



## HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

### Minutes for Approvals Committee Meeting

Tuesday 31 March 2020 | 09:00 AM - 1:30 PM

Video Conference

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	
<b>MEMBERS</b>	
Mr Dillon Kombumerri	Chair
Mr Ian Clarke	Deputy Chair
Mr Bruce Pettman	Member
Mr David Burdon	Member
Ms Caitlin Allen	Member
Mr Niall Macken	Member
Ms Ingrid Mather	Observer
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
Mr Brett Whitworth	Member
<b>EXTERNAL PRESENTERS</b>	
Mr Graham Brooks	Heritage Consultant, GBA Heritage – item 2.1
Mr Frank Stanisic	Director, Stanisic Architects – item 2.1
Mr Matthew Daniel	Development Manager, Pacific Planning – item 2.1
Mr Paul Davies	Heritage Architect, Paul Davies Pty Ltd – item 3.1
<b>HERITAGE NSW STAFF</b>	
Ms Pauline McKenzie	Executive Director
Ms Olgica Lenger	Senior Team Leader Secretariat
Ms Natasha Agaki	Senior Secretariat Officer
Ms Katrina Stankowski	Senior Team Leader, North Regional Heritage Assessments - items 2.1 and 4.0

Mr Rajeev Maini	Senior Team Leader, South Regional Heritage Assessments – item 3.1 and 3.2
Ms Veerle Norbury	Senior Heritage Assessments Officer – item 3.1
Ms Caitlin Stevens	Senior Heritage Assessments Officer – item 3.2

## 1.0 Welcome and formalities

The Deputy Chair, Mr Ian Clarke opened the meeting at 09:00am, delivered an Acknowledgment of Country and welcomed attendees.

- Late apologies were accepted from the Chair, Mr Dillon Kombumerri, who arrived at 9:10am.
- Apologies were accepted from Mr Brett Whitworth; and it was noted that quorum had been met.
- Members were asked to raise any conflicts of interest with items on the agenda; the below potential conflict was declared:

Decision
<p>The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted following potential conflict of interest declaration and agreed that no further action needed to be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr David Burdon, item 2.1 21 Gregory Place, Harris Park – Dr Burdon previously worked with DCP heritage planning controls for Parramatta City Council in the CBD area, however this work was unrelated to the project being discussed.</li> </ol>

## 1.1 Minutes from previous meeting - 3 March 2020

The Committee received the Minutes UNCONFIRMED from the previous ordinary meeting.

Resolution 2020-13 – Confirmation of previous meeting minutes
<p>The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confirmed the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting (Tuesday, 3 March 2020) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting subject to minor amendments.</li> <li>2. Agreed that Minutes should include more reasoning around concerns expressed by the Committee, in general.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Moved by Mr David Burdon and seconded by Ms Caitlin Allen.</b></p>

## 1.2 Action report

The Committee received the monthly Action Report and requested the following:

1. Item 3.1 Albion Hotel, Braidwood – clarify that the Committee requests an audit of all the works undertaken, as opposed to only those relating to the Balustrade.

## **2.0 External Presentations - Part 1**

### **2.1 2A Gregory Place, Harris Park**

The Committee received a presentation from Mr Graham Brooks, Mr Frank Stanisic and Mr Matthew Daniel; and a paper and verbal report from Ms Katrina Stankowski, Heritage NSW. The presenters left and the Committee discussed:

#### **1. Planning, design and scale**

- Affordability Housing Compatibility Certificate granted to the proponent including the requirement to consult with the Heritage Council to address the heritage issues.
- Lack of clarity on Parramatta City Council's position in relation to building heights and rezoning.
- The intention for affordable housing is commendable, however the overall design is unsympathetic and does not respect the scale of the surrounding setting.
- Although the compatibility certificate granted overrides local planning and height controls, a merit assessment must take into consideration sound design principles.
- Current urban design principles could be reshaped to ensure heritage is appropriately addressed and managed within the landscape and built form.

