

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

Approvals Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING

7th December 2005

NSW Heritage Office, 3 Marist Place, Parramatta



PRESENT Mary-Lynne Taylor (Chair), Jacqui Goddard (National Trust of Australia, NSW), Peter Mould (Government Architect), Gary Prattley (Dept. of Planning), Susan MacDonald (Heritage Office), David Logan (RAIA, RAPI) Rod Leaver, Megan Jones, Diane Jones.

APOLOGIES

ALSO PRESENT Heritage Office:
Vincent Sicari, Nikki Ward, Can Ercan, Alice Brandjes, Brad Vale, Ed Beebe, Stuart Read, Murat Gul
For Sydney Water Corporation:
Ken Taylor, Phil Bennett, Graham Brooks
For White Horse Inn, Berrima:
Jim Allman (Allman Johnston Architects Pty Ltd), Eric Savage & Clive West (President Berrima Residents Association)
For The Priory, Hunters Hill:
David Gaunt (Hunters Hill Trust), Jyoti Somerville (GML)

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 1:10 pm.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

Declarations of Interest

Pecuniary Interests

David Logan

The Priory – Item 5.4

Non Pecuniary Interests

NIL

Conflicts of Interest

NIL

2.0 Confirmation of Minutes

2.1 Approvals Committee Meeting of 5 October 2005

Members received a copy of the minutes.

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meetings of 5 October 2005 be adopted.

3.0 Action Report

Members received a copy of the action report.

Resolved:

that the Action Report of the meetings of 5 October be adopted.

4 Presentations

4.1 Crown Street Reservoir and Site

The committee discussed whether the heritage significance was related to the use of the site as a whole, or if it was related to the relationship between the buildings and other structures on the site. It is the Heritage Office's view that the heritage values of the site can be retained and conserved adequately whether the property is part leased or part sold.

Sydney Water would prefer to sell its asset and are genuinely committed to the conditions of consent of the previously approved S60. Sydney Water would like to commence negotiations with the Heritage Office, immediately, regarding preparation of the Heritage Agreement, in the hope of embodying all elements required by the Heritage Office in order for the land to remain, in total, on the State Heritage Register and that the heritage elements are retained.

4.2 White Horse Inn, Market Place, Berrima

The application was deferred at the request of the applicant and the committee agrees as the proposal in its current form is unsatisfactory.

Jim Allman (architect) presented the view that various points made in the Heritage Report were factually incorrect. Mr Allman put the case that, although there is a DCP condition that states that buildings built behind heritage buildings in Australia should be smaller than and less significant than the heritage building, the land on the site slopes keeping the visual height of the building lower. The design incorporates a basement level on the lower side of the slope – essentially creating a 3 level building. Mr Allman expressed concern that time and money had been wasted in developing a design that was not acceptable to the Heritage Council at the outset. Jim and the client are keen to continue discussions with the Heritage Office to work on design plans, and would be willing to reduce the scale and bulk of the current design to meet Heritage Office requirements. Specifications in design stipulations from the Heritage Office would be appreciated. Mr Allman was invited by the Chair to forward a letter to the Heritage Office outlining elements of the report which he believed to be inaccurate.

Eric Savage (Berrima Resident's Association) pointed out that the proposed development is incompatible with the DCP. The proposed development occupies the maximum possible space that could be used in that space, going from one boundary to the other, being 3 storeys high. The Association is concerned that the vista between the buildings fronting the street is compromised as well as concern about the proposed use of the property, particularly regarding the sale of strata units.

Clive West (Berrima Resident's Association) put forward the view that the proposal could be considered a medium density residential subdivision in disguise within a commercial town centre. The new development detracts from the rustic character of the bush setting on the river. The whole township is a fine example

of early Georgian, colonial town planning. To preserve the heritage of the township, the Association is trying to get the whole township of Berrima heritage listed as an item, rather than as a collection of items, pointing out the importance of the approaches to the township. The White Horse Inn's relationship to the river is considered of important significance. Clive also noted that two thirds of the lot is below the floodline and can't be built on – which impacts on floor space of the proposed building.

