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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Urbis has been engaged to prepare the following Heritage Impact Statement to accompany the Stage 1 DA for the proposed works at 201 Elizabeth Street, Sydney. In summary, this staged application seeks approval for the demolition of the existing structures on the subject site and the establishment of a new building envelope which does not exceed the height of the existing building.

The subject site is not a locally listed heritage item under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012. It is, however, located within the vicinity of a number of state and locally listed heritage items as identified in Section 1.1 and within the Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area. This HIS is therefore required to assess the potential heritage impact of the proposed works on the proximate heritage items and the special character area generally.

In Section 5 of this report Urbis has assessed the proposed works against the relevant provisions in the City of Sydney LEP and DCP, including the principles set out for development within the College Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area. The following observations have been summarised from this assessment:

- The subject building is not a listed heritage item and there is therefore no statutory requirement to retain it from a heritage perspective. Further, the assessment of the heritage significance of the subject site concludes that the existing building does not have heritage significance and that its removal would have no heritage impact;
- The proposed reconstruction of the tower to a similar height to that existing would have limited heritage impact on the listed items in the vicinity in addition to that generated by the existing building;
- The new tower would be set back 8 metres from the eastern façade of the podium and from the existing tower. This would be a positive action in terms of visual dominance over the park compared with the existing building;
- The tower would have a 5 metre setback from the podium to Park Street. Although this is closer than that existing, it should be considered that Park Street is not an intact early streetscape but one which is characterised by a combination of some early buildings and various high density residential/commercial towers. The existing tower already exists as a dominant element in this streetscape. Further, the siting of the tower further to the north presents a better opportunity to minimise overshadowing of the ANZAC Memorial to the south east and does not impact on any particularly significant views towards heritage items westward from Park Street. It is therefore considered that the reduced setback to Park Street is acceptable from a heritage perspective;
- The width of the base of the new tower would be wider than that existing to create a podium. Presently the bulk of the building is set back from Park Street and separated from it by the ground floor retail/food court. However historically, the principal forms of the buildings that have existed on the site including the T&G Building and Dixson’s Tobacco factory were built close to Park Street and established a strong basis for the east west axis which bisects the park. It is therefore considered that reducing the setback of the principal mass would not detract from the understanding of Hyde Park and would conversely serve to re-establish the aforementioned axis;
- The podium would be comparable in height to the existing commercial developments along the western side of Elizabeth Street adjacent to Hyde Park. As such, continuity in scale and the enclosed character of the western side of the park would be maintained;
- The proposed building envelope departs from the prismatic form of the existing building. The podium would maintain regularity in form, reinforcing the enclosure of Hyde Park. However, the tower has an irregular shape whereby it presents a significantly thinner façade to the south east and north west. This would ensure that the tower has a reduced visual impact from some vantage points around Hyde Park including the ANZAC Memorial in comparison to the existing tower; and
- Due to its form, it is understood that the tower envelope would have reduced overshadowing to Hyde Park, specifically the area around the ANZAC Memorial in comparison to the existing building. This would ensure that continued enjoyment of the heritage item is maintained.

In accordance with the above observations the Stage 1 envelope is supported from a heritage perspective.
Recommendations for Stage 2 design development

- The subject site is located in close proximity to a number of heritage listed items as identified in this report including three state listed items to the east. Future development on the subject site facilitated by this Stage 1 application must therefore have regard for the identified significance of each of these items and consider the provisions set down in the DCP relevant to development in the vicinity of a heritage item (Section 3.9.5). The heritage impact of the Stage 2 proposal on these items must be addressed in a heritage impact statement as part of the Stage 2 application;

- Further to the above, it is recommended that the development of the Stage 2 design includes the appropriate treatment of the tower and podium through materials, form and siting to ensure its compatibility with the conservation area. The design development should be undertaken with input from the heritage consultant. The treatment of the built forms should consider the relevant provisions set down in the DCP (Section 5.1). Specifically:
  - The podium should not have an overbearing sense of enclosure around Hyde Park. It should relate to the street frontage height of adjacent buildings. It is noted that the proposed Stage 1 envelope is achieving this objective;
  - In relation to 5.1.2 Front Setbacks, there are no specific references to heritage matters. Proposed Stage 1 setbacks should relate to the overall streetscape character area and allow for a meaningful expression of the podium element;
  - Reference should be made to Section 5.1.3 Street frontage heights and setbacks for Special Character Areas. This sets out minimum and maximum street frontage heights, and setbacks to ensure that new development remains compatible with the surrounding development and the Special Character Area generally; and
  - Section 5.1.6 Building Exteriors sets down the appropriate treatment of building exteriors in Special Character Areas. Particular consideration should be given to the treatment of the podium in relation to its compatibility with the materiality of the proximate heritage fabric. Further, large expanses of blank glass or solid wall should be avoided so to ensure that the apparent mass of the podium is further visually broken down. The podium should have an appropriate configuration at ground floor level which maintains a human scale and activates the surrounding area.

- Provision for a future tunnel connection to Museum Park/Museum railway station access is proposed as part of this application. The details of this tunnel are yet to be resolved however it is understood that it would be designed to intersect fabric associated with a state listed heritage item. Therefore, the future design development of the tunnel should consider the significant fabric comprised within Museum Station and ensure that any heritage impact, specifically physical impact, is avoided/mitigated. The design of this element should be undertaken in consultation with the heritage consultant and the relevant department/stakeholder.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

Urbis has been engaged to prepare the following Heritage Impact Statement to accompany the Stage 1 DA for the proposed works at 201 Elizabeth Street, Sydney.

The subject site is not a locally listed heritage item under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012. It is, however, located in the Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area and in the vicinity of a number of state and locally listed heritage items, including:

- 'Municipal sewer vent' at Elizabeth Street, corner Bathurst Street (SHR 01642; Local Item No. I1752)
- Museum Railway Station including interiors, Elizabeth Street (SHR 01207; Local Item No.I1743)
- 'Anzac War Memorial including Pool of Reflection, pavements, plantings, flagpoles, staircase, platform, interiors, lightwells, bas reliefs, statues, sculptures and movable heritage (artefacts and memorabilia)' at 120 Elizabeth Street (SHR 01871; Local Item No. I1742)
- 'Hyde Park' at 110-120 Elizabeth Street (SHR 01871; Local Item No. I1654)
- 'Former Australian Consolidated Press façade' at 189–197 Elizabeth Street (Item No. 1751)
- 'Former CENEF House" including interiors' at 201 Castlereagh Street (Item No. I1700)
- 'St George's Church including interior and forecourt' at 201A Castlereagh Street (Item No. I1701)
- 'Porter House" including interior' at 203 Castlereagh Street (Item No I702)
- 'Former tram shelter including interior' at 110 Elizabeth Street (Item No. I741)

This HIS is therefore required to assess the potential heritage impact of the proposed works on the proximate heritage items and the special character area generally.

1.2. SITE LOCATION

The site is located at 201 Elizabeth Street, Sydney (Figure 1).
Figure 1 – Aerial view of the subject site (shaded yellow).