#### **2. Cultural landscape**

- Interpretation of the cultural landscape requires more focus on character and experience, not just how the concept responds to visual connections with heritage items.
- The proponent's focus on the cultural landscape is appreciated, however there is currently no connection to Aboriginal culture within the concept plan.
- Location of the proposed community centre disrupts an important relationship between Clay Cliff Creek and Experiment Farm.
- Height controls in this area could provide an opportunity for a better context and experience of this nationally significant cultural landscape.

#### **3. Analyses presented and the need for further investigation on heritage values**

- A wide range of existing landscape analyses have not been considered in response to a cultural landscape setting; massing and infringement in to set back borders is currently problematic.

- Concerns around the view analysis presented in terms of authorisation and accuracy of perspective.
- The interrelationship of Elizabeth Farm, Experiment Farm and Hambledon Cottage in terms of views is clearly disrupted; none of the buildings can be viewed from the others.
- A range of studies conducted on Eric Nicholls' work, as well as the visual setting and cultural landscape of these three sites, may indicate heritage values that have not yet been investigated.
- The need for further assessment on how the sites co-exist socially and culturally in Parramatta today, and how the heritage issues fit within the urban development framework.
- Possible heritage significance of the Maronite Church.
- The significance of Clay Cliff Creek could be explored further.

#### 4. **Archaeology**

- The site is located on the Parramatta Sand Sheet, a highly significant Aboriginal cultural layer, and mass scale excavation on this site would require significant removal of this.
- Should the development progress, an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Statement (AHIP) and Historical Archaeology Permits would be required.

#### **Resolution 2020-14 - 2A Gregory Place, Harris Park**

The Approvals Committee provided the following comments:

- The Committee supports previous Approvals Committee concerns regarding the current bulk and scale of the development of the site and the impact on surrounding SHR listed items and cultural landscape setting. The Committee does not support the current concept proposal.
- The principles lack adequate consideration of the cultural landscape, including the creek line and engagement with Aboriginal culture.
- The proposal is missing adequate consideration of a range of studies done about the interconnection of the three SHR sites, how the sites exist in today's cultural context, and how this information can be incorporated into the urban design principles.
- The Factory itself may have heritage significance as it was designed by Eric Nicholls, a close associate of Walter Burley Griffin and a noted architect in his own right. Because of this, adaptive reuse needs to be considered.
- The Approvals Committee requests that Parramatta City Council provide context for this development regarding proposed changes to height and zoning in the CBD.

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The Approvals Committee would like to continue to work with the applicant regarding the urban design principles for the site and how they will ultimately shape the development of the site.</li><li>- To support this work, the Committee would like to undertake a synthesis of previous heritage research done around the SHR sites including their past and present cultural landscape.</li></ul> |
|---|

<p><b>Moved by Dr Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Mr Niall Macken.</b></p>
---

### 3.0 External Presentations – Part 2

#### 3.1 St Andrews Cathedral near Town Hall, Sydney - IDA

The Committee received a presentation from Mr Paul Davies and a paper and verbal report from Ms Veerle Norbury, Heritage NSW. Following the presentation and:

1. Discussed impacts of rebuilding the verger's office into the George Street streetscape on the street façade, original fabric and character of the building.
2. Discussed design and location options for the verger's office that may be more architecturally sympathetic and may mitigate the impacts discussed.
  - The possibility of alternative locations on and off site to preserve the George street façade and/or negate the need for an extension.
  - Integration of any addition to the George Street corner with the Church's garden layout.
  - How a new addition may be interpreted as part of the Church's progressive development and story.
  - The need to consider local planning controls in design suggestions.
3. Commended the proposal for material reuse.
4. Discussed whether the level of need for an extension warrants the impacts of compromising an important façade.
5. Noted that the use of Cathedral's changes over time, but without proper planning and consideration for the building's intent and functionality, cumulative impacts to heritage become problematic.
6. Considered the issue of incremental development more broadly and how to define a threshold.
7. Discussed successful examples of historic Cathedrals that adapt to changing use over time to become dynamic forms of living heritage.
8. Noted the archaeological assessment and considered that relocating the office could present a risk around excavation issues relating to burials.

