



# INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Lauren Franks - Development Assessment Officer  
**FROM:** Peter Brooker  
**DATE:** 30 August 2019  
**FILE REF:** DA17/1001  
**SUBJECT:** Development Application No. DA17/1001  
 Description: Partial demolition of existing surf club and alterations and additions to North Cronulla Surf Life Saving Club  
 Property: 62 Prince Street CRONULLA NSW 2230

---

## COMMENT on REVISED DESIGN

In regard to the DRF review of the original proposal and the matters raised, the revised design in comparison has moved to a more resolved layout of internal spaces together with more appropriate external finishes.

The DRF comments of the proposal as reviewed at that time were:-

- 1. It is regrettable that the interface between the perimeter of the building and the park land setting has not been explored in a meaningful way. The serviceability aspect creates a hard edged, defensive and undesirable division of the building to the open public area that also raises concerns of public safety*

Response: this comment was more of an observation that the open park land to the west of the building might have been an opportunity to engage the internal spaces with the parkland. However the conflict with the required back of house delivery and waste services spoiled that.

- 2. Heritage concepts. A stronger analysis and design argument in support of the design decisions as they specifically relate to the proposal's Heritage issues is required to support the outcomes of the CMP and, more broadly, to the Burra Charter guidelines.*

The original scheme was too dominant in its external presentation which undermined the Heritage Character of the existing building. The revised scheme 'blends' the new building forms in a respectful manner with the existing building. Although the new areas create a larger form than the existing, the proportions and horizontal articulation treatment of the new tends not visually compete to a level that distracts attention from the existing heritage building.

- 3. A limited and careful selection of the material palette based on a 'Fit for purpose' material criteria that is appropriate to its environment needs to be considered. In this*

*regard, by way of an example, you are referred to the palette of Angelo Candalepas's residential flat building at 29-35 Mitchell Rd as a precedent.*

The palette of colours and materials have been reduced from the original 9 selections and limited to a balanced and practical selection that are appropriate for the corrosive environment of this location.

*4. A simplification of form was suggested, in line with point 2 above, that results in a more simplified, rationalised and refined integration of the new building complex with the heritage facades and its presentation to Dunningham Park. In particular, the joining of the new wing to the heritage building along esplanade should be clearer and more decisive, with the NW additions to the heritage façade responding in a more thoughtful manner providing historical legibility, as prescribed in the Burra Charter.*

This has been undertaken resulting in a far less visually 'busy' building façade. The Esplanade view of the 'connection' of the new to the existing heritage building fits much more comfortably with the transparent nature of the link between the two. This allows the heritage character of the existing building to be better seen as an element in its own right.

The southern façade fronting Dunningham Park has been rationalised with reduced height and a less 'confused' arrangement of openings and finishes creating a much more refined and significantly less dominant building form. The engagement and treatment of the new to the existing along the western façade is far more thoughtful with a defined separation being created through the use of materials, colours and a defined transparent break.

A small 'imbalance' within the new building form are the higher parapets of the western egress stair 2 and southern Lift Foyer above the other parapet levels which creates a disconcerting and distracting emphasis on these relatively unimportant elements of the proposal. These should be lowered to match the adjoining parapet heights.

It is noted that there are differences in some of the proposed external finishes between the rendered and the line drawings which need to be resolved. In this regard it is suggested that the rendered drawing proposed finishes are the appropriate selections to be incorporated into the final design.

*5. The skillion roof looks out of place with the general building composition and would prove to be impractical and costly from a maintenance point of view in the long term.*

These roof forms have been removed which achieves the objectives of the DRF comments provided.

*6. Safety and the practical use of all access driveways should be prepared by the relevant experts to the satisfaction of council.*

The reconsidered planning of spaces that access the driveway areas has reduced the perceived numerous conflicts of access between vehicles and pedestrians and users of the complex. The safety of these areas is now more apparent and acceptable.

- 7. A more cohesive and articulate drawing package that addresses and simplifies all responses to the key issues should be presented in future iterations, facilitating a thorough comprehension to any third-party assessment.*

The documentation of the revisions has improved but could be better if considered in-conjunction with other disciplines such as landscape and services. However, there appears that there has been a better resolution in the planning and arrangement of the internal spaces which will assist in rationalising their connections to the internal and external infrastructures and external open spaces.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

*The issues noted above should be taken into account in a revised proposal to realise an outcome that could be supported by the Panel. The panel still feels many of the previous DRF review comments remain relevant requiring further or clearer refinements but chief of the concerns noted above in this DRF are that the built form and material quality of the proposal could be significantly improved.*

In light of the significant changes to the original proposal the resultant built form and material quality have achieved an appropriate and acceptable standard for this location and its relationship to the existing heritage building.

Peter Brooker – DRF Officer