

## RECORD OF BRIEFING MEETING

Meeting Date: 29 November 2017

Meeting Time: 11:35 am to 12:45pm

<b>PANEL REF</b>	2017SSH029
<b>DA NUMBER</b>	DA17/1001
<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>	Partial demolition and alterations and additions to North Cronulla Surf Life Saving Club.at 62 Prince Street, Cronulla (North Cronulla Surf Life Saving Club)
<b>COUNCIL</b>	Sutherland Shire Council
<b>MEETING LOCATION</b>	Sutherland Shire Council, 4 Eton Street, Sutherland

## ATTENDEES

<b>PANEL MEMBERS</b>	Bruce McDonald – Acting Chair Steve Simpson Peter Scraysbrook
<b>COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF</b>	Mark Adamson Lauren Franks Carolyn
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	Morris Iemma and Nicole Gurran

## KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED – further details on the following:

### Ownership and Probity Issues

- Council is the land owner and leases it the surf club.
- The site is surrounded by Crown Land.
- Should there be a review considering Council is the owner of the site addressing;
  - a) Councils role in preparing assessment
  - b) Councils role in undertaking / assessing the development
- Councillors cannot be involved in determining the DA.
- Council is contributing \$750,000 to the development so Council is significantly involved.

- Intent of LEP is that surf living clubs become self-sufficient however the permissibility's and objectives are the determining issues.
- Council needs to have constructive and collaborative discussions with the surf club as they are receiving over \$750,000 in funds from council.
- Balance competing proposals, e.g., impacts on Dunningham Park, commercial venture, but assessed with same vigor as any other applicant.

#### Prohibited Use issues

- Are these proposed services permitted use in that location?
- They can have a kiosk and gym but concerns over 'function centre' which is a prohibited use.
- Comparisons made to restaurants at other surf clubs. That is a restaurant and therefore not deemed to be a 'function centre'.
- Over 700sq metre area shown on floor plan so reasonable to assume would be used as a function area.
- Need intentions from applicant as to how the area is to be used.
- Issue of permissibility to be addressed.

#### Heritage Issues

- Part of the building is a local heritage item as is Dunningham Park.
- Plan of management requested from applicant.
- The heritage component of the building is defined on the plans (in 'yellow') There have been other additions, not heritage, added over time.
- Old extensions proposed to be demolished.
- The building form encroached about 10 metres into Dunningham Park and would require removal of a Norfolk Island pine. Council's Heritage Architect did not have a concern with removal of a tree.
- Other Norfolk Island pines will need pruning.
- No Heritage Management Conversation Plan has been provided.
- Heritage Management Conversation Plan will be asked for from the applicant and then that may define what is to be impacted.
- Context of Heritage Management Conversation Plan requires a response.

#### Architecture Issues

- Councils own staff architect has been asked to look at how to reduce bulk and scale. Looked at comments made to date and balance that with what the surf club want.
- In terms of this application, council's architects have tried to assist in working with the applicant to achieve a suitable outcome for all parties.
- The ARAP panel gave their opinions and council architect has taken those comments into account and is addressing those in the options that will be provided to the applicant. It is not council's design, just a provision of design options.
- Relationship at rear in Dunningham Park and access lane issues. Does not have community 'back of house' appeal from the park. No goods lift, no materials delivery

area defined.

- Is this therefore a start again proposition? What is actually being proposed and is the impact acceptable on the Heritage items.
- Need to go back to fundamental stage and almost start again so bulk and form responds to Heritage form.

#### Noise / Privacy Issues

- Residents have voiced concerns from dwellings adjacent to proposed
- Residents need to be assured in conditions that noise from proposed balconies comply with standards.
- Provisions in coastal SEP that it minimizes overshadowing and lack of view.
- Must consider visual / scenic amenity, & bulk and scale of proposed development.

#### Bulk and Scale Issues

- Pre DA held in 2015. Subsequent discussions with council staff as to incorporation of community needs proposed in the application.
- Concerns over the overall bulk and scale.
- Only have kiosk as income stream for surf club.
- A meeting is planned with the applicant and the numerous council stakeholders.
- Panel will be kept updated on developments from meetings.