**Item 3.1 St Andrew’s Cathedral near Town Hall – IDA**

Resolution 2020-16

In accordance with Section 4.47 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the Heritage Council of NSW (the Heritage Council) does not grant General Terms of Approval for the Integrated Development Application, for the following reasons:

1. The St Andrew’s Anglican Cathedral and Chapter House is a place of State heritage significance that is protected on the State Heritage Register for its historic, associative, aesthetic, social, research, rarity and representative values. The introduction of the relocated vestry into the George Street streetscape will have a detrimental impact on its aesthetic and historic values. The demolition of original stonework for the new door opening is considered to have unacceptable impact upon original fabric. The relocated structure will impact upon views to the significant stained-glass windows.
2. It is not possible to mitigate or minimise these impacts through conditions of approval.
3. The application will result in a permanent detrimental impact to the overall significance of the SHR item.
4. The Approvals Committee would like to work with Mr Paul Davies and the Church to develop options and find a more appropriate solution.
5. The Approvals Committee recommends that the Church considers development of a Master Plan to guide the ongoing development of the site

**Moved by Mr Ian Clark and seconded by Mr David Burdon.**

**3.2 199 Wallace Street, Braidwood - IDA**

The Committee received a paper from Ms Caitlin Stevens and a verbal report from Mr Rajeev Maini, Heritage NSW. The Committee

1. Discussed impacts of locating the property within a highly significant view line.
  - Visual disruption and the separation of Braidwood town from its significant rural setting.
  - Although plenty of rural space would remain, there is risk in setting a precedent for further developments infringing on the borders of the town.
  - The risk of undermining principles and reasoning within the Land and Environment court case decision on the absence of ribbon development on the approaches to Braidwood town.
2. Noted the Archaeological zone that is the former police lock up and considered alternative locations for the placement of the property.

**Item 3.2 199 Wallace Street, Braidwood - IDA****Resolution 2020-16**

In accordance with Section 4.47 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* the Heritage Council of NSW (the Heritage Council) does not grant General Terms of Approval for the integrated development application, for the following reasons:

1. *Braidwood and its setting* is a place of State heritage significance that is protected on the State Heritage Register for its historic, aesthetic and associational values. The adjustment of the lot boundaries to include the surrounding rural landscape into the low-density residential zone would alter the historic transitional view of the township and its pastoral setting. The proposed dwelling at the western corner of the subject property would obstruct the historic urban-rural boundary located at the edge of the historic township.
2. The Police Paddocks have historically remained grazing land since the 1830s and the proposed location of the subject dwelling would break the visual continuity that is associated with its historic land use. The proposal in its current form will have a detrimental impact on the values of the Police Paddocks within *Braidwood and its setting*.
3. It is not possible to mitigate or minimise these impacts through conditions of approval.
4. The application will result in a permanent detrimental impact to the overall significance of the SHR item.
5. The development could create a precedent for similar developments within the conservation area, which would gradually erode the relevance of the state heritage listing of *Braidwood and its setting*.

*Advisory note: Any future applications must be sensitively designed to maintain the significant views, character, setting and curtilage of Braidwood and its setting, and conserve any significant archaeology. Interpretation and ongoing management of heritage values should also be addressed.*

**Moved by Dr Nick Brunton and seconded by Ms Caitlin Allen**

**Item 4.0 Closebourne House - IDA**

The Committee received a paper and verbal report from Ms Katrina Stankowski, Heritage NSW and:

1. Noted that the Approvals Committee is bound by the heritage agreement and previous decisions made in relation to this application.
2. Discussed design changes made from the previous iteration and noted a significant improvement overall.

