



HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

MEETING MINUTES - Approvals Committee

Tuesday, 2 March 2021 | 09:00 AM - 02:10 PM

Zoom Teleconference

ATTENDANCE	
MEMBERS	
Mr Dillon Kombumerri (part meeting)	Chair
Mr Ian Clarke	A/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 Angelo Candalepas	Candalepas Associates (item 2.1)
Mr Jonathan Bryant	Urbis (item 2.1)
Councillor Greg Cummings	Councillor, Cumberland City Council (item 2.2)
Mr David Williams	Chair, Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Consultative Committee, Cumberland City Council (item 2.2)
Mr Adam Ford	Landscape Architect, Parks and Recreation, Cumberland City Council (item 2.2)
Mr Graham Brookes	GBA Heritage (item 2.3)
Mr Frank Stanisic	Stanisic Architects (item 2.3)

Mr Matthew Daniels	Pacific Planning (item 2.3)
Mr Peter Lonergan	Aboriginal cultural heritage (item 2.3)
Mr Steve Nix	Heritage Specialist, Sydney Trains (item 2.4)
Mr Simon Wiltshire	Technical Director, Mott MacDonald (item 2.4)
Ms Natalie Vinton	CEO, Curio Projects (item 2.4)
Ms Yvette Andrews	Community and Engagement, City of Sydney (Item 3.2)
Ms Lauren Flaherty	Community and Engagement, City of Sydney (Item 3.2)
Mr Brent Jackson	President, Bondi Surf Bathers Life Saving Club (item 3.4)
Mr Jesse Lockhart-Krause	Architect/Head Consultant, Lockhart-Krause Architects (item 3.4)
HERITAGE NSW STAFF	
Ms Pauline McKenzie (part meeting)	Executive Director
Mr Tim Smith OAM (part meeting)	Director Heritage Operations
Mr Steven Meredith	A/ Regional Manager, Northern Region
Ms Barrina South (part meeting)	A/ Regional Manager, Southern Region
Mr Rajeev Maini	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments, South (item 2.1, 2.4, 3.2, 3.4)
Ms Veerle Norbury	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional South (item 2.1)
Mr James Quoye	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional North (item 2.2)
Ms Katrina Stankowski	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments, North (item 2.3)
Ms Mariyam Nizam	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional Heritage Assessments, South (item 2.4)
Ms Shikha Jhaldiyal	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer, Regional Heritage Assessments, South (item 3.4)
Ms Natasha Agaki	Senior Secretariat Officer

1.0 Welcome and formalities

The A/Chair, Ian Clarke, opened the meeting at 9:00am and delivered an Acknowledgement of Country.

It was noted that Dillon Kombumerri would be in attendance until 11:00am and 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 2021-07

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the following perceived conflict of interest declarations and agreed that no further action was required:

1. David Burdon – Mr Burdon is Director of Conservation at the NSW National Trust, which owns and manages Elizabeth Farm (item 2.3).
2. Niall Macken – Mr Macken previously worked for Inner West Council, the LGA of Sydenham Station (item 2.4).

1.2 Out of Session Activity

The following took place out of session:

1. 09 February 2021 – Bruce Pettman attended the Sydney Modern Design Integrity Panel Meeting as observer and representative of the Heritage Council Approvals Committee. Mr Pettman reported on some minor design concerns, most notably with the proposed lawn at the main building's front façade and additional palm trees at the front of the existing gallery. Bruce Pettman to work with Heritage NSW on any further design review taking place.
2. 23 February 2021 – Dillon Kombumerri, Ian Clarke and Niall Macken attended a site visit and design workshop with proponents for the Cathedral of the Annunciation of Our Lady, Redfern, DA. Outcomes discussed at item 2.1.
3. 23 February 2021 – Dillon Kombumerri, Ian Clarke and Bruce Pettman attended a workshop with proponents for the Bondi Surf Bathers Life Saving Club DA to discuss revised roof design options. Supported design discussed at item 3.4.

1.3 Minutes from Previous Meeting - 2 February 2020

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

Resolution 2021-08

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee confirms the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting (Tuesday, 2 February 2021) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting.

Moved by Caitlin Allen and seconded by Bruce Pettman.

