



HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

MEETING MINUTES - Approvals Committee

Tuesday, 1 June 2021 | 09:00 AM – 3:30 PM

Zoom Teleconference

ATTENDANCE	
MEMBERS	
Mr Dillon Kombumerri	Chair
Mr Ian Clarke	Deputy Chair
Mr Bruce Pettman	Member
Dr Nicholas Brunton	Member
Mr David Burdon	Member
Ms Caitlin Allen	Member
Mr Niall Macken	Member
Mr David McNamara	Alternate Member
Ms Ingrid Mather	Observer
EXTERNAL PRESENTERS	
Mr Zac Abrams	Project Manager, Google Australia (item 2.1)
Mr Blair Johnston	Architect, Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Mr Graham Brooks	Heritage Consultant, GBA Heritage (item 2.1)
Mr Sven Ollmann	Observer - Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Mr James Morgan	Observer - Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Ms Nicola Catherwood	Observer - Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Mr Michael Rowe	Observer – EthosUrban (item 2.1)
Mr Jim Murray	Observer – EthosUrban (item 2.1)
Mr Dov Midalia	Observer – GBA Heritage (item 2.1)

Mr Scott Maunder	Director Community Recreation and Cultural Services, Orange City Council (item 2.2)
Mr Ian Brewster	Architect, Partner Brewster Hjorth (item 2.2)
Mr David Walker	Town Planning Discipline Lead, Premise (item 2.2)
Prof Richard McKay AM	Consultant, Mackay Strategic (item 3.1)
Mr Ray Christison	Consultant (item 3.1)
Mr Andrew Fletcher	Administrator, Bathurst Showground Land Manager (item 3.1)
Mr Michael Magney	Project Manager, TfNSW (item 4.1)
Mr Ben Nacard	Design Manager, TfNSW (item 4.1)
Mr Daniel Percival	Heritage Officer, TfNSW (item 4.1)
Ms Natalie Winsen	Urban Design Lead, TfNSW (item 4.1)
HERITAGE NSW STAFF	
Ms Pauline McKenzie (part meeting)	Executive Director
Mr Tim Smith OAM (part meeting)	Director Heritage Operations
Mr Rajeev Maini	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments, South (item 2.1, 5.2)
Ms Shikha Jhaldiyal	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional Heritage Assessments, South (item 2.1, 5.2)
Ms Katrina Stankowski	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments, North (item 2.2, 3.1)
Ms Tempe Beaven	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional Heritage Assessments, North (item 2.2, 3.1)
Ms Sarah Jane Brazil	Senior Team Leader, Major Projects, Heritage Operations (item 4.1, 5.1)
Mr Hendry Wan	Senior Heritage Operations Officer, Major Projects (item 4.1)
Mr David Nix	Senior Heritage Operations Officer, Major Projects (item 5.1)
Ms Natasha Agaki	Senior Secretariat Officer

1.0 Welcome and formalities

The Chair, Dillon Kombumerri, opened the meeting at 9:00am.

- Delivered an Acknowledgement of Country and welcome attendees.
- Acknowledged 2021 National Reconciliation Week and urged members to keep its theme *More than a Word: Reconciliation takes Action* in mind for all the Committee's work.
- All members were present. It was noted that quorum had been met.

1.1 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members were asked to raise any conflicts of interest with items on the agenda.

Resolution 2021-26 - Item 1.1 Conflict of Interest Declarations

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Notes** the following conflict of interest declarations:
 - a) Bruce Pettman – Mr Pettman's office, Heritage Assets, Public Works Advisory (PWA) is advising the project managers and Orange City Council on the Heritage aspects of item 2.2 Bloomfield Sports Precinct, tree removal IDA.
2. **Supports** Mr Pettman's decision to remove himself from decision making relating to item 2.2.

1.2 Out of Session Activity

Members noted the following business was conducted out of session:

1. 12/05/21 – Dillon Kombumerri, Ian Clarke, Nicholas Brunton and Caitlin Allen attended the final pre-DA design workshop for Google, REVY.
2. 18/05/21 – Ian Clarke, Caitlin Allen, Bruce Pettman and Niall Macken attended the first of three scheduled community consultation workshops for the Millers Point & Dawes Point Village Precinct.

1.3 Minutes from Previous Meeting - 4 May 2021

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

Resolution 2021-27 – Item 1.3 Minutes from Previous Meeting

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Confirms** the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting (Tuesday, 4 May 2021) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting.

Moved by Ian Clarke and seconded by David McNamara

1.4 Matters Arising

No matters were raised.

1.5 Action Report

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the action report and briefly discussed:

- The site visit to Jenolan Caves has been placed on hold whilst the EOI for Heritage Council Committee memberships is in progress.
- Status of draft response letter to Richard Kovaks reflecting the AC comments discussed.
- Conversations underway with Transport for NSW relating to points of contact for the s170 register as well as a potential MoU around managing Railway projects across the agencies.
- Paper outlining Heritage NSW actions and lessons learned around compliance and permit reviews to be discussed in item 5.2. Heritage NSW is in contact with the Owner of Albion Hotel, Braidwood, requesting outstanding documentation to support his most recent application before it can be assessed.
- A workshop with staff to discuss how to link reasoning of decisions to significance will be arranged once the Millers Point Heritage Principles project has completed.
- The scale and height of the Chief Secretary's Building are being considered in stakeholder conversations relating to the SHR listing of the Precinct including possible impacts to National listing. The proposal has been submitted to the Department of Primary Industries and Environment (DPIE).
- Christchurch Cathedral, Newcastle – The applicant has not expressed a willingness to participate in a design workshop with the AC.

2.0 External Presentations

2.1 Pre-DA – Google at Pyrmont: Royal Edward Victualling Yards (REVY)

Members of the Heritage Council of NSW joined the Approvals Committee for this item. Frank Howarth AM, Robyn Parker, Colleen Morris, Paul Knight and Brian Lindsay were in attendance.

Members received a presentation from representatives of Google Australia, Warren & Mahoney and GBA Heritage and a report from Shikha Jhaldiyal, Heritage NSW.

Key points discussed:

- The AC's previously recommended two-level option (Option 2) would be preferable in terms of clarity, legibility and attaining a discreet piece of architecture, however the majority support in principle the applicant's preferred design (Option 6), subject to the development of further detail to ensure that its potential is met.
- Aspects of the Option 6 design proposal:

- The view that the rooftop pavilion is considered sufficiently lightweight to not be too intrusive.
 - Rooftop access from the third atrium level provides functionality, opens up movement throughout the building, increases activation of the roof space and improves the overall experience of the historic building.
 - Development of the gatehouse to complement the new addition is a superior proposition to leaving it in its current form.
 - Connectivity to Pirrama Rd from the proposed relocated plant room as a very positive element of the proposal.
 - The proposal mitigates the risk of the existing gatehouse structure changing under different ownership in the future. Replacement of the gatehouse with the relocated plant room provides a positive opportunity to activate Pirrama Rd instead.
 - Potential for interpretation through design rather than just by way of signage, etc.
 - The importance of maintaining the openness of the circulation space beneath the tower and ensuring it is not filled.
 - The view that the third level atrium could still be minimised whilst providing access to the rooftop.
 - The proposed green plant room and possible rooftop design do not align with the Naval character of the Work Yard's former use.
 - Impacts of rooftop paraphernalia should be carefully considered.
 - The clip-on walkway to the boardwalk is a better solution for decluttering the water area than previous design iterations. Security measures relating to the boardwalk would be an issue for the applicant to manage, however public access from the boardwalk through to Pirrama Rd should be ensured.
- Heritage Council to consider the proposal at its meeting, 2 June 2021.

Resolution 2021-28 – Item 2.1 Pre-DA - REVY, Google Campus

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Notes** the supporting documentation and the applicant's presentation.
2. **Thanks** the applicant for their presentation and notes the additional options presented.
3. **Provides** the following comments and recommendations to the Heritage Council of NSW to assist in its consideration of the Pre-DA at its meeting on 2 June 2021:
 - a. **Provides in principle support** to the adaptive reuse of REVY A and B buildings as part of the Google Campus.
 - b. **Provides in principle support** to Massing Option 6 and the proposed open ground floor plan that interprets former use of the work yard, subject to development of the following design details:
 - i. Scale, materiality and relationship to the existing building

- ii. Atrium to be reduced in height to align with top of window lintels and pulled back to align with existing openings in the building.
- iii. The roof terrace design should be uncluttered. Any shading devices should be carefully considered to minimise its visual impact.
- iv. Clarify the purpose, architectural form and materiality of the building to Pirrama Road which replaces the existing gatehouse.
- c. Strongly supports on-site public accessway along the waterfront through to Pirrama Road.
- d. Supports amended scale of both eastern pavilions (Pavilion Option 1) which have been reduced in height by lowering the structures below ground and the proposed treatment of the facades.
- e. The Tech Talk glass pavilion should be modified (reduced) to reveal archway to REVY A building behind.
- f. Recommends that the proposed excavation on the site should be based on a detailed understanding of archaeological resource present on site and the likely impact of the proposal on that resource (including both land and maritime archaeology). The proposal should be designed to avoid impacts to significant archaeology present on site. The archaeological assessment should be undertaken prior to finalising the detailed design.
- g. Recommends that the proposal should be accompanied by a detailed interpretation plan to reflect the evolution of the site and its structures, its history from Aboriginal occupation to present times and its significance. Interpretation at the ground level of the former yard should be explored further.
- h. Requests the applicant to consult with Approvals Committee regarding the final proposal prior to lodgement of any formal development application.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Ian Clarke.

2.2 IDA - Bloomfield Sports Precinct - removal of trees

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from representatives of Orange City Council, Brewster Hjorth and Premise; and a report from Tempe Beaven, Heritage NSW.

Key issues discussed:

- Significant improvement to previous iteration; the reduced height of the grandstand is more sympathetic to the landscape.
- Landscaping considerations

- The opportunity to restore a significant portion of the original landscape with fertile soil banks; e.g. if the soil has DNA that regenerates the original, this could be a powerful way of connecting to Country.
- Many different strategies that could be applied to the landscape which would drastically reduce the need for tree removal.
- Objections from the Orange community to the proposed tree removal.
- Tree planting along the Forest Rd frontage should be of a historic rather than Native character.
- A detailed Masterplan that includes suggestions from the AC is needed for a more strategic and nuanced approach to the landscape.
- Potential to integrate passive recreation into the Precinct with pedestrian walkways and interpretation of the site's history.
- Further consideration could be given to the relocating the carpark from the side entrance of the Precinct to the Northern boundary in terms of functionality and landscaping.
- The applicant's engagement with Bloomfield Hospital regarding emergency access and traffic flow.
- How best to approach the issue of AC requiring a landscape Masterplan for the approval of the Stadium concept plan.

Resolution 2021-29 – Item 2.2 IDA - Bloomfield Sports Precinct - removal of trees

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Thanks** the applicant for amending the application to take into account the issues raised by the Approvals Committee.
2. **Notes** the applicant's presentation.
3. **Notes** that The Bloomfield Hospital is a place of State heritage significance that is protected on the State Heritage Register. It is a rare example of a mental health institutional site in NSW in a landscape setting that requires a coordinated management approach across the whole site, regardless of land ownership, informed by a Masterplan based on the current CMP and ideally supported by a site-specific DCP. Orange City Council are requested to facilitate the coordinated management approach and Masterplan process to ensure that this site's heritage is protected appropriately.
4. **Acknowledges** the community concerns relating to the proposed removal of trees at the site.
5. **Provides general support** for the proposed Concept Plan May 2021 subject to the following:
 - a. Proposed future development of this site should be designed in order to ensure the new buildings, civil works and landscape design respects the existing heritage

character of the place without dominating the landscape setting that contributes to the State heritage values.

- b. The applicant is required to provide a detailed Landscape Masterplan that reflects the GA NSW Connecting with Country Framework. This should be provided prior to the DA for the wider civil works across the site and include the following elements:
 - i. Retain as many existing mature trees as possible.
 - ii. Detailed surface water management that respects existing natural landscape.
 - iii. Best fit of topography with the context of the primary heritage curtilage of Bloomfield Hospital.
 - iv. Review the grading concept to reflect the existing landscape context.
 - c. Strongly recommends more community engagement regarding the broader concept planning for the site, including the landscaping.
6. **Delegates** approval of the IDA application for the removal of trees at the Bloomfield site to the Executive Director, HNSW, to be determined within 14 days of the 1 June 2021 meeting (15th June) in accordance with relevant advice provided below.
- a. Tree removal is approved in the immediate area of the stadiums to support associated civil works.
 - b. Removal of the remainder of trees across the wider site is subject to the provision of a landscape master plan as part of the DA for wider civil works across the site.
 - c. Retain as many existing mature trees as possible as part of this proposal.
 - d. Provide a minimum of new trees to replace those that are removed.

Moved by Ian Clarke and seconded by David McNamara.

3.0 External presentations

3.1 S.60 Bathurst Showground

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from representatives of Bathurst Showground and a report from Tempe Beaven, Heritage NSW.

Key points discussed:

- Note the social significance of the site and generally support re-adaptation of the building into a contemporary context to support its continued function and use.
- Structural engineering evidence to support the requirement for demolition for safety reasons is not clear. However, should replacement be necessary, the proposal and its intention are generally supportable.

- The visual contribution of the existing building to the character of the Precinct and its setting is remarkable. Retaining a timber aesthetic is an important aspect in keeping with the character of the site.
- The statement of significance and CMP policy don't reflect the community's attachment to the building which is evident through the submissions.
- Costing considerations and possible impacts to the building long term if funding for replacement is not secured, including demolition by neglect.
- The need to consider this as an interpretive project that incorporates historic fabric into the design and mimics key features of the original building, e.g. reuse of the existing structural grid and timber columns.
- The need for proper consultation with the tenant and community.

Resolution 2021-30 - Item 3.1 S.60 Bathurst Showground

1. The Heritage Council Approvals Committee **generally supports** an adaptive reuse of the building, however, has concerns with the application in its current form.
2. It is recommended that the applicant withdraw the current Section 60 application and lodge a revised proposal as follows:
 - a. The proposed adaptive reuse of the structure expressly incorporates as much of the existing fabric as possible (e.g. front façade, naming plate, timber wall cladding, galvanised roof sheeting, bush posts) and where necessary incorporate complementary traditional material.
 - b. Support new steel roof trusses resting on bush posts with a concrete floor. The proposed total new steel frame is not supported.
 - c. The adapted building should replicate the existing structural grid.
 - d. The central dividing wall could be relocated elsewhere in the building.
 - e. The plan be prepared as part of the application detailing the fabric to be retained together with graphic images showing the final form of the new structure.
 - f. The proposed development application be widely advertised, and the applicant engage in specific consultation with the Prior family and all other major stakeholders.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Caitlin Allen.

4.0 External presentations

4.1 Sydney Harbour Bridge (SHB) Northern Cycleway

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from representatives of Transport for NSW and a paper from Hendry Wan, Heritage NSW.

Key points discussed:

- The design language should not only resonate with the Sydney Harbour Bridge (SHB) but fit in with the character of the broader area.
- Notes Heritage Council sub-committee's current preference for a loop design, rather than lineal as reducing the dominance of the structure and visual masking of SHB abutments.
- The design should avoid a visually dominant structure that is incongruous to the angular existing station frontage and detracts from the SHB and should be harmonious with the setting; the aim should be for a distinguishable feature that sits quietly in the landscape.
- Heard from TfNSW two current schemes – one lineal and one circular ramp.
- Note the extensive work with specialists to determine an appropriate gradient that aligns with project costs and objectives.
- Extent of impact resulting from a gentler gradient and any scope for reducing this, noting that steep hills are a common feature for cyclists in Sydney.
- Significant issues around safety and functionality being considered with both the linear and looped design options, including impacts to users of the area, traffic flow, possible shared zones, etc.
- Effective lighting strategies that consider safety, wayfinding, aesthetics, and any impacts to the surrounding residential areas, noting that impacts would be greater for the looped rather than linear cycleway option.
- Possible options to align the linear design more closely with the street path to minimise impact on the surrounding area and its use.
- How the integration of a lift has been considered in the design process and determined unfeasible from a cost, safety and customer experience perspective.
- Extent of stakeholder consultation to date and the significant challenge of reconciling varying views on the design options and project as a whole.

Resolution 2021-31 – Item 4.1 Sydney Harbour Bridge (SHB) Northern Cycleway

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Notes** the information in this report including attachments.
2. **Thanks** Transport for NSW for their presentation.
3. **Notes** the upcoming community consultation and looks forward to discussing the outcomes with the proponent.
4. **Provides** the following comments on the two shortlisted options:
 - a) Encourage that the ramp gradient be explored to reduce the length of the ramp.
 - b) The neighbourhood history, context and character need to be taken into consideration for the design of any option.

Moved by Bruce Pettman and seconded by Caitlin Allen

5.0 Heritage NSW Updates

5.1 Draft Key Heritage Principles

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper from David Nix, Heritage NSW and a verbal report from Sarah Jane Brazil, Heritage NSW.

Key points to consider incorporating into the document:

- Include a prefacing comment to define 'tolerance to change' in relation to the assessment of a heritage item.
- Provide commentary in the 'key impacts' section that includes reasoning behind how and why an item may be impacted.
- Connect the Key Heritage Principles to the GANSW Connecting to Country Framework.
- Examples provided should be to test the principle, rather than describe how they have been used. Consider using examples that provide principle-based guidance.

Resolution 2021-31 – Item 5.1 Key Heritage Principles

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Considers** information provided in this briefing paper.
2. **Notes** the information provided and that Heritage NSW will consult further with members out of session.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Bruce Pettman

5.2 Albion Hotel, Braidwood - Lessons Learned

The Approvals Committee deferred consideration of this paper until the 6 July 2021 due to time constraints.

5.3 Millers Point Principles Community Consultation - Project Update

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted an update paper from Shikha Jhaldiyal, Heritage NSW and briefly discussed:

- Community frustration around existing systems in place to manage heritage within the Precinct.
- Positivity around the development of design guidelines, consultation workshops and the involvement of heritage experts to assist.

Further discussions were deferred to to the 6 July meeting due to time constraints.

6.0 General Business

6.1 Forward agenda

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the forward agenda.

7.0 Meeting Close

There being no items of further business, Dillon Kombumerri, Chair, declared the meeting closed at 3:30PM.



.....
Mr Dillon Kombumerri

Chair, Heritage Council Approvals Committee

Date: 9/7/2021