3. Discussed architectural solutions to improve the relationship between the common dining area behind Closebourne House, the laundry building and the Courtyard, in particular adjustments to the roof form.
  - Considered how pitching the main roof for a lower edge to the Courtyard would reduce the scale as it relates to the back of Closebourne House.
  - Relating the lower pitched roof line to the new utility room to the South of the laundry block may improve views.
  - Lowering the roof link between the Courtyard and Closebourne House for a more discreet connection to the main roof.
4. Discussed further work to be done to better respect the remaining cultural landscape fabric and layout, and to better respond to the rural setting through detailed landscaping plans.
5. Considered how delaying the archaeological testing poses a risk for the applicant in the approvals process; should findings require retention in situ, the proponent may need to amend the IDA.

**Item 4.0 Closebourne House - IDA**

**Resolution 2020-17**

In accordance with Section 4.47 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the Heritage Council of NSW (the Heritage Council) grants the following General Terms of Approval for the integrated development application (draft letter in TAB E of report):

**APPROVED DEVELOPMENT**

1. Development must be in accordance with:
  - (a) Architectural drawings, by Jackson Teece, as listed below:

Drawing No.	Title	Date	Rev
000-00	COVER SHEET	13/02/20	6
000-01	LOCALITY PLAN	19/09/19	3
000-03	SITE PLAN	12/12/19	6
100-00	DEMOLITION PLAN - SHEET 1	12/12/19	4
100-01	DEMOLITION PLAN - SHEET 2	12/12/19	5
100-10	PERSPECTIVE	19/09/19	2
200-00	FLOOR PLAN - LOWER GROUND	12/12/19	5
201-00	FLOOR PLAN - GROUND	12/12/19	5
301-00	FLOOR PLAN - FIRST	19/09/19	3



303-00	FLOOR PLAN - ROOF	19/09/19	3
400-00	ELEVATIONS (WITH TREES) – SHEET 1	12/12/19	4
400-01	ELEVATIONS (WITH TREES) – SHEET 2	19/09/19	3
400-10	ELEVATIONS (WITHOUT TREES) – SHEET 1	13/02/20	3
400-11	ELEVATIONS (WITHOUT TREES) – SHEET 2	01/11/19	1
400-12	ELEVATIONS (WITHOUT TREES) – SHEET 3	13/02/20	1
500-00	SECTIONS - SHEET 1	19/09/19	3
900-10	PERSPECTIVE	19/09/19	2

## (b) Heritage Fabric drawings, by Jackson Teece, as listed below:

<b>Drawing No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Rev</b>
ASK-000-00	COVER SHEET	06/11/19	8
ASK-000-50	DOOR SCHEDULE	01/11/19	2
ASK-200-00	FLOOR PLAN - GROUND	06/11/19	8
ASK-200-01	FLOOR PLAN - GROUND	19/09/19	6
ASK-301-00	FLOOR PLAN - FIRST	19/09/19	7
ASK-302-00	FLOOR PLAN - ROOF - SHEET 1	19/09/19	7
ASK-302-01	FLOOR PLAN - ROOF - SHEET 2	19/09/19	5
ASK-400-00	ELEVATIONS – SHEET 1	19/09/19	6
ASK-400-01	ELEVATIONS – SHEET 2	19/09/19	6
ASK-400-02	ELEVATIONS – SHEET 3	19/09/19	5
ASK-400-03	ELEVATIONS – SHEET 4	19/09/19	5
ASK-500-00	SECTIONS - SHEET 1	06/11/19	6
ASK-500-01	SECTIONS - SHEET 2	06/11/19	6
ASK-500-02	SECTIONS - SHEET 3	06/11/19	6
ASK-550-00	SECTION - DETAIL SHEET 1	06/11/19	7
ASK-550-01	SECTION - DETAIL - SHEET 2	06/11/19	7
ASK-550-02	SECTION - DETAIL - SHEET 3	19/09/19	6
ASK-550-03	SECTION - DETAIL - SHEET 4	06/11/19	1

ASK-550-04	SECTION - DETAIL - SHEET 5	06/11/19	1
------------	----------------------------	----------	---

- (c) Landscape Design Report, Revision 6, by Aspect Studios, dated 18 December 2019.
- (d) Statement of Heritage Impact, Issue G, by Placemark Consultants, dated 19 December 2019.
- (e) Plans submitted by Lendlease via email on 25 March 2020.