1.3. METHODOLOGY

This Heritage Impact Statement has been prepared in accordance with the NSW Heritage Branch guideline ‘Assessing Heritage Significance’ (2001). The philosophy and process adopted is that guided by the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 1999 (revised 2013). Site constraints and opportunities have been considered with reference to relevant controls and provisions contained within the City of Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012.

1.4. AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION

The following report has been prepared by Alexandria Barnier (Heritage Consultant). Unless otherwise stated, all drawings, illustrations and photographs are the work of Urbis.

1.5. THE PROPOSAL

In summary, this application seeks staged approval for:

- Demolition and clearance of the existing buildings and basement structures on the site;
- Establishment of a building envelope for a mixed-use building comprising:
  - Three basement levels (car parking, bicycle parking, storage and building services)
  - Lower ground, ground and mezzanine level retail;
  - Podium level retail premises;
  - Podium level hotel development; and
  - Tower level residential apartments.
- Establishment of a building envelope
- Establishment of a building envelope to comply with:
  - the Hyde Park West sun access plane; and
  - the permitted exceptions to the sun access plane control.
- Establishment of a building envelope providing a maximum building height of RL198.220 for the tower element;
- Provision of below ground pedestrian connection to Museum railway station access way; and
- Provision of access to basement car park of 227 Elizabeth Street.

This report has been written with reference to the Design Report prepared by FJMT dated 10 02 2017 and following plans prepared by FJMT:

- Indicative design summary 15.12.2016
- Indicative design – North-south axonometric view 15.12.2016
- Indicative design – North-south axonometric view with context 15.12.2016
- Indicative design – North-south axonometric view Castlereagh St 15.12.2016
- Indicate design – East elevation Elizabeth Street 15.12.2016
2. SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is located directly opposite Hyde Park on the south-western corner of the intersection of Elizabeth Street and Park Street which bisects the park. In contrast to the eastern and northern sides of Hyde Park with its landmark buildings, the western and southern sides of Hyde Park comprise higher density commercial and residential developments.

The subject site comprises 0.4 hectares most of which is occupied by the tower. The building is also known as the Pacific Power Building. It is a simple prismatic form, was completed in the late 1970s and has a steel frame with a concrete core. It has mirrored glazing and concrete horizontal spandrel panels on all facades. The protruding vertical members are also concrete with a ribbed finish. These members appear to become internalised at the ground floor and are enclosed by glazing.

The building constitutes a 1,360-foot development over 42 levels (164 metres) including 34 levels of office space. The primary entrance to the building is on the northern façade with direct access to the tower foyer off Elizabeth Street. There is also a significant entrance to the lower ground floor retail/food court area off Park Street. This area constitutes a double height space with significant glazing adjacent to the Elizabeth, Park and Castlereagh Street footpaths. The area presents as a single storey to the street and is covered by a roof projecting from the northern façade of the tower. The overhang of this roof on the eastern side is glazed and set within a steel frame and provides covering for the pedestrians circulating around the building. There are 12 retail shops on the lower ground level and an early learning centre.

The building also has direct access to museum station and 175 underground car park spaces.

Views from the upper levels extend east over Hyde Park and west towards Sydney Harbour.

Figure 2 – External images of the subject site.

Picture 1 – View west across Hyde Park towards the subject site.

1 201 Elizabeth Street, A View on Cities, available at: http://www.aviewoncities.com/buildings/sydney/201elizabethstreet.htm, accessed 30.06.16
Picture 2 – View south east across Park Street towards the northern façade of the subject site.

Picture 3 – View west across Elizabeth Street towards the eastern façade of the subject site.

Picture 4 – View south towards the entrance to the lower off Elizabeth Street.

Picture 5 – View east across Castlereagh Street towards the ground floor retail/food court area.
Figure 3 – Internal images of the subject site.

Picture 6 – View south towards the entrance to the property.

Picture 7 – View south into the lower ground floor retail space.

Picture 8 – View across the lower ground floor circulation space.

Picture 9 – View south into the lower ground floor retail space.

2.1. COLLEGE STREET/HYDE PARK SPECIAL CHARACTER AREA

The below description of College Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area has been sourced from the City of Sydney DCP 2012.

*College Street and Hyde Park form a precinct, which clearly separates the City from the residential areas to the east, forms part of the green eastern edge and frames an important gateway to the City.*

*Hyde Park has two distinct edges: the north and east, flanking College Street and St James Road, comprise important institutional free-standing sandstone buildings and significant public open spaces including Queens Square, which is one of the earliest examples of formal urban design in Central Sydney. The west and south edges consist of commercial development of larger scale with strong street alignment, creating a greater sense of enclosure to Hyde Park.*

*Hyde Park is the oldest public park in Sydney being reserved for public recreation by Governor Macquarie in 1810 and is prized by Sydneysiders for its recreational opportunities. Its current formal*
plan, dating from the 1920s, demonstrates the application of City Beautiful principles. It contains significant and symbolic monuments including the war memorial, obelisk and Archibald Fountain.

Figure 4 – View towards heritage listed items in the vicinity of the subject site.

Picture 10 – View north east from the subject site to the heritage listed items opposite including Hyde Park.

Picture 11 – View south west across Castlereagh Street towards the heritage listed items opposite.

Picture 12 – View towards the listed items to the north of the subject site from Castlereagh Street (north of Park Street) These facades are not visible from the subject site.

Picture 13 – View towards the listed items to the north of the subject site from Elizabeth Street.

1.1 LISTED ITEMS IN THE VICINITY OF THE SUBJECT

1.1.1 Hyde Park

The below description of Hyde Park has been sourced from the State Heritage Inventory database sheet for the item3:

________________________

3 Heritage Branch Database no.5060189
Hyde Park is in the City of Sydney’s south-centre, lying broadly on the ridge that runs south-north to Bennelong Point and forming the city’s eastern ‘edge’. The park is broadly flat, though sloping slightly east and west to the adjacent streets (College & Elizabeth Streets).

Hyde Park is broadly rectangular with a rounded northern end. It is bisected east-west by Park Street and ringed by other major city streets (Liverpool and College Streets, Prince Albert Road, St.James’ Road, Elizabeth Street) and stands in strong contrast to the closely-built up and intense environment of the city beside it. Its landscape design offers shady avenues, green sward areas and colourful vistas. Its layout and monuments offer a sense of the city’s and nation’s history and its design reflects certain aspirations which have found expressions in its vistas, layout and monuments. The park is centred on its great shaded promenade under magnificent mature Hill’s figs (Ficus microcarpa var.Hilli). Dense and lacy, these trees have grown tall and now dominate the planting and design, despite some having to be removed due to fungus attack in recent years. A climax at each end of the park is provided by the two major monuments of the Archibald Fountain at the northern and most populous end and by the solid bulk of the Anzac Memorial at the southern end. These two monuments are of essential importance to the park’s design and character.

