

## Approvals Committee Minutes

1:55pm – 4:45pm  
Wednesday 02 May 2018  
10 Valentine Avenue, Parramatta  
Conference Room 1 and 2 | Level 6

### Attendees

Quorum requires that the majority of Voting Members shall be present. (4)

Governance Role			
Chair	Dr Deborah Dearing	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Mr Stephen Davies	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Mr Bruce Pettman	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Ms Kerime Danis	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Mr Gary White	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Mr Peter Romey	N/A	N/A
Voting Member	Ms Jane Irwin	N/A	N/A
Non-voting Member	Mr Dillon Kombumerri	N/A	N/A
OEH staff	Ms Pauline McKenzie	Executive Director	OEH
OEH staff	Mr Tim Smith OAM	Director Heritage Operations	OEH
OEH staff	Mr Steven Meredith	Regional Manager, Southern	OEH
Invited Guests <i>Item 2.1</i>	Ms Rachel Neeson		Neeson Murcutt Architects
	Mr Tasman Storey		Tropman & Tropman Architects
OEH staff <i>Item 2.1 and 4.1</i>	Mr Rajeev Maini	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments (South)	OEH
	Ms Shikha Jhaldiyal	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer	OEH
Invited Guests	Mr George Phillips	Heritage Consultant	TKD Architects

<i>Item 2.2</i>	Mr Anthony Henry		Macquarie
	Mr Michael Silman,		Macquarie
	Mr Paul van Ratingen		JPW Architects
OEH staff <i>Item 2.2</i>	Mr James Quoye	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer	OEH
Invited Guests <i>Item 2.3</i>	Mr James Phillips		Weir Phillips Heritage
	Mr Daniel Bourke		FJMT Studios
	Mr Ian Innes		Sydney Living Museums
	Mr Michael Ellis		
OEH staff <i>Item 2.3, 3.2</i>	Ms Verena Mauldon	Senior Heritage Officer, Major Projects	OEH
	Mr David Nix	Senior Heritage Officer, Major Projects	OEH
OEH staff <i>Item 3.1, 4.2</i>	Ms Katrina Stankowski	Senior Team Leader, Regional Heritage Assessments (North)	OEH
	Mr Ed Beebe	Senior Heritage Assessment Officer	OEH
Secretariat	Ms Natasha Agaki	A/Team Leader	OEH
Secretariat	Dr Susannah Clement	Graduate Officer	OEH

## MINUTES

### Item 1 Welcome and formalities

**Dr Deborah Dearing** opened the meeting at 1:55pm, delivered an Acknowledgment of Country and welcomed attendees.

It was noted that quorum had been met and there were no apologies to note.

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

The following potential conflicts of interest were raised:

1. Mr Stephen Davies – Item 4.2 Roxy Theatre Site Visit Report
2. Ms Jane Irwin – Item 2.1 Former Workmen’s Dwelling, 30-42 Lower Fort Street and 2-4 Trinity Avenue, Millers Point
3. Mr Peter Romey – Item 3.2 Sydney Harbour Bridge - rail deck replacement (Sydney Trains)

No items of further business were raised.

#### Decisions

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **NOTED** the potential conflict of interest for **Ms Jane Irwin**, in that she has submitted a proposal to work on a Millers Point project.
2. **AGREED** that **Ms Jane Irwin** will not participate in discussion of agenda *Item 2.1*
3. **NOTED** the direct conflict of interest for **Mr Stephen Davies**, in that his company is involved in the proponent’s concept proposal.
4. **AGREED** that **Mr Stephen Davies** will not participate in discussion or field visit related to agenda *Item 4.2*.
5. **NOTED** the potential conflict of interest for **Mr Peter Romey**, in that he is working on a Conservation Management Plan for the Sydney Harbour Bridge, however unrelated to the proposal in item 3.2.

### Item 1.1 Minutes from previous Approvals Committee meeting

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received the Minutes UNCONFIRMED from the previous ordinary meeting.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. Minor amendments to be made.

**Decisions**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **CONFIRMED** the minutes of the previous meeting (Wednesday 04 April 2018) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting, subject to the following amendments:
  - a. Replace 'Mr George Phillips' with 'Mr Scott MacArthur'.
  - b. Adjust font size at Item 2.3.

Moved by **Dr Deborah Dearing** and seconded by **Ms Kerime Danis**

**Item 1.2 Action Log**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received the Action Log from the previous ordinary meeting.