**EXCEPT AS AMENDED BY THE BELOW GENERAL TERMS OF APPROVAL:**

**WORK TO BE ADDRESSED PRIOR TO LODGEMENT OF THE S60 APPLICATION**

2. Following the issue of the development consent and prior to lodgement of the s60 application, the Applicant shall undertake an archaeological testing program to inform final design for the redevelopment and its impacts to archaeology. The results of the archaeological excavation shall be outlined in an excavation report which complies with Heritage Council of NSW Guidelines and is supported by relevant documentary records from the excavation.

The outcomes of the testing shall be used to support amended detailed design plans which conserve the archaeology. To comply with the order of approvals, the Applicant must ensure that prior to lodgement of the s60 application, that any plans amended to allow state significant archaeology to remain *in situ* are first lodged for approval under a s4.55 application under the *EP&A Act 1979*.

*Reason: The Application has not responded to policies in the 2005 Endorsed CMP for management of Significant archaeology for the current redevelopment. The CMP outlines policies to manage significant archaeology consistent with the Statement of Significance for 'Morpeth House, Closebourne House, Adjoining Chapels and Diocesan Registry Group'. Archaeological resources have been removed in other parts of the SHR site due to redevelopment requirements causing cumulative impact to this State significant resource/value.*

**ADVICE:**

Permission to conduct an archaeological testing program identified in Condition 2 should be sought and obtained under a s57(2) exemption application. This application should include the name of a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist with a relevant archaeological research design and excavation methodology adequate to guide the investigation of anticipated features predicted in the *Historical Archaeological Assessment prepared by AMAC Group dated November 2019* in support of the current IDA. The s57(2) application should also confirm when the final excavation report which documents the findings of the excavation program will be lodged at the end of the program.

Heritage NSW recommends that if the Proponent wishes to meaningfully address the advice from the Heritage Council Approvals Committee, an excavation director who is suitable to manage State significant archaeology throughout the entire redevelopment process from testing through to design review, post excavation analysis and production a final excavation report should be engaged.

### **DETAILS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL WITH THE S60 APPLICATION**

3. The following information is to be submitted with the s60 application for approval by the Heritage Council of NSW (or delegate) and Maitland City Council:

#### Closebourne House

- (a) Amended architectural drawings for the connection between Closebourne House and the new café building detailing Option 1, as demonstrated in sketch plans submitted on 25 March 2020.
- (b) The eaves must be reduced to the southern elevation of the café to be consistent with the general roof form of the former laundry building.
- (c) The link between the proposed café and enclosed courtyard of Closebourne House be a separate element sitting below the eaves of the glass enclosure.
- (d) Amended architectural drawings to reduce the scale, form and location of the Porte Cochere as demonstrated in sketch plans submitted on 25 March 2020 including ensuring it sits lightly within the setting of Closebourne.
- (e) Amended architectural drawings to relocate the substation and option 1 for the location of the condensers as demonstrated in sketch plans submitted on 25 March 2020
- (f) Amended architectural drawings to relocate and reconfigure the café within the new building as demonstrated in sketch plans submitted on 25 March 2020
- (g) Amended architectural drawings to move the new building footprint to the east as demonstrated in sketch plans submitted on 25 March 2020
- (h) Details of the amended fencing height of 1m adjacent to Arkell House to be provided along with confirmation of the rural post and rail style of this fencing.
- (i) Detailed drawings of the exposed surfaces of the demolished sections of wall in Closebourne House around the lift lobby.
- (j) The widening and heightening of principal doorways e.g. e.D-09 (waiting room) and e.D-25 (first floor lift lobby) are **not approved** as there is insufficient justification for the change. Detailed information must be submitted justifying these changes. Details of the door widening to be confirmed for essential accessibility requirements only.
- (k) Amended detail of the proposed widening of the doorway opening to the verandah in the east wing. The new opening should retain a nib wall and be reduced in height to relate to the underside of the verandah.
- (l) Design details of all replacement doors at Closebourne House.
- (m) Amended design detail of the two new doors in the rear wings, ensuring that they relate to the architectural character of the place.
- (n) Amended door schedule to reflect design modifications.
- (o) Further details of the floor height increase to the rear wings, to demonstrate that key features will not be affected and skirting reinstated.