4.3 The Priory, Hunters Hill

David Gaunt (Hunters Hill Trust) spoke in objection to the application, stating that:

- the proposal is not compatible with the heritage significance of the Priory;
- it does not comply with planning controls relating to 5a special uses, heritage conservation zoning of the curtilage and a two-storey height limitation;
- it's bulk and scale is such that it dominates the Priory, rather than being subservient to it; and
- it prejudices the potential adaptive re-use of the Priory.

Mr Gaunt put forward that The Priory's curtilage is integral to its heritage value. Its existing curtilage, including the lots owned by Keppel land, is the minimum size. The Trust supports the retention of the Priory and its curtilage for public ownership, to be publicly accessible and managed by Hunters Hill Council. For this reason, potential adaptive re-use is an important factor.

Jyoti Somerville (Godden Mackay Logan) spoke in support of the application stating that major heritage issues have been addressed through:

- dedicating the section of the Priory to the north and east (the most significant portion) to the public domain; and
- confining development to the southwest corner of the site in an area most suitable to lessen overall heritage impacts.

Godden Mackay Logan (GML) acknowledges impact on heritage and have worked on reducing the size of development. The owner of the site is not against future public ownership of the site, however they emphasise it is currently in private ownership.

Part of the development application is to give legal right of way across the subject land to Lot 823988 which contains the actual Priory house.

A number of graphic aids will be made available to the Heritage Council upon a visit to the site.

LEP 18, condition 15, states that 'development may, but only with Council approval, be permitted on this site subject to it being judged compatible with the heritage significance of the site'.

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

5.1 Crown Street Reservoir and Site

The Sydney Water Corporation (SWC) lodged a section 60 application in May 2005 for the subdivision of the Crown Street Reservoir site. The Approvals Committee at its meeting on 13 September 2005 approved the application subject to long term lease rather than sale. The SWC addressed the Approvals Committee for the deletion of Condition 1 of the S60 approval, which will allow the sale of the surplus portion of the site. SWC considered that, while the heritage values of the site need to be safeguarded, the sale of the land is necessary for the appropriate management of their property portfolio. A part of the Crown Street site is surplus to the corporation's needs and the buildings occupying the land are empty and without a use. The corporation also considers that long-term lease is inappropriate in this instance.

The panel was addressed by Ken Taylor (Sydney Water Corporation) and it was noted that a commitment was made to a Heritage Agreement.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council:

- 1. Consider the presentation.**
- 2. Advise the applicant that it considers the deletion of the condition to be appropriate.**
- 3. Advises the applicant that a S65A application should be submitted to amend the current approval and that this be delegated to the Director of the Heritage Office for processing.**

5.2 Towns Place North, Hickson Road, Walsh Bay – S60

In 2004 Waterway Construction Pty Ltd, leased the former Pier 9 Board Office building at Towns Place North, Walsh Bay from Walsh Bay Finance (WBF). Under conditions of the lease, the NSW Maritime Authority requires that repair of the substructure provides a design life of 50 years, as well as minimising future maintenance needs. Four structural options were considered. Option 4, involving new steel piles with concrete slab and beam transfer structure, is the applicant's preferred option and is supported by their consultant structural engineer. According to independent engineering advice from Simon Wiltshier, Option 4 is the preferred option primarily because it gives the best opportunity to conserve the Towns Place Building for the longest period. He is of the opinion that, although Option 4 will result in the eventual loss of the most of the substructure, the original substructure does not have the rarity of the building it supports. The fabric and pattern of the substructure is still currently well represented both in Sydney and elsewhere in the State. The current S60 application is for general repair and refurbishment of the former Pier 9 Board Office building, incorporating new substructure with steel piles and suspended concrete slab.

Resolved:

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

- 1) The development is to be in accordance with the following documents:**
 - i) DA 149-05-02 /s60 approval drawings: Nos. DA003 to 006 Rev B; Structural Drawings by Robert Bird and Partners: S1.01 Rev P1 Ground Floor Plans, S1.02 Rev P1 Ground Floor Details; New slab detail drawing No. SK006 dated 2 June, 2005 prepared by Bates Smart;**
 - ii) Structural Specification for Proposed Refurbishment Work dated 10 June, 2005 by Robert Bird + Partners;**
 - iii) Supplementary Heritage Impact Statement dated, prepared by Otto Cserhalmi & Partners Pty Ltd received by the Heritage Office on 2 November, 2005;**
 - iv) Maritime Archaeological Impact Assessment, dated June, 2005 prepared by Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd;**
 - v) The Conservation Management Plan for Towns Place North prepared by Tropman and Tropman Architects dated July 2001;**
 - vi) The Towns Place North Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Tropman and Tropman Architects dated February 2001; and**
 - vii) The Walsh Bay Precinct Conservation Plan prepared by Clive Lucas Stapleton and Partners dated December 1998.**