**Decisions**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **NOTED** the action log.

**Item 2 Presentations****Item 2.1 Former Workmen's Dwelling, 30-42 Lower Fort Street and 2-4 Trinity Avenue, Millers Point (PRE-DA)**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper on the **Former Workmen's Dwelling, 30-42 Lower Fort Street and 2-4 Trinity Avenue, Millers Point (PRE-DA)** and a presentation from **Ms Rachel Neeson (Neeson Murcutt Architects)** and **Mr Tasman Storey (Tropman & Tropman Architects)**.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. The adaptive reuse proposal for the buildings to enable their continued life.
2. Proposal to add an extension to the rear of the building to accommodate an additional bedroom wing.
3. Different design options:
  - a. Roofing
    - i. Flat roof, pitched roof and varied roof options.
    - ii. Pitched roof option is consistent with the look and feel of Millers Point.
  - b. Entries
    - i. Challenges achieving compliance.

- ii. Explored internal lifts to each wing – this option impacts on significant fabric and loses ground floor/garden area for accessibility.
  - iii. Central lift – this option is quite intrusive and destructive of the fabric.
  - iv. Proponent suggests off-centred lift – this is less discernible from the main street and complimentary to the proposed design option for the stairway.
- 4. Height of lift
  - a. Needs to fit under the gutter lines of the existing roofs.
- 5. Compliance
  - a. Balancing the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and the Building Code of Australia (BCA) in design considerations.
  - b. Challenges around achieving a compliant stairway.
    - i. Proponent suggests compliance can be achieved by lengthening the existing treads and reangling the streamer for a narrower stairway.
    - ii. If egress width is taken through a compliant doorway and this width is retained as a path to the street, compliance may be achieved.
- 6. Light weight metal sheeting for the enclosed verandas.

**Resolution 2018 - 31**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **NOTED** the information in the paper;
2. **CONSIDERED** the presentation; and
3. **PROVIDED** the following comments:
  - a. The rear additions should have a simplified and consistent roof form with a general preference for the pitched roof option.
  - b. The externally located lift overruns should be reduced in height so as to be within the existing roof. Consistent with our general policy for lifts in Millers Point.
  - c. The adaptation of the exceptionally significant common stairs and landings is supported.
  - d. Creation of openings between rooms should be limited to minimum required in size and numbers.
  - e. Conversion of existing bedrooms into kitchen and bathrooms should ensure that the room's integrity and spatial character is retained.

Moved by **Mr Peter Romey** and seconded by **Dr Deborah Dearing**

[Ms Rachel Neeson and Mr Tasman Storey left at the completion of this item.]

**Item 2.2 Martin Place Metro Precinct – over station development**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper on the **Martin Place Metro Precinct – over station development** and a presentation from **Mr George Phillips (TKD Architects)**, **Mr Anthony Henry (Macquarie)**, **Mr Paul van Ratingen (JPW Architects)** and **Mr Michael Silman (Macquarie)**.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. Summary of proposed changes to North Tower
  - a. Connections to 50 Martin Place from Ground floor, level 5 and level 10 and proposed materials used.
    - i. Proposed connections intend to be complimentary to the existing lifts which will be retained.
  - b. Three significant artworks to be incorporated into the base of the North Tower, in the public domain.
    - i. Currently proposed in/around the Metro entrance which closes for two hours a day.
    - ii. Challenges of reinstating the artwork into the streetscape and/or south entrance.

- iii. The wider Public Art Strategy should be used to refresh the existing artworks.
2. Development of South Tower
    - a. Proposed podium
      - i. solid masonry form.
      - ii. ceramic and glass façade for consistency with materiality.
      - iii. Expression is consistent with existing building in terms of depth, form and façade.
  3. Council agrees that there is not enough information to make extensive comment on the design.

#### Decisions

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **NOTED** the report and presentation.
2. **PROVIDED** the following comments on the proposed development;
  - a. Portal preferred to laneway as a connection between the two buildings, subject to appropriate design and materiality.
  - b. Combination of materials seems reasonable but unable to see what it means from an elevational perspective due to lack of detail.
  - c. Ground Floor openings appear to conflict with the underside of the stair and do not work from a heritage or design perspective.
  - d. More detail is required for the Committee to provide extensive comment.

[Mr George Phillips, Mr Anthony Henry, Mr Paul van Ratingen and Mr Michael Silman left at the completion of this item.]

