

## Summary of Proposal for Reinstatement of the Haven Stage

### Introduction

- 1 Friends of the Haven (FOH), Haven Amphitheatre Management Committee (HAC), and Haven Promotions Inc (HPI) are 3 community organisations dedicated to the redevelopment of the Haven. They have developed a detailed design proposal for the Haven redevelopment (as an alternative to the Council's DA-approved design), for consideration by the community. By way of summary, the proposal:
  - (a) substantially replicates the position, size, design and functionality of the stage and undercroft demolished in 2016. The stage straddles the gully and creek, between the terraced seating of the natural Haven amphitheatre. It sits low in the valley, with its front edge nestled naturally into the contours of the gully sides. The stage surface can be painted the colours of the bush. Its back edge is gently curved. Its positioning allows the stage undercroft to be obscured from almost all angles in the gully. The overall effect is to create the illusion that the stage comprises part of the natural floor of the gully. The proponents contend that it is the bare minimum size reasonably necessary to stage the performances and events of the type historically staged at the Haven;
  - (b) seeks to rebuild the Haven as a striking and unique embodiment of the Griffin philosophy of the integration of nature, the built environment, community, and the performing arts;
  - (c) seeks to resurrect the Haven as the dynamic cultural and community hub of Castlecrag. The Proposal provides for a stage which can accommodate a broad range of theatrical and musical performances and other community gatherings and events.

### Comparison to DA Design

- 2 Some key differences with the Council's DA Design are that:
  - (a) *Shape*. The Proposal has a curved oval-shaped design which hugs the gully contours. The DA design is triangular, with a straight front edge which does not align with the gully contours, rendering it more obtrusive in the sensitive Haven setting.
  - (b) *Location*. The DA design is located further up the Haven creek, covering a waterfall and requiring the removal of several beautiful and prominent tree palms. The location of the DA Design necessitates raising of the height of the stage, again rendering its placement more obtrusive in the gully;
  - (c) *Ramps*. A key feature of the DA design is a ramp system for disabled access, causing a stark and substantial incursion into the bush setting, and requiring the removal of a number of significant tree ferns and a significant portion of terraced seating on the northern slope. The Proposal abandons the ramps, and includes either a disabled viewing platform on the Barricade, or a discreet platform chairlift. The estimated cost of the chairlift is under \$100,000, compared to \$300,000 for the ramp system;

- (d) *Stage surface.* The DA Design provides for a wharf-like raised timber deck (over an independent waterproof roof for the undercroft). The Proposal involves a light-weight composite material, which is superior because it requires less maintenance, can be painted the colours of the bush, allows the stage to sit lower in the gully, and is generally a more appropriate performance surface.
- 3 Some key similarities are that both: (a) include a toilet and undercroft (being a simple water-proof, lockable room under the stage, which is regarded as critical for performance, and which is invisible from almost all angles in the Haven); (b) straddle the creek bed.

### **Respect for Natural Heritage**

- 4 The Proposal is consistent with the Griffin philosophy that the built environment be subservient to nature:
  - (a) the Proposal substantially replicates the footprint of the (small) demolished stage;
  - (b) the construction of the stage will not necessitate the removal or destruction of any significant tree ferns or trees in the gully;
  - (c) as noted in paragraph 1(a) above, there are a number of features of the stage design which cause the stage to integrate unobtrusively with its bushland setting.
  - (d) the undercroft will be invisible from most viewing points;
  - (e) construction is not anticipated to require the use of cranes or other heavy machinery in the gully, thus significantly minimising potential collateral damage to the natural environment during the construction phase;
  - (f) To the extent that the reinstatement of the stage has some impact on the Haven natural environment, that is consistent with the Griffin philosophy of the sympathetic integration of the built and natural environment:

### **Costings**

- 5 *Stage and undercroft and viewing balcony.* An independent builder has provided a preliminary estimate of \$600,000.
- 6 *Disabled chair lift.* Preliminary estimates in early 2018 for the disabled chair lift (referred to in paragraph 2(c)**Error! Reference source not found.** above) was up to \$90,000.
- 7 By way of comparison to the DA Design, Council suggested the cost to build according to the DA Design (including ramps) would be \$1,388,000 (\$1,088,000 for the stage plus \$300,000 for ramps).

# A

**Fig 1 Photo of the Haven Stage demolished in 2016**



**Fig 2 Concept sketch of the Proposed Stage overlaid on Fig 1 Photo**



**In Fig 2:**

The stage to have a semicircular rear.

The pre stage area is a flat area for sets and equipment used during a performance. Behind this area there would be a ramp to facilitate loading stage equipment Both are based on the demolished stage.

The connecting bridge was the planked area over the waterfall. An option in the Proposal is to link the northern and western seating so providing a premier seating position.

This bridge area needs to be raised to comply with the hydrology report specification to allow space above the waterfall.

The stage is set below the waterfall as did the demolished stage. Final stage height will be determined by the stage surface design, hydrology report and undercroft ceiling height.