

16 January 2011

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 Council and Heritage Council Submissions**

We provide the following response to the matters raised by Randwick City Council and in relation to the above 75W application.

#### **Council Matters**

The issues raised by Council in their letter dated 22 December 2011 are addressed chronologically below.

#### **DEFERRAL OF SWAB BUILDING**

The ATC remains committed to undertaking the adaptive reuse of the Swab Building and the delay to the commencement of the works will not compromise the interpretation of buildings that are to be demolished. The only change to the proposal is to stage the works and the potential use of the building for display of historical elements will remain unchanged.

In terms of the interpretation of buildings to be demolished, the ATC is committed to the implementation and management of the Spectator Precinct interpretation in accordance with the recommendations of the *Royal Randwick Racecourse Interpretation Plan - Phase 1: Strategic Overview* and the *Royal Randwick Racecourse - Spectator Precinct Alison Road, Randwick, Revised Interpretation Strategy* required by Condition B11 of the existing consent.

This will include interpretation of the demolished buildings in an appropriate location on the site. The delay to the adaptive reuse of the Swab Building will not compromise the appropriate interpretation and display of these elements. Therefore it is not considered necessary or appropriate to impose a condition of consent requiring the adaptive reuse of the Swab Building be undertaken within a set timeframe.

#### **VISUAL IMPACTS**

Council's comments on improved visual impact are noted.

#### **PHYSICAL IMPACTS**

Council's comments noting satisfactory detail in relation to physical impacts are noted.

#### INTERNAL CHANGES

The 75W includes additional works within the Official's Stand, as per the coloured area indicated on the submitted plans DA-11 and DA-12. To avoid confusion, the note on each of the plans suggesting that this might not be the case has been removed in the attached amended plans.

In terms of the need for additional documentation of the proposed internal works to the Epsom Bar, further information on the extent of changes and an assessment of the impact of these changes is provided in the attached letter from Graham Brooks and Associates dated 4 January 2012 (prepared in response to comments from the Heritage Council, also referred to below).

#### TREE AND LANDSCAPE COMMENTS

A tree transplanting contractor has been consulted in relation to the feasibility and practicality of replanting the nominated tree. As outlined in the **attached letter from Transplant Industries Pty Ltd**, this contractor is confident that the tree can survive the transplant procedure both in horticultural and logistic terms

#### DRAINAGE COMMENTS

Council's no further comment in this regard is noted.

#### ACOUSTIC COMMENTS

Council's no further comment in this regard is noted.

#### Heritage Council Comments

The issues raised by the Heritage Council of NSW in their letter dated 16 December 2011 are addressed in the **attached letter by Graham Brooks and Associates** dated 4 January 2012.

In addition to the matters addressed in the attached letter we note in relation to the last dot point that the ATC would like not to proceed with the proposed amendment to Condition 14.3 of the existing consent.

We trust that this additional submission satisfactorily responds to all outstanding matters and allows the Department to proceed with the assessment and determination of the proposal.

Please contact me with any further queries.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Atree-Williams  
Associate Director