



HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

MEETING MINUTES – Approvals Committee

Tuesday, 3 May 2022 | 09:00 AM – 1:45 PM

Via Teleconference

ATTENDANCE	
MEMBERS	
Mr Dillon Kombumerri	Chair
Mr Ian Clarke	Acting Chair
Mr Bruce Pettman	Member
Mr David Burdon	Member
Ms Caitlin Allen	Member
Ms Julie Marler	Member
Mr David McNamara	Alternate Member
APOLOGIES	
Dr Nicholas Brunton	Member
EXTERNAL PRESENTERS	
Mr Graham Brooks	Heritage Architect, GBA Heritage (item 2.1)
Mr Blair Johnston	Architect, Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Ms Michael Rowe	Planner, Ethos Urban (item 2.1)
Mr Zac Abrams	Observer – Google/CBRE (item 2.1)
Mr Dov Midalia	Observer – GBA Heritage (item 2.1)
Mr Sven Ollmann	Observer – Warren & Mahoney (item 2.1)
Mr Jim Murry	Observer – Ethos Urban (item 2.1)
Mr Jesse Lockhart-Krause	Architect, Lockhart-Krause Architects (item 2.2)
Mr Stephen Davies	Heritage Architect, Urbis (item 2.2)

Mr Rob Sabarto	A/Executive Manager, Major Projects and Project Manager, Waverly Council (item 2.2)
HERITAGE NSW STAFF	
Mr Rajeev Maini	Manager Assessments, Heritage Assessments (item 2.1 – 2.2)
Ms Shikha Jhaldiyal	A/ Manager Assessments, Heritage Assessments (item 2.1 – 2.2)
Ms Veerle Norbury	Senior Heritage Assessments Officer, Heritage Assessments (item 2.1)
Ms Anna London	Manager Assessments, Heritage Assessments (item 3.1)
Ms Rebecca Newell	Senior Policy Officer, Heritage Policy Strategy (item 3.1)
Ms Caroline Ford	Manager Policy and Reform, Heritage Policy Strategy (item 3.2)
Ms Emma Dortins	Principal Policy Officer, Heritage Policy Strategy (item 3.2)
Mr Michael Ellis	Manager Assessments, Heritage Assessments (item 3.3)
Ms James Quoyale	Senior Heritage Assessments Officer, Heritage Assessments (item 3.3)
Ms Natasha Agaki	Secretariat Officer

1. Welcome and formalities

The Chair, Dillon Kombumerri, opened the meeting at 09:00am.

- The Chair delivered an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed attendees.
- The Chair thanked Ian Clarke for chairing the previous meeting.
- Apologies were accepted from Dr Nicholas Brunton.
- 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 2022-16
The Heritage Council Approvals Committee: 1. Notes the following standing conflict of interest declarations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Julie Marler – Although not directly involved in Callan Park (item 3.3), Ms Marler is lead designer on the Landscape Management Plan for Fernhill Estate, part of the Greater Sydney Parklands.
2. Supports Ms Marler's decision to have her access to all papers relating to item 3.3 restricted and to leave the meeting for the duration of the item.
Moved by Caitlin Allen and seconded by Bruce Pettman

1.2 Out of Session Activity

1. The Heritage Council Approvals Committee noted that Ian Clarke, Caitlin Allen, David Burdon and Bruce Pettman attended the Heritage Act Reform workshop on 12 April 2022 with Heritage Council and State Heritage Register Committee members.
2. Workshop discussions focused mainly on objects of the Act, listing categories, intangible heritage, definitions and resourcing.

1.3 Minutes from Previous Meeting – 5 April 2022

The Committee received the Minutes from the previous ordinary meeting.

Resolution 2022-17
The Heritage Council Approvals Committee: 1. Confirms the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting (Tuesday, 5 April 2022) as a complete and accurate record of that meeting.
Moved by David McNamara and seconded by Julie Marler

1.4 Action Report

The Committee noted the action report.

2. External Presentations

2.1 IDAs - Google Pyrmont - Royal Edward Victualling Yards (REVY)

The Committee received a presentation from Google Australia on the three integrated development applications being submitted for the REVY. A paper was also received from Veerle Norbury, Heritage NSW.

