

1 PURPOSE

This addendum addresses matters raised by Heritage Council NSW in relation to the Cockle Bay Marine Structures Renewal State Significant Development (SSD6611), received on 9 September 2015.

2 SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED AND RESPONSE

Issues Raised in Submission	Response
<p>1. Management Strategy for South Steyne</p> <p>The Maritime Archaeological Survey and Statement of Heritage Impact (MAS&SOHI) states that the proposal would not diminish the heritage significance SS South Steyne (SHR 755) which is listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR). The current use of the vessel as a restaurant in a busy recreational precinct provides financial viability of the item and ensures its ongoing maintenance. The proposed relocation of the vessel may impact on this. Whilst the report states that the vessel will be moved to another wharf within six months, future management options and exact mooring locations have not been addressed. To reduce the likelihood of adverse impacts to SS South Steyne, it is recommended that a strategy for the ongoing management of the vessel is provided, including mooring locations, prior to the approval of the SSD.</p>	<p>SHFA does not own or manage the SS South Steyne, a state significant movable cultural heritage item.</p> <p>The future management of the vessel is the responsibility of the owner of the vessel. The owner has been given reasonable notice to relocate the vessel.</p> <p>The Harbourside Jetty is at the end of its working life and presents compliance risk. As a result, it is scheduled for demolition in early 2016.</p> <p>The owners of the South Steyne are required to have a Conservation Management Plan that includes guidelines for the relocation of the vessel from one berth to another and the steps and process that should be included. It is the responsibility of the owners of the vessel to follow these guidelines and procedures.</p> <p>SHFA only administers the berths within Cockle Bay and has no jurisdiction over other moorings in Sydney Harbour.</p>
<p>2. Visual Impacts on Pyrmont Bridge and Woodward Water Feature</p> <p>The SOHI does not address any impacts to the setting of SS South Steyne, including any visual impacts that relocating the vessel would have on nearby SHR items Pyrmont Bridge and Woodward Water Feature. The report should be updated to address these impacts.</p>	<p>The relocation of the South Steyne will have no visual impact on the Woodward Water Feature and a positive visual impact on Pyrmont Bridge.</p> <p>The South Steyne is an identified state significant movable cultural heritage item and should not be considered a permanent feature of Cockle Bay. The vessel was relocated to its current mooring c.2000 for the Sydney Olympics.</p>
<p>3. Relationship between Potential Relics and Proposed Piling Locations</p> <p>The EIS states there is a high potential for remains associated with previous wharves, jetties, and activities in Cockle Bay buried below sediment that has accumulated since the last dredging in the 1980s. This is representative of the earliest maritime infrastructure in Sydney Harbour and is considered to have State heritage Significance (EIS section 8.11.3). Physical remains evidence in the survey only</p>	<p>The Maritime Archaeologist has prepared a report documenting the location of potential relics against the existing structures and assessed the impact of the proposed scheme on those locations. Refer Attachment B.</p>

Issues Raised in Submission	Response
<p>identified modern debris and high sediment content. The MAS&SOHI and the EIS did not provide a specific assessment of the effects of the proposed piling on these phases of occupation or their likely significance. The EIS needs to compare the known phases of occupation and relics against the proposed piling locations in order to assess any likely impacts.</p>	
<p>4. Effects of Piling on Maritime Archaeological Remains</p> <p>The MAS&SOHI and EIS have not considered the impact of this proposal on the state significant archaeology. The proposal has stated that the piling will cause harm to state significant archaeology within the seabed. On this basis, it is recommended that any impact should be minimised as much as possible through a careful consideration of the pile design in this area. The mitigation of the loss of state significant archaeology should be clearly outlined in the EIS prior to any approval of the SSD by the DPE. It is recommended that upon receipt, DPE refer this additional information to the Heritage Council for consideration of its adequacy and to advise DPE of any additional conditions of approval that may be appropriate.</p>	<p>Impacts are expected to be to less than 0.01 % of the potential maritime archaeological remains associated with the former wharves with direct impacts expected to be 0.354 m2. This impact has been assessed as acceptable as there is no long term direct or indirect impact to the remaining potential archaeological deposit.</p> <p>The Maritime Archaeologist has provided options for test excavation of the site and concluded that any mitigation measures may impact on a larger area than that impacted by the proposal itself. Refer Attachment B. No further mitigation is proposed in advance of construction.</p>
<p>5. Approvals Requirements</p> <p>The EIS and SOHI incorrectly advise that an approval under Section 139(4) is appropriate under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>. Approval under Part 4, section 89J of the <i>Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979</i> negates the need for approvals under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> where this area forms part of the proposed SSD activity.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6. Approvals Requirements</p> <p>The proposal to display the 1850s-1870s seawall as a feature of the new design would have a positive impact through appreciating the site's significant heritage fabric. Given that the seawall is possibly the only surviving seawall from this period in Darling Harbour, the proponent may wish to consider nominating the site for listing on the SHR.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

3 Attachments

Attachment A: NSW Heritage Council Submission

Attachment B: Maritime Archaeologist Report in Response to Submission