
From: Rowan Hanley
Sent: 16/01/2023 12:55:13 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc: Brendan Donohoe
Subject: TRIMMED: Application no. REV2022/0024 : Review of Determination of Application DA2021/2173
Attachments: Newport SLSC Appeal Submission FINAL.pdf;

Dear Adam,

Please find attached Surfrider Foundation Northern Beaches submission regarding the review of the Planning Panel's determination for DA 2021/2173.

We and the waves thank you.

Warmest,
Rowan

Rowan Hanley
Branch Secretary
Surfrider Northern Beaches
30 Years of protecting waves & beaches

Surfrider Foundation acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of Country upon which we work & live. We pay our respects to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, their cultures, their elders past, present and emerging and the continuing connection they have to land, sea, sky and community.



Newport SLSC Development-Appeal of Planning Panel Decision Surfrider Foundation (Surfrider) was a participant in the original Planning Panel deliberations regarding the Newport SLSC upgrade Development Application (DA) and is strongly opposed to the appeal by Northern Beaches Council (Council) to have the DA refusal overturned.

Surfrider is not opposed to the development of facilities befitting the proud traditions of Newport SLSC in any way however we vigorously oppose the current proposition of protecting the current building by constructing a concrete seawall to protect it.

Surfrider is not calling for the immediate demolition of the old club.

As evidenced in the supporting documentation, Council has decided to ignore a prior Pittwater Council decision requiring any major renovation of the club to relocate it to a less vulnerable site in terms of storm inundation. In doing so Council has chosen to follow a subsequent Plan of management which inappropriately over-rode the available hazard studies behind the previous decision and failed to take into account a more recent hazard study which again demonstrated the vulnerability of Newport beach and the surf clubhouse. Council also poorly advised the Newport SLSC that the current proposal meets the requirements of the previous and current Coastal Acts. It does not!

This is the third attempt by Council to convince experts of the planning panel of the validity of this logically flawed proposal (particularly when factoring in Climate Change considerations as required by the Coastal Management Act 2016) and once again Council appears to go to its current modus operandi of commissioning reports to satisfy its highly contentious coastal management practices.

The claims made by many of the same council staff and consultants about suitability of a brutalist destructive vertical concrete seawall at Collaroy/Narrabeen by selectively quoting parts of WRL/MHL reports and claiming they endorse the design where no such endorsement exists are again seemingly on display here with this DA.

Over the past decade, Council staff seemed to have convinced themselves that somehow a greatly altered, poorly sited and damaged 90 year old building must be preserved, not restored but preserved. The clubhouse was a rare inclusion on a very incomplete local heritage list that has so obviously failed to list a plethora of privately owned buildings of greater significance to the area apparently as an example to the community. The same Council has allowed some of Sydney's greatest examples of seaside architecture to be replaced with inappropriate buildings, but now the heritage considerations of a broken building somehow override the heritage considerations of the very beach it was commissioned to serve.

The Conservation Management Plan by Heritage21 quite heavily quoted by the Rhelm Report (3.4) Heritage, is essentially a description of the building rather than a statement of significance. The Rhelm report clearly fails to quote the Heritage21 Report section 4.1.2 on page 21/52 Statement of Cultural Significance of the that states "the clubhouse has been significantly altered and retains limited significant

fabric” and the “interior of the building has been significantly altered,the exterior has undergone several additions to its northern and southern wings reducing its historic bulk and scale”

People do not love Newport Beach because of its surf club, they love the beach.

The documents provided clearly show wave sunup lines currently landward of the most landward extent of the current building and indeed virtually the extent of the proposed new extension. The building is designed to last 60 years where the expected wave sunup lines are clearly marked as having migrated significantly inland!

Having badly advised the Newport SLSC for the best part of a decade the Council officers have pursued an agenda of appeasing a desire to keep a building well past its used by date. To achieve this, and in 2023, with all the current disaster relief stories and associated costs to society filling news services around the country and world, it is proposed that thousands of tonnes of concrete be injected into a fore-dune in seeming direct contradiction of the Coastal Management Act 2016 at an estimated cost of over \$3M.

That this action defies logic is obvious.

Highly regarded, greatly experienced experts have warned of the damage the wall will cause to the beach compartment that includes Bilgola.

An independent planning advisory panel has found unanimously against Council's proposal (twice, when a week to show cause finding from original hearing is taken into account). This has been swiftly appealed by Council using more public money to commission supportive 'expert' reports for its position, rather than genuine assessment of the panel's findings.

That vast amounts of public money would be expended in such a profligate and damaging manner while resources are seemingly so scarce for good coastal management practices beggars belief.

Reports have been commissioned at public expense to justify the ill-conceived and rejected DA that do not properly address the issues raised by the planning panel with regard to the Coastal Act, in a way that clearly indicates a preference for an identified desired outcome as opposed to a properly considered one that would not cause the community intergenerational maintenance problems of increasing magnitude.

Surfrider has strongly opposed this DA from the first time it was presented. We have never sought to thwart the development of necessary facilities to carry out the core functions of surf lifesaving and have applauded the seeming lack of commercialisation proposed that has been evident at both Avalon and Mona Vale SLSC redevelopments.

Surfrider strongly supports the unanimous findings of the Sydney North Planning Panel in refusing the current DA for Newport SLSC. We implore that the same panel of proven coastal experts is repanelled to hear the appeal and critique the newly commissioned reports or if that is not possible that a panel of similarly skilled and experienced coastal experts be found.

For further details regarding this submission please contact: Brendan Donohoe President Surfrider Foundation Australia Northern Beaches Branch

E:

M:

