

2 February 2012

Ms Pilar Aberasturi  
Department of Planning  
23-33 Bridge Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Pilar,

### MP10\_0097 MOD 1 - Section 75W Modification Application Spectator Precinct at Royal Randwick Racecourse – Response to Further Heritage Council Submission

We provide the following response to the further matters raised by the Heritage in their letter dated 30 January 2012.

The first four sets of comments have been responded to by Heritage Expert Graham Brooks and Associates in the attached letter dated 2 February 2012. In summary, Graham Brooks and Associates

*“supports the proposed amendments and recommends approval of this s75W application with a condition that early bricks, windows and doors removed are salvaged, catalogued and stored for possible future replacement or relocation.”*

We address the final two comments relating to tree protection and landscaping below (Heritage comments in italics).

***Modification to the design and slight reorientation of the ‘Theatre of the Horse’ parade ring. This modification also entails the removal and relocation of a tree identified on the draft Royal Randwick CMP as ‘an element of exceptional significance’ and in the Royal Randwick Racecourse DCP as ‘a highly significant tree’;***

*As stated previously, in principle the Heritage Branch does not object to the proposed changes to the design and orientation of the parade ring. However it was noted that the HIS did not address whether the proposed amendment would impact upon the significance of the Tramway Turnstile Complex or the Totalisator Building (assessed in the draft CMP as being of high significance).*

*As discussed above, the Tramway Turnstile Complex is set below the level of the Spectator Precinct, the Heritage Branch accepts Graham Brooks & Associates’ assessment that there will be no additional heritage impact upon the significance of this building. In regards to the Totalisator Building, having reviewed drawings detailing the proposed modification the Heritage Branch accepts Graham Brooks & Associates’ assessment that there will be no additional heritage impact upon the significance of the Totalisator building.*

*In relation to the relocation of the Fig tree (identified as having exceptional/high significance), as previously stated the Heritage Branch accepts the comments of the project Arborist that the tree is constrained by its existing enclosure and will do better in the proposed new location. The Branch recommends consideration is given to including the following specific consent conditions:*

- *Appropriate tree protection measures shall be prepared and implemented by a qualified Arborist, with demonstrated experience working with historic trees, to the satisfaction of the Director-General of Planning & Infrastructure or their delegate. The tree protection measures should be retained and monitored for the entire duration of the works;*
- *The health and condition of the tree to be monitored for a period of 12 months with bimonthly reports on the condition of the tree provided to the Director-General of planning & Infrastructure or their delegate.*

*The Branch also recommends that the Director-General consider asking for a tree protection bond to cover like-for-like replacement in the low likelihood the tree does not survive, which could be held on trust for two years following approval of the proposed works. The Heritage Branch has no objection to the proposed new location for the Fig tree as shown on the Landscape Master Plan, provided the location is approved by a suitably qualified and experienced Arborist.*

#### COMMENT

Reports from an Arborist and a tree transplant contractor both confirm that transplanting of the significant tree is in fact feasible and practical. The Arborists Report includes a tree management plan that will be implemented to ensure the protection of the tree and a Statement of Commitment has been included in this regard. In the circumstances, it is not considered necessary to require a bond or bi-monthly reporting on the health of the tree.

#### **Modification**

***Inclusion of a temporary landscape solution for the area adjacent to the Swab building to allow for the staged construction of works in this area;***

*While the Heritage Branch notes Graham Brooks and Associates' comment, that the amended landscape plans respond to the proposed modifications to the design scheme, neither the HIS for the 75W application or the additional information provided indicate what the 'temporary landscape solution' entails or how it 'responds' to the proposed modifications.*

*Therefore Heritage Branch is unable to provide comment on this aspect of the proposal. The Heritage Branch recommends the following condition of consent be included in any approval of the design scheme:*

- *The applicant shall provide a detailed design of modifications to the Swab Building and surrounding landscape for approval by Heritage Council when Stage 2 of the redevelopment is lodged.*

#### COMMENT

As noted in the Planning Report accompanying the 75W modification, the Stage 1 landscape works will not include any modification to the area adjacent to the Swab Building. The area adjacent to the Swab Building will remain as per that existing. As requested by the Heritage Branch, landscaping of the area adjacent to the Swab Building will be undertaken in the context of the works to the Swab Building, as per that already approved in the existing consent.

We trust that this additional information resolves the matters raised by the Heritage Branch and enables the Department to proceed with their assessment of the 75W proposal.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Atree-Williams  
Associate Director