1.4 Matters Arising

No further matters raised.

1.5 Action Report

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the Action report.

2.0 External Presentations

2.1 Cathedral of the Annunciation of Our Lady, Redfern – IDA

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from Mr Angelo Candalepas and Mr Jonathan Bryant. Key points discussed:

1. The site's Aboriginal archaeological potential; the need to carry out an ACH Assessment and plan for treatment of objects if found, prior to commencement of works.
2. Alternative locations for the proposed café to the South of the Rectory building, including within Prince Alfred Park, the Museum and/or Bookstore; associated concerns around logistics, impacts of plumbing and the presence of commercial activity within a space of worship.
3. Support for activation and encouraging heritage interaction with the public in a manner that is sensitive to its context.
4. The impact of proposed tree removal has not been thoroughly assessed; if retention is not possible, trees should be replaced with native species.
5. The benefit of involving the local Aboriginal community in landscaping decisions.
6. Visual impact of the modifications proposed for the Cathedral ceiling, noting its reversibility, and how the intention could be achieved more sensitively.
7. Logic for the proposed demolition of the largely in-tact Church Hall building and how the applicant has explored options for retention, salvage and reuse of its significant elements.
8. Location of the proposed new opening along the Cleveland Street brick fence; alternative options for retention and reuse of brickwork and sandstone material and the opportunity to strengthen interpretation along the street.

Resolution 2021-09

Heritage Council Approvals Committee resolved, in accordance with Section 4.47 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, to grant the following General Terms of Approval:

APPROVED DEVELOPMENT

1. Development must be in accordance with:
 - a) Architectural drawings, prepared by Candalepas Associates as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
--------	-----------	------	-----

Project Name: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese & St Andrews Theological College

DA-1050	Site Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-1051	Site Analysis	3/12/20	A
DA-1060	Cathedral – Demolition Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-1100	Cathedral – Ground Floor Plan & Crypt Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-1101	Cathedral – Roof Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-1110	Cathedral – Iconostasis Detail	3/12/20	A
DA-1111	Cathedral – Crypt & Sacristy Detail	3/12/20	A
DA-1301	Cathedral Elevation North & East	3/12/20	A
DA-1302	Cathedral Elevation South & West	3/12/20	A
DA-1401	Cathedral Interior Elevation 1 & 2	3/12/20	A
DA-1402	Cathedral Interior Elevation North & East	3/12/20	A
DA-1403	Cathedral Interior Elevation 5	3/12/20	A
DA-2060	Demolition Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2101	Ground Floor Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2102	Level One Floor Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2103	Level Two Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2104	Level Three Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2105	Roof Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2110	Basement 1 Plan	3/12/20	A
DA-2201	Section A & B	3/12/20	A
DA-2202	Section D	3/12/20	A
DA-2301	Elevations East and West	3/12/20	A
DA-2302	Elevation North	3/12/20	A
DA-2401	Montage 01	3/12/20	A
DA-2402	Montage 02	3/12/20	A
DA-2403	Montage 03	3/12/20	A
DA-2601	Shadow Diagram	3/12/20	A
DA-2602	Shadow Diagram	3/12/20	A
DA-2801	Development Calculations	3/12/20	A
DA-2581	Material Schedule	3/12/20	A

b) Landscape drawings, prepared by Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese			
-	Landscape Plan	1/12/20	-

- c) *Heritage Impact Statement – Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, 242 Cleveland Street, Redfern*, prepared by Urbis, dated 4 December 2020
- d) *Historical Archaeological Baseline Assessment – Report to Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia*, prepared by Artefact Heritage, dated November 2020, as listed in Condition no.1
- e) *Letter to Father Athinagoras, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, re: Redevelopment of 242 Cleveland Street, Redfern [Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence]*, written by Artefact Heritage, dated 25 November 2020
- f) *Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan, 242 Cleveland Street Redfern*, prepared by ADP Consulting Engineering, dated 3 December 2020
- g) *Arboricultural Impact Assessment – 242 Cleveland Street, Redfern NSW 2016*, prepared by Tree Report Arboricultural Consulting, dated December 2020
- h) *Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia DA Landscape Report – 242 Cleveland Street, Surry Hills Sydney*, prepared by Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture, dated 1 December 2020

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the General Terms of Approval:

2. DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT

The approval is subject to Deferred Commencement in accordance with s.63A of the Heritage Act 1977 and is subject to the following conditions being met to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council or its delegate:

a) The applicant must undertake additional Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment, including Aboriginal consultation and test excavations, in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (as amended).

