

14/4/2020

Local Planning Panel
Northern Beaches Council
DA 2019/1280
Attention: Peter Robinson, Executive Manager Development Assessment

This submission is in response to Council's advice to approve DA 2019/1280.

This application is a 'contentious' development with 19 submissions of complaint received. It is 'a departure from development standards' exceeding >12% in height and 50% in setback.

It is 'sensitive development' in Council's own terms,
And 'impacting on surrounding land/premises'.

In this submission of our objections to Council's reasons for approval of the DA, and the developer's defence, we find their arguments for approval inappropriate, illogical, inconsistent, insufficient and irrelevant. Therefore, we strongly request that you find against the approval as it stands.

We give reasons for this as follows.

We are residents living opposite this development in Beaconsfield Street, and have no objections to a development within compliant standards. This DA does not comply.

This part of Newport known as 'little Newport' is not the major commercial centre that is 1.5 kms away, but a small hub of local shops. It has a character of its own.

It is worrying that mention in Council's report is of 'the future character of this zone'. What is this future character as it was not mentioned in any community consultations we attended? We value the one that we have now. This development application that exceeds Council's own regulations is setting a dangerous benchmark for what may become our changed 'future character'.

1.

4.6 Excessive height, scale and bulk of development

The height of this building is 1.1 metres in excess of the 8.5 allowed. Justification for this is an empty argument, just installing solar panels is not sufficient reason to exceed height restriction and make this a 4-storey development. If this installation is essential, the development should be lowered to accommodate this. Council should therefore reject the applicant's proposed building height.

A rooftop terrace with a roof cover for solar panels and shade is not sufficient justification for the impact of a 4-storey height on the street view.

The height, bulk and scale of this development is unreasonable and unnecessary and is “incompatible with the height and scale of surrounding nearby development” that is within height restrictions and set back appropriately.

2.

D10.11 Non compliant setback

We notice in the list of criteria for compliance, that this is left out as a non-compliant factor and therefore not seen to be a ‘no’ – not compliant.

21 Pittwater Development Control Plan

It is clear that the setback of the front building line on both Beaconsfield and Queens Parade is non compliant by 53.8%

The building frontline (D10.7) on Beaconsfield Street is equivalent to 4 storeys with the canopy on the roof terrace. This set back is far from acceptable and adds to a street scape of imposing bulk and scale.

The argument to achieve the ‘desired future character’ mentioned more than once in this report of the locality cannot justify such a great violation of the Development Control Plan. The non-compliance is found to have maximum impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

3. Traffic Safety and Congestion

We do not find that this has been adequately addressed by telling us that the back-up of traffic down Beaconsfield street caused by the school and the lights is outside the scope of this report. This DA will severely impact this problem, not decrease it. The argument that more parking is created for the development’s residents is not an argument for possibly 36 more cars to be regularly on this already busy road.

4. Inconsistencies in the reporting

p. 187 of the agenda

It is noted that for Driveway and Access comments “Council Development Engineers is unable to support this application” and deemed the access arrangement to be unacceptable. However the report states that there are ‘no Development Engineering objections subject to conditions’. We find this inconsistent. What are these conditions please?

In summary, the DA is inconsistent with Pittwater DCP21, an unnecessary violation of Pittwater PLP, has an inadequate traffic report and is insufficient in addressing residents’ objections.

Yours sincerely

Wendy Batchelor

On behalf of all residents of 75 Beaconsfield Street, Newport.