The Park is an accomplished melange of modern City Beautiful, Beaux Artes and Art Deco inspiration (Whitehead, 2001, 180). A series of cross paths, perpendicular and angled to the central promenade, connect city streets to its north, west and south with key streets leading to the suburbs of Woolloomooloo, East Sydney and Darlinghurst to the east.

The two major east-west perpendicular paths in the park’s north lead from Market Street to the Archibald Fountain, and from this to St. Mary’s Cathedral. Major perpendicular east-west paths in the park’s south run east from Bathurst Street past the obelisk and crossing the northern end of the paved plaza north of the Anzac Memorial and reflective pool (to Sydney Grammar School); and another bisecting the Anzac Memorial and connecting directly with Francis Street to the park’s east.

Flights of steps lead down from the central promenade to Park Street which bisects the two halves of the park. Other flights of steps lead diagonally off both north and south-eastern corners off Park Street, the entry opposite Francis Street, as both Park and College Streets are at a lower level than much of the adjacent park (or its ridge). Broadly both halves (running north-south) of the park are grassed areas, with scattered trees mostly framing and following cross paths.

Wide paved areas surround both the Archibald Fountain and the Anzac Memorial. A rectangular Pool of Remembrance is set among a wide paved area north of (and on all sides of) the Anzac Memorial, the pool’s edges being lined with fastigiate poplar trees (Populus alba ‘Fastigiata’ which replaced earlier Lombardy poplars (P.nigra ‘Italica’).

1.1.2 Municipal Sewer Vent

The below description of the Municipal Sewer Vent at the corner of Elizabeth and Bathurst Streets has been sourced from the State Heritage Inventory database sheet for the item4:

The obelisk is based on the dimensions of Cleopatra’s Needle. It has a sandstone base, a stucco shaft with sphinx motifs around its base, and a decorative bronze ventilator apex.

1.1.3 Former “Australian Consolidated Press”

The below description of the Former “Australian Consolidated Press” has been sourced from the State Heritage Inventory database sheet for the item5:

The Australian Consolidated Press building is composed of two distinct sections, the lower six levels form the Inter-War Free Classical/Commercial Palazzo portion and the upper six storeys were added during the 1960s. The lower sandstone clad portion is symmetrical in its massing with a heavily moulded central section that utilises large attached columns, an elaborate entablature and a large

---

4 Heritage Branch Database no.5053881
5 Heritage Branch Database no.2424004
central arched window. It expresses a conservatism well suited to the commercial nature of the building. The upper post-war section is a very simplified interpretation of the original facade, clearly distinguishable from it, with unadorned windows set in a plain wall surface. The interiors have been heavily modified over the years with plasterboard stud walls and ceilings throughout. Remnants of original terrazzo flooring and iron balustrading remain in the fire stairs.
3. **HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

3.1. **AREA HISTORY**

Elizabeth Street is shown as being aligned before 1807 as evident in Meehan’s plan. The Government Gazette of October 27, 1810 described the new street in the section “New Street and Lanes”. At this time it was described as extending from Hunter Street and terminating “in Hyde Park” which extended as far as Devonshire Street. The roads and footpaths were not immediately laid however. The street was initially identified as Camden Street however it was renamed Elizabeth by Macquarie for his wife, Elizabeth Campbell.

Hyde Park dates to roughly the same time. In 1810 it was announced in the Sydney Gazette that the portion of ground yet unoccupied in the vicinity of the Town of Sydney which had been known until that point variously as “The Common,” “Exercising Ground,” or “Cricket Ground” should thereafter be known as Hyde Park. However, the area was known as The Racecourse by sometime after. The first event to be held in the park was on October 15, 1810. The park was used as a racecourse until about 1824 and it was not enclosed in any way until 1830. From 1827 to 1856 the park was used as a cricket ground. There was no charge to the public for admission. A detailed history of Hyde Park is set out below.

Figure 5 – 1867/1870. View south down across College Street at Hyde Park.

Source – State Library of New South Wales

---

3.1.1. Hyde Park

The below history of Hyde Park has been summarised from the State Heritage Inventory database sheet for the item:

At the time of European settlement in 1788 local Aboriginals hunted ducks in the swampy marshes that were to become Hyde Park. The valley of the Tank Stream was cradled between two slightly elevated sandstone and shale ridges which ran down to the harbour to form Dawes Point and Bennelong Point on each side of Sydney Cove. The Tank Stream itself was only a tiny rivulet which rose in marshy ground skirting the western slopes of the ground which later became Hyde Park.

From 1788 this was a place where soldiers could be quickly assembled in case of a convict rebellion. It was probably the site of a bloody battle between Aboriginals and Europeans for control of land around Sydney. Before Governor Phillip departed from the settlement in December 1792, he had drawn a line from the head of Woolloomooloo Bay to the head of Cockle Bay (now Darling Harbour) and noted in writing on the map that no land within the line was to be leased or granted and should remain the property of the Crown. In subsequent years this directive was whittled away.

The area of Hyde Park however, fell largely within this line, and became regarded as a sort of “Common” on the edge of the town. It had quite a different status to the Governor’s Domain, which became the Botanic Gardens. It was land that belonged to the people, rather than to the Governor or his officials. The settlers grazed their animals on it and used its brush and trees as firewood. It was gradually denuded of vegetation. By 1810 it would have been a relatively open, elevated space and by then it would have had views out to the north east across Woolloomooloo to the harbour. Early on there were shingling parties and saw pits operating in the vicinity. It was known as “the Common” even before Governor Macquarie defined its size and use by his proclamation of 5 October 1810.

Later it became the colony’s first sports centre and racecourse. Prize fights and cricket matches were held here. In 1803 cricket was introduced on The Common by British officers. It was delineated only as a space at the end of Macquarie Street, where the military held parades, and townspeople cut firewood and carted off soil. It became a favourite place for cricket, a playground for local school boys, a racecourse and - with its slightly elevated position - a promenade cites Hyde Park as being Sydney's cricket ground from 1827-56.

In 1811 Macquarie framed further regulations to secure the space for public recreation. He closed access across the park to the Brickfields beyond, forbade carts to cross it, or cows, sheep, goats and pigs’ to graze upon it, and ordered that no cattle headed for markets near Darling Harbour were to be driven across it. He
caused a fence to be made between the park and the brickfields and directed that carts carrying bricks or pottery should go through the turn-pike gate in George Street. He directed that all traffic crossing the park was to use the new line of road along the route of Liverpool Street to South Head Road (or Oxford Street). This roadway then defined the southern boundary of Hyde Park.

The northern boundary was at first defined by the edge of the Governor's Demesne (Domain), which the Macquaries came to regard as their personal pleasure grounds. Macquarie himself directed the building of Hyde Park Barracks (1817-19), St.James’ Church (1820) and the Law Courts (1819-28) at the northern end of Hyde Park, using Francis Greenway as his architect, with these buildings as fine embellishments to the colonial town, facing each other across a plaza which terminated Macquarie Street. Macquarie blocked the street named after himself at what was later known as Queens's Square and excluded all roadways from the park.