- (p) Details of the retention and restoration of all fireplaces and all its components.
- (q) Amended architectural drawing including a notation that there will be no changes to the internal staircase including balustrade height.
- (r) Details of the new flooring to the courtyard waiting area. The new flooring is to be laid to interpret an exterior space and have an appropriate finish.
- (s) Details of the proposed refinishing of the verandah stone floor.
- (t) Amended drawings for the integration of the Bishop Stretch footings into the new flooring, in a manner that avoids change to or damage to the footings, such as a glass layer, rather than sealant.

#### Arkell House and laundry/gym

- (u) Details of replacement materials and profiles for all works at Arkell House and the laundry/Gym building, including roofing, flooring, windows and doors. All works shall relate to the architectural character of those buildings.

#### New building and signs

- (v) Materials, profiles, colours and finishes schedule and detailed elevations of the new facility, ensuring that they are complementary to the heritage setting.
- (w) Amended drawings showing the new free-standing signs to be reduced to a maximum height of 2.5m.

#### Cultural landscaping character

- (x) Detailed landscape plans that demonstrate respect for the remaining cultural landscape fabric and layout, ensuring that adequate planting is provided to soften the impact of retaining walls and structures, without obstructing historic views.
- (y) All new landscaping should compliment and enhance the rural of the site.
- (z) Ensuring the planting is adequate to screen and soften the impact of the proposed new structures.

*Reason: The details requested were either not supplied during the assessment of the application or were unsympathetic to the heritage values of the place. The assessment and management of these details is considered essential in order to obtain a good heritage outcome.*

#### **HERITAGE INTERPRETATION PLAN**

4. An interpretation plan for the Closebourne House Group must be prepared in accordance with the Heritage NSW publication 'Interpreting Heritage Places and Items Guidelines' (2005) and submitted for approval to the Heritage Council of NSW (or delegate) with the s60 application.
5. The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of the Closebourne House Group will be provided for the public, and make recommendations regarding public accessibility, signage and lighting. The plan must identify the types, locations, materials, colours, dimensions, fixings and text of interpretive devices that will be installed as part of this project.

6. The approved interpretation plan must be implemented prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate

*Reason: Interpretation is an important part of every proposal for works at heritage places.*

#### **PHOTOGRAPHIC ARCHIVAL RECORDING**

7. A photographic archival recording of all buildings and structures (interior and exterior), landscaping and spaces within the Closebourne House Group must be prepared prior to the commencement of any demolition and works, during works and at the completion of works. This recording must be in accordance with the Heritage NSW publication 'Photographic Recording of Heritage Items using Film or Digital Capture' (2006). Prior to the issue of an Occupation Certification for the new aged care facility, the digital copy of the archival record must be provided to Heritage NSW, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

*Reason: To capture the condition and appearance of the place prior to, and during, modification of the site which impacts significant fabric.*

#### **REGISTER OF REMOVED BUILDING ELEMENTS**

8. Prior to the issue of an Occupation Certification, a register of all removed building elements and their storage location shall be provided to Heritage NSW, Department of Premier and Cabinet. All removed elements shall be appropriately marked, recorded, and safely stored to avoid damage to fabric.

*Reason: To ensure retention of significant fabric.*

#### **HERITAGE CONSULTANT**

9. A suitably qualified and experienced heritage consultant must be nominated for this project. The nominated heritage consultant must provide input into the detailed design, provide heritage information to be imparted to all tradespeople during site inductions, and oversee the works to minimise impacts to heritage values. The nominated heritage consultant must be involved in the selection of appropriate tradespersons and must be satisfied that all work has been carried out in accordance with the conditions of this consent.

*Reason: So that appropriate heritage advice is provided to support best practice conservation and ensure works are undertaken in accordance with this approval.*

#### **SPECIALIST TRADESPERSONS**

10. All work to, or affecting, significant fabric shall be carried out by suitably qualified tradespersons with practical experience in conservation and restoration of similar heritage structures, materials and construction methods.

*Reason: So that the construction, conservation and repair of significant fabric follows best heritage practice.*

#### **SITE PROTECTION**

11. Significant built and landscape elements are to be protected during site preparation and the works from potential damage. Protection systems must ensure significant fabric, including landscape elements, is not damaged or removed.

*Reason: To ensure significant fabric including vegetation is protected during construction.*

### **HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY**

12. Based on the amended detailed designs resulting from the testing excavation, the applicant may need to lodge the following with the s60 application to manage disturbance to remaining archaeology (including under floor and wall cavity deposits) which will not be retained *in situ* within the SHR curtilage:

(a) The Applicant shall submit an Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist as part of the section 60 application.

(b) The name of a nominated Excavation Director suitable to satisfy the Excavation Director Criteria of the Heritage council of NSW for the proposed activity and significance level.

(c) Following the receipt of the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology as part of the Section 60 Application, the Heritage Council of NSW reserves the right to issue Archaeological Conditions as part of the Section 60 Approval to manage the archaeology. Matters such as (but not limited to) fieldwork methodology, artefact analysis, final reporting may be included as part of these archaeological conditions.

*Reason: To ensure significant historical archaeology impacted by the works is recorded prior to construction*

### **UNEXPECTED HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RELICS**

13. The applicant must ensure that if unexpected archaeological deposits or relics not identified and considered in the supporting documents for this approval 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.

*Reason: This is a standard condition to identify to the applicant how to proceed if historical archaeological deposits or relics are unexpectedly identified during works.*

### **ABORIGINAL OBJECTS**

14. Should any Aboriginal objects be uncovered by the work which is not covered by a valid Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit, excavation or disturbance of the area is to stop immediately and the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment is to be informed in accordance with the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (as amended). Works affecting Aboriginal objects on the site must not continue until Heritage NSW has been informed and the appropriate approvals are in place. Aboriginal objects must be managed in accordance with the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*.

*Reason: This is a standard condition to identify to the applicant how to proceed if Aboriginal objects are unexpectedly identified during works.*

**COMPLIANCE**

15. If requested, the applicant and any nominated heritage consultant may be required to participate in audits of Heritage Council of NSW approvals to confirm compliance with conditions of consent.

*Reason: To ensure that the proposed works are completed as approved.*

**SECTION 60 APPLICATION**

16. An application under section 60 of the *Heritage Act 1977* must be submitted to, and approved by, the Heritage Council of NSW (or delegate), prior to work commencing (including demolition).

*Reason: To meet legislative requirements.*

**Moved by Mr Ian Clarke and seconded by Nicholas Brunton.**

Note: Ms Caitlin Allen did not support the redevelopment proposal and voted against the issuing of General Terms of Approval.

**5.0 General Business**

No further items were discussed.

**6.0 Meeting Close**

Mr Dillon Kombumerri, Chair, closed the meeting at 1:30pm.



.....  
Mr Dillon Kombumerri

Chair, Heritage Council Approvals Committee

Date: 8/5/2020