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 and approved by the Director of the Heritage Office prior to the commencement of the works;**
- 3) The nominated heritage consultant is to advise on detail design resolution (including installation of new services) and inspect the**

demolition and construction works to minimise loss of significant fabric and reuse of salvageable material.

Progress and Final Reports

- 4) A monthly progress report (illustrated with site photographs) by the nominated heritage consultant is to be submitted to the NSW Heritage Office which describes the work, any impacts/damage and remedial works carried out. A final report is to be submitted and approved by the Director of the NSW Heritage Office within 1 month of the completion of the works;**

Timber Piles

- 5) All piles in the outermost row are to be timber piles;**

Further Information

- 6) No work is to commence on site until the following details are approved by the Director Heritage Office:**
 - i) Details of the proposed installation of the concrete slab showing the extent of removal of the hardwood decking, joist and girders;**
 - ii) Details to confirm the sampling and display of the existing ground floor flooring structure;**
 - iii) Details of an external colour scheme based on an investigation of early colour schemes; and**
 - iv) A full condition survey and analysis of existing fabric;**

Work Method Statement

- 7) No work is to commence on the site until a work method statement is prepared to the approval of the nominated heritage consultant and approved in writing by the Director of the Heritage Office. The work methods are to ensure that the work is carefully carried out to limit the loss of significant fabric and prevent damage to the Towns Place North building and the early 20th Century precast concrete seawall;**

Archaeology

- 8) Prior to the commencement of the works, all contractors and relevant personnel are to be made aware of the existence of possible historical archaeological remains at the site and the requirements of the Heritage Act, 1977 by way of an induction process undertaken by Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd, author of the Maritime Archaeological Impact Assessment, dated June, 2005;**
- 9) If any unidentified historical archaeological remains or deposits are exposed, the works are to cease immediately in the affected areas and Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd is to be notified to undertake an evaluation of the potential extent and significance of such relics. The NSW Heritage Office is to be notified in accordance with Section 146 of the Heritage Act. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area based on the nature of the discovery;**

Works

- 10) Work involving significant fabric is to be carried out by qualified tradesmen with practical experience in the conservation and restoration of similar heritage buildings;**
- 11) Work involving significant fabric is to be inspected weekly by the nominated heritage consultant;**
- 12) Significant building elements, features, fixtures, fittings and fragile materials are to be protected from damage during the works. Protection systems must ensure significant fabric is not removed;**
- 13) All work to install new services is to minimise damage or removal of significant fabric and shall not obscure significant features. Service runs are to be grouped and concealed within the new work. Penetrations through significant fabric are to be minimised;**
- 14) Surviving examples of early painted finishes are to be conserved in-situ and recorded in accordance with NSW Heritage Office guidelines;**

Interpretation

- 15) A site specific Interpretation and Signage Plan is to be prepared in accordance with the Walsh Bay Interpretation Strategy. The Plan and is to include relevant historical themes and propose appropriate media and signage (design, location and fixing). The plan is to be developed in consultation with and to the approval of the nominated heritage consultant and approved by the Director of the Heritage Office prior to the relevant work commencing. Interpretation media is to be installed prior to occupation;**

Archival Record

- 16) No work is to commence on the building until an archival record of the Towns Place North building and site has been prepared and a draft submitted and approved by the Director of the Heritage Office:**
 - i) The record is to include measured drawings and an archival photographic record before any work commences;**
 - ii) Changes during the work are to be documented, including any significant fabric/detail uncovered;**
 - iii) The archival record is to be prepared in accordance with the Heritage Office guidelines and copies lodged with City Of Sydney and Heritage Office libraries**

Commencement

- 17) 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.**

5.3 White Horse Inn, Market Place, Berrima - IDA

In December 2004 the Heritage Office received a development application referral from Wingecarribee Shire Council proposing demolition of four existing motel units and the construction of Georgian style motel and long stay strata titled units at the White Horse Inn, Market Place Berrima. An Integrated Development Application for the proposal was lodged in late March 2005. The initial proposal was amended by the applicant in response to concerns expressed by the Heritage Office. The current proposal seeks approval for demolition of the existing motel and construction of motel and self contained tourist accommodation suites at the rear of the inn.