Key points:

- The Committee acknowledged the work of the Heritage NSW Assessment Team and the long and successful process of engagement with Google Australia to date.
- The applicant has responded to advice provided by the Approvals Committee.
- The Committee discussed possible impacts of the new two-storey Building D upon the Arrow Marine Building, which gained a significant amount of public feedback. It was noted that Arrow Marine Building CMP did not contain a policy contrary to the proposal; that the proposed replacement building on Site D is proposed to solve other heritage impacts on the REVY buildings (i.e., reducing the height of Building F); and that introducing a 2m setback could potentially result in further heritage issues.
- As the Arrow Marine building is locally listed, the Committee agreed that it is the role of City of Sydney Council to consider planning and building code issues in relation to the setback as part of their detailed assessment. The Approvals Committee's focus is on conservation of the SHR listed values of the site as a whole.
- The Committee discussed how the landscape could be simplified to relate more sympathetically to the austere nature of the industrial setting and the interpretation strategy.
- The wedge-shaped corner of the Site E landscape plan (along the water's edge) should ideally be included as open space in line with the interpretation of REVY A and B, as the tram tracks through that section form part of the historic and functional aspects of the work yard. Integrating this corner will strengthen the interpretation of the tram tracks and the legibility of the historic REVY buildings in relation to the work yard.
- Ideally, this Site E corner should also be softened and opened further to provide greater public visibility and access. Google staff and members of the public should not be viewed as separate from one another in considering its amenity.
- Connection to Country has not been a strong part of this scheme, however, there is still scope to connect the development to its broader context of Aboriginal culture and history.
- The Committee previously advised against the staged approach to the applications to avoid the risk of the scheme and its public benefits not being delivered in its entirety. The applicant will need to carefully manage the risks associated with this approach. It was noted that if the Boardwalk DA is not approved by TfNSW, the easement along the water's edge would still be available to ensure a public walkway.

- The Committee was not unanimous in its resolution to grant the below General Terms of Approval in relation to the new two-storey Building D adjacent the Arrow Marine building. David Burdon did not support abutting the Arrow Marine building.

Resolution 2022-18 - Google Pymont – REVY A + B

The 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

- Development must be in accordance with:
 - Architectural drawings, prepared by Warren and Mahoney as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Google Pirrama Rd			
DA2.001	Cover Sheet	8/9/21	C
DA2.010	Location Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.020	Existing Site Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.030	Proposed Site Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.050	GFA Area Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.060	L-00 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.061	L-01 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.062	L-02 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.063	L-03 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.064	L-04 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.065	L-05 Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.066	Roof Demolition Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.070	Existing North Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.071	Existing South Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.072	Existing East Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.073	Existing West Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.100	Proposed Basement Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.101	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.102	Proposed 1 st Floor Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.103	Proposed 2 nd Floor Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.104	Proposed 3 rd Floor Plan	8/9/21	C

DA2.105	Proposed 4 th Floor Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.106	Proposed 5 th Floor Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.110	Proposed Roof Plan	8/9/21	C
DA2.180	Shadow Diagrams – Existing	8/9/21	C
DA2.181	Shadow Diagrams – Proposed	8/9/21	C
DA2.200	Proposed North Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.201	Proposed South Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.202	Proposed East Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.203	Proposed West Elevation	8/9/21	C
DA2.300	Overall Section 01	8/9/21	C
DA2.301	Overall Section 02	8/9/21	C
DA2.302	Overall Section 03	8/9/21	C

b) Civil engineering drawings, prepared by Northrop as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Google REVY			
DAC01.01	Cover Sheet, Drawing Schedule & Locality Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC01.21	Combined Services Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC02.01	Concept Sediment & Soil Erosion Control Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC02.11	Sediment & Soil Erosion Control Details	27/8/21	01
DAC03.01	Bulk Earthworks Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC03.11	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 01	27/8/21	01
DAC03.12	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 02	27/8/21	01
DAC03.13	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 03	27/8/21	01
DAC04.01	Siteworks & Stormwater Management Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC05.01	Stormwater longitudinal Sections – Sheet 01	27/8/21	01
DAC05.02	Stormwater longitudinal Sections – Sheet 01	27/8/21	01
DAC05.03	Stormwater longitudinal Sections – Sheet 01	27/8/21	01
DAC05.41	Stormwater Catchment Plan	27/8/21	01
DAC05.51	Stormwater Calculations	27/8/21	01

c) *Statement of Heritage Impact, Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road Pyrmont, Site A/B*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated September 2021.

