

## Heritage Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2021/2173
<b>Date:</b>	30/03/2022
<b>To:</b>	Adam Mitchell
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 7094 DP 1059297 , 394 Barrenjoey Road NEWPORT NSW 2106 Lot 1 DP 1139445 , 394 Barrenjoey Road NEWPORT NSW 2106

### Officer comments

HERITAGE COMMENTS		
Discussion of reason for referral		
<p>This application has been referred as the works affect a local heritage item, being <b>Item 2270445 - Newport Surf Life Saving Club, 394 Barrenjoey Road, Newport</b>, listed in Schedule 5 of Pittwater LEP 2014.</p>		
Details of heritage items affected		
<p>Details of the heritage item, as contained within the Heritage Inventory, are: <b>Item 2270445 - Newport Surf Life Saving Club, 394 Barrenjoey Road, Newport</b></p> <p><u>Statement of Significance</u> The Newport Surf Life Saving Club, formed around 1911 as the early surf lifesaving club, has historic, social and aesthetic significance for the Newport community. It features characteristic elements of the Mediterranean club house including the light-coloured textured walling, the use of round arched openings and loggia, terraces and pitched tiled roof. It is an important local landmark building and it is historically and socially significant in the area representative of its type and period. The current building, built in 1933, has been subject to additions and modifications however, these do not reduce its ability in demonstrating the original design intention or presentation of the club as a Mediterranean club house. The listing includes the interiors of the building; however detailed analysis and assessment should be undertaken at the time of any future changes to the interior in order to ascertain the relative heritage significance.</p> <p><u>Physical Description</u> The club is located in an urban landscaped setting on the beach. The club is a two storey rendered brick structure with terracotta tile roof, arched window openings with moulded architraves and multi-pane sash timber joinery. Later extensions are of similar but simplified style and detail. Typical features of the Mediterranean club house include the light-coloured textured walling, the use of round arched openings and loggia, terraces and pitched tiled roof.</p>		
Other relevant heritage listings		
Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	No	Comment if applicable
Australian Heritage Register	No	
NSW State Heritage Register	No	
National Trust of Aust (NSW) Register	No	
RAIA Register of 20th Century Buildings of	No	

Significance		
Other	No	

### Consideration of Application

This application proposes alterations and additions to the Newport Surf Club building, along with coastal protection works involving a submerged wall to protect the existing building from the effects of future coastal events.

The works propose partial demolition of the surf club building, changes to the internal floor plan on both the ground and first floors, along with a new 2 storey extension on the northern end. This extension is to accommodate more storage on ground level and a committee room, training room, bar and open terrace area on the 1st floor. As mentioned, the application also proposes submerged coastal protection works.

As the building is listed as a local heritage item in Schedule 5 of Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014, it is subject to the provisions of Clause 5.10 of the LEP, which includes the following objectives:

(a) to conserve the environmental heritage of Pittwater:

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

As Council is the applicant, heritage comment was sought from external heritage architects, PTW Architects.

They undertook a thorough examination of all relevant DA documents and provided a full report on their findings. It is noted that their brief did not include assessment of the proposed coastal protection works, being confined to the physical changes proposed to the Newport Surf Club building and its setting and the impact on the heritage significance of this item. The full report (PTW Architects - March 2022 - Revision C), has been provided, which includes a full review and assessment of relevant DA documentation.

In summary, PTW Architects could not support the current application, concluding that "*the DA documents provide an inadequate response in recognising the heritage significance of the place, including the aesthetic and social significance of the building*". The Recommendations of the Report are included, verbatim, below:

#### **"6.2 Recommendations**

*An assessment of DA2021/2173 is not supported in its current form. This is confirmed in the tabulations of inadequacies identified under Sections 3 - 5 of this report, including the previous commentary.*

*While this report supports in principle the need to provide additional storage space and to modernise the public change rooms, along with a need to improve operational and economic viability of the club, the proposed alterations and additions to Newport Surf Club, a local heritage LEP item, has adverse heritage impact. This impact is not adequately assessed in the supporting SoHI document.*

*DA2021/2173 therefore cannot be supported on heritage grounds as confirmed by the following three reasons (refer Figure 11):*