### Item 2.3 The Mint Lift Project - Sydney Living Museums

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper on **The Mint Lift Project - Sydney Living Museums** and a presentation from Mr James Phillips (Weir Phillips Heritage), Mr Daniel Bourke (FJMT Studios), Mr Ian Innes and Mr Michael Ellis (Sydney Living Museums).

The proponents discussed:

1. Biomechanical and technological forms of modern design.
  - a. Biomorphic shape as a generating idea for the form and structure.
  - b. Archaeologically sensitive site; and the proposed form reduces the impact on the existing Mint building.
    - i. Archaeological sensitivity analysis has been conducted on broader site.

- ii. There is currently one being conducted specifically beneath the lift footing.
2. Lifts and Accessibility
- a. Lift providing access to three levels.
  - b. Enhancement of accessible toilet facilities to enable public use on the top floor.
  - c. Lift intended as a detachable element that can be removed in the future.
3. Materiality and Form
- a. Stainless steel and mirrored material intends to reflect the context and surrounding environment.
  - b. Complex form and shape is derived from:
    - i. the complexity of the space itself.
    - ii. the need for vertical transportation in that location.
    - iii. the need for a design that attaches lightly and does not damage the heritage significance of the building.
  - c. Some members expressed that the complexity of its sculptural form is problematic:
    - i. dominant and aggressive rather than deferential.
    - ii. The form and finish has the potential to be dramatically conflicting with its surroundings.
  - d. Size and scale should be as small as possible in order to house functional elements (lift, toilets), but not dominate the setting.

[presenters left the room]

- 4. The existing Ministerially approved broad site specific exemptions for Sydney Living Museums properties was discussed.
- 5. The Committee noted the location within the buffer of Hyde Park Barracks World Heritage site, and a location of potential national significance.
- 6. The dominant and potentially jarring form of the conceptual linking building.



**Decisions**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **NOTED** the information in this report and the Sydney Living Museums presentation; and,
2. **RAISED** concerns about the uncomfortable relationship of the proposed prominent addition with the existing buildings and entry walkway.
3. **SUPPORTED** the desire to significantly differentiate the old from the new, but the current proposal is detrimental to the high quality of the existing buildings, 2004 extensions, and the courtyard.
4. **QUERIED** whether the brief to add the proposed number of toilets to support an increase in the intensity of use is reasonable given the significance and associated constraints of the site.
5. **NOTED** that the proposed design is a substantial addition to a building which is of State significance and probably National significant, as one of the first substantial colonial buildings in Australia.
6. **NOTED** that the building is within the buffer of the World Heritage Convict Site of Hyde Park Barracks and therefore, EPBC referral should be made to the Commonwealth.
7. **ADVISED** that the Approvals Committee requests further consultation.

Moved by **Mr Gary White** and seconded by **Mr Peter Romey**.

[Ms Verena Mauldon left at the completion of this item.]

**Item 3 Integrated Development Applications/s.60/s.140 Excavation Permits****Item 3.1 Coal River Precinct (SHR 01674) – s65A**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper on the **Coal River Precinct (SHR 01674) – s65A** and a verbal report from **Mr Ed Beebe** and **Ms Katrina Stankowski (OEH)**.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. That the Applicants had submitted a new Interim Landscape Management Plan that is supported by the Heritage Division.
2. Applicants are required to submit a final landscape plan and put in place a Heritage bond.
3. Heritage Division requested 50% more vegetation. Council commented:
  - a. The plant boxes in an otherwise flat landscape appear intrusive.
  - b. Although intended to screen the roadway and retain the natural look of the area, the visual impact is more adverse than the roadway itself.

- c. Treatment is overly complicated and out of character with the grassland setting. Requires a more sympathetic approach.
4. Newcastle Council receiving community concerns.
- i. Some locals are concerned by the track pavement outcome.
  - ii. However, some families enjoy use of the pavement for recreational activity.
5. Heritage Council suggestions for improved design:
- a. relocating the structures away from the paved area to better integrate with the grass and pave setting.
  - b. relocate the trees and pots off the pavement to an alternative location that reflects the pattern of the vegetation.
  - c. Integrate with existing landscape rather than reinforcing the shape of the road.
6. Council members agreed to
- a. Remove the condition for a 50% increase in vegetation.
  - b. have the portion of the road remain un-grassed and be used for active recreation.
  - c. Executive Director, Heritage Division to approve under delegation.