The western boundary was defined as Camden Street (later Elizabeth Street, renamed by Macquarie for his wife, Elizabeth Campbell), marked out in Meehan’s plan of 1807 almost as far as present day Park Street. This was first a street of scattered small wattle and daub thatched houses, brush and grass trees. These were gradually replaced by more substantial houses in the next four decades. It became a fashionable residential street, with elegant terrace houses overlooking the maturing Hyde Park.

The eastern boundary was not sharply defined when the Macquaries departed in 1821. A map of that year shows a vegetable garden of 11 acres allocated to the Barracks and a site marked out for the Roman Catholic Chapel... ‘near the rubbish dump’. The foundation stone for what would become St.Mary's Cathedral was laid in 1821 on a site adjoining Hyde Park’s north-eastern side, the first site granted to the Roman Catholic Church in Australia.

In 1832 William and Macquarie Street (southern extension) were constructed severing Hyde Park and establishing its central axis (Clouston, 2006: 16). Also in 1832 College Street was built which divided off part of the park, in the area which became Cook and Phillip Parks. Also in 1832 Sydney College was built (later Sydney Grammar School). With the nearby Lyons Terrace (1851) and the Australian Museum (1849-51) the southern end of Hyde Park attracted significant and imposing buildings which increased its importance as a planned open space envisaged by Francis Greenway (Whitaker, 2009).

From the 1850s civic monuments began to be erected in the park. The first in 1857 was the Thornton Obelisk. It is also irreverently known as ‘Thornton's Scent Bottle’ (Whitaker, 2009) constructed on the park's western side entrance facing Bathurst Street (intersection with Elizabeth St.). This is actually a sewerage ventilator, made to appear like Cleopatra's Needle, an Egyptian Obelisk now displayed in London (ibid).

Figure 7 – 1937. View north over Hyde Park (subject site indicated).
1.2 SITE HISTORY

3.1.2. Early Development & Dixson’s Tobacco Factory

It appears that in the mid-19th century the subject site comprised a number of small buildings and ancillary structures which fronted Elizabeth Street, Park Street and Castlereagh Street (refer Figure 8 below).

However, by at least 1882-1883, (refer Figure 9) the subject site was partly occupied by Dixson’s Tobacco Factory which was a five-storey building extending 160 feet to the corner of Park and Elizabeth Streets. The building also had an additional basement level, a large factory chimney and two patent lifts worked by steam power. The building was to be used as a warehouse, office and factory for Dixon and Sons.7

The company of Dixson and Sons dated from 1839 and the first factory was located in Wynyard Lane. An 1883 issue of the Freeman’s Journal described in detail the new factory which had moved to the corner of Elizabeth and Park Streets.8 Figure 10 and Figure 11 indicate that the western portion of the subject site was still occupied by smaller buildings, likely commercial terraces, at this time.

In 1901 a new addition to Dixons Factory was described as adjoining the south of the existing structure. A large chimney stack which rose to a height of 162 ft was identified as a feature of the building.9

Figure 8 – 1855-1865. Survey plan showing extent of development on the subject site at that time.

---

7 The Riverine Grazier, 1/1883
8 Freeman’s Journal, 11/1883
9 The Sydney Morning Herald, 7/1901

Source – State Library of New South Wales.
Figure 9 – 1882-1883. Postcard image of Dixson & Sons on the corner of Elizabeth and Park Streets. 

Source – State Library of New South Wales.

Figure 10 – 1890. City of Sydney Section 18 showing the approximate boundaries of the subject site (blue).

Source – State Library of New South Wales.
Figure 11 – 1902. City of Sydney Section 18 showing the approximate boundaries of the subject site (blue).

Source – State Library of New South Wales.

3.1.3. Australian Temperance and General Assurance Company

In 1912 the Dixson and Sons building was sold to the Australian Temperance and General Assurance Company. The T & G Company was an insurance company that operated in Australia and New Zealand. The company was founded in Victoria in 1876, emerging from the Assurance branch of the Independent Order of Rechabites. The branch was severed from the I.O.R Rechabite Lodge after six years of operations. In 1983 the T&G Society amalgamated with the National Mutual Life Association and is now known as Axa Asia Pacific.

The Sydney Morning Herald notes that it was proposed to add four floors to the existing building to accommodate the company and to remodel the entire building for the purposes of providing “suites of chambers for professional men, residential flats and a large restaurant.” In the end only three floors were added to the existing building. This was completed in 1914 and was designed by a Mr Tidswell.

In 1928 the existing building was demolished completely to make way for the new building which was completed in 1931. At this time, the height of the building was 68m to the top of the tower. It was the tallest building in Sydney until 1939 when it was surpassed by the 112M AWA Tower. The building was designed by architects A&K Henderson.

Figure 12 indicates that by 1956 the rear (west) portion of the subject site to Castlereagh Street was occupied partly by the later southern extension of the T&G Building and also by smaller buildings including the Equitable Building, Harvard House, Christies Auction House and Forsayth House.

---

10 Remodelling of Dixson’s Tobacco Factory, The Sydney Morning Herald, 10 September 1912; pp 7.
11 Temperance & General Society (T&G Building), Sydney Architecture available at: http://sydneyarchitecture.com/GON/GON112.htm
12 Ibid.
13 The T & G Building Elizabeth and Park Streets, Sydney in 1915, 18 May 1938.
Picture 14 – c1914. View west across Hyde Park towards the subject site. New additions were completed at this time (FLICKR).

Picture 15 – 1916. View west across Hyde Park towards the subject site (City of Sydney Archives).

Picture 16 – 1923-1928. View south west across Hyde Park towards subject site (blue arrow). (City of Sydney Archives).
Picture 17 – c1928. View south showing construction of the new T&G building on the subject site. (City of Sydney Archives).
Picture 18 – 1932. View south west from Hyde Park towards the replacement building soon after its completion (City of Sydney Archives).
Picture 19 – 1953. View from Hyde Park towards the subject site (City of Sydney Archives).

Figure 12 – 1956. City building surveyors detail sheet (6) showing the extents of the subject site in blue.

Source – City of Sydney Historic Atlas.
3.1.4. The Subject Building

The former buildings on the subject site including the earlier T&G Building and the smaller buildings to the west were demolished in 1975, and replaced by 201 Elizabeth Street which was originally known as the T&G Hyde Park Square building. The image below shows the T & G Building sometime in the 1970s nearing completion. The building was completed in 1979\textsuperscript{14}. It was designed by architects Kann, Finch & Partners Pty Ltd.

The building was acquired by Dexus Property Group in August 2000.

\textsuperscript{14} 201 Elizabeth Street, The Skycraper Centre available at: http://www.skyscrapercenter.com/building/201-elizabeth-street/3063

Picture 20 – 1970s. View south east towards the subject site showing the existing building nearly complete (City of Sydney Archives).
4. HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

4.1. WHAT IS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE?

Before making decisions to change a heritage item, an item within a heritage conservation area, or an item located in proximity to a heritage listed item, it is important to understand its values and the values of its context. This leads to decisions that will retain these values in the future. Statements of heritage significance summarise a place’s heritage values – why it is important, why a statutory listing was made to protect these values.