Reason: The Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Letter, prepared by Artefact Heritage and dated 25 November 2020, identified an area of archaeological sensitivity that requires further investigation. An Aboriginal site (AHIMS 45-6-3848) has recently been recorded during test excavations close by at 244 Cleveland Street, Surry Hills, increasing the archaeological sensitivity of the area.

b) If Aboriginal objects are found that would be harmed by the proposed works, then the applicant must apply to Heritage NSW and be issued with an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP).

Reason: To meet legislative requirements.

c) Detailed report being submitted confirming the viability of the excavation below the sacristy through investigative works by an appropriately qualified and experienced structural engineer.

Reason: Impacts of the proposed excavation upon the cathedral is not clear. Insufficient evidence has been provided to show that this excavation would be achievable without damage to the cathedral. The submitted Structural Report does not discuss the proposed below-sacristy excavation.

3. CATHEDRAL WORKS

- a) Replacement of the sacristy roof requires further consideration. Detailed amended design of the roof should be submitted for approval to the Heritage Council or its Delegate.**

Reason: No clear reasons for the replacement have been provided. Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the HIS' stance that the roof fabric is non-original. The replacement roof would obscure the stained-glass window to the east façade of the north aisle.

- b) Excavation below the sacristy requires further consideration. Following Archaeological assessment, detailed amended design should be submitted for approval to the Heritage Council or its Delegate.**

Reason: Impacts of the proposed excavation upon the cathedral is not clear. Insufficient evidence has been provided to show that this excavation would be achievable without damage to the cathedral. The Structural Report does not discuss the proposed below-sacristy excavation.

- c) The proposed new ceiling inside the Cathedral shall be amended to allow exposure of some of Blackett's aesthetic while achieving the acoustic balance desired by the applicant.**

Reason: The new Cathedral ceiling, which is visible on the drawings, has not been further discussed in the HIS. No clear reasons for the replacement have been provided. The new ceiling would obscure the existing collar braced roof / ceiling which is significant fabric.

- d) The following information is to be submitted with the s60 application for approval by the Heritage Council of NSW (or delegate):**

- **Significance of the pews which would require relocation/removal due to the installation of the extended soleas;**
- **Proposed storage conditions / location of these pews;**
- **Details of the extended soleas clearly showing interactions between significant fabric and new construction, indicating clearly how significant fabric (e.g. tiles, columns etc) would be protected;**

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

4. SITE WORKS

- 1. The new café to Cleveland Street is not approved.**

Reason: The structure would impact views to the site and Rectory building. As the café is intended to be used by the site's users only, it is recommended that this use be incorporated into one of the spaces within the new additions at the rear of the Rectory building or adjoining the Park.

- 2. The proposed solar panels must be completely hidden behind the parapet and not be visible from public domain.**

Reason: The panels would impact views to the site, Rectory and the Cathedral buildings.

- 3. A potential for connection between Prince Alfred Park and the Cathedral should be incorporated into the design. It could be in the form of visual connection which may be converted into a physical connection if opportunity arises in future.**

Reason: The demolition of later buildings presents an opportunity to explore this potentially historical connection, whether it be a physical or visual connection.

SCHEDULE OF CONSERVATION WORKS

5. A Schedule of Conservation Works shall be prepared by a suitably qualified by a suitably qualified heritage consultant (in consultation with an experienced specialist stonemason) for all buildings to be retained on site. This shall be submitted for approval with the section 60 application for this proposal. The approved Schedule of Conservation Works shall be implemented prior to the issue of the Occupation Certificate.

Reason: To provide a guiding document for the ongoing conservation of the buildings on the site.

HERITAGE CONSULTANT

6. 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

7. 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

8. 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.
9. Physical impacts upon significant elements/buildings caused by the proposed demolitions/excavation/construction works must be kept to a minimum. Vibration monitoring and alternative methods (including concrete saws rather than jackhammers) must be utilised near adjacent structures, in line with the ADP report recommendations.

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

HERITAGE INTERPRETATION PLAN

10. An interpretation plan 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) prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate/ Government certification.
The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of the Cathedral of the Annunciation of Our Lady 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.
11. 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

12. A photographic archival recording must be prepared prior to the commencement of 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). The digital copy of the archival record must be provided to Heritage NSW, Department of Premier and Cabinet.
13. High-resolution TIFF and RAW images must be included as part of this submission.

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

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

14. The Applicant shall submit a detailed archaeological assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist. This assessment should identify whether relics of local or state significance may be harmed by this activity as well as appropriate mitigate measures based on the significance of the relics which may be present.
15. Should archaeological monitoring or excavation be proposed the Applicant shall submit an Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist.
16. Following the receipt of the Archaeological Assessment, the Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate reserves the right to issue additional archaeological conditions to manage the archaeology. Matters such as (but not limited to) preparation of an archaeological excavation methodology and research design, fieldwork methodology, artefact analysis and final reporting may be included as part of these archaeological conditions.

ABORIGINAL OBJECTS

17. 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 Heritage NSW 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

18. 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

19. 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.

Reason: To meet legislative requirements.

Moved by Bruce Pettman and seconded by Nicholas Brunton

2.2 Pre-DA - Prospect Hill - Proposed access stair and paths

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from Councillor Greg Cummings, Mr David Williams and Mr Adam Ford. Key points discussed:

1. Strong support for the acknowledgment and protection of the cultural landscape and the need for equitable access.
2. The Aboriginal community's expectations for the protection, planning and development of the site and the importance of their long-term involvement in its ongoing management.
3. Inconsistencies between the Masterplan and CMP. The long-term protection of the cultural landscape and its integrity requires a holistic plan of management that incorporates planned future additions (e.g. pedestrian bridge, Community Centre, car park).
4. The Masterplan should better consider the approach to connecting Prospect Hill and Marrong Reserve and managing the broader landscape as a single SHR listing.
5. Possible impacts of future developments on site use, access and management, and the ability to read the landscape as a whole.
6. Design and material issues relating to the current access stair and path proposal.
 - Impact of earth works and the irreversible built structure on Prospect Hill's setting.
 - Opportunity for a light weight, reversible structure, e.g. timber/steel to reduce cost and impact.
 - The need to ensure sympathetic integration of the structure with the landscape.
 - The design and materiality of the access path as a separate issue to unlawful access and prevention of site desecration.

7. The permanent closure of Butu Wargun as an opportunity to connect Prospect Hill and Marrong Reserve.

Resolution 2021-10

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Notes** the information presented and the applicant's presentation.
2. **Strongly supports** Cumberland City Council's ongoing engagement with Aboriginal people who have cultural connections to Prospect Hill, to tell a broad range of stories that contribute to the project as it develops and to improve the stewardship of these important sites.
3. **Provides** in principle support for safe universal pedestrian access which sits within this significant heritage landscape, and acknowledges it is an urgent priority for Cumberland City Council to prevent hazard from falls, especially for the elderly, as well as to provide equal access for event participants in accordance with the 2005 CMP.
4. **Encourages** the design team to align the proposed access design with the Prospect Hill Landscape Master Plan (PHLMP), in particular by planning for a connection between the proposed works and Marrong Reserve.
5. **Recommends** a move away from the current highly engineered approach to lighter and softer materials and fencing of the proposed access stair and paths (using examples from other sensitive sites) to avoid:
 - a) Impacting adversely on the setting of *Prospect Hill* as a landmark feature; and
 - b) Dividing permanently the two elements of the single listing.
6. **Provides** the following recommendations in the draft Letter back to the applicant:
 - a) Prospect Hill is part of a larger listing that includes Marrong Reserve. The design response to the entry, the stairs and paths should serve to reconnect Prospect Hill (north) and Marrong Reserve (south). This response would benefit from reference to lessons learnt from the work already implemented by Cumberland City Council at Marrong Reserve to the south.
 - b) The AC recommends that Cumberland City Council continue working with HNSW to resolve the management and mitigation of the potential visual impact of the proposed furniture and finishes: paths, stairs, handrails, lookout, bins, signage to all ensure that all aspects of the significant heritage of these important sites is celebrated and highlighted by these works.
 - c) Recommend the formation of a Subcommittee to work with the applicant in an on-site meeting, and further meetings as required, to resolve design issues.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by David Burdon

