDA proposes substantial alterations and refurbishment work for the 1939 Building focusing on: restoration of the two-storey Ratings Chamber including removal of an intrusive mezzanine level added in 1965, re-opening the original Pitt Street entrance into the Ratings Chamber, restoration of the façades to Pitt Street and Wilmot Street, opening up of the walls that constitute the light-well and turning it into an atrium, addition of an extra partial storey on the roof, demolition of some building slab on each of the upper floors to enable

construction of a new lift well on the north side and removal of some heritage fabric on upper levels to aid their transformation into high quality contemporary-styled office space.

These two applications were considered at the 3rd December 2008 meeting and then at the 6 February 2009 meeting of the Approvals Committee. It was resolved to seek some clarifications and further information. The applicant has submitted further amendments in response to Approvals Committee determinations.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee noted that revised drawings submitted for the meeting differed from those noted in the report, therefore plan numbers would be amended in the resolutions to reflect the revised plans. The Approvals Committee supported the proposal and remaining recommendations.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council issue the following General Terms of Approval for the 1939 and the 1965 buildings:

- 1. The shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:**
 - a. A-1100-DA 9 to A-1110-DA 9; A-1150-DA 9, A-1600-DA 4, A-1601-DA 5, A-1602-DA 4, A-1603-DA 4, A-1604-DA 5, A-1606-DA 5, A-1607 5, A-1608 4, A-1609 4, A-1300-DA 1, A-1301-DA 1 prepared by Hassell Limited;**

As amended by the following conditions:

- 2. The proposed lift core must be amended in accordance with Drawings 090324_SK003 A and 090324_SK001 A showing the existing lift lobby being reused by adding a new lift to the existing lift core. Details of this arrangement must be submitted with the s60 application and approved prior to a construction certificate being issued.**
- 3. Further significant fabric shall be retained on all floors of the 1939 building and incorporated within the new office fit outs. The amended proposal must be submitted and approved with the s60 application.**
- 4. A fit out guideline document must be submitted by the applicant providing future tenants information about significant features that must be retained and incorporated within the fit outs. This fitout guideline must be submitted and approved with the s60 application.**
- 5. It is expected that the restored lay light within the Ratings Chamber will be able to be lit naturally. Details of the restoration of the Ratings Chamber and the Lay light must be submitted with the s60 application and approved prior to a construction certificate being issued.**
- 6. The separation between the bottom of the cantilever of the new building and the top of the highest point of the 1939 building must be at least 12.5 metres. Details of how this will be achieved shall**

be submitted with the section 60 application and approved prior to a construction certificate being issued.

7. This approval does not constitute approval for the removal of any archaeological relics of state significance. The Applicant must ensure that if substantial intact archaeological deposits and/or State significant relics are discovered, work must cease in the affected area(s) and the Heritage Council of NSW must be notified. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery.
8. A Heritage Agreement under the provisions of the Heritage Act must be put in place prior to the construction certificate being issued. A portion of the economic advantages of the proposed cantilever of the new office tower over the 1939 Building and the redevelopment of the office space on levels 2-9 of the 1939 Building shall be committed to the proposed refurbishment works. These works are to include, but not be restricted to, the reinstatement of the two-storey Ratings Chamber and the restoration of the building's facades to Pitt Street and Willmot Street.
9. A s60 application must be submitted and approved under the provisions of the Heritage Act prior to a construction certificate being issued for the proposed development or any demolition being carried out on site.

5.5 Bathurst Rail Bridge over Macquarie River – S60

The proposal was for construction of a new bridge parallel to and on the northern side of the existing bridge with a new concrete super structure on the existing concrete mass piers constructed C. 1912.

Presentation

The proponent explained that the existing bridge was reaching the end of its design life and a replacement bridge was required. Concrete girders were proposed which would create some visual impact to the existing bridge. The disused concrete piers already in place parallel to the bridge would be capped, due to weathering, and used for the new bridge. The rail level of the new bridge would be slightly higher (2 metres) than the existing bridge to allow for future increases rainfall levels due to climate change. The rail line will divert to the northern side of the existing bridge, re-connect with the existing line on either side of the river. The existing bridge would be retained and maintained by the current owner, however it is hoped that Bathurst Council will take on maintenance of the bridge.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee noted that the contract for works had been let prior to consultation with the Heritage Branch, Department of Planning. The Committee expressed its concern at the applicant's lack of adherence to the Heritage Act and their statutory obligations by not consulting with the Heritage Branch at an earlier stage. The Approvals Committee considered that the new bridge would be better located on the southern side of the existing bridge to enable better views from

the main road. Existing concrete girders could be left in place for interpretive purposes. A 'calm' design for the new bridge would be preferable.

Determination of this application was delegated to the Director, Heritage Branch, Department of Planning. Consideration regarding determination would include a long term maintenance plan for the heritage bridge as well as an interpretation and access plan.