4.2. SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT

The Heritage Council of NSW has developed a set of seven criteria for assessing heritage significance, which can be used to make decisions about the heritage value of a place or item. There are two levels of heritage significance used in NSW: state and local.

The following assessment of heritage significance has been prepared in accordance with the ‘Assessing Heritage Significance’ (2001) guides.

Table 1 – Assessment of heritage significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Significance Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Historical Significance</td>
<td>The subject building dates from the end of the 20th century, which is not considered to be a key period of development in Sydney. It further does not show evidence of a significance human activity. It is therefore considered that the subject building does not meet the requisite level of significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Inclusion</td>
<td>▫ shows evidence of a significant human activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ is associated with a significant activity or historical phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ maintains or shows the continuity of a historical process or activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Associative Significance</td>
<td>The existing building on the subject site is not strongly representative of any significant individual’s life’s work. The building was once associated with the T&amp;G Company which was a notable company in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, there are no remnant identifiers of this association and the company has not been associated with the site since at least 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Significance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C – Aesthetic Significance</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in the local area.&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>It is therefore considered that the building does not meet the requisite level of significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong>&lt;br&gt;- shows evidence of a significant human occupation&lt;br&gt;- is associated with a significant event, person, or group of persons</td>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong>&lt;br&gt;- has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important people or events&lt;br&gt;- provides evidence of people or events that are of dubious historical importance&lt;br&gt;- has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D – Social Significance</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in the local area for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest that the subject building has any significance to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong>&lt;br&gt;- is important for its associations with an identifiable group</td>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong>&lt;br&gt;- is only important to the community for amenity reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria

#### E – Research Potential

*An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the local area’s cultural or natural history.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• is important to a community’s sense of place</td>
<td>• is retained only in preference to a proposed alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is retained only in preference to a proposed alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not anticipated that the subject site comprises any information that cannot be easily gained from other sources. Refer to the archaeological assessment prepared by Urbis under separate cover for an assessment of archaeological potential.

#### F – Rarity

*An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the local area’s cultural or natural history.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• provides evidence of a defunct custom, way of life or process</td>
<td>• the knowledge gained would be irrelevant to research on science, human history or culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrates a process, custom or other human activity that is in danger of being lost</td>
<td>• has little archaeological or research potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows unusually accurate evidence of a significant human activity</td>
<td>• only contains information that is readily available from other resources or archaeological sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is the only example of its type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrates designs or techniques of exceptional interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows rare evidence of a significant human activity important to a community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late twentieth century office buildings are not considered rare in Sydney.

#### G – Representative

*An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSWs (or the local area’s):*

The building generally represents a late twentieth century office building of no particular significance.
### Criteria

- cultural or natural places; or
- cultural or natural environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Significance Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Inclusion</td>
<td>Guidelines for Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is a fine example of its type</td>
<td>- is a poor example of its type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has the principal characteristics of an</td>
<td>- does not include or has lost the range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important class or group of items</td>
<td>characteristics of a type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has attributes typical of a particular way</td>
<td>- does not represent well the characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of life, philosophy, custom, significant</td>
<td>that make up a significant variation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process, design, technique or activity</td>
<td>a type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is a significant variation to a class of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is part of a group which collectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrates a representative type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is outstanding because of its setting,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition or size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is outstanding because of its integrity or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the esteem in which it is held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

It is not considered that the subject site meets the threshold for local significance.

The building generally represents a modernist office building built in the late twentieth century which is not considered to be a key period of development in Sydney. The typology of the building is further not considered to be rare in Sydney. The building was once associated with the T&G Company which was a notable company in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, there are no identifiers of this association remnant and the company has not been associated with the site since the at least 2000.

### 1.3 HYDE PARK

Hyde Park has State significance as public land (the Australian colony’s first common) that has influenced the development of Sydney’s layout from as early as 1789, occupying approximately the same site since that time. Proclaimed by Governor Macquarie, it is Australia’s oldest designated public parkland (1810), and has been continuously used from 1788 for public open space, recreation, remembrance, celebration and leisure. Hyde Park has contributed to the cultural development of the city as a recreational space encapsulating the principles of a Victorian parkland through the use of a hierarchy of pathways and the strategic siting of monuments, statues and built items. It is of State significance as a demonstration of the international spread of the English public parks movement originating in the mid-19th century. It provides evidence of the influence of transport infrastructure on urbanisation by its upheaval and re-creation after construction of the city underground railway in the 1920s. It was site of some of Australia’s first sporting events, and remains the prime open space in Sydney for special events, protests and festivals as it has been since 1810. The Park
contains a collection of monuments and sculptures which mark key events and personalities in the history of the State including war memorials and significant artistic works.\textsuperscript{15}

### 1.3.1 Municipal Sewer Vent

The first planned sewerage system in the City of Sydney was completed in 1857. The Obelisk was the first major sewer vent constructed and the only ventshaft constructed partially of sandstone. The Obelisk Vent was an ambitious achievement at the time of construction owing to its utilitarian purpose. It is historically significant as one of the oldest items of infrastructure in the early city sewerage system and the oldest special sewer vent in the SWC system. It has landmark qualities, providing a fitting terminus to the eastern end of Bathurst Street. It is also significant for its contribution to the streetscape of Elizabeth Street, its visual role in the axial vistas of Sydney, and as a significant object within Hyde Park.\textsuperscript{16}

### 1.3.2 Museum Railway Station

Museum Station has state significance as the first underground station in Australia (with St James opened the same day) and demonstrates the adaptation of the London tube style station to the Australian situation. The station is well constructed, proportioned and detailed and represents the culmination of many years of political lobbying to have a city railway system in place.

The station complex is an important part of the larger NSW railways network, particularly the inner-city system, and has associations with prominent persons such as JJC Bradfield and organisations such as the Department of Railways. It played an important part in the development of the CBD in Sydney as evidenced by direct pedestrian subway connections to adjacent department stores such as Mark Foys.

The Museum Station entry building (Liverpool Street) is a fine and largely intact example of a small-scale Inter-War Stripped Classical style building which adds to the general character of the immediate area. It has significance as one of two buildings of its type and style remaining in the city (the other being St James). The combination of the entry portals, pedestrian subways and decorative interiors including light fittings, tiling and signage contribute to the aesthetic significance of the place and evoke a former era of railway travel.