#### **1 Inadequate visual and physical separation between the old and new**

*The proposed addition with a new eaves line and projecting west facing wing, do not satisfactory distinguish the old from the new. This adverse impact is therefore unacceptable.*

**Recommendation 1A and 1B:** *Amend the design so that the proposed eaves line is more sympathetic in detail and that the projecting two storey west facing wing is positioned further away*

*from the historic item. To the proposed addition: provide an eaves line which reinterprets the original Mediterranean style eave; and provide a larger recess (that is, a negative joint) adjacent to the existing building (say in the order of 2m) so that a greater physical and visual separation is provided.*

### **2 Failure to retain internal highly significant fabric**

*Removal of the original volumetric form of the upper-level Hall is unacceptable, given that the CMP identifies this as fabric of high significance. This adverse impact is therefore not supported.*

*Furthermore, the SoHI does not assess the impact of the removal of original fabric and does not assess the loss of heritage significance.*

**Recommendation 2:** *Replan the upper-level portion of the proposed works so that the volumetric form of the Hall is retained. Consider relocating the lift and toilets so that the proposed addition retains the heritage significance of the place.*

### **3 An inadequate SoHI and an incomplete CMP**

*The SoHI is inadequate and doesn't fully assess the heritage impact of the proposal on the significance of the building and its setting. The CMP is incomplete and does not identify the moveable heritage items or establish how these items are to be conserved.*

**Recommendation 3:** *Revise the SoHI so that all impacts are assessed. Identify and assess the adverse and minor impacts once the architectural drawings are revised, as per the above recommendations. Seek to have the CMP revised so that moveable heritage items are identified along with how these items are to be conserved onsite. The architectural drawings should be revised to identify these items."*

Further supporting information on these points is found within the PTW Architects report.

In relation to the submerged coastal protection works, no objections are raised on heritage grounds. The works are primarily submerged and will not adversely affect views from and to the heritage building. Such works should ensure protection for the heritage building in the event of future coastal events, which will ensure the on-going social, historical and aesthetic significance of this heritage item. However, extreme care must be taken to ensure that the structural integrity of the heritage building is not affected during construction works.

**Therefore, based on the report from PTW Architects, this application cannot be supported on heritage grounds.**

### **Further Staff Consideration**

Based on these recommendations from PTW Architects, there are two main issues to be resolved:

- Comprehensive, updated heritage documents (CMP and SoHI) need to be prepared and submitted, to fully assess the impact of the works proposed by the DA (including changes to internal fabric and moveable heritage); and
- Further work is needed on the design of the new addition and its relationship to the original building and the external treatment of the addition and the eastern facade.

The SoHI needs to be updated to assess the submitted DA plans and to fully assess the impact of the proposed works on the heritage significance of the item, based on the policies contained within the CMP. This should include assessment of the removal of fabric identified as being significant in the CMP (i.e. the main hall), as well as assessment of the impact of the proposal on the many items of moveable heritage which are currently in the surf club. The CMP should also be updated to include moveable heritage.

The design of the new addition and treatment of the eastern facade needs to be reviewed in light of

the comments contained in the report by PTW Architects. Consideration should be given to ways that the new addition can be designed to be separated from the heritage building or give the appearance of separation. The materials, colours and detailing of the northern extension also need to be revised, including an alternative to the use of external shading. Some changes also need to be made to the detailing of the eastern facade, so as to be more sympathetic with the aesthetic character of the original building (e.g. not using glass balustrades).

**NOTE:** Recommendation 2 from PTW Architects will be reassessed upon the receipt of an updated SoHI which addresses the impact of the removal of the original volumetric form of the main hall on the heritage significance of the item. This will be done taking into account the updated SoHI, the social and historical significance of the surf club and the need for the building to continue to be used as a functioning surf club into the future

Consider against the provisions of CL5.10 of PLEP 2014:

Is a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) Required? YES

Has a CMP been provided? YES (dated October 2020)

Is a Heritage Impact Statement required? YES

Has a Heritage Impact Statement been provided? YES (dated October 2020 - not based on DA plans)

COMPLETED BY: Janine Formica, Heritage Planner (based on heritage advice received from PTW Architects)

DATE: 30 March 2022

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

**Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:**

Nil.