- d) *Conservation Management Plan, Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated August 2021.
- e) *Interpretation Strategy, Former Royal Edward Victualling Yards, 38-42 Pirrama Road Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated September 2021.
- f) *Archaeological Assessment Report, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020.
- g) *Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Assessment Report, REVY*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020.
- h) *Geotechnical Investigation Report, 38-42 Pirrama Road Pyrmont*, prepared by JKGeotechnics, dated 31 August 2021.
- i) *Landscape Development Application REVY Site A/B*, prepared by Aspect Studios, dated 9 September 2021.
- j) *Upgrade Fire Safety Strategy, 34-38 Pirrama Road, Google REVY*, prepared by ARUP, dated 27 August 2021.
- k) *REVY Masterplan*, no author, undated (from Ethos Urban Planner on 30/3/22)
- l) Letter to City of Sydney Council re: *Request for Additional Information – D/2021/1058*, prepared by Ethos Urban, dated 23 February 2022.
- m) Letter to Heritage NSW re: *REVY D/2021/1058 – Draft General Term*, prepared by Ethos Urban, dated 12 April 2022.

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the General Terms of Approval:

PUBLIC BENEFITS

2. The works as proposed under concurrent Development Application for Site E D/2021/1182 and Site D D/2021/1507 (as part of the Royal Edward Victualling Yard, SHR no. 01855), and the boardwalk, are to be substantially completed prior to the issue of any Occupation Certificate for the subject application.

Reason: The Approvals Committee resolutions specified that any approval would be conditional upon the entirety of the proposed scheme being delivered as the scheme combines public benefits with heritage preservation and interventions, and the Committee strongly recommended that DA1 (REVY A+B) and DA 2 (REVY E) were integrated. Due to the scheme being proposed as three separate IDA's and a DA to Transport for NSW, this condition aims to ensure that the public benefits are guaranteed by linking the proposals.

DEMOLITION

3. Demolition of timber floors and subfloors within REVY B is not approved. Options of mitigating impact on significant fabric via design modifications shall be explored. Additional assessment

shall be submitted that clearly demonstrates that the preferred option has the least impact. Amended drawings are to be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate).

Reason: The impact upon significant fabric will be major and has not been adequately justified. Discrepancies between demolition and proposal drawings exist. The retention of the current fire stair location should be investigated as this would result in an improved heritage outcome.

4. Demolition of timber windows and brickwork within REVY A Ground Floor east façade arches is not approved. Options of retaining some of these windows and brickwork while utilising previously altered sections for entry shall be explored to minimise impact. Amended drawings are to be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate).

Reason: The impact upon significant fabric will be major and has not been adequately justified. The central three windows within the existing brickwork are the only three original double hung sash windows remaining, as designed by Vernon, and form part of Vernon's structural response to the site's context (reclaimed land, fill). Other options for the new entry should be investigated, for example using some of the arches which were previously altered.

5. Demolition of timber windows and brickwork in REVY B Ground Floor west façade is not approved. Amended drawings are to be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate).

Reason: The impact upon significant fabric has not been adequately assessed and justified. The drawings appear to indicate the demolition of three louvre windows, however streetview images seem to suggest only one of the windows is a louvred window while others appear original. The need for three windows to be converted into a fire exit is not clear from the documentation. Potentially one (louvred) window may be approved as a fire exit.

6. Demolition of the timber windows, roof/structure and brickwork of the northern wall (penetrations due to services) to the Dining Room is not approved. Amended drawings are to be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate).

Reason: The impact upon significant fabric has not been adequately assessed and justified. The reason for removing the Dining Room windows and roof/structure is not clear. The documentation also does not provide details regarding the extent of penetrations required for services.

SHADING DEVICES

7. Shading devices along the waterfront are not approved.

8. Shading devices on the new building's rooftop should be kept to a minimum. Details of such devices are to be submitted for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate) as part of the s.60 application.

Reason: To minimise visual impact and clutter. The Heritage Council Approvals Committee June 2021 Resolution noted that the roof design be uncluttered and that any shading devices should be carefully considered to minimise visual impact.

DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION WORKS

9. A dilapidation report for the SHR item (both built fabric and landscape elements) shall be prepared prior to Construction Certificate, as per recommended by the Geotechnical report.
10. Potential vibration and subsidence impacts created by the proposed excavation and construction works shall be monitored by a structural engineer to ensure that the SHR item is adequately protected from potential damage.
11. If damage occurs to the SHR item during the works, works must cease immediately, and remedial action undertaken prior to any further works being undertaken.

Reason: To ensure the condition of the SHR item is adequately recorded prior to the works. To ensure any damage caused by adjoining works is adequately remediated.

SALVAGE OF HERITAGE FABRIC

12. A salvage schedule listing the heritage fabric proposed for removal is to be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council (or Delegate). The schedule should include the location and significance level of the elements and clarify their proposed reuse.

Reason: The HIS advises that removed floorboards, joists and struts are to be salvaged, and either reused to infill areas where these were previously removed, or stored for 'possible future use'. It is unclear what is proposed to other elements such as brickwork, windows, timber loading bay doors, spandrels and aprons.

HERITAGE CONSULTANT

13. 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

14. 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

15. 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.

16. The stockpile inside building A as shown on the Civil Engineering Drawings is not approved.

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

HERITAGE INTERPRETATION PLAN

17. 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.

18. The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of the *Royal Edward Victualling Yard* 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.

19. 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

20. A photographic archival recording of the site, both externally and internally (including all equipment, machinery and moveable items) 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.

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

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

21. The applicant must submit the following documents with the section 60 application for assessment and additional conditions, if required, as outlined below:

- a) An Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist as part of the Section 60 application and should include consideration of any maritime archaeological issues in this area. Any maritime archaeological assessment should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced maritime archaeologist. This assessment should include submerged areas and any reclaimed areas that were previously submerged. This document shall include more detailed research questions to guide the archaeological work at this site.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed in accordance with the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology. The HAA notes that potential relics are likely to be associated with 19th Century maritime occupation, among other occupation phases. Reclaimed areas have previously demonstrated significant maritime archaeological deposits, including maritime infrastructure sites and shipwrecks that were previously under water but now buried under reclaimed land.

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

Reason: To ensure that archaeological excavation at the site is managed by a suitably qualified excavation director.

- c) Following the receipt of the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology, the Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate reserves the right to issue additional archaeological conditions as part of the Section 60 approval 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.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed appropriately.

Unexpected historical archaeological relics

22. 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.

COMPLIANCE

23. 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

24. 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.

ADVISORY NOTE

1. Boardwalk

It is strongly recommended that the boardwalk, subject to the DA to be submitted to Transport for NSW, is substantially completed prior to the issue of any Occupation Certificate for the subject application. This is to ensure that the public benefits resulting from the new Boardwalk are delivered. This was proposed as part of a condition by the Ethos Urban letter dated 27 February 2022.

It is noted that while the Boardwalk would be located outside of the SHR curtilage, this is an important element of the proposed scheme. The boardwalk should be executed sympathetic to the broader heritage context.

2. Aboriginal Objects

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

Moved by Ian Clarke and seconded by Bruce Pettman

Resolution 2022-19 - IDA - Google Pymont – REVY E

The 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:

DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT

1. This approval is subject to Deferred Commencement in accordance with section 63A of the Heritage Act 1977 and is subject to the following condition being met to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate):

LANDSCAPE

The landscape design shall be amended to be more in keeping with the industrial heritage setting, interpretation strategy and the intended function to have more integrated open space that relates to the surrounding setting and views, including the open space, buildings and harbour. Amended design must be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate).

Reason: Reduce visual clutter and improve the relationship between REVY A and B and REVY E, as well as the public and private spheres.

APPROVED DEVELOPMENT

2. Development must be in accordance with:
 - a) Civil drawings, prepared by Northrop as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Google REVY Site E			
DAC11.01	Cover Sheet, Drawing Schedule & Locality Plan	24/9/21	01
DAC11.21	Combined Services Plan (Existing)	24/9/21	01
DAC12.01	Concept Sediment & Soil Erosion Control Details	24/9/21	01
DAC12.11	Sediment & Soil Erosion Control Details	24/9/21	01

DAC13.01	Bulk Earthworks Plan	24/9/21	01
DAC13.11	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 01	24/9/21	01
DAC13.12	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 02	24/9/21	01
DAC13.13	Bulk Earthworks Sections – Sheet 03	24/9/21	01
DAC14.01	Siteworks & Stormwater Management Plan	24/9/21	01
DAC15.01	Stormwater Longitudinal Sections – Sheet 01	24/9/21	01
DAC15.02	Stormwater Longitudinal Sections – Sheet 02	24/9/21	01
DAC15.03	Stormwater Longitudinal Sections – Sheet 03	24/9/21	01
DAC15.41	Stormwater Catchment Plan	24/9/21	01
DAC15.51	Stormwater Calculations	24/9/21	01

- b) *Landscape Development Application, Google REVY Site E*, prepared by Aspect Studios, dated 1 October 2021.
- c) *Edge Treatment Interface Sketch, Google DA4 Boardwalk*, prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated 26 October 2021.
- d) *Open Space Plan of Management, 6 Darling Island Road Pyrmont*, prepared by Ethos Urban, dated 8 February 2022.
- e) *Public Accessible Areas Management Plan (PAAMP)*, no author, undated.
- f) *Site Map of Skip Bin Locations*, prepared by FDC, undated.
- g) *Statement of Heritage Impact – Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 6 Darling Island Road, Pyrmont, Site E*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated September 2021.
- h) *Archaeological Assessment Report, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020.
- i) *Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Assessment Report, REVY*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020.
- j) *Interpretation Strategy, Former Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated September 2021.
- k) *Conservation Management Plan, Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated August 2021.
- l) Letter to City of Sydney Council re: *Request for Additional Information – D/2021/1058*, prepared by Ethos Urban, dated 23 February 2022.

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the General Terms of Approval:

HERITAGE CONSULTANT

3. 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

4. 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

5. 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.

HERITAGE INTERPRETATION PLAN

6. 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.
7. The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of the Royal Edward Victualling Yard 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.
8. 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.

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

9. The applicant must submit the following documents with the section 60 application for assessment and additional conditions, if required, as outlined below:
 - a) An Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist as part of the Section 60 application and should include consideration of any maritime archaeological issues in this area. Any maritime archaeological assessment should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced maritime archaeologist. This assessment should include

submerged areas and any reclaimed areas that were previously submerged. This document shall include more detailed research questions to guide the archaeological work at this site.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed in accordance with the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology. The HAA notes that potential relics are likely to be associated with 19th Century maritime occupation, among other occupation phases. Reclaimed areas have previously demonstrated significant maritime archaeological deposits, including maritime infrastructure sites and shipwrecks that were previously under water but now buried under reclaimed land.

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

Reason: To ensure that archaeological excavation at the site is managed by a suitably qualified excavation director.

- c) Following the receipt of the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology, the Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate reserves the right to issue additional archaeological conditions as part of the Section 60 approval 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.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed appropriately.

UNEXPECTED HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RELICS

10. 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.

COMPLIANCE

11. 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

12. 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.

ADVISORY NOTE

1. Prior approvals

On 5 September 2012 general terms of approval were issued by the Heritage Council for 2012/IDA/023 for the adaptive reuse of REVY C for residential purposes and construction of new residential flat building REVY E (DOC/A840736).

However, while the adaptive reuse of building C and the construction of a basement carpark adjacent to building C was approved under Section 60 application S60/2017/85 on 10 July 2017 (DOC17/192089), it is noted that an approval under Section 60 for the new residential flat building REVY E has not been issued.

2. Aboriginal Objects

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

Moved by Julie Marler and seconded by Ian Clarke

Resolution 2022-20 - IDA - Google Pymont – REVY D

The 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 Warren and Mahoney as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Google Pirrama Road			

DA5.001	Cover Sheet	3/12/21	C
DA5.010	Location Plan	3/12/21	C
DA5.020	Existing Site Plan	3/12/21	C
DA5.030	Proposed Site Plan	3/12/21	C
DA5.050	GFA Area Plans	3/12/21	C
DA5.060	L00 Demolition Plan	3/12/21	C
DA5.101	Ground Floor	3/12/21	C
DA5.102	First Floor	3/12/21	C
DA5.110	Roof Plan	3/12/21	C
DA5.170	Shadow Diagrams – Existing	3/12/21	C
DA5.171	Shadow Diagrams – Proposed	3/12/21	C
DA5.200	External Elevations – North & South	3/12/21	C
DA5.201	External Elevations – East & West	3/12/21	C
DA5.300	Overall Sections	3/12/21	C

b) Civil engineering drawings, prepared by Northrop as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: Google REVY			
DAC51.01	Cover Sheet, drawing schedule and locality plan	3/12/21	01
DAC51.21	Combined services plan (existing)	3/12/21	01
DAC52.01	Concept sediment and erosion control plan	3/12/21	01
DAC52.11	Sediment and erosion control details	27/8/21	01
DAC54.01	Siteworks and stormwater management plan	3/12/21	01
DAC55.41	Stormwater catchment plan	3/12/21	01

c) *Statement of Heritage Impact – Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont, Site D*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated December 2021.

d) *Archaeological Assessment Report, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020. [including August 2021 Addendum]

e) *Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Assessment Report, REVY*, prepared by Curio Projects, dated December 2020. [including August 2021 Addendum]

f) *Interpretation Strategy, Former Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated September 2021.

- g) *Conservation Management Plan, Royal Edward Victualling Yard, 38-42 Pirrama Road, Pyrmont*, prepared by GBA Heritage, dated August 2021.
- h) Letter to City of Sydney Council re: *Request for Additional Information – D/2021/1058*, prepared by Ethos Urban, dated 23 February 2022.

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the following general terms of approval:

FURTHER INFORMATION

- 2. Reconsider the extent and nature of the green wall in relation to the industrial character of the site. A landscape report assessing the long-term viability and maintenance regime required for the proposed green walls shall be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council of NSW (or Delegate). If the green walls require high maintenance and are not viable in the long term, other design options should be investigated.

Reason: While the Heritage Council Approvals Committee raised this issue during the August 2021 meeting, no supporting information was submitted. The assessment and management of these details is considered essential in order to obtain a good heritage outcome.

- 3. A detailed structural report confirming the depth of proposed foundations and depth of the coolant chamber and conduits shall be submitted with the s.60 application for approval by the Heritage Council of NSW (or delegate). The report should confirm that the proposed excavation for the bridging foundations is achievable without damage to the underlying coolant chamber.

Reason: The HIS notes that the precise depth of the 1920s water chamber/conduit beneath the site remains to be determined. No information was submitted to demonstrate how the bridging foundation would avoid physical contact with or structural impact upon these elements.

HERITAGE CONSULTANT

- 4. 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

5. 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

6. 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.

HERITAGE INTERPRETATION PLAN

7. 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.
8. The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of *Royal Edward Victualling Yard* 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.
9. 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.

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

10. The applicant must submit the following documents with the section 60 application for assessment and additional conditions, if required, as outlined below:

- a) An Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced historical archaeologist as part of the Section 60 application and should include consideration of any maritime archaeological issues in this

area. Any maritime archaeological assessment should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced maritime archaeologist. This assessment should include submerged areas and any reclaimed areas that were previously submerged. This document shall include more detailed research questions to guide the archaeological work at this site.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed in accordance with the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology. The HAA notes that potential relics are likely to be associated with 19th Century maritime occupation, among other occupation phases. Reclaimed areas have previously demonstrated significant maritime archaeological deposits, including maritime infrastructure sites and shipwrecks that were previously under water but now buried under reclaimed land.

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

Reason: To ensure that archaeological excavation at the site is managed by a suitably qualified excavation director.

- c) Following the receipt of the Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology, the Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate reserves the right to issue additional archaeological conditions as part of the Section 60 approval 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.

Reason: To ensure archaeological resources are managed appropriately.

UNEXPECTED HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICALY RELICS

11. 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.

COMPLIANCE

12. 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

13. 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.

ADVISORY NOTES

1. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Please refer to attached Heritage NSW letter dated 22/3/2022 (DOC22/227726-1) in relation to Aboriginal Cultural Heritage.

2. Aboriginal Objects

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.

Moved by Ian Clarke and seconded by Bruce Pettman

David Burdon abstained from voting; he does not support abutting the Arrow Marine building.

2.2 IDA – Bondi Surf Bathers’ Lifesaving Club (BSBLSC) Conservation and Upgrade

The Committee received a presentation on the integrated development application for BSBLSC from Lockhart-Krause Architects, Urbis and Waverly Council. A paper was also received from Shikha Jhaldiyal, Heritage NSW.

Key points:

- The Committee commended the work progressed around Aboriginal cultural heritage.
- The roof proposal was generally supported, but the Committee encourage the applicant to ensure that its support columns are sympathetic to the character and design of the pitched roof,

the robust nature of the buildings, as well as the broader context of the beach and its setting, including the adjacent Bondi Pavilion.

- The core heritage aspect of the Surf Club within the Statement of Significance is its function. Therefore, the proposed ramp locations, which best address access and safety regulations whilst minimising impacts on pedestrians, were supported by the Committee.
- The landscape should focus on celebrating its stronger elements, e.g., the green roof and deep soil planting in the courtyard, and not detract from these elements with additional strip planting around the building perimeter and arches.
- There are strong concerns around the resilience and long-term maintenance of the proposed development within a harsh beach environment. Design detail and finessing will be critical in addressing the impacts of weathering.
- Further detail is needed to ensure the intent of the design concept can be delivered.

Resolution 2022-21

The 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:

1. APPROVED DEVELOPMENT

Development must be in accordance with:

- a) Architectural drawings, prepared by Lockhart-Krause Architects, as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: BONDI SURF BATHERS' LIFESAVING CLUB			
01	Cover Sheet, Proposed	-	-
02	Context Analysis, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
03	Streetscape Analysis, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
04	Site Plan, Existing	13/04/2022	B
05	Site Plan, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
06	Ground Plan, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
07	First Plan, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
08	Second Plan, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
09	Roof & Basement Plan, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
10	Elevation South, Existing	13/04/2022	B
11	Elevation South, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
12	Elevation North, Existing	13/04/2022	B

13	Elevation North, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
14	Elevation East, Existing	13/04/2022	B
15	Elevation East, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
16	Elevation West, Existing	13/04/2022	B
17	Elevation West, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
18	Section AA & BB, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
19	Section CC & DD, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
20	Section EE & FF, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
21	Section GG, Proposed	13/04/2022	B
22	Backing Sheet, Proposed	-	-
28	Ground Plan, Demolition	13/04/2022	C
29	First Plan, Demolition	13/04/2022	C
30	Elevation East & West, Demolition	13/04/2022	C
31	Elevation North & South, Demolition	13/04/2022	C

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

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: BONDI SURF BATHER'S LIFE SAVING CLUB CONSERVATION AND UPGRADE PROJECT			
000	Cover Sheet	21/04/2021	C
001	Landscape Plan - GF	21/04/2021	C
002	Landscape Plan - Roof	21/04/2021	C
003	Landscape Section	21/04/2021	B
004	Landscape Precedents and Materiality	21/04/2021	A

c) Civil Drawings, prepared by WSP Australia Pty Ltd., as listed below:

Dwg No	Dwg Title	Date	Rev
Project Name: BONDI SURF BATHER'S LIFE SAVING CONSERVATION AND UPGRADE PROJECT			
PS119376_C001	Cover Sheet, Drawing Schedule and Locality Plan	Sept 2020	C
PS119376_C002	General Notes	Sept 2020	C

PS119376_C01	Overall Site Plan	Sept 2020	C
PS119376_C02	General Arrangement Plan	Sept 2020	C
PS119376_C05	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	Sept 2020	C
PS119376_C051	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Notes and Details	Sept 2020	C
PS119376_C051	Civil Details	Sept 2020	C

- d) Report titled, *Heritage Impact Statement Bondi Surf Bathers Life Saving Club, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Bondi Beach*, prepared by Urbis, dated 28 April 2021.
- e) Report titled, *Visual Impact Assessment Revision A* prepared by Lockart-Krause Architects, dated 21 April 2021.
- f) Letter, *Development Application DA - 173/2021 – Bondi Surf Club, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Bondi Beach NSW 2026*, prepared by Urbis dated 22 November 2021.
- g) Report titled *Façade Engineering, Phase 2 - Authority Approval Documentation, DA Report, Bondi Surf Bathers Life Saving Club*, prepared by Lockhart-Krause Architects, dated 21 April 2021.
- h) Report titled, *Visual Impact Assessment Revision A* prepared by Lockart-Krause Architects, dated 21 April 2021.

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the following General Terms of Approval:

DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT

2. This approval is subject to Deferred Commencement in accordance with section 63A of the *Heritage Act 1977* and is subject to the following conditions being met to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate):
- a) Ensure the roof structural supports, rainwater gutters and downpipes suit the character and design of the roof, the robust nature of the buildings, and the broader context of the pavilion. This should be reflected in the detailed drawings required in Condition 4.

Reason: To minimise visual impacts and to ensure that BSBLSC and the Bondi Pavilion can be appreciated as part of an architectural group designed to relate to each other.

- b) The narrow strips of landscaping around the first-floor perimeter of the building and around the ground floor courtyard arch length are not approved. Amended drawings must be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate).

Reason: To ensure the new additions are sympathetic to the heritage character of BSBLSC. These embellishments detract from the integrity of the original form and do not respond to the design of the Bondi Pavilion.

- c) Roof cover to the courtyard along the northern façade of BSBLSC building shall be redesigned to allow for improved views and appreciation of original stair tower. Amended drawings must be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate).

Reason: To minimise visual impact on significant views and setting of BSBLSC and to ensure reinstated elements to the northern façade can be appreciated in the round as originally designed.

- d) The design of the glazed balustrade to the upper level (beach front southern elevation) shall be amended to be sympathetic with the solid masonry character of the BSBLSC and the pavilion building. Amended drawings must be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate).

Reason: To ensure the new additions are sympathetic to the heritage character of BSBLSC and the Pavilion.

FURTHER INFORMATION

3. The proposed lighting proposal dated 20 April 2021 prepared by Electrolight provides general lighting approach to BSBLSC and the surrounding pathways and is supported in principle. Detailed proposal shall be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate) with the section 60 application. The proposal shall be supported and informed by a lighting strategy for the broader Bondi Beach Cultural Landscape to ensure a coordinated approach for such upgrades and a heritage impact statement.

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. Detailed drawings of the proposed works affecting the 1930s BSBLSC building shall be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate) with the section 60 application.

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.

5. A detailed schedule of conservation works for the BSBLSC building shall be submitted to and approved by the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate) with the section 60 application. The works shall be implemented as part of this project prior to issue of an Occupation Certificate.

Reason: To ensure the building is conserved appropriately and to mitigate impacts.

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.

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

9. The installation of new services shall be carried out in such a manner as to minimise damage to or removal of historic fabric and shall not obscure historic features. Any new penetrations through heritage fabric shall be minimised. Where possible, existing service points shall be used.

Reason: To minimise impact on significant fabric and to allow significant fabric and elements to remain visible.

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.
11. The interpretation plan must detail how information on the history and significance of BSBLSC and its moveable heritage items will be provided for the public, and make recommendations regarding public accessibility, activities, signage (entry, wayfinding and interpretive signs) and lighting. The plan should respond to and convey significant Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural heritage values of the place as recognised by any relevant Conservation Management Plans and National Heritage listing and State Heritage Register listing. 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.
12. 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

13. A photographic archival recording of the affected areas 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.

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

UNEXPECTED HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RELICS

14. 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.

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.

Reason: To meet legislative requirements.

ADVICE

Aboriginal Objects

- The Applicant shall submit evidence of how potential impacts to Aboriginal objects have been assessed in accordance with Heritage NSW guidelines (available online at: <https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/applications/aboriginal-objects-and-places/before-you-apply/>). The assessment shall be provided with the Section 60 application.
- The applicant must identify any requirement for an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (as amended) at the time of submitting the section 60 application, based on the outcome of an Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment prepared in accordance with Heritage NSW guidelines.
- Should any Aboriginal objects be uncovered by the work which are 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: Additional values linked to Aboriginal cultural and archaeological heritage of the Bondi Beach Cultural Landscape have been identified in the Conservation Management Plan. The above advice will ensure that the values are identified, assessed and protected in an appropriate manner.

Moved by Caitlin Allen and seconded by Bruce Pettman.

3. Heritage NSW presentations

3.1 Revised s140/s144 archaeology conditions – Confidential

The Committee received a paper and verbal report from Anna London and Rebecca Newell, Heritage NSW, outlining proposed amendments to Section 140 / Section 144 archaeology conditions.

Resolution 2022-22

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:

1. **Noted** the information in the report presented, including the proposed changes.
2. **Provided** comments on the proposed changes to the letter and conditions for Heritage NSW to action.

Moved by Caitlin Allen and seconded by Ian Clarke

3.2 Heritage Bill: Proposed definition of ‘activation’ – Confidential

The Committee noted an update presentation on the Heritage Amendment Bill from Caroline Ford and Emma Dortins, Heritage NSW.

Resolution 2022-23

The Heritage Council Approvals Committee reviewed the definition of “activation” and provided Heritage NSW with a list of issues to consider.

Moved by David Burdon and seconded by Caitlin Allen

3.3 Callan Park Amenities Building – update

The Committee received a paper and verbal report from James Quoye and Michael Ellis, Heritage NSW, outlining modifications to the proposal for Callan Park amenities building, presented to the Committee on 1 March 2022.

Key points noted:

- The roof form no longer protrudes outside of the building envelope. The structure has been relocated eastward to sit within the envelope of the recently demolished building.

- Relocation of the structure means it is now in compliance with the Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act.
- By relocating the structure approximately 1.8m away from adjacent casuarina grove the leaf litter will present less of a maintenance issue to manage.
- The design has not changed. However, the colour palette of the amenities building has been modified to a recessive colour and will complement the colours of the natural setting and resonate with the character of the casuarina grove, as requested by the Approvals Committee.

Resolution 2022-24
The Heritage Council Approvals Committee:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the modified proposal described in TAB 3.3A of the report presented. 2. Recommends Heritage NSW or Delegate exercise delegation to determine the modified IDA and/or Section 60 application for approval.
Moved by Ian Clarke and seconded by David McNamara

4. General Business

4.1 Forward agenda

The Committee noted the forward agenda.

4.2 Other matters

1. The development proposal for the Chief Secretary’s Building, 50-52 Phillip Street, Sydney, has been rejected by Cabinet.

5.0 Meeting Close

There being no further items of business, Dillon Kombumerri, Chair, declared the Approvals Committee meeting closed at 1:45PM.

.....
 Mr Dillon Kombumerri
 Chair, Heritage Council Approvals Committee
 Date: