

**DECISION OF
NORTH SYDNEY LOCAL PLANNING PANEL
MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2023**

ITEM 5

DA No:	145/23
ADDRESS:	201 Miller Street, North Sydney
PROPOSAL:	Replacement of existing window shrouds and repairs and maintenance of the façade of a 23-storey commercial building and heritage-listed item.
REPORT BY NAME:	Rachel Wu, Graduate Assessment Officer
APPLICANT:	Urbis Pty Ltd

No Written Submission

Registered to Speak

Submitter	Applicant/Representative
	Abigail Cohen – LaSalle Investment Management – representing applicant
	Nick Sissons – Architect
	Matthew Bailey – LaSalle – on behalf of the Applicant

Panel Consideration and Decision

Panel members have undertaken a site inspection prior to the meeting and notes there are no written submissions. The Council Officer’s Report and recommendation is also noted.

The Panel’s decision is to defer the determination of the application for the reasons below.

The Panel notes the North Sydney LEP 2001 amendment 9 gazetted 28/02/2003 and LEP 2013 gazetted 02/08/2013 is based on the NSW Heritage Inventory Statement listing and describes the building as being significant for the following reason:

‘An example of a highly integrated office tower in the Late Twentieth Century International style of considerable quality and distinctive detailing designed and built by prominent construction firm Sabemo Pty Ltd, contributing much to the urban streetscape of this high-rise area. It was notable when first completed in 1972-1973 for its unusual and prominent orange-coloured fibreglass exterior and finish. Although substantially modified in 1989 in the Post-modern style, which included interiors, a new Pavilion building, and the change of the orange exterior to more muted green and later grey colours, the building retains its distinctive original exterior form and construction’.

Having regard to the above reason for the State Heritage listing, the Panel considers that it is unreasonable to require that the colour scheme for the building should be orange to match the original building colour given that the building has already undergone colour changes as noted in the listing above. At the same time the proposed colour scheme is not supported for this heritage item.

The Panel considers that the Applicant’s preferred scheme for replacement of the window shrouds in a modular, assembled system could be supported.

At the same time, however, the Panel also considered that the materiality of the heritage item, whilst substantially changed in earlier refurbishments, remained an important feature which should be reflected in an amended scheme of materials.

The Panel therefore considers the application requires further refinement to ensure its heritage value of “ it’s distinctive original exterior form and construction” is respected.

The Panel has decided that the matter be deferred for amended plans to be submitted to include the following changes:

Amended Architectural Plans:

- a. Proposed window shroud design to be a ~~unitary~~ modular structure fabrication to be installed as modular façade units for each window shroud
- b. ~~The original distinctive “orange” colour scheme for the proposed window shrouds~~
A revised colour scheme, including glazing colour, that is more complementary of the heritage significance of the building is to be achieved. The selected colour is to be distinctive and better reflect the design quality and expression of the original building façade. Stark white is not supported.
- c. ~~No existing window units on the Northern Elevation to be deleted to reveal the exoskeleton~~
- d. Consideration of the removal of the portico to the main forecourt and reinstatement of the original supporting column profiles evident in photographs of 1972 from Stanton Heritage Centre, Local History Collection (n.d.).

The deferral of this matter is to allow the Applicant to submit amended plans and changes information.

The amended plans are required to be submitted within 3 months from the date of this deferral and for a supplementary report to be prepared by Council Officers and submitted to the panel in a timely manner. In the absence of amended plans and documentation the Panel will move to determine the matter on the basis of information at hand.

Voting was as follows:

Panel Member	Yes	No	Community Representative	Yes	No
Jan Murrell	Y		Ken Robinson	Y	
Ian Pickles	Y				
Gerard Turrisi	Y				