### 1.3.3 Former “Australian Consolidated Press”

The Australian Consolidated Press Offices was designed by the influential firm of Spain & Cosh, and Bruce Dellit (whilst in their employ). The sandstone facade has aesthetic significance as a confident expression of the inter-war Free Classical style. It was designed to express the most modern standards of publishing and staff amenity. The building has been continuously associated with newspaper publishing since its construction in 1925. Its construction at that time is representative of an important period of redevelopment in the city.\textsuperscript{17}

### 1.3.4 St George’s Church

St George’s Church is historically and socially significant as the only Free Presbyterian church remaining within metropolitan Sydney. It was the site a meeting of the Synod of Eastern Australia on 15 November 1864 which passed a motion that eventually led to the dissolution of the ecclesiastical connections with the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, and allowed for the formation of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. St George’s Church is aesthetically significant as a fine example of the ecclesiastical work of the architectural firm of Field & Rowe.\textsuperscript{18}

### 1.3.5 Former Cenef House

The former C.E.N.E.F. House, is a five storey building of Federation Free Classical Style modified in the 1940s. The building, together with Porter House at 203 Castlereagh Street, is historically significant for its contribution to understanding the late nineteenth-early twentieth century character of this part of the city as an industrial and warehouse precinct. The building has aesthetic significance as a typical original commercial.

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/heritageapp/ViewHeritageItemDetails.aspx?ID=2424612
exterior. The building with the adjacent church and Porter House is an important component of the streetscape. The building is socially significant for the important role it played as a centre for volunteer workers and church organisations in assisting returned servicemen to adjust to civilian life following the Second World War.¹⁹

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1. HERITAGE LISTING

The subject site is not a locally listed heritage item under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012, as shown in Figure 1, below. It is, however, located within the vicinity of a number of state and locally listed heritage items, including:

- ‘Municipal sewer vent’ at Elizabeth Street, corner Bathurst Street (SHR 01642; Local Item No. I1752)
- ‘Anzac War Memorial including Pool of Reflection, pavements, plantings, flagpoles, staircase, platform, interiors, lightwells, bas reliefs, statues, sculptures and movable heritage (artefacts and memorabilia)’ at 120 Elizabeth Street (SHR 01871; Local Item No. I1742)
- Museum Railway Station including interiors, Elizabeth Street (SHR 01207; Local Item No. I1743)
- ‘Hyde Park’ at 110-120 Elizabeth Street (SHR 01871; Local Item No. I1654)
- ‘Former Australian Consolidated Press façade’ at 189–197 Elizabeth Street (Item No. 1751)
- ‘Former CENEF House” including interiors’ at 201 Castlereagh Street (Item No. I1700)
- ‘St George’s Church including interior and forecourt’ at 201A Castlereagh Street (Item No. I1701)
- ‘Porter House” including interior’ at 203 Castlereagh Street (Item No I702)
- ‘Former tram shelter including interior’ at 110 Elizabeth Street (Item No. I741)

The subject site is also located within the College Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area.

This HIS is therefore required to assess the potential heritage impact of the proposed works on the proximate heritage items and the College Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area generally.

Figure 13 – Heritage map indicating the location of the proximate heritage items to the subject site.

Source – City of Sydney LEP 2012
5.2. STATUTORY CONTROLS

5.2.1. Local Environmental Plan

The proposed works are addressed in the table below in relation to the relevant clauses in the LEP.

Table 2 – Local Environmental Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUSE</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Heritage conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Heritage items (if any) are listed and described in Schedule 5. Heritage conservation areas (if any) are shown on the Heritage Map as well as being described in Schedule 5.

(1) Objectives

The objectives of this clause are as follows:

(a) to conserve the environmental heritage of the City of Sydney,

(b) to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views,

(c) to conserve archaeological sites,

This heritage impact statement has been prepared in order to assist the consent authority in determining the potential heritage impact of the proposed envelope of the new building on the proximate heritage items identified above.

It is considered that the proposed works are generally in keeping with the heritage objectives set down in the SLEP 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUSE</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d) to conserve Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places of heritage significance.</td>
<td>The subject site is not a locally listed heritage item under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012. It is, however, located within the vicinity of a number of state and locally listed heritage items as identified above in Section 5.1. This heritage impact statement is therefore required to assess the potential heritage impact on the proximate heritage items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Requirement for consent

Development consent is required for any of the following:

(a) demolishing or moving any of the following or altering the exterior of any of the following (including, in the case of a building, making changes to its detail, fabric, finish or appearance):

(i) a heritage item,

(ii) an Aboriginal object,

(iii) a building, work, relic or tree within a heritage conservation area,

(b) altering a heritage item that is a building by making structural changes to its interior or by making changes to anything inside the item that is specified in Schedule 5 in relation to the item,

(c) disturbing or excavating an archaeological site while knowing, or having reasonable cause to suspect, that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged or destroyed,

(d) disturbing or excavating an Aboriginal place of heritage significance,

(e) erecting a building on land:

(i) on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or

(ii) on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance,

(f) subdividing land:

(i) on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or

(ii) on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance.
CLAUSE

(4) Effect of proposed development on heritage significance

The consent authority must, before granting consent under this clause in respect of a heritage item or heritage conservation area, consider the effect of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the item or area concerned. This subclause applies regardless of whether a heritage management document is prepared under subclause (5) or a heritage conservation management plan is submitted under subclause (6).

DISCUSSION

The following points have been summarised from the detailed assessment set out in the table below:

- The assessment of the heritage significance of the subject site concludes that the existing building does not have heritage significance and that its removal would have no heritage impact;
- The proposed reconstruction of the tower to a similar height to that existing would have no additional heritage impact on the listed items in the vicinity;
- The new tower would be set back 8 metres from the eastern façade of the podium and from the existing tower. This would be an improvement in terms of visual dominance over the park;
- The width of the base of the new tower would be wider than that existing to create a podium. Presently the bulk of the building is set back from Park Street and separated from it by the ground floor retail/food court. However historically, the principal forms of the buildings that have existed on the site including the T&G Building and Dixson’s Tobacco factory were built close to Park Street and established a strong basis for the east west axis which bisects the park. It is therefore considered that reducing the setback of the principal mass would not detract from the understanding of Hyde Park and would conversely serve to re-establish the aforementioned axis;
- The podium would be comparable in height to the existing commercial developments along the western side of Elizabeth Street adjacent to Hyde Park. As such, continuity in scale and the enclosed character of the western side of the park would be maintained;
- The proposed building envelope departs from the prismatic form of the existing building. The podium would maintain regularity in form, reinforcing the enclosure of Hyde Park. However, the tower has an irregular shape whereby it presents a significantly thinner façade to the south east and north west. This would ensure that the tower has a reduced visual impact from
CLAUSE | DISCUSSION
--- | ---
some vantage points around Hyde Park in comparison to the existing tower;  
- There is a carpark linkage proposed from basement 1 of the proposed building to the southern neighbour (227 Elizabeth Street). The building to the south is not heritage listed and it is not anticipated that the carpark comprises any fabric of heritage significance. Accordingly, these sub surface works would not have any heritage impact.

(5) Heritage assessment  
The consent authority may, before granting consent to any development:
(a) on land on which a heritage item is located, or
(b) on land that is within a heritage conservation area, or
(c) on land that is within the vicinity of land referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

require a heritage management document to be prepared that assesses the extent to which the carrying out of the proposed development would affect the heritage significance of the heritage item or heritage conservation area concerned.

This HIS has been prepared in order to fulfil this condition.

5.2.2. Development Control Plan  
The proposed works are addressed in the table below in relation to the relevant provisions in the DCP.