The Heritage Office recommended that the proposal be refused on the basis of unreasonable impact on the heritage significance of the "White Horse Inn" and the visual, built and landscape character and values of Berrima.

The Committee requested that the width of open space seen between Market Place the Wingecarribee River be increased to maintain the existing pattern of development within the local landscape. The footprint of the new buildings should be reduced to ensure the scale is compatible with the grain of similar historical development in Berrima.

Resolved:

- 1) That the Heritage Council defer, at the request of the applicant, consideration of the Integrated Development Application for the White Horse Inn at Berrima and advise the applicant and Wingecarribee Shire Council that the design should be amended in the following manner;**
 - a) compliance with the provisions of Development Control Plan no. 14 in terms of height, scale, building form and floor space ratio because:**
 - i) the footprint is too large;**
 - ii) the height is excessive by the number of storeys – resulting in unacceptable bulk;**
 - iii) new buildings are too close together; and**
 - iv) architectural expression is too complex and should be simplified.**
- 2) that the Heritage Office convene discussions with the applicant, Wingecarribee Shire Council and the Heritage Advisor in regard to the matters stated in 1) above prior to the preparation of amended plans**
- 3) Plans submitted should be to scale and dimensioned.**

5.4 The Priory, Hunters Hill – IDA

The applicant sought to build within the curtilage of the Priory: one residence on Lot 2, an apartment block of 22 dwellings over five above-ground storeys and dedication of land to the public. This application would concentrate redevelopment into the south-west corner to minimise the adverse impacts on the site that is within the curtilage of the Priory. An apartment building of five stories would be partially screened by existing trees and an adjacent hill. The height is controlled so as not to be visible in views from the east along Tarban Creek in the public domain. The apartments would be visible in less significant views from Salter Street. A detached house would also be constructed within an area enclosed by tall hedges. More than half of the site would be dedicated to the public as a reserve.

Resolved:

- 1) That the Heritage Council consider this report, the public submissions and the presentations.**
- 2) That the Heritage Council appoint a sub-committee to visit the site and meet in early January to discuss the application.**
- 3) That the Heritage Council defer the matter for further consideration and determination at the February 2006 meeting.**

5.5 South Chatswood Uniting Church – Childcare Centre – S60

The Church has stated that it needs to develop an income stream from a more productive use of its site in order to support the on-going use by the church community of this site. A mid-twentieth-century manse would be demolished and replaced with a childcare centre. The childcare centre would not be as high, but would have a larger volume. The new building has been kept away from the sandstone church building and takes a broken up form that makes some reference to a late nineteenth-century school.

The Committee discussed the size of the footprint of the church in comparison to the footprint size of the proposed child-care centre. The key view is from the north-east, which would not be effected. The church cannot be seen from the south due to low hedges and tall turpentine trees. It was suggested to have Building A extend only as far as the southern wall of the Fellowship Centre to create a defined space and curtilage for the church, opening up views. The architecture could be improved, including increased natural lighting into the building. It was also requested to obtain confirmation of the distance required between the heritage trees and any new building.

Resolved:

The Heritage Council support the proposed use but resolves to appoint a sub-committee of three members of the Approvals Committee to meet with the site owner and architect to revise the design to:

- 1) Minimise built elements north of grid line C;**
- 2) Ensure construction of footings, services and other built elements do not threaten the health of the specified heritage trees on site; and**
- 3) to resolve details, colours and finishes to minimize the impact of the childcare centre on the church building and its setting,**

and recommends that delegated authority for approval be given to the Director of the Heritage Office.

5.6 Kelvin Park, Bringelly – Subdivision and extension - IDA

Kelvin Park estate is rare as the remaining core of a colonial farm on the Cumberland Plain that has retained much of its original 1200 acres for most of the 20th century, despite subdivisions since the 1940s and particularly c.1980. The PCO boundary was revised in 1985 to allow closer subdivision of the immediate setting of the farm group, leaving a better curtilage to protect that setting, of homestead group on a low hilltop, with paddocks sloping east to Thompson's Creek.

This application proposes a small ensuite bathroom addition to the house's south-east, repair of two slab sheds, alterations and maintenance to main homestead verandah, including the removal of concrete floor accretions and replacement with original type fabric. In addition a further four lot subdivision is proposed to allow the Medich children to in future build 2 homes on parts of the remaining 9 hectares, alongside the homestead to the north-east, and below it to the south-west. A previous Heritage Council approval for subdivision was taken with the understanding there would be no further subdivision.

The northern house development site is too close and intrusive on the dominance and legibility of the homestead group on its hill. A heritage agreement was recommended by the Heritage Office to ensure any future owner is committed to conserving and maintaining this special place, and clarifying that no further subdivision will be considered. A separate section 60 application would be required for any future houses proposed.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council approves the application on the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall give further consideration to relocating the proposed northern development area on lot 2712 further to the west, and possible adjustment of the proposed boundary between lot 2712 and 2713, to allow ongoing use of lot 2713 for horse agistment, and retention of any archaeological remains of the original access**

- driveway to Kelvin Park from the east over Thompson's Creek and in the north of lot 2712;
- 2) Before any revised subdivision map is finalised, it must be subject to the satisfactory revision of the draft conservation management plan particularly sections 2.2- 2.5 (mapping and ranking significance of all elements include landscape/ non-built elements, views and archaeological resources), better integration of these sections with the contents of section 3.2 (conservation policies) & Appendix A (conservation policies/actions) to address all identified significant elements, including landscape elements such as access drives, turning loops, views, archaeological resources, agreement on and signature of a heritage agreement;
 - 3) A heritage agreement shall be prepared to ensure ongoing funding to conserve the property's significant heritage features, and which addresses inter alia:
 - a) Title restrictions on the use, location (specified new building footprints), size, scale, type, form, colours, materials and finishes of future development, a concept design plan to indicate appropriate areas and forms of new development, appropriate fencing, landscape guidelines, access to lot 2711, 2712 and 2713 to be by the existing driveway access;
 - b) A clear statement that no further subdivision is permissible;
 - c) A clear understanding that only single-storey future buildings are permissible in agreed development areas on lots 2712 and 2711;
 - d) Owner compliance with a final revised conservation management plan as outlined in (2) above which has been endorsed by the Director of the Heritage Office;
 - e) Establishment of a heritage conservation fund to sustain the property;
 - f) Conservation, repairs and maintenance requirements of and prioritised works to conserve each identified item of heritage value (including built, vegetative, archaeological, visual) over the short, medium and long terms;
 - g) Costed works at (f) and agreement on amounts to be spent each year;
 - h) Proposed mechanisms to monitor and report on adherence to (f) to the Heritage Council each year;
 - i) The Owner will report in writing to the Director every second year about:
 - 1) the amount or amounts paid into the Fund under clause 3(e), and
 - 2) the Maintenance and Conservation Works undertaken, and the amount spent on works every 2 years under clause 3(f);
 - j) One public access day to the historic buildings at Kelvin Park being provided per year;
 - 4) A revised subdivision plan for four lots, and draft heritage agreement as per (1-3) above shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of the Heritage Office prior to its submission to the Minister responsible for Heritage;
 - 5) On the Minister's and owner's signatures of a heritage agreement, the revised subdivision plan shall be registered at the Land Titles Office;
 - 6) the detailed design of any additional future dwelling on the new lot created in the subdivision plan at (5) shall be subject to a separate application made under section 60 of the *Heritage Act 1977*;

and that the Heritage Council instructs the Heritage Office to liaise with Liverpool City Council seeking that it prepare a Development Control Plan by December 7 2006 to address appropriate forms of development within the setting of historic farm properties, to ensure the conservation of their rural curtilage and setting, including retention of sufficient land to allow ongoing rural or semi-rural functions, guidelines for subdivision, siting, design, scale, form, materials and colours of new buildings, driveways, fencing types, appropriate forms and types of plantings, retention of landscape character, and retention of significant modern or historic views of such properties, and seeks that Liverpool City Council submits the draft Development Control Plan for the comment of the Heritage Council, before it is placed on public exhibition.

5.7 Observer Hotel, The Rocks – IDA

The applicant proposes to carry out some works including` internal modifications to the first Floor of the 1909 hotel building, to demolish the existing single-storey extension and to construct a two-storey addition along Mill Lane and alterations to the layout of the commercial kitchen. The proposed modifications will enable the use of the former hotel rooms, which have been vacant for a long period, as a function space as part of the hotel. The proposed infill will also provide additional bar area that will be linked with the proposed function space on the first floor of the 1909 building.

Although the proposed modifications to the 1909 building will result in the loss of some original fabric, the proposal is considered acceptable as the current configuration and size of the former hotel rooms do not enable them to be used for accommodation purposes in line with the contemporary standards. The proposed use as a function room is consistent with both the use of the hotel and The Rocks overall context as an entertainment and cultural precinct.

The applicant has been asked to make some minor modifications to provide a wider setback from Mill Lane and a more simplified design of the elevation.

Members of the committee expressed interest in consideration of: interpretation of archaeological remains (ie. box drains) which will be amended by this proposal; the lightweight addition on the original rear area wall, ensuring it does not sit flush against the existing wall; the degree of removal of original windows and fabric from the rear elevation; and the scale of the new addition against the existing building and views this may block into the courtyard from Mill Lane.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council recommend to Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority that the application be approved with the following conditions:

- 1) All work shall be carried out in accordance with the following documentation:**
 - a. Drawings 0308.03/DA01 A, 0308.03/DA03 F, 0308.03/DA04 F, 0308.03/DA05 F prepared by Form Architects dated 08 March 2005, 24 & 25 November 2005; and**
 - b. Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Form Architects dated March 2005.**

And EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the conditions of this approval.

- 2) **The detail of the new building work on Kendall Lane shall be designed to keep the new fabric off the existing wall. The detail shall be submitted for approval together with the S60 application.**
- 3) **The archaeological remains in the North West corner of the site shall be retained for viewing from Kendall Lane. The modified drawings shall be submitted for approval together with the S60 application.**
- 4) **A full archival recording of the site (both measured drawings and photographic recording) shall be prepared in accordance with the NSW Heritage Office's guidelines and submitted together with the S60 application.**
- 5) **The design of the façade of the proposed addition along Mill Lane shall be modified to achieve a more simplified design. The modified design shall be submitted for approval together with the S60 application.**
- 6) **A detailed method statement for any excavation work that may be required for the proposed development shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority. The statement must include, at least, a baseline archaeological assessment as allowed in Section 3.1 of the Archaeological Assessment Guidelines (1996). These documents shall identify the impact of the development on the archaeological significance of the site and appropriate mitigation techniques and shall be submitted for approval together with the S60 application.**
- 7) **An interpretation strategy and plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval together with the S60 application.**
- 8) **The external seating elements and canopies are not part of this approval.**
- 9) **No signage is part of this approval and shall require a separate approval.**
- 10) **Prior to commencement of work a S60 application shall be submitted in accordance with the Heritage Act 1977.**

6. Development Application Referrals

NIL

7. Conservation Management Plans

7.1 CMP Report

The current number of CMPs waiting review is 64, 7 less than last report. No new CMPs have been received for consideration. The following points can be noted:

- The CMP for Old Windsor Road/Windsor Road was endorsed at the last meeting of the Heritage Council.
- Since the endorsement by the Heritage Council of the CMP Strategy in April 2005, the number of CMPs awaiting review and endorsed has been halved within a period seven months.

Three CMPs have been endorsed in the past month (Croydon Sewer Vent, The Boulevard Sewer Vent in Lewisham, Wollie Creek Sewage Aqueduct) under delegation. Outsourced and in-house reviews of CMPs on hand are continuing. Two other CMPs have been withdrawn from the review process.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council Approvals Committee as delegate of the Heritage Council notes this status report.

8.0 Matters for Consideration

NIL

9.0 Matters for Information

NIL

10.0 General Business

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 4:45pm.

Michael Collins Chair Approvals Committee Heritage Council of NSW Date:	Next Meeting of the Approvals Committee 1 March 2006 NSW Heritage Office 3 Marist Place Parramatta
--	---