



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 9 December 2021

1 - DA2021 2173 - 394 Barrenjoey Road NEWPORT

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

Development Application no. 2021/2173 seeks development consent for alterations and additions to the Newport Surf Life Saving Club (SLSC) located at 394 Barrenjoey Road, Newport.

The site is owned by Northern Beaches Council and is the applicant.

The Panel notes that the Council has consulted widely on the project. Surf Life Saving Clubs are an important part of the community and on the northern beaches in particular.

The Panel therefore takes the amount of floor space required, and the need for lounge, meeting, training storage and operational spaces as given. The Panel understands that the amenity and quality of the facilities including spaces for hire and general community use is a significant factor in attracting membership and participation in the club activities and are integral to the club's viability.

The architect presented a comprehensive analysis of the spatial requirements and interrelationships between functional spaces. Again, these will be taken as given.

Nevertheless, the Panel notes that the building is large and changes the appearance and presentation of the existing building, which though modified, is a good example of the 'Mediterranean style' surf clubs typical of the 1930s and the Northern Beaches.

Scale, built form and articulation, façade treatment, aesthetics, heritage.

These matters are interrelated.

Heritage

The Panel recognises that the original 1933 building has been significantly modified and is no longer fit for purpose.

Given these factors and that the built fabric and form of the building is not of exceptional significance, it is the Panel view that further significant modification of the building are acceptable but that the differentiation of the new wing and old building should be more pronounced and clearer.

For these reasons:

- The Panel does not support the extension of the gabled roof as this destroys the symmetry of the original building when viewed from the landside and is not consistent with the principles of the Burra Charter, in particular in relation to guidance for new work which states:

Imitative solutions should generally be avoided: they can mislead the onlooker and may diminish the strength and visual integrity of the original. Well-designed new work can have a positive role in the interpretation of a place.

Burra Charter Article 22 – New Work

- The symmetry of the seaward side of the building has already been compromised by the boat store and external stair.

The proposed removal of the stair will help reveal the original form of the building, however the overall appearance will remain as an assembly of heterogeneous elements; there is little point in attempting to formalise or clarify the eastern elevation.



The modifications to the original toilet block to accommodate 'plant' in the north and to extend the male change rooms are not supported and result in very awkward roof arrangements.

Recommendations

1. The gable roof should not be extended over the new section
2. There should be a clear separation of the new sections of the building from the old. This could include a recessive 'joining section' in neutral materials and incorporate the stair within the mass of the joining section of the building
3. In order to achieve #2, consideration could be given to cantilevering the upper storey of the new wing north ward, that would serve to reduce the apparent bulk of building but also further articulate the new from the old.
4. The articulation of the two sections of the building should also occur on the beach side with a clear expression of the new building from the old. This would be relatively easy to achieve.
5. The use of glass balustrading, particularly on the south eastern corner of the old building is questioned. Consideration should be given to the use of masonry and terracotta exclusively for balustrades and modifications to the old section of the building. Delineation of the new from the old could be achieved by subtle changes in colour or materials, just as is evident in the slightly different roof tile colours in the existing building.
6. The new section of the building could be more clearly expressed as a 'box' on the north eastern corner where the delineation of the old and new is particularly weak and ambiguous. This could be achieved by allowing the new section of terrace to project further seaward, and by continuing the screen elements in some form along the entire northern façade.
7. There should not be modifications to the original toilet blocks to accommodate 'plant' in the north and male toilets in the south- re-plan to keep these within the existing walls

Access, vehicular movement and car parking, landscape

Given the prominence of the new addition that projects into the car park, the Panel suggests that a reconfiguration of the car parking arrangements combined with a more extensive landscape scheme that provides a more generous setting for the old building would be desirable.

The Panel notes the arboricultural report and recommendations and relies on its conclusions despite the significant impacts that have been identified.

Recommendation

8. Develop a landscape scheme for the broader site and reconfigure car parking to provide a more generous landscape setting.

Amenity

The dimensions of the public change rooms and toilets appear tight and appear to be designed to minimum clearances. The entry doors have an awkward relationship to the cubicles.

The location on the southern side is not ideal and it would be unfortunate if the spaces need to be continually artificially lit. The female facilities are currently naturally lit and ventilated, and the male facilities appear to have been reduced in size.

One of the joys of facilities built in the 1930s was their open-air sunlit character that was characteristic and seems to have been lost in many more recent facilities that are often dank and dark. Compare Nielsen Park and Manly or Freshwater for example.

Greater attention appears to have been given to the club facilities compared to the public facilities. There appears to have been a reduction in the area of the male facilities



Recommendations

9. Review dimensions and circulation within the male and female public amenities. All toilets and change rooms should be naturally lit and ventilated.
10. Consider re-arranging the urinals, cubicles and change facilities to provide more generous spaces.
11. Consider incorporating an accessible stall in in each of the male and female change/toilets (check whether such an arrangement would be compliant.) This might also be possible for the upstairs toilets.

Sustainability

The building achieves NCC compliance, specifically:

Section J compliance is only required for all new building work including fabric and services. The new building work should not reduce the existing building's level of energy efficiency.

All existing construction will not need to be upgraded to Section J requirements. Only the fabric (glazing and walls) on the envelope that is new need comply with this report. Where the new work provides access to the existing roof cladding, wall cladding or wall lining, insulation should be added where practical to comply with this Part.

The NCC is a blunt instrument that gives little consideration to the particular circumstances on a site.

In the case of the surf club, it could be argued that it will be most important to have the lettable hall air-conditioned but less, so the other club training area given the seaside location.

It is hard to understand how the building has been modelled to come up with an estimate of 81.7987 MWhr- considering that the facility might be fully operational for say 200 days for 8 hours that is 1600 hours. $81.79\text{MWhr}/1600\text{hr} = \text{approx. } 50\text{kW}$ which seems extraordinarily high.

The point is not to question the modelling but to suggest that a more nuanced and detailed approach is taken in order to make the building as efficient as possible based on an understanding of its actual operation. This might mean greater emphasis is given to performance glass in some locations or retrofitting of insulation in others **even if not required by NCC.**

The Panel notes that the estimates use assumptions for occupancy and equipment as per JV Specification requirements for Class 5 buildings. It is likely that these bear little or no relation to the actual hours of operation or to the actual climatic and weather conditions. It would be interesting to benchmark and compare these estimates to the existing power demand and aim to maintain the same amount or less.

Recommendations

12. Develop a site-specific set of sustainability aims, objectives and targets that take into account the actual patterns of usage
13. Reconsider the amount of glazing (including the south east corner), and the operability of the sliding/bifold screens (compared to operable louvres)
14. Further consideration could be given to the specific uses in each part of the building and need for air conditioning.
15. Optimise the amount of PV taking into account over shadowing.
16. Consider utilising electric heat pump hot water and induction cooktops to replace the use of gas.
17. Add external windows to bathrooms and utility rooms wherever possible



PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.

There is a range of improvements that should be investigate including:

- Clearer articulation of the old and new
- Material choices that differentiate the old from the new
- Development of a broader site and landscape plan
- Amenity of public amenities