Resolved:

The Heritage Council considered the application and resolved:

- A. That the Heritage Council express its concern to the applicant at the lack of understanding of its obligations under the Heritage Act;**
- B. That the Heritage Council request the Chair of the Heritage Council to write to the ARTC and other stakeholders expressing concern at the letting of contracts for the works prior to approval being granted for the project.**
- C. That the Heritage Council delegate to the Director of the Heritage Branch the approval of the application once submissions are received.**
- D. That the Heritage Council provide the following advice to the Director of the Heritage Branch to assist in the determination of the application:**
 - 1. An interpretation Plan should be prepared by the applicant and implemented during the construction period. The Plan must also incorporate an acknowledgement of the contributions of Aboriginal occupants of the area in pre and post European contact periods.**
 - 2. A maintenance plan should be prepared by the applicant and submitted to the Heritage Branch within six months of determination of the application.**

5.6 Science Building, Emanuel School Randwick – IDA

The applicant proposed construction of a 3 level Science building with basement parking. The current vehicular entry to the site would be relocated further north.

Presentation

The proponent showed elevations demonstrating that the proposed new building would be sunken lower than existing surrounding buildings. It would be a 3 level contemporary building using a design to complement and enhance the heritage qualities of the site and complementing the streetscape. The new building would be of a similar scale to other buildings on the site and meets development requirements. Views to the Brender-Moss building would remain unchanged. Along the street boundary the current entry gate would be closed, with that section of wall reinstated to its original heritage appearance, with a new gate installed in another position.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee supported the application and conditions of consent.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council provide the following General Terms of Approval to Randwick Council:

1. All work shall be undertaken in accordance with:

- Drawings DA 100C, DA 101D, DA 102D, DA 103E, DA 104E, DA 105D, DA 200C, DA 201C, DA 202D, DA 300D & DA 400A, prepared by Baker Kavanagh Architects and dated Dec. 2008;
- SoEE prepared by City Plan Services and dated Dec. 2008 HIS prepared by FORM Architects and dated Nov. 2008.

2) All repairs and the reinstating of the Chepstow Street boundary wall to its original appearance shall be performed by qualified tradesmen using traditional methods and materials (i.e. bricks) salvaged from the sections of wall to be demolished, and bound by a traditional blend of mortar.

3) An application under section 60 of the NSW Heritage Act must be submitted and approved by the NSW 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 Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome, Evans Head - CMP for Bellman Hangar 160

A Conservation Management Plan to plan for the continuing conservation and use of the Bellman Hangar 160 was submitted for endorsement.

The final draft CMP for the Bellman Hangar 160 located at the Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome presents a clear and coherent document that describes the history and significance of this site and provides policies for the ongoing maintenance, conservation and reuse of this significant element of the Evans head Memorial Aerodrome site. The current revised version of the CMP requires minor editing to address some typographical errors and errors in the Table of Contents.

Consideration

The Approvals Committee endorsed the CMP subject to conditions being met subject to the satisfaction of the Director, Heritage Branch, Department of Planning.

Resolved:

That the Approvals Committee as delegate of the Heritage Council endorses the conservation management plan "Evans Head Memorial Aerodrome: Bellman Hangar Conservation Management Plan," prepared by Converge Heritage and Community in 2009 for Richmond Valley Council, subject to the conditions detailed below being addressed to the satisfaction of the Director of the Heritage Branch:

- 1. Addition of figure showing levels of significance recommended for Section 6.5 as described in the Checklist; and**
- 2. Other detailed items and corrections noted in the checklist.**

8.0 Matters for Information

8.1 Newcastle Port Centre, Newcastle – S60

Proponents for the Newcastle Port Centre gave a presentation to the Approvals Committee regarding proposed development on the site following on from the Approvals Committee's consideration of the proposal in their March 2009 meeting. The proponents stated that, due to the need to employ more people to carry out necessary operations of the Port Centre, there would not be enough space available in the existing Pilot Station. Therefore it was necessary to construct a new purpose built building. The location of the new building needs to be far enough north to be able to see around and over the top of the existing 2 storey TS Tobruk building to enable operators to see up the harbour toward the headlands. Due to tidal zones the new building would not be built closer to the harbour. The orientation of the new building would enable retention of the historic aspect between buildings to the boat ramp and sight lines between the buildings to the harbour from the main road would be retained. The various options considered for placement of the building were shown, demonstrating how the final preferred option was decided upon. It was intended to keep the bulk of open space on the site in one area, thereby clumping buildings together. There were no current intentions develop anything on the site where buildings are proposed to be demolished in western portion of the site. Although the current proposal did not address fencing around the site, the proponents stated that materials to be used had not yet been considered. Any fencing would need to be at least 2 metres high to meet security needs.

The Committee determined that the conditions of the March 2009 meeting resolutions still stand and concerns raised and additional information requested in that meeting had not been addressed in the presentation provided at this meeting. The Approvals Committee would like to give the proponent the option to return at another meeting to present and address concerns raised by the Approvals Committee at the March 2009 meeting.

9.0 General Business

There being no further business the Acting Chair closed the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Peter Mould Chair Approvals Committee Heritage Council of NSW	Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee 6 May, 2009 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	--