Hi Matthew,

The Department has reviewed the additional comments from the Heritage Division and note the concerns about the detail design and heritage interpretation for the proposed travelator and loading dock.

The Department considers the recommended conditions contain a series of conditions that work together to address the comments from the Heritage Division.

The Department’s recommended conditions require the Heritage Council be involved in the development of the detailed design and heritage interpretation of the loading dock and travelator, over three stages, as follows:

1. **Condition B33 Heritage Interpretation** - the condition requires the Stage 1 HIP to be reviewed and updated in consultation with the Heritage Council, to the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary, prior to the first CC. It requires an outline of the next steps for the Stage 2 HIP, including concepts that have been developed for the Locomotive Workshop and specifically requires detail of interpretative elements that have been developed for the loading dock and travelator.

   This condition requires the Stage 1 HIP to be updated in consultation with the Heritage Council and approved by the Planning Secretary prior to any CC’s for the Locomotive Workshop being issued.

2. **Condition B38 Detailed Design Information** - Prior to the issue of the CC3 Structure, the condition requires the Applicant to provide detailed drawings, in consultation with the Heritage Council and Council to the Planning Secretary for:
   a. Detailed drawings and proposed construction of the loading dock, loading dock wall protection, loading dock wall design and barriers to protect the Davy Furnace and significant heritage fabric
   b. Detailed plans of the travelator design, its balustrade and heritage interpretation design

   This condition requires the heritage interpretation design for the travelator and detail for the loading dock, prior to CC3, which will allow the Heritage Council to be involved in the detailed design and heritage interpretation for these specific elements prior to the CC for any structure. This addresses the concern raised in the additional comments from the Heritage Division about further detail being required to understand how the travelator and loading dock impacts will be managed.

   The loading dock and travelator detailed design work undertaken and provided at this stage will then further inform the finalisation of the Stage 2 HIP.
3. **Condition E4 Heritage Interpretation** – the condition requires the Stage 2 HIP for the whole Locomotive Workshop to be submitted for approval by the Planning Secretary, prior to the first OC being issued. Stage 2 is required to be prepared in consultation with the Heritage Council and other stakeholders.

This condition is informed by steps 1 and 2 above and will incorporate the information and documentation informing the development of the loading dock and travelator required through conditions B33 and B38.

These recommended conditions demonstrate a hierarchy of requirements the applicant must meet at various stages (prior to first CC, prior to CC3-Structure and prior to first OC) to provide detail design of the travelator, loading dock and heritage interpretation for the Locomotive Workshop, all in consultation with the Heritage Council.

The Department has considered the Applicant’s documentation and the Heritage Division comments in finalising its assessment report and the draft conditions of consent and believes the recommended conditions provide for a balanced approach to ensuring heritage interpretation occurs in progressive stages to facilitate the adaptive re-use of a large site, with particular focus for the loading dock and travelator. The Department considers the additional comments provided by the Heritage Division are addressed through the recommended conditions outlined above.

The Department also notes the Commission may want to consider referring the Heritage Division’s additional comments to the Applicant for their comment.

If you have any further questions please get in touch.

Regards Emily

Emily Dickson
Senior Planning Officer
NSW Department of Planning & Environment
320 Pitt Street | GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 12 February 2019 1:21 PM
To: Emily Dickson
Cc: David McNamara
Subject: FW: Locomotive Workshop Australian Technology Park SSD 8517 and SSD 8449
Importance: High

Good afternoon Emily,
On 4 February, the Commission requested clarification from the Heritage Council of their meeting with the Department and their position on the timing of the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan. The Heritage Council has provided a response in the email below.

I spoke with David last week and agreed that I would forward this information onto the Department for comment. If you have any comments on the Heritage Council’s email please let me know as soon as possible.

Regards,
Matthew

Matthew Todd-Jones | Team Leader
Independent Planning Commission NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Sarah Jane Brazil
Sent: Tuesday, 12 February 2019 12:43 PM
To: Matthew Todd-Jones
Cc: Tim Smith; David Nix; Hendry Wan
Subject: Locomotive Workshop Australian Technology Park SSD 8517 and SSD 8449
Importance: High

Hi Matthew

I confirm that I, not the Heritage Council, met with DPE and the applicant on 23 August 2017 to discuss the submission of the Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Plan.

It is acceptable to the Heritage Division that Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Plan be submitted for approval prior to the first Occupation Certificate. However this is subject to the following that:

- the following draft conditions are met for SSD 8517 – B33, B34, B36, B38, B44, E4, E8, E9 & F9 and for SSD 8449 – B29, B32, B37, B40, E4, E6, E8, E9 and F9.
- the Heritage Council NSW (or its delegate) being consulted prior to the issue of various Construction Certificates (CC), as required by the proposed conditions in SSD 8517 Condition B38 and SSD 8449 Condition B32.
- In addition to the Stage 1 Heritage Interpretation Strategy, the concepts, tasks, program as
provided in its addendum January 2019 are to be implemented as an integral component of both SSDs.

- the nominated heritage consultant for this project continues be involved throughout the design development as well as to advise on demolition, as required by the proposed conditions SSD 8517 B34 and SSD 8449 B40.

In addition, as the Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Plan will now not be submitted prior to the first Construction Certificate, the Heritage Division does not agree at this stage to the proposed travellator tunnel as it is a high adverse heritage impact to the place. The Heritage Division requires the further detailed developed of the interpretation plan and design to understand how this will mitigate/offset the impacts of this proposed component. The proponent has known of this requirement since 2017. This advice also applies to the proposed loading dock.

Therefore, at this stage, it is the Heritage Division advice that the demolition for the proposed travellator tunnel (see CC1) and the of proposed foundations, excavation, in-ground works & services (CC2) are to be excluded from these CCs. This also applies to the proposed loading dock.

Please don’t hesitate to contact me to discuss.

Regards

Sarah Jane Brazil
Senior Team Leader
Major Projects
Level 6, 10 Valentine Ave, Parramatta
PO Box A290, Sydney South 2000

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 4 February 2019 2:48 PM
To: Sarah Jane Brazil [redacted]
Subject: Locomotive Workshop Australian Technology Park SSD 8517 and SSD 8449
Importance: High

Hi Sarah-Jane,

Re: Locomotive Workshop Australian Technology Park SSD 8517 and SSD 8449

I refer to the above project which is currently before the Independent Planning Commission for determination.

I have recently spoken to Emily Dickson from the Department of Planning and Environment who explained that the Heritage Council provided a response to the applicant’s Environmental Impact Assessment on 15 December 2017. With regards to the staging of the Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP), the Heritage Council’s responses states that it should be provided to prior to approval of the project.

The Department’s assessment report states that this HIP should be submitted for approval prior to the first occupation certificate. I was informed by Emily that the Heritage Council had agreed to this position, but this seems contrary to the Heritage Council’s response from 15 December 2017. Emily informed me that this position was agreed upon at a meeting between the Department, the Heritage Council and the applicant, but no record of the meeting was filed.
I would be grateful if you could provide me with the following information as soon as possible:

- Confirmation that the Heritage Council held a meeting with the Department of Planning and Environment and the applicant (please specify the date if possible) to agree on the position that a Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Plan should be submitted for approval prior to the first occupation certificate, rather than prior to the first construction certificate as originally requested by the Heritage Council in their response to the applicant’s Environmental Impact Assessment dated 15 December 2017.

This information will be provided to the Commission Panel who will consider this information as part of their determination of the project. It will also be published on the Commission’s website.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss further.

Regards,
Matthew

Matthew Todd-Jones | Team Leader
Independent Planning Commission NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.