



# HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

## Approvals Committee – RESOLUTIONS

05/05/2020 | 09:00 AM - 13:50 PM

Virtual Meeting

<b>Resolution 2020-19</b>
<b>Item 1.1 Minutes from previous meeting – 31 March 2020</b>
The Heritage Council Approvals Committee confirmed the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting (Tuesday, 31 March 2020) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting, subject to minor amendments.
<b>Resolution 2020-20</b>
<b>Item 2.1 Christ Church Cathedral, Newcastle - Alterations and Additions</b>
<p>The Heritage Council Approvals Committee resolved, pursuant to section 63 of the Heritage Act 1977, to refuse the above described Section 60 application, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Christ Church Cathedral, Movable Collections, Cemetery and Park is a place of State heritage significance that is protected on the State Heritage Register for its Historic, Associational, Aesthetic, Technical, Social, Research and its Representative values.</li><li>2. The proposed works involve significant changes to the existing fabric and layout which will have a negative impact on these values. It is not possible to mitigate or minimise these impacts through conditions of approval.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The proposed spire would have a major impact on the aesthetic values of the cathedral. The AC recommends that, given the visual impact on the entire city of Newcastle, extensive community consultation is sought on the proposed spire, and any spire would require a separate approval.</li></ol></li></ol>

- b. Does not approve the incomplete concept of a lift in a spire and suggests this is considered as a separate proposal as outlined above, including impact on internal cathedral spaces.
  - c. The proposed landscaping requires the input of a landscape architect to ensure that significant values relating to the landform and the landscaping around the site are not lost in any redevelopment.
  - d. There is some potential for penal era archaeological evidence in the s-w corner of the site and for unknown burials. The possible in situ retention of these remains needs to be considered in any redevelopment of the site. The proponent and the nominated excavation director need to develop a strategy for identifying and managing penal era and burial-related archaeological remains.
  - e. Reconsideration needs to be given to the elevation, location, form and size of the coffee shop.
  - f. Proponent to advise whether consideration has been given to repurposing the existing buildings next to the Eastern end of the Church as part of this proposal.
  - g. Support in principle underground facilities as required to meet their objectives, but have concerns about how the Southwest corner would be resolved, the connections to ground level (including the addition to the Southwest elevation of the church), and the impacts on the land form.
  - h. Access and wayfinding requires more clarity and as proposed has a negative impact on the heritage fabric and setting.
  - i. Further justification is needed on the proposed relocation of the belfry.
  - j. The AC notes that there is significant community opposition to this project and considers that any future proposal should undergo wide community consultation.
3. Insufficient information has been provided to support this application, including:
- a. A strategy for identifying and retaining the penal era and burial related archaeological remains.
  - b. Structural engineers report;
  - c. Arborist report;
  - d. Geotechnical engineers report;

- e. Visual Impact Assessment;
  - f. Drawings that have adequate dimensions and notations regarding materials and details;
  - g. Landscape assessment report including public activation and pedestrian and vehicular access analysis;
  - h. Landscape plan.
  - i. Consultation with Aboriginal community to respond to Aboriginal culture and heritage in relation to the precinct.
4. The Approvals Committee notes there was no interface with the Committee prior to the submission and would therefore like to assist in resolving these issues with the Applicant to ensure that a suitable proposal can be considered in the future. To this end the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Approvals Committee would like to arrange a meeting with the applicant and EJE as soon as practicable to start this discussion.

#### **Resolution 2020-21**

#### **Item 3.1 Albion Hotel, Braidwood – Balustrades compliance matter**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee

1. Advised Heritage NSW to await Queanbeyan Palerang Regional Council's response to the Heritage Council's correspondence on this matter and take action as appropriate.
2. Noted the advice on Compliance Certification received within the Major Works grant relating to the Albion Hotel, shops and stables.
3. Requested a detailed compliance report on the entire property to support consideration of the appropriate follow up action at the June 2020 meeting.
4. Noted the current grant governance and acquittal processes and acknowledged that the processes will require improvement in regard to pre and post inspections.
5. Resolved that Heritage NSW needs to be more specific in relation to details, materials and finishes when drafting Section 60 and Grant approval conditions.

#### **Resolution 2020-22**

#### **Item 3.2 AC Input into the Design Competition Brief for Stage 2 DA, 93-97 Macquarie Street, Sydney.**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee provides the following comments to City of Sydney:

1. The Committee notes that City of Sydney Notice of Determination dated 12 March 2020 includes Condition 7 that requires the competitive design process brief and

the detailed design development application to incorporate design requirements to mitigate impacts on the SHR listed item *Health Department Building (former)* and its setting.

2. The Committee provides the following input into future design competition brief for Stage 2 DA for the tower development to further mitigate impacts:

#### **Design guidelines for the tower and podium development**

- a) The scheme should be considered in light of the pending National Listing of this precinct.
- b) The new tower and podium buildings are to be of exceptional design merit and quality to complement the architectural quality and workmanship displayed in the State Heritage Register (SHR) buildings located within and in the immediate vicinity of the site, including the *Health Department Building (former)*, *the Justice and Police Museum buildings*, *the former Treasury Building* and the *Royal Automobile Club of Australia*.
- c) The tower and podium buildings should respect and respond to existing views to and from the SHR listed sites in the immediate vicinity and significant vistas along Macquarie Street. The visual legibility and identity of the *Health Department Building (Former)* as a distinct stand-alone building should be maintained.
- d) The Macquarie Street and Albert Street facades to podium level of new building should be recessive to and respect the established identity and character of the block (bounded by Macquarie, Bridge, Phillip and Albert Streets) and its setting, which is strongly grounded in the traditions of public architecture featuring robust stone and brick facades. Details to the facades should relate to proportions of adjacent heritage buildings such as openings, parapet and cornice lines to create a relationship between new and old. Sympathetic materials and colour schemes should be employed to minimise visual impacts.
- e) The design of the tower in terms of its form, materiality and external treatment/articulation should be aimed at reducing the perceived bulk of the building to mitigate visual impact on SHR listed heritage items in the vicinity. Consideration should be given to stepping the form of the tower along Macquarie Street. Façades should be detailed to provide texture and elements to break up form and scale. Façade treatment should minimise the reflection of sunlight from the building to surrounding areas and buildings. The final design should present an elegant building with high quality detailing.

- f) The design of the ground floor courtyard between the new building and the former Health Department Building should facilitate the adaptive reuse and interpretation of the former Health Department Building.
  - g) Service and plant areas are to be minimised, discretely located and fully screened to reduce any potential visual impact from neighbouring heritage items and the public domain.
  - h) The potential visual impacts of the driveway/tunnel entry adjacent to the Health Department Building on Albert Street, are to be minimised.
  - i) A design statement similar to a Heritage Impact Statement responding to the principles as outlined should be produced.
3. The Committee requests City of Sydney to nominate an Approvals Committee member to the Design Jury Panel for the competitive design process.

#### Resolution 2020-23

##### Item 3.3 AMP Building front façade

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee

1. Agree that the Glacier glass is the most appropriate sample for the coloured glazing panels on the front façade.
2. Request further information about other materials, finish and scale for the Eastern/Western façades.

#### Resolution 2020-24

##### Item 3.4 Parliament House s.60

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee provided the following comments to the applicant:

1. Acknowledges the need for securing and enhancing security at Parliament House for public safety.
2. Supports the security features of the bollard but has concerns about the design and configuration.
3. Given an adverse impact on the exceptionally significant setting and views of the Parliament House, within its Macquarie Street setting recommends a design process in consultation with the City of Sydney to agree on an appropriate look and feel for the bollard sleeve to ensure it is in keeping with other items within the Precinct.

- |   |
|---|
| 4. A revised scheme in keeping with the character of Parliament House and the historic Macquarie Street precinct consistent with the CMP policies should be submitted for approval to the Director, Heritage NSW (as Delegate of the Heritage Council). |
|---|

<b>Resolution 2020-25</b>
---------------------------

<b>Item 4.1 Sydney Trains Exemptions Package</b>
--

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:
---

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Approves the amended wording, subject to minor amendments.</li><li>2. Recommends the Exemption Package to the Minister, subject to confirmation of the delegations of the Approvals Committee.</li></ol> |
|---|

**Secretariat**

**Heritage Council of NSW**

UNCONFIRMED