**Resolution 2018 - 32**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **RECOMMENDED** to modify the approval under section 65A of the Heritage Act 1977, subject to the conditions discussed, and delegate final application approval to the Executive Director.

Moved by **Dr Deborah Dearing** and seconded by **Ms Kerime Danis**.

[Mr Ed Beebe and Ms Katrina Stankowski left at the completion of this item]

**Item 3.2 Sydney Harbour Bridge - rail deck replacement (Sydney Trains)**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a paper on the **Sydney Harbour Bridge - Rail Deck Replacement (Sydney Trains)** and a verbal report from **Mr David Nix (OEH)**.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. Sydney Trains' proposal to replace the timber decking rail deck corridor on the Sydney Harbour Bridge (SHB), with concrete decking panels.
  - a. Members gave in principle support for the replacement, noting the concrete decking will reduce maintenance requirements, and will not require total replacement of the stringer elements. Further, Members

- noted the SHB was a vast, robust structure and that a more robust material for the rail deck would not be out of place.
- b. However, adverse impacts resulting from the removal of significant fabric type, form and colour of the timber wearing surface were discussed.
  - c. Members also noted there would be adverse visual impacts from both underneath the bridge and along the rail corridor itself.
  - d. Options to minimise impacts included interpreting the timber decking surface, reconfiguring the concrete panels to better reflect the current timber decking configuration, or resizing the concrete panels to align more closely with the timber decking.
  - e. Members recommended that Sydney Trains provides further options that are better aligned with the current rail deck surface, including the possible east/west orientation of the proposed decking.
2. The provision of two 1.5m high collision protection barriers either side of the steel hangers to protect the SHB from potential train derailments.
    - a. At present Sydney Trains argue collision protection barriers do not currently comply with Australian Standards (AS 5100).
    - b. The installation of collision protection barriers on either side of the hangers will impact on views to significant fabric and introduce another element within the rail corridor which will add clutter to the rail corridor.
    - c. It was discussed whether the introduction of another element on the rail corridor is completely necessary.
    - d. Members approved the collision protection barriers in principle. However, they seek written assurance from the Asset Standards Authority within Transport for NSW of the safety justification for the need to introduce these new elements on the SHB.
  3. Repair and reconstruct the two huts on the SHB.
    - a. Members were generally supportive of the works. However, they noted works should be undertaken by appropriately skilled tradespeople with practical experience in conservation and restoration of similar structures, materials and methods.

**Resolution 2018 - 33**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **RECOMMENDED** that, pursuant to section 63 of the Heritage Act 1977, approval is granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report, and detailed in the meeting discussion.

Moved by **Dr Deborah Dearing** and seconded by **Mr Gary White**.

[Mr David Nix left at the completion of this item.]

**Item 4 Matters for consideration and/or decision****Item 4.1 State Library Access Ramp**

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee received a verbal report on the **State Library Access Ramp** from **Mr Rajeev Maini (OEH)**.

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee discussed:

1. The revised ramp design and noted that it was a significant improvement from the original proposal, however the visual impact was still adverse.
2. Mr Gary White and Mr Dillon Kombumerri did not support the revised design.

**Resolution 2018 - 34**

After discussion, the Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **ACCEPTS** the ramp is required for disability access and this solution is a significant refinement on previous options that the Approvals Committee has considered, and therefore, is approved in accordance with the recommended general terms of approval outlined in the Heritage Division report.
2. **ACKNOWLEDGES** that the ramp will have an adverse visual impact on the building and therefore, encourages further design refinements to reduce the impacts.

Moved by **Mr Peter Romey** and seconded by **Ms Jane Irwin**.

[Mr Rajeev Maini left at the completion of this item].

**Item 4.2 Roxy Theatre Site Visit Report**

This item was deferred due to timing overrun of the meeting.

**Item 5 General Business****Item 5.1 Matters arising**

No matters were discussed.

**Item 6 Future meetings**

It was noted that future meetings of the Heritage Council Approvals Committee are scheduled for:

- Wednesday 06 June 2018 – venue near Circular Quay to accommodate Heritage Council site visit to Fort Denison.

**Item 7 Meeting close**

There being no further items of business, **Dr Deborah Dearing** closed the meeting at 4:43pm.



.....

Ms Kerime Danis

Acting Chair, Heritage Council Approvals Committee

Date: 07 June 2018

This page is intentionally blank.