

---

**Sent:** 11/06/2021 9:28:15 AM  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to Mod2021/0203 1102 Barrenjoey Road  
**Attachments:** Rydstrand - 1102 objection.pdf;

**From:** Prue Rydstrand <[prydstrand@googlemail.com](mailto:prydstrand@googlemail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 9 June 2021 10:12 PM  
**To:** Jordan Davies <[Jordan.Davies@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Jordan.Davies@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Cc:** Josh Taylor-Real <[josh@outlookplanningdevelopment.com.au](mailto:josh@outlookplanningdevelopment.com.au)>  
**Subject:** Re: Objection to Mod2021/0203 1102 Barrenjoey Road

Sorry I don't know if you can view the documents. I'll try again if not here is the content.

To Council,

We are residents of 1100 Barrenjoey Road, Palm Beach, on the southern boundary of 1102. We have engaged a town planner who is working on a formal submission, and will submit when ready. However, please find our initial concerns with this proposed iteration of the development below.

**1. The "modification" is substantially different to the original approved DA** in 2014 in both size, scale, design, optics and foot-print, for example (but not exhaustive)

- Proposal for development to extend further back into the eastern boundary

- 6 apartments instead of 4

- Substantially different design

- New wrap-around balconies overlooking our property and far less privacy for the main areas of our property

- Dual direction car entrance off Barrenjoey Road

- More glass and glazing,

- More (and changed) balconies and terraces

We struggle to find things that are unchanged vs the prior DA. **We would argue that this development warrants a new DA submission rather than a modification**, but we will leave that more in-depth discussion to the town planner's submission.

**2. The size of the development is too large**, the proposed height exceeds the restrictions, and we query whether the floor area breaches buildable area, per the land size. 6 apartments is way too many for this location, and will cause more acoustic and privacy issues than the original 4. We believe the development should be modified to adhere to the height restrictions and think a 2 storey building is a more appropriate size. It wouldn't dwarf Barrenjoey house then. The development also appears very dominant and out of place next to our normal sized house.

I refer to the recently denied application at Bilgola (BilambeeLn) where it was found the proposed height of 11.2m was in breach of the local height limit and the bulk and scale was out of character with the area. We argue it is similarly the case for this proposal, and note the surrounding Pittwater Park area is of arguably higher relevance to more people/the overall community (it has a Neighbourhood Centre zoning).

*Exhibit 1. Denied Bilgola 3 level shoptop apartments*



**3. Privacy is a serious issue and the proposed “modification” is a significant threat to our privacy.** The addition of 2 wrap-around balconies on our boundary overlook the most used areas of our house - the middle/upper levels look into our open dining and lounge room, sun room and balcony and our spa and outdoor area are totally exposed to onlookers. Floor to ceiling windows in the bedrooms also pose a risk to our privacy and amenity on the balcony, where we entertain often. **Overall, the proposed is an unacceptable level of privacy impact and a significant deviation from the original plans.** These had no wrap around balconies and were more sympathetic to our privacy. We don't subscribe to the efficacy of the very unattractive louvres or immature shrubbery.

**4. The design, materials and feel are not fitting for a coastal area and are inappropriate for the location.** Pittwater park as an amenity for the public offers a relaxed and inviting feel, that respects the local surroundings and features, and this design is not in keeping with the seaside village area. It has the same bulky look and concrete elements as the refused Bilgola and Whale Beach developments. We argue the design be modified to reflect the coastal seaside village nature of the area and surrounding homes.

**5. Heritage impacts - Barrenjoey House looks small and insignificant compared to this development,** which is an issue given it's one of the most grand and oldest buildings in Palm Beach and a key tourist attraction. In the previous heritage report, the guidance was that this development shouldn't detract from BJH in height or character, and this proposal is taller than BJH and negatively detracts from BJH. **Any lessening of the appeal of BJH would negatively affect the desirability and utility of the area for tourists/ ferry trippers as well as all neighbouring properties. This development should attempt to enhance the appeal of the area, not detract.**

**6. The number of car spots are non compliant and insufficient for the proposed number of apartments.** Parking is already a serious issue and this will add to the number of permanent residents parking on the street and the already packed car park.

**7. The garbage facilities are non-compliant:** Design requirements state that Council's

collection staff have access to the proposed development's bin room. The proposed design does satisfy this requirement, and instead the applicant proposes that the Owners Corporation moves the bins from the bin room to Barrenjoey Road on collection days - and is not required to remove them from Barrenjoey Road until the evening of the collection day. With 6, 3 bedroom apartments and 410 square metres of commercial space proposed, this non-compliance does not seem reasonable and poses significant risk to the public using Barrenjoey Road and its footpaths and shoulders.

**8. We object to cutting into the large sandstone boulders that are on our shared southern boundary**, due to structural issues and concerns around the visual appeal for our property. The last iteration built around them, and they are a coastal feature of the area. Another thing to note, this DA has been running for many years, starting with the withdrawn proposal that was quite sympathetic looking. It featured a pitched roof much like Barrenjoey House.

I understand that original design with the pitched roof was deemed unsatisfactory partly due to its imposing height vs Barrenjoey House. Hence, the pitched roof was deleted to rectify that, and the building became a flat structure.

The current proposal is asking for more height, and the proposed development now dwarfs BJH - which is what council was trying to avoid in the first place. We seem to have gone full circle given this development proposes a flat structure that: 1) is taller, 2) dwarfs Barrenjoey house yet again, and 3) is less sympathetic than the one that council was originally unsupportive of?

Also, for such an important area of Pittwater, I am concerned about the lack of knowledge/awareness of this development in the community. How did that happen? The town planner will submit the formal report as soon as it is ready.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Prue Rydstrand

Sent from my iPhone

On 9 Jun 2021, at 10:06 PM, Prue Rydstrand <[prydstrand@googlemail.com](mailto:prydstrand@googlemail.com)> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Please find our initial concerns with the proposed development at 1102 Barrenjoey Road.

Josh from Outlook Planning and Development is working on a formal submission, which we will submit as soon as it's ready.

Please confirm receipt of this email. Have a good night,  
Prue

<Rydstrand submission to proposed 1102 Barrenjoey Development Application.pdf>

<Rydstrand submission to proposed 1102 Barrenjoey Development Application.docx>

Sent from my iPhone

To Council,

We are residents of 1100 Barrenjoey Road, Palm Beach, on the southern boundary of 1102. We have engaged a town planner who is working on a formal submission, and will submit when ready. However, please find our initial concerns with this proposed iteration of the development below.

**1. The “modification” is substantially different to the original approved DA** in 2014 in both size, scale, design, optics and foot-print, for example (but not exhaustive)

- Proposal for development to extend further back into the eastern boundary
- 6 apartments instead of 4
- Substantially different design
- New wrap-around balconies overlooking our property and far less privacy for the main areas of our property
- Dual direction car entrance off Barrenjoey Road
- More glass and glazing,
- More (and changed) balconies and terraces

We struggle to find things that are unchanged vs the prior DA. **We would argue that this development warrants a new DA submission rather than a modification**, but we will leave that more in-depth discussion to the town planner’s submission.

**2. The size of the development is too large**, the proposed height exceeds the restrictions, and we query whether the floor area breaches buildable area, per the land size. 6 apartments is way too many for this location, and will cause more acoustic and privacy issues than the original 4. We believe the development should be modified to adhere to the height restrictions and think a 2 storey building is a more appropriate size. It wouldn’t dwarf Barrenjoey house then. The development also appears very dominant and out of place next to our normal sized house.

I refer to the recently denied application at Bilgola (Bilambee Ln) where it was found the proposed height of 11.2m was in breach of the local height limit and the bulk and scale was out of character with the area. We argue it is similarly the case for this proposal, and note the surrounding Pittwater Park area is of arguably higher relevance to more people/the overall community (it