Table 3 – Development Control Plan

| PROVISION | DISCUSSION |
--- | --- |
(3) Alterations and additions to buildings and structures and new development of sites in the vicinity of a heritage item are to be designed to respect and complement the heritage item in terms of the:
(a) building envelope;  
(b) proportions;  
(c) materials, colours and finishes; and  
(d) building and street alignment.  
The subject site is located in close proximity to a number of heritage listed items including four state listed items to the east. Future development on the subject site facilitated by this Stage 1 application must therefore have regard for the identified significance of each of these items and consider the corresponding DCP provisions.

The heritage significance of the subject site has been assessed above. It is concluded that the existing building does not have heritage significance and does not contribute to the setting
**PROVISION**

(4) Development in the vicinity of a heritage item is to minimise the impact on the setting of the item by:

(a) providing an adequate area around the building to allow interpretation of the heritage item;

(b) retaining original or significant landscaping (including plantings with direct links or association with the heritage item);

(c) protecting, where possible and allowing the interpretation of archaeological features; and

(d) Retaining and respecting significant views to and from the heritage item.

**DISCUSSION**

of the identified listed items. Therefore, its removal would have no heritage impact on the proximate heritage items or the special character area.

It is proposed to demolish the existing tower and to construct a new tower to a similar height to that existing. Although it is recognised that the existing tower is higher than the remaining buildings adjacent to Hyde Park and along the west side of Elizabeth Street it is a similar height to that existing on the subject site. It therefore would have no significant additional heritage impact on the listed items in the vicinity in terms of height/scale. Rather, the well-considered form of the tower would reduce the apparent bulk of the tower, particularly from the south east.

Notwithstanding the above, the width of the base of the new tower would be wider than that existing to form a podium structure. The podium would be comparable in height to the existing commercial developments along the eastern side of Elizabeth Street. As such, continuity in scale and the enclosed character of the western side of the park would be maintained.

The new tower would be set back 8 metres from the eastern façade of the podium and from the existing tower. This would be an improvement in terms of visual dominance over the park compared to the existing building.

The tower would have a 5 metre setback from the podium to Park Street. Although this is closer than that existing, it should be considered that Park Street is not an intact early streetscape but one which is characterised by early building and high density residential/commercial towers. The existing tower already exists as a dominant element in this streetscape. Further, the siting of the tower further to the north presents a better opportunity to minimise overshadowing of the ANZAC Memorial to the south east and does not impact on any particularly significant views towards heritage items westward from Park Street. It is therefore considered that the reduced setback to Park Street is acceptable from a heritage perspective.

It is considered that the proposed podium would not have a detrimental impact on the significance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVISION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of the proximate items. Presently, the bulk of the existing building is set back from Park Street and separated from it by the ground floor retail/food court. However historically, the principal forms of the buildings that have existed on the site including the T&amp;G Building and Dixson’s Tobacco factory were built close to Park Street and established a strong basis for the east west axis which bisects the park. It is therefore considered that reducing the set back from Park Street would not detract from the understanding of Hyde Park and would conversely serve to re-establish the aforementioned axis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The western setback of the tower from Castlereagh Street would be reduced. However, this allows for a larger setback from the eastern boundary and Hyde Park. Further, there are no heritage listed items located directly to the south of the subject site and the subject site is separated from the heritage items to the north by Park Street. As such, the reduced setback from Castlereagh Street would not have a significant impact on any views to listed heritage items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed building envelope departs from the prismatic form of the existing building. The podium would maintain regularity in form, reinforcing the enclosure of Hyde Park. However, the tower has an irregular shape whereby it presents a significantly thinner façade to the south east and north west. This would ensure that the tower has a reduced visual impact from some vantage points around Hyde Park in comparison to the existing tower.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lower floors of the podium are proposed to be designated for retail use. This would ensure that the area surrounding Hyde Park is activated and would encourage appreciation of the proximate heritage items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a carpark linkage proposed from basement 1 of the proposed building to the southern neighbour (227 Elizabeth Street). The building to the south is not heritage listed and it is not anticipated that the carpark comprises any fabric of heritage significance. Accordingly, the sub surface item would not have any heritage impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 – Development Control Plan – College street/Hyde Park Special Character Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVISION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Development must achieve and satisfy the outcomes expressed in the</td>
<td>a) The proposed envelope has been assessed below with regard for the supporting principles of the character statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character statement and supporting principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Recognise the institutional area east of College Street as one of</td>
<td>b) The proposed envelope would have no additional heritage impact on the area east of College Street as there would be limited apparent change in terms of scale. Further, the building would present as a thinner form than that existing from some vantage points as the south east façade is significantly thinner than the north east facade. The widened area to the base is not likely to be easily visible from the eastern side of College Street due to the vegetation in Hyde Park. The concept design indicate a simple elegant building which would not detract from the institutional area opposite or change the character of the outlook from this area. This design is subject to further design resolution at Stage 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney’s pre-eminent public areas characterised by a concentration of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage items which house activities of State and National significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Reinforce the urban character and scale of College Street by requiring</td>
<td>c) The proposed building would not be located on College Street, but on Elizabeth Street. The scale of the buildings along Elizabeth Street is notably larger than those along the former and these contribute to the sense of enclosure from the west. The podium of the proposed building would respond to this larger scale and reinforce the western enclosure, and the tower would constitute the replacement of that existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new buildings to be integrated with the form of existing buildings and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally limiting the height of new buildings to the prevailing height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of existing buildings, and to maintain the sense of openness east of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Enhance and reinforce the precinct’s role as a major gateway to the</td>
<td>d) The view west across the park from William Street would remain largely unchanged as a result of the proposed envelope of the building as it would be a similar height as that existing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City from the east, particularly from William Street to Park Street, by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVISION</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensuring that development does not adversely affect the views when approaching the City.</td>
<td>would present a façade of a similar width to that existing to the north east. However, the new tower would be positioned further to the north than that existing and there would be a multi storey podium element built to the boundary. It is not considered that this would have a negative heritage impact in the context of the heritage items as there are no significant views westward from William Street/Park Street towards any heritage items which would be obscured by the new position of the tower or the podium element. Impact on views generally when approaching the city is an urban design consideration and reference should be made to the Design Report prepared by FJMT for the relevant discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Maintain and strengthen the sense of enclosure provided by the buildings to the west and south of Hyde Park, by requiring new buildings to be built to street alignment, to have street frontage heights consistent with the existing development and to have adequate setbacks above those street frontage heights.</td>
<td>e) As above, the sense of enclosure around Hyde Park would be strengthened as the proposed envelope would extend further north towards Park Street. A street wall is proposed which would establish consistency in terms of scale with the existing developments along Elizabeth Street. It is recommended that the development of the Stage 2 design include the appropriate treatment of the podium through materials and form. This treatment of the podium should aim to establish a visual distinction between it and the tower above, compliment the materiality extant in the vicinity and avoid large expanses of glass or solid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Maintain and enhance views to and through the Park and along College Street to landmark buildings such as St Mary’s Cathedral east and Centre Point Tower west.</td>
<td>f) Due to the existing vegetation in the park, there are only restricted views from the corner of Park and Elizabeth Streets to the landmark fabric on the east side of Hyde Park. As such, the extension of the envelope north towards Park Street would not impact significant existing views to these items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Maintain and enhance the role of the precinct as a major recreational open space for Sydney’s workers and residents.</td>
<td>g) It is understood that this Stage 1 application will facilitate the future reinvigoration of the site. It is anticipated that subject to further design development of the building, the site has the potential to be a notable gateway to the CBD. The proposed retail use of the podium at ground level would activate the area and facilitate the role of the precinct as a major recreational space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. VIEWS ANALYSIS

There are a number of highly significant heritage items comprised in Hyde Park and located around it. While the proposed envelope is replacing a tower of a similar height which already overshadows Hyde Park, the proposed envelope has been designed with cognisance for the significance of the proximate heritage items and ensure that there is no additional impact on them. A variety of options for the tower have been explored including the retention and refurbishment of that existing to develop the most sensitive response to the context.

This section considers the View Analysis’ set out in the Design Report by FJMT in the context of the heritage items and assesses the impacts in terms of scale and visual dominance. Only impact on heritage items is addressed herein. Issues related to amenity/overshadowing are addressed in the Environment Impact Assessment under separate cover.

Views from Hyde Park

As shown in the visual analysis below, the existing tower visibly exceeds the width of the ANZAC Memorial and is the dominant feature in the backdrop when the item is viewed from the south east. This is exacerbated by the wide, slow moving shadow which is casts in the area of the memorial at certain times of the day. As discussed above, the proposed option allows for a narrower presentation to the south east than that existing which gives the proposed tower form a recessive quality in the visual context of the ANZAC Memorial and minimises overshadowing. The Urban Design Report prepared by FJMT indicates that overshadowing of the ANZAC Memorial on ANZAC Day would be minimised, thus improving the enjoyment of the item on the significant day.

The siting of the tower to the north of the subject site further ensures that from this angle (roughly the western end of Oxford Street) the tower would not be located directly behind the Memorial. As above, it is considered that from this angle, the prominence of the podium element and the set back of the tower from it makes the tower read as a recessive element and part of the established skyline of Sydney while the podium relates to the scale and context of the park.

Figure 15 – Options considered – view from south east.

Source: Design Report – FJMT.

Views from Park Street

It is considered that impact on views from Park Street is an urban design consideration. It is acknowledged that the view corridor would be narrowed given the proposed siting of the new tower to the north of the site. However, this is not considered to have a direct heritage impact as there are no existing significant views to any items on Park Street or Castlereagh Street which would be obscured by the siting of the proposed tower.
Further, although the form would be more dominant over Park Street than one located slightly further south it should be considered that Park Street is character by a combination of building typologies, one being high density residential towers and that the extant tower on the subject site is already a dominant feature of the streetscape. The proposed new location of the tower on the subject site would therefore not have a notable impact on the existing character of Park Street.
6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Section 5 of this report Urbis has assessed the proposed works against the relevant provisions in the City of Sydney LEP and DCP, including the principles set out for development within the College Street/Hyde Park Special Character Area. The following observations have been summarised from this assessment:

- The assessment of the heritage significance of the subject site concludes that the existing building does not have heritage significance and that its removal would have no heritage impact;
- The proposed reconstruction of the tower to a similar height to that existing would have limited heritage impact on the listed items in the vicinity in addition to that generated by the existing building;
- The new tower would be set back 8 metres from the eastern façade of the podium and from the existing tower. This would be an improvement in terms of visual dominance over the park compared with the existing building;
- The width of the base of the new tower would be wider than that existing to create a podium. Presently the bulk of the building is set back from Park Street and separated from it by the ground floor retail/food court. However historically, the principal forms of the buildings that have existed on the site including the T&G Building and Dixson’s Tobacco factory were built close to Park Street and established a strong basis for the east west axis which bisects the park. It is therefore considered that reducing the setback of the principal mass would not detract from the understanding of Hyde Park and would conversely serve to re-establish the aforementioned axis;
- The podium would be comparable in height to the existing commercial developments along the western side of Elizabeth Street adjacent to Hyde Park. As such, continuity in scale and the enclosed character of the western side of the park would be maintained;
- The proposed building envelope departs from the prismatic form of the existing building. The podium would maintain regularity in form, reinforcing the enclosure of Hyde Park. However, the tower has an irregular shape whereby it presents a significantly thinner façade to the south east and north west. This would ensure that the tower has a reduced visual impact from some vantage points around Hyde Park in comparison to the existing tower.

In accordance with the assessment set down in this report, the proposed Stage 1 envelope is supported from a heritage perspective.

Recommendations for Stage 2 design development

- The subject site is located in close proximity to a number of heritage listed items as identified in this report including three state listed items to the east. Future development on the subject site facilitated by this Stage 1 application must therefore have regard for the identified significance of each of these items and consider the provisions set down in the DCP relevant to development in the vicinity of a heritage item (Section 3.9.5). The heritage impact of the Stage 2 proposal on these items must be addressed in a heritage impact statement as part of the Stage 2 application;
- Further to the above, it is recommended that the development of the Stage 2 design includes the appropriate treatment of the tower and podium through materials, form and siting to ensure its compatibility with the conservation area. The design development should be undertaken with input from the heritage consultant. The treatment of the built forms should consider the relevant provisions set down in the DCP (Section 5.1). Specifically:
  - The podium should not have an overbearing sense of enclosure around Hyde Park. It should relate to the street frontage height of adjacent buildings. It is noted that the proposed Stage 1 Envelope is achieving this objective;
In relation to 5.1.2 Front Setbacks, there are no specific references to heritage matters. Proposed Stage 1 setbacks should relate to the overall streetscape character area and allow for a meaningful expression of the podium element;

Reference should be made to Section 5.1.3 Street frontage heights and setbacks for Special Character Areas. This sets out minimum and maximum street frontage heights, and setbacks to ensure that new development remains compatible with the surrounding development and the Special Character Area generally; and

Section 5.1.6 Building Exteriors sets down the appropriate treatment of building exteriors in Special Character Areas. Particular consideration should be given to the treatment of the podium in relation to its compatibility with the materiality of the proximate heritage fabric. Further, large expanses of blank glass or solid wall should be avoided so to ensure that the apparent mass of the podium is further visually broken down. The podium should have an appropriate configuration at ground floor level which maintains a human scale and activates the surrounding area.

Provision for a future tunnel connection to Museum Park/Museum railway station access is proposed as part of this application. The details of this tunnel are yet to be resolved however it is understood that it would be designed to intersect fabric associated with a state listed heritage item. Therefore, the future design development of the tunnel should consider the significant fabric comprised within Museum Station and ensure that any heritage impact, specifically physical impact, is avoided/mitigated. The design of this element should be undertaken in consultation with the heritage consultant and the relevant department/stakeholder.
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