
Sent: 6/09/2019 3:23:49 PM
Subject: Online Submission

06/09/2019

MR Robert Robert Mather
- 78 Queenscliff RD
Queenscliff NSW 2096
robertmather@me.com

RE: DA2019/0845 - 68 A Queenscliff Road QUEENSCLIFF NSW 2096

To whom it may concern, we write with respect to DA2019/0845

We live a few doors up from the subject site and although not directly adjacent, stand to be affected by the development in terms of the impact it will have on our neighbourhood community and character.

We will be pleased to see the possible return of a Cafe/Restaurant, bringing much needed convenience to the area and naturally, are positive about the redevelopment of the site which presently contains an unused, dilapidated building.

We see the site as a great opportunity to make something which fits in to the area and enhances the neighbourhood, however we feel that the proposed development may achieve the opposite. We have listed our concerns below, some of which we have had the benefit of an Architect friend assist us in articulating.

Rooftop Terrace

The provision of private open space on the roof has an unreasonable impact on the amenity of neighbours as noise from activity on the roof will travel further and overlooking from the roof to adjacent properties will be severe.

The roof terrace is not in keeping with the desired character of the area.

It is potentially dangerous as council cannot control the use of loose objects which may be blown off the roof in the high winds the area regularly experiences.

The provision of a roof terrace in this case poses as an expression of greed and causes unnecessary negative impact as it sits upon a structure which is already in breach of the height limit.

It would set a poor precedent to future development in the area.

Height

Due to the large height exceedance, the development does not fit in with desired future character of the area.

The impact of the development's bulk and scale is not minimised.

The large exceedance in height would set a poor precedent and may have the unforeseen impact of contributing to and accelerating an agglomerated affect of incremental height limit breach.

Parking

Because the area is not well serviced by public transport, parking spaces should be allocated in at least the rates council suggests in the DCP.

If parking capacity is a limitation, perhaps this suggests that less apartments should be built on

the site.

We wonder if the applicant has adequately explored and ruled out car stacking solutions? We note the torturous vehicular driveway in the basement and wonder whether the solution proposed of having to make 5 or more movements to get in and out of a car space with a small car (only) is practical for residents.

Appearance

The proposed development has blank, dominant facades which are not cohesive or well proportioned.

It's appearance and materials do not respond to or contribute positively to the neighbourhood context.

It's patchwork of screens and boxes applied to the facades is a thinly veiled attempt at disguising the plain, bulky mass of the proposal.

Lift shaft and 'privacy walls' on rooftop have the effect of creating a bulky, deformed roof line, appearing messy, out of scale and out of character.

This site is in a dramatic, elevated location. A building on this site has the potential to be iconic and to have a positive contribution to the local identity. As currently proposed, the design of the development is placeless, generic and inapposite. The building should be redesigned to reflect some of the recent good examples of local shop top housing such as some located on Pittwater Road, Manly.

Cafe

The residential levels of the development are blank, dominant and not significantly differentiated from the retail levels. This prevents the development from performing it's principal character role in creating a 'village like atmosphere'. If the residential levels were set back from Queenscliff Road, or there was a street awning to Queenscliff Road, the Cafe would have more prominence and the residential facades may recede.

A street awning would have the further benefit of controlling noise from the cafe and providing protection to the footpath from sun and rain. Note: we often see pedestrians resting under the existing awning in the rain on their way up the hill.

The cafe should have a higher ceiling of 4M so that it has a better chance of viability through increased presence and serviceability. This is required of other similar developments in compliance with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) fig. 4C.1

Landscape

The proposal provides little in the way of soft landscaping within the site, however, some pathways, lawn and trees are proposed to be located on council land adjacent to Queenscliff Road. Due to it's importance, this area should be designed by a landscape architect in conjunction with council to ensure the needs of the local community, the cafe operator and council's maintenance team are met satisfactorily.

Amenity

We believe that having good amenity is key to a happy, healthy functioning community, especially when it comes to apartment living. We believe this proposal has some shortcomings which have not been addressed adequately by the applicant or their architect as follows:

Privacy - The visual and acoustic privacy between this development and it's southern neighbour's living spaces and Private Open Space is uncomfortable and inadequate. Objective 3F-1 in the ADG is clear in stating equitable application of required separation distances which this proposal falls well short of.

Deep Soil Landscape - The proposal falls short of the 7% required in the ADG

Storage - the proposal has inadequate internal storage, falling well short of the ADG minimum requirement. This will lead to residents using balconies as makeshift storage which will be

unsightly and will reduce the liveability of the space.

Ceiling height of Cafe/Restaurant - falls short of 4M requirement (ADG fig. 4C.1) this affects viability of cafe and presentation of building.

Safety

The roof top deck presents a safety concern in that loose items of furniture or plants may be blown off in high winds

More seriously, the 'tilt stair' in unit 4 presents a fire egress impediment when in use. This could result in injury or worse in the event of a fire.

In summary, while we are happy about the prospect of development of the site occurring and by the return of a cafe/Restaurant to the area, we feel disappointed that the design is not of a higher standard and that it does not embrace and enhance it's unique location. We hope that the design may be improved significantly and that those improvements will be recognised by council in turn, but as the application stands, we strongly object.

Sincerely,

Rob Mather