

HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

Addendum

Australian Catholic University Strathfield Campus Concept Plan



Mount St. Mary during the interwar period

WEIR PHILLIPS

Architects and Heritage Consultants

Level 5
69 Regent Street
Chippendale 2008
NSW Australia
(02) 9310 1010

June 2012

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report is an addendum to a Heritage Impact Statement for the Strathfield Campus of the Australian Catholic University, Strathfield, New South Wales, prepared by Weir Phillip Architects and Heritage Consultants, to accompany a Concept Plan application under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1977* in December 2011. This application is now known as:

Part 3A Development- Australian Catholic University, Strathfield
Campus- 25B Barker Road (or 179 Albert Road) and 167 Albert Road,
Strathfield- Major Project 10_0231.

This addendum addresses comments received from:

- NSW Heritage Council, in the form of a letter addressed to Mr. Alan Bright, Metropolitan & Regional Projects South, Department of Planning and Infrastructure (undated).
- Strathfield Council, in the form of a letter addressed to Council prepared by Godden Mackay Logan and dated 7 March, 2012.

These comments are made with reference to revised plans prepared by Hassell and found in Appendix C of the revised report, dated 12 June, 2012.

2.0 RESPONSE

2.1 Addendum to the Heritage Impact Statement in Response to Comments Received from the NSW Heritage Council

Each of the recommendations made by the Heritage Council are addressed separately below.

Infill Development

1. *The western end of the building envelope for Precinct 1 shall be reduced to a maximum of three storeys.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to minimise visual dominance of new development in the vicinity of principal historic buildings.

Response: The revised drawings now indicate the western end of Precinct 1 to be three storeys. This will better fit with the scale and height of the Edmund Rice Building, the Barron Chapel and the Mullens Building.

In particular it will be more appropriate in scale in relation to its nearest neighbour, the Edmund Rice Building.

2. *No approval is granted or implied for surface car parking in the location of the existing playing fields, which shall be contained wholly under the existing ground level.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to minimise loss of historic setting and because some submitted documentation suggest potential surface car parking on these playing fields.

Response: It is understood that car parking in this area will be underground. The provision of parking underground provides the opportunity to minimise loss of historic setting.

3. *In the event of any inconsistency between approved figures for floor space yields, building heights and envelopes and other development indicated in the concept plan, the smaller figure will prevail.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to ensure the final scale of development is no larger than indicated, as modified by the conditions of consent, in the event of calculation errors.

Response: While it is understood that floor space has an effect on the bulk and scale of a building, more important relationships with regard to heritage significant buildings have been established in terms of building envelope. Floor space therefore becomes a planning issue.

4. *Building envelopes, heights, footprints and floor area yields, as modified by these conditions, are the maximum approved with capacity for a reduction in the next stage of design resolution to accommodate modulation of new building forms, articulation of buildings addressing open spaces, maximum landscaping and protection of existing trees.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to maximise compatibility of new building forms when the detail design is proposed.

Response: This becomes a matter of detailed planning, to be dealt with in subsequent submissions.

5. *New development shall reinforce the character of the site and be sensitive to heritage significant elements with regards to scale, density, form and siting, including consideration of significant view corridors and spatial relationships consistent with the Heritage council guidelines for infill development "Design in Context". An assessment against the checklist criteria contained in the guideline "Design in Context" shall accompany future development applications to demonstrate compliance with this condition.*

Response: The document, *Design in Context Guidelines for Infill Development in the Historic Environment*, has been taken into consideration in the production of this Concept Plan. Future submissions will include an assessment against the checklist criteria contained in the guideline.

6. *New development shall maintain the garden-like surrounds, including the courtyards formed by major buildings and prevalence of Canary Island Date Palms.*

Response: The existing courtyards are considered an important and integral part of the site. The proposals seeks to enhance the importance of the courtyards in the hierarchy of spaces on the campus.

Significant Trees

7. *The existing avenue of trees between Albert Road and the Edmund Rice Building and the two historic Bunya Pines shall be retained in their existing position.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to maintain landscape features of assessed heritage significance.

Response: The northern elevation of Precinct 1 has been further set back to maintain the avenue of trees between Albert Road and the Edmund Rice Building. The two Bunya Pines, *Araucaria bidwillii*, are to be retained; the envelope of Precinct 1 has been adjusted to be clear of the nearer Bunya Pine. See Arborist Report for further detail.

8. *The north and north eastern building set-backs for development in Precinct 1 shall be increased to ensure development does not encroach near the root and drip zones of these trees.*

Reason given by the Heritage Council: to maintain and reinforce significant landscape features and vistas.

Response: This setback has been increased by 3 metres to ensure the built component of Precinct 1 does not encroach on root and drip zones of these trees. See Arborist Report for further detail.

Site Works

9. *No approval is granted or implied in this concept plan approval for new site works outside of the approved building envelopes including, but not limited to, the northern promenade, changes to the university commons and southern service area enhancement. These and other site works shall be the subject of a future application to be accompanied by a detailed heritage assessment of the significance of site features and historic alignments and a statement of heritage impact detailing how impacts on these features have been minimised.*

Response: This is a procedural planning matter. A heritage response will be included with any submission.

Conservation Management

10. *The proponent shall submit a completed nomination form for consideration of the site for listing on the State Heritage Register by the Heritage Council as one of the measures to recognise the heritage significance of this site in planning for its redevelopment. The nomination should be submitted to the Heritage Council prior to the determination of application after Concept approval, noting that listing under the Heritage Act has no legal affect for Part 3A developments.*

Response: A completed nomination form for consideration of the site for listing on the State Heritage Register by the Heritage Council will be submitted as one of the measures to recognise the heritage significance of this site in planning for its redevelopment.

-
11. *The Conservation Management Plan for this site shall be lodged with the Heritage Council for review prior to the determination of applications after Concept Plan approval.*

Response: A Conservation Management Plan is nearing completion in draft form.

12. *The Conservation Management Plan shall include a schedule of prioritised conservation works on the site with set timeframes for completion of these works to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council.*

Response: A Schedule of prioritised conservation works on the site, with set timeframes for completion of these works to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council, will be included in the CMP.

13. *An Interpretation Plan for works to interpret the heritage significance of the site shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council prior to the determination of applications after Concept Plan approval.*

Response: It is proposed to produce an Interpretation Plan as part of the CMP.

14. *An archival photographic recording of the site shall be prepared prior to the commencement of works to the satisfaction of the Heritage Council. The recording shall be prepared in accordance with the Heritage Council guidelines "Photographic Recording of Heritage Items using Film or Digital Capture." The recording shall document the existing layout, buildings, other structures, views and landscape of the site, concentrating on features and vista identified as significant in the Weir Phillips environmental assessment and areas of the site affected by the works. This shall include the interiors, exteriors and views to the former handball courts to be demolished. The original copy of the archival record shall be lodged with the Heritage Council. An additional copy shall be provided to Strathfield Council.*

Response: An archival recording will be commissioned. A scope of recording will be submitted to the Heritage Council prior to commencement, as a complete archival recording would be onerous and expensive.

Archaeological Relics

15. *Before excavation commences on site, the Application must engage a suitably qualified historical archaeologist to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the likelihood and significance of any archaeological relics in areas proposed for excavation. This assessment must contain an appropriate methodology for any archaeological work required and an appropriate research design to guide the archaeological works. This archaeological assessment must be submitted to the Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, for comment prior to any archaeological works commencing on the site.*
16. *All demolitions and excavation works on the site of the former villa known as Ardross or other significant relics identified in the archaeological assessment must be monitored by a suitably qualified historical*

archaeologist. Details of this archaeologist must be forwarded to the Heritage Council for sign off prior to works commencing.

- 17. Should archaeological evidence related to this villa or other relics be revealed during works, all works must stop and the archaeologist must be given adequate resources to allow full and detailed recording of this archaeology to be undertaken to the satisfaction of the NSW Heritage Council.*
- 18. The Applicant must ensure that the site under archaeological investigation is made secure and that the un-excavated artefacts, structures and features are not subject to deterioration, damage or destruction.*
- 19. The Applicant is responsible for the safe-keeping of all relics recovered from the site.*
- 20. The Applicant must ensure that the approved Excavation Director or an appropriate specialist cleans, stabilises, labels, analyses, catalogues and stores any artefacts recovered from the site in a way that allows them to be retrieved according to both type and provenance.*
- 21. The Applicant must ensure that a summary of the results of the field work, up to 500 words in length, prepared by the approved Excavation Director is submitted to the Heritage Council of the NSW for approval within one (1) month of completion of archaeological field work.*
- 22. The Applicant must ensure that a final excavation report is written by the approved Excavation Director to publication standard, within one (1) year of the completion of the field based archaeological activity. This report must include an assessment of the significance of the archaeology, statement(s) on how archaeological investigations at this site have contributed to the community's understanding of Ardross and other comparative sites in the area and recommendations for the future management of the site.*

Response: An archaeologist will be appointed to deal with these recommendations.

2.2 Addendum to the Heritage Impact Statement in Response to Comments Received from Strathfield Council

Siting for Future Development

The response concurs with the submitted heritage impact statement, with the exception of Precinct 1, which is discussed further below.

Precinct 1 (South Eastern Precinct)

See comments above regarding proposed restrictions to Precinct 1.

Precinct 2 (Eastern Precinct)

The comments concur with the submitted heritage impact statement.

No further comments.

Precinct 3 (Western Precinct)

The comments concur with the submitted heritage impact statement.

No further comments.

Precinct 4 (Central Precinct)

The comments concur with the submitted heritage impact statement.

No further comments.

Landscaping Works

Design of these works should be undertake in collaboration between architect, heritage consultant and landscape architect.

3.0 CONCLUSION

The Concept Plan as now submitted concurs with, and complies with, Recommendations 1 – 22 of the Heritage Council's letter of 22 March, 2012.

The recommendations are adopted on the basis of making the Australian Catholic University Campus one which recognises the heritage values of the existing buildings on the site and their history, while furthering the existing social significance of the site as a learning institution.