2.3 2A Gregory Place, Parramatta - Update

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from Mr Graham Brookes, Mr Frank Stanistic, Mr Matthew Daniels and Mr Peter Lonergan. Key points discussed:

1. Plans for public access to and movement between Elizabeth Farm and Hambledon Cottage.
2. Opportunity for more connections along the heritage walk channel, including access for vehicles and emergency services, noting constraints of the topography.
3. Concerns around how the restoration of visual connection between Elizabeth Farm and Hambledon Cottage might be achieved.

4. Significant archaeological potential of the former creek line; excavations and development along the alignment should be avoided.
5. Important to consider preserving the view of Our Lady of Lebanon Church by lowering the building heights.
6. Possible impacts of the basement carpark and the need to consider access and archaeology.
7. Ways that the organic form of Building E could be reduced in bulk to better integrate with the other buildings.
8. The importance of consultation with the Aboriginal community prior to submission of the DA.

Resolution 2021-11

That the Heritage Council Approval Committee:

1. **Notes** the information provided by the Applicant in their presentation and in the paper presented and its appendices; and
2. **Thanks** Pacific Planning and their heritage consultants for their most recent presentation on the proposed affordable housing development plan at 2A Gregory Place.
3. **Acknowledges** the additional design work and processes undertaken to date to address the heritage values of the wider Precinct and the previous comments of the Approvals Committee.
4. **Supports** progression of the scheme to Stage 1 Development Application.
5. **Provides** the following advice to the applicant:
 - a) Preserve and enhance public access between Elizabeth Farm and Hambledon Cottage.
 - b) Interpret the original creek line and re-naturalise the current creek (e.g. by adding reed beds).
 - c) Consider carefully the location and extent of car parking under the building, associated access arrangements and archaeological considerations.
 - d) Engage with Aboriginal community prior to submission of a Development Application.
 - e) Reconsider the bulk of Building E by using a stepped profile to match the other buildings.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Niall Macken

2.4 Sydenham Railway Group (Gleeson Avenue Overbridge) - Pre-DA

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from Mr Steve Nix, Mr Simon Wiltshire and Ms Natalie Vinton. Key points discussed:

1. Extent of change to the SHR listed Station since the 2009 contemporary extension along Gleeson Avenue; heritage impacts overtime and the need to re-assess the Precinct for its existing heritage values to determine whether the Gleeson Avenue Overbridge should remain within the SHR curtilage and its character and aesthetic preserved.
2. Proposed form and detailing of the parapet and possible impacts of rolling out the scheme across other Railway Stations.

3. Alternative locations for the advertising and interpretation including impacts to aesthetics and maintenance requirements overtime.
4. NSW Railway stations historically welcomed extensive advertising.

Resolution 2021-12

That the Heritage Council Approval Committee:

1. Notes:

- a) the supporting documentation and the applicant's presentation.
- b) the information in this paper.

2. Provides the following comments:

- a) The Committee acknowledges the need to remove the parapet.
- b) The Committee commends and strongly supports the interpretation strategy.
- c) Advertising panels and interpretation panels should be limited to the existing size and respaced to reduce visual clutter.
- d) Given the contemporary aesthetic of Gleeson Avenue, Sydney Trains and HNSW to reassess the SHR listing and curtilage of the Sydenham Railway Station Group to exclude areas that no longer reflect the heritage values that are reflected in its statement of significance.
- e) Revisit the Sydney Trains Heritage Assessment process that occurred in 2010 (in light of subsequent and planned upgrades for equitable access associated with the Sydney Metro) to:
 - i. Consider delisting items that are no longer of State Significance
 - ii. List items that may have become of State Significance
 - iii. Update and amend SHR listings, including curtilage, and any ongoing conservation plans
 - iv. Revise Section 170 Register accordingly.

Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Bruce Pettman

3.0 Internal Presentations

3.1 Braidwood Compliance - Albion Hotel

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper and verbal report from Tim Smith OAM.

Key points discussed:

1. Recent application lodged to carry out repair works on site; additional proposal for a single storey residence and commercial shop front.
2. The State Heritage Register Committee (SHRC) and Heritage NSW to meet with Palerang Council to discuss a review of the listing process and compliance matters related to this site. The SHRC to develop a Working Group to discuss the listing review.

3. In progress HNSW report on the feasibility of pursuing the reinstatement of Hotel balustrades without the support of the local council; report to be presented at upcoming meeting.
4. Lessons learned from this non-compliance matter, the need to take corrective action and enhance internal processes.

Note
<p>The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes the report. 2. Advises Heritage NSW to learn from the situation to assist in enhancing the wider compliance process and feeding into future processes for heritage reform.
Moved by David McNamara and seconded by Caitlin Allen.

3.2 Millers Point Vision Statement and Principles - Update

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper and verbal report from Mr Rajeev Maini (HNSW), Lauren Flaherty and Yvette Andrews (City of Sydney). Key points discussed:

1. Approach, process and timeline of community consultation, including with stakeholders beyond the resident community.
2. Role of the Approvals Committee and their involvement in the public workshop.
3. Millers Point community as custodians of its heritage and the importance of a sense of ownership and responsibility in preserving it.

Note
<p>The Heritage Council Approvals Committee notes the project update and that Heritage NSW will be providing regular updates to the Approval Committee on the progress of the project until its completion.</p>
Moved by Nicholas Brunton and seconded by Caitlin Allen.

3.3 Correspondence: No 7&9 Dalgety Road, Millers Point

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a verbal update from Ms Pauline McKenzie and briefly discussed:

1. Heritage NSW conducting a review of the complete interaction of all applications and requests relating to this property for presentation at the April meeting.
2. Suggest that key elements of the Land & Environment Court judgement be fed into the Draft Millers Point Heritage Principles to inform future assessments of occupied residential heritage assets, noting it is not a precedent ruling.

Note

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the correspondence from Richard Kovaks to the Heritage Council Chair, dated 12 February 2021.

Moved by David Burdon and seconded by Nicholas Brunton

3.4 Bondi Surf Bathers Life Saving Club - Final roof designs

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a presentation from Mr Brent Jackson and Mr Jesse Lockhart-Krause. Key points discussed:

1. Response to August 2020 AC comments and subsequent workshops with the appointed subcommittee, particularly with regard to the roof and landscape design and Aboriginal community engagement.
2. Preferred roof option
 - Strong support for an open and independent lightweight structure with a minimum 15-degree roof pitch.
 - Open space would provide flexibility for functions and recreation beneath.
 - Opportunity for a continuous range roof that connects the old and new elements of the site and responds to the Bondi Pavilion roof.
 - Proposed design and material of the preferred option meets functionality requirements and is sympathetic to the character and setting of Bondi Pavilion Cultural Landscape.

Resolution 2021-13

That the Heritage Council Approval Committee:

1. **Thanks** the applicant and consultants for their presentation and notes that design option 3 is a significant improvement to the roof treatment from previous iterations.
2. **Provides** the following comments on the preferred concept design, as supported by the subcommittee:
 - a) The proposed building better relates to the Bondi Landscape as a whole;
 - b) The proposed building delivers the functionality required by Bondi SLC whilst respecting the heritage of the original building and its iconic location;
 - c) The Committee encourages the design team to continue to engage with the Aboriginal community on landscaping design;
 - d) The Committee encourages the use of innovative and independent structural roof supports, (e.g. the Foster and Partners Winery example cited);
 - e) The material palette of the tiled roof of both pavilions should match the Bondi Pavilion renovation;
 - f) The roof pitch should be a minimum of 15 degrees; and
 - g) The site plan should optimise deep soil plantings (to support shade trees) and integrate with the surrounding Park context.

Moved by Bruce Pettman and seconded by Niall Macken

4.0 General Business

No further matters were raised for discussion.

4.1 Forward agenda

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted the forward agenda.

5.0 Meeting Close

There being no items of further business, Dillon Kombumerri, Chair, closed the meeting at 4:20pm



.....
Mr Ian Clarke

A/Chair, Heritage Council Approvals Committee

Date: **8 APR 21**