

# Clarence Valley Council Heritage Advisory Committee

10.00am Monday 14th May 2012  
Council Offices, 6 Prince Street, Grafton

## MINUTES

**Attendance.** Ruth McAulay; Leone Roberts; Jim Clay; John Beal; Linda Wright; James Moloney; Cllr Margaret Mc Kenna; Deborah Wray,

Item		Discussion/ Comments	Reporting Officer	Actions	Action Officer
01	<b>Welcome</b>		DW		-
02	<b>Apologies</b>	Colin Clague, John Melenhorst			
03	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	None			
04	<b>Confirmation of Minutes of previous meeting held</b> on 19 <sup>th</sup> October 2011 Moved LR Seconded RM				
05	<b>Business Arising from the Minutes</b>				
05.01	<b>Update on removal of buildings from Maclean Public School</b>	Progress with Development applications and funding. DMU Meeting was held on 22/2/12 for Building F and a development application is awaited.	CC/LW	Substantial progress has been made with the plans and the DA should be lodged shortly. Some delays have occurred due to family issues of applicant.	-

Item		Discussion/ Comments	Reporting Officer	Actions	Action Officer
5.2	<b>HERITAGE GRANTS 2010-11</b>	All projects are completed (1 was delayed by obtaining CC). Excellent results. Next round of funding will be advertised in September 2012. Target area to be confirmed.  <b>Resolution</b> <b>That the Heritage Advisory Committee adopt the Annual Report 2011-12.</b> <b>Moved MM /JC</b> <b>Carried</b>	DW	Report to be submitted to Heritage office and Council by end of May and copy to be sent to Councillors.	DW
5.3	<b>Heritage Volunteer awards</b>	Correspondence from NSW Office of Env't and Heritage	DW	No action required	-
6	<b>Business for this meeting</b>				

6.1	<p><b>Proposed Demolition of 93 Victoria Street DA 2011/0542</b></p>	<p>The committee reviewed the information in the Statement of Heritage Impact prepared by Edwards Planning for proposed demolition of 93 Victoria Street.</p> <p>Building maintenance and condition, potential value of a restored building, lack of structural reports, Dev Control plan requirements and sustainability and adaptive re-use issues were discussed.</p> <p><b>Resolution</b></p> <p><b>That the Heritage Advisory Committee does <u>not</u> support the proposed demolition of the building at 93 Queen Street for the following reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The building is considered historically significant and exhibits rarity for architectural detailing as per its listing on the Clarence Valley LEP 2011 and should be retained and adaptively re-used.</b></li> <li><b>2. Notwithstanding its visual appearance of dilapidation, no evidence has been provided of structural inadequacies apart from the need to re-level piers, which is a common work carried out to buildings of this age.</b></li> <li><b>3. Considering the age and type of the building, the interior is also likely to include features of historic significance such as pressed metal ceilings and joinery which are worthy of retention.</b></li> <li><b>4. A boundary adjustment could be explored to enable the proposed 51m2 extension of the existing adjoining building whilst still allowing for the retention or re-sale of the dwelling for restoration and adaptive re-use.</b></li> <li><b>5. The application is inconsistent with the requirements of the Development Control Plan which requires detailed plans to be submitted to accompany any applications for demolition to provide clarity of intention on the footprint, building form, setback, and scale and detailing of any replacement building on the site.</b></li> </ol> <p>Moved LW/JM Carried</p>	DW	<p>Comments to be sent to Patrick Ridgeway dealing with DA with subsequent consideration by full Council.</p>	
-----	--	---	----	---	--

<p>6.2</p>	<p><b>Options for future of Story Park Bridge from Palmers Island Channel</b></p>	<p><u><b>The bridge is not a listed item, or in a Conservation Area.</b></u></p> <p>Based on the inspection with Jeff and Brian Castle Council's Bridge Construction Supervisor I would recommend that the bridge be removed for the following reasons reinforced by Jeff's report -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The bridge needs to be completely dismantled if it was to be repaired. The financial cost to do this would be excessive and based on discussions with Jeff and Brian in the order \$400-500,000.</li> <li>2. If the bridge were to be rebuilt there are only a few people with the knowledge of truss bridge construction who could do that and it is a specialist tasks not something that a community group could do.</li> <li>3. Most of the bridge would not be able to be reused other than the deck that has been replaced in various parts in recent years.</li> <li>4. The bridge is out of context and not in its original location. Its serves no practical purpose in this park.</li> <li>5. The bridge is a hazard and currently dangerous. Action needs to be taken on its future ASAP. We have fenced the area around it temporarily pending a decision.</li> </ol> <p>If a budget was made available then an interpretative sign/board could be placed at the site where it was originally removed.</p> <p>Alternatively Council could consider taking measures to try to retain any other similar truss bridges still in service - e.g. the Lawrence bridge. However that would be based on the need for a full life cycle assessment as with any major project and consideration of the financial issues related to that bridge is strongly recommended.</p> <p><b>The Committee discussed the above issues with Manager Peter Birch</b></p> <p><b>Resolution</b></p> <p><b>That the Heritage Advisory Committee supports the removal of the remnant structure for the reasons given and considers that resources would be better utilized to conserve timber bridges insitu such as Sportsman's Creek Bridge or Briner Bridge, Tucabia. Any salvageable materials are to be retained in the depot for other repairs. JC/MM Carried</b></p>	<p>DW</p>	<p>Site inspection, Historical Information.</p>	<p>DW</p>
------------	---	---	-----------	---	-----------

6.2	<b>Draft Heritage Strategy Report 2011-12</b>	<p>Assesses strengths and weaknesses of Council's heritage management</p> <p>An outline of the draft document was given by Deborah Wray to the committee and comments are sought for the next meeting</p>	DW	For consideration	
6.3	<b>Any other business</b>	<p>Grafton Regional Gallery Maintenance and Repair Work.</p> <p>James Moloney alerted the Committee to the fact the treated pine was being used in repairs instead of a profiled hardwood. The Manager of Assets has been made aware of this and had advised that this will be corrected. This raises issues of consent/minor works approvals being required under the new CV LEP 2011 and the need for all sections of Council to be fully aware of legal heritage policies in the implementation of works. This in turn relates to the Draft Strategy.</p> <p><b>Resolution</b></p> <p><b>That the use of treated pine is inappropriate on this heritage listed building and is a short term economy as it is likely to fail. It must be replaced with a profiled hardwood to match original details. LW/JM Carried</b></p>			
		<p>Pilot Hill Viewing location</p> <p>Peter Birch presented a follow up proposal for Pilot Hill which took into account previous advice of the committee not to introduce a stone wall fixed structure in this important maritime precinct. It is now proposed to replace a 3-4 round wire fence with a simple timber and stainless steel fence of 4-6 metres in length to retain a safety barrier to the hillside.</p> <p><b>Resolution</b></p> <p><b>That the Heritage Advisory Committee supports the intention of a replacement 'low key' fence of timber and stainless steel materials of 4-6 m in this location</b></p> <p><b>JC/RM Carried</b></p>			

		<p>Flagpole Norfolk Park</p> <p>Maintenance is need to the flagpole which was originally taken from Pilot Hill and placed in Norfolk Park. It is a heritage item. It is possible to relocate it back to its original location in the future.</p> <p><b>Resolution</b></p> <p><b>The heritage Advisory committee supports the future relocation of the flagpole back to Pilot Hill.</b></p> <p><b>RM/JC Carried</b></p>			
7	<b>Time, date and venue of next meeting</b>	10.00 am 25 <sup>th</sup> June 2012			
8	<b>Meeting close</b>	1.15pm			
<b>Items for attention by Executive Officers Group Meeting</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Heading</b>			<b>Additional Comment if required</b>	
Minutes approved by: signature_		dd /mm/ yy	Dataworks # : ____		
Dataworks # : ____					

<b>REPORT ON BRIDGE AT STORY PARK YAMBA</b>
---

### BACKGROUND

The Bridge at Storey Park is a single span timber truss bridge which is 22.9 metres long spanning a 3 metre wide drain. The bridge structural configuration is a timber truss which consists of upper and lower chords and steel tension bars and timber diagonals which connect them. Cross girders span between the timber trusses. The longitudinal timber stringers support the deck. The stringers and deck were not part of original structure. The lower chord on the north eastern end has failed and fallen to ground.

### BRIDGE ASSESSMENT

All the major members of the upper and lower chords of the bridge have major rot and have to be replaced. Only some of the diagonals are retrievable. The cross girders have major rot and are not useable. The steel members have varying amounts of corrosion. Most steel members have to be removed, sand blasted and galvanised. Some have to be replaced. All nuts and washers have to be replaced. The condition of stringers is unknown. The deck can be reused. Because of the rot in upper and lower chords, the dismantling of the bridge is impossible and demolition by an excavator is advised.

To reconstruct from the ground up would require a major structure to support members as they are assembled as the truss. The new bridge would be similar to original in configuration.

The drain could be spanned easily by a culvert or small bridge if required.

### CONCLUSION

It is recommended to remove the existing structure and if required and there is a demonstrated need install a new minor replacement.

Jeff Madden  
**Bridges Engineer**

**Attachment - Images of Story Bridge in Story Park Yamba**



**Figure 1 – Fenced Story Bridge**



**Figure 2 – Deterioration of Girders Story Bridge**