
Sent: 17/09/2021 3:56:50 PM

Subject: DA2020.1756 351 Barrenjoey Rd Newport

Attachments: Submission re DA 2020.1756 351 Barrenjoey Rd - comment on new plan variations.pdf;

We refer to the above DA and the modified plans lodged on the 27th August and wish to make the following submission.

Thank you

Gavin Butler

President

Newport Residents Assn



Newport Residents Association Inc.

PO Box 1180

Newport Beach NSW 2106

President - Gavin Butler (gebutler@aapt.net.au) 0409 395 102

Vice-President - Kyle Hill 0412 221 962

Hon. Secretary - (wendydunnet@gmail.com) 0418 161 074

Hon. Treasurer - Glenn Moore 0418 609 207

www.newport.org.au

17th September 2021

The Chief Executive Officer,
Northern Beaches Council,
PO Box 1336,
Dee Why, NSW 2099

Dear Sir,

Re Submission re DA 2020/1756 351 & 353 Barrenjoey Rd Newport – comments re Plan Variations

We refer to the above amended DA and the varied plans which appear on the council website dated 27th August 2021 and the accompanying letter from the developers architects Crawford Architects dated 23rd August 2021 and appearing on the website 27th August 2021. We wish to make the following responses to the points raised in that letter which we believe are significant.

Driveway Access Issues

1. The Crawford responses with the amended plans noted the difficulty of ramping up, safety and RMS queuing concerns if the driveway moved closer to Barrenjoey Rd. **It should be pointed out quite strongly that the same Architects Crawford's designed the DA opposite at 349 Barrenjoey Rd** wherein they were able to design a vehicle access off Roberston Rd closer to Barrenjoey Rd (closer than half way.). They were able to manage the ramping issues quite comfortably in that design so it is impossible to see how they cannot do it across the road with the same gradient etc. The Traffic consultants Crawfords used for 349 Barrenjoey Rd did not raise any safety issues with the vehicle entrance distance from Barrenjoey Rd.
2. The *seamless continuity of the shop front glazing experience* rates poorly compared to value to the community of a plaza in the future.
3. A redesign could accommodate *Back-Of-House services* for a mid-site ramp.
4. It is unlikely that the greatly reduced parking availability would result in queuing concerns due to the corresponding reduction in traffic volume if the removal of one level of parking was approved.
5. As safety is *the most important consideration* then the safety of Robertson Road would be best improved with no through traffic providing for a plaza in the future.
6. The removal of the second level of basement parking provides an enormous benefit to the applicant and not much benefit to the community unless the position of the entrance was moved east.

7. The amended proposal does not address the main concern raised by the community by removing the potential for the future provision of a plaza in Robertson Road. It is unreasonable to depend on a Post Office site redevelopment for the communities' vision to be achieved. The proposed position of the access driveway has not changed and the proposal therefore does not support the intent of the Newport Masterplan and should not be approved.
8. In addition to item (7) above, under the Newport Masterplan Item 4.7.1 Streets –states succinctly: *“Design Robertson Road to be able to be closed off to vehicle traffic for special events that open the whole street and associated public plaza to pedestrians.”* Nowhere in the DA has a proposal been put forward to allow this provision to be achieved and until such time it does the DA cannot be considered for approval.


Other Non-compliance issues

1. D10.9 of the Pittwater DCP, which states a 6.0m rear setback at ground level is required has been ignored with Crawford's claiming both the north-east and north-west boundaries are side boundaries. While this is a reasonable assumption on a corner site this means the application should still setback from the corner point by 6m along both boundaries and therefore reducing density and allowing good landscaping. This still provides development greater than would be permissible on a regular site. Some version of this setback was anticipated in the Newport Masterplan especially as this corner adjoins the heritage listed St John's church and is subject to a variety of future pedestrian outcomes in the NMP Built Form Fig 4.9.1, 4.2 Open Space Fig. 4.2, and 4.5 Pedestrian and Cycle Network Fig. 4.5.
2. The third level addressing Barrenjoey Road continues to ignore the DCP Newport Masterplan 5.5.2 to incorporate the required minimum 3m. setback from the common boundary on the third level, again with adverse visual impact, particularly when viewing the exposed side party wall from Barrenjoey road. This is likely to remain very prominent for years to come as the adjoining plaza shops are in multiple ownerships and unlikely to be redeveloped soon. Non-compliance with this requirement of the DCP results in greater building density as well as a lost opportunity for better amenity (sunlight and seabreezes) along the desirable north-eastern boundary. The stated outcomes of the Newport Masterplan include that new developments are of two storeys visually and this setback is critical to this outcome. Allowing noncompliance with this makes a mockery of the planning controls.
3. Some height limits still exceeds the DCP & LEP. Whilst the new plans have made an allowance down to 8.5m in the centre of Robertson Road that allowance does not go back far enough at the north-western end and needs to be at 8.5m for the total Lot as per the diagram Figure 5.5.2 Height on page 51 of the NMP.

SUMMARY

To achieve the Village aims for Newport we strongly believe that the proposed development needs to be redesigned to avoid non-compliances with Pittwater 21 DCP and in particular the provisions of the Newport Village Centre Masterplan.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink on a light green rectangular background. The signature is cursive and appears to read 'Gavin Butler'.

Gavin Butler
President