

19 October 2012

Attention: Mr Jonathan Darwen

Sweett (Australia) Pty Ltd
Level 9, 8 - 10 Loftus Street
Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Re: Peer Review of Revised Heritage Impact Statement
Griffith House as part The St George Hospital Masterplan
Authored by Urbis and dated October 2012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provide a peer review of the revised Heritage Impact Statement noted above.

I am a heritage consultant with over 15 years experience. I have dealt extensively with heritage issues pertaining to the procurement of public and private hospital works in New South Wales.

REVIEW

The author of the report is Stephen Davies, a director of Urbis Pty Ltd, a consultancy located in a number of countries and offering among, a number of others, planning and heritage services.

The report follows the standard Heritage Council of New South Wales guidelines for statements of heritage impact. This is the accepted methodology and is used extensively by heritage professionals in New South Wales. Appropriately, the following has been used in the preparation of the Heritage Impact Statement:

- The standard New South Wales Heritage Branch guidelines for heritage significance that include the seven Heritage Council criteria.
- The relevant provisions of the Local Environmental Plan (Kogarah LEP 1998).
- Section 170 of the Heritage Act 1977 with regard to the property owned by the Department of Health.
- Heritage Office guidelines for heritage impact assessment.
- The Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.

The Executive Summary adequately outlines the purpose and conclusions of the Report.

The site description is adequate. It would be assisted if the photos were of larger format and there was a more comprehensive photographic coverage of the relationship of Griffith House to the streetscape and to the existing hospital.

The historic overview would be greatly assisted with a more detailed history overall and in particular of the house and of the hospital. This would give a better understanding the role played by Griffith House in the overall history of the hospital and the local area.

It is not clearly stated in the report as to whether Griffith House is or is not on Health Infrastructure's Section 170 Register. This maintains uncertainty as to the heritage status of Griffith House.

The analysis of heritage impact is contradictory in that it refers to over 50 site layout options in one part of the report and of over 32 options in another.

The *Conclusion and Recommendations* should give greater attention to the influence the site layout options had on the conclusion that demolition of the house is required.

The bibliography and references are adequate. It is noted that the sources of the historical overview are not listed in the bibliography.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the Report is adequate for its intended purpose. However the Report and the drawing supplied, (SGHED-A-P-SS-1), do not address a major risk to the carriage of the project with regard to the consent authority.

Demolition of a heritage item, regardless of the benefit it creates, always has the potential to generate public interest. Drawings and reports that reach the public domain should take this into account and be thorough in the presentation of information and easily legible by the general public. I make the following recommendations:

1. The Heritage Impact Statement and Statement of Environmental Effects should have a fuller account of the 32 (or over 50) options, including diagrams, as an appendix to each document.
2. Drawings be prepared to demonstrate the site constraints and to clearly show the functional relationships of the Emergency Department with the hospital generally. These drawings may be diagrammatic.
3. More graphic emphasis should be given to the encroachment of the Emergency Department onto the outline of Griffith House and a specific, compelling use, be given to the car parking on the Griffith House site. (i.e, the car spaces have some specific allocation)
4. Both the Heritage Impact Statement and the Statement of Environmental Effects should state more clearly and emphatically that operational requirements of the hospital take precedence over heritage considerations where heritage considerations cannot be reasonably included as part of an operationally viable plan for the hospital,

and that fulfilling these operational requirements is essential to the timely and effective treatment and well-being of patients.

5. More information should be provided as to the substance and form of the interpretation strategy

If you have any further questions, please call me on 9310 1010.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JP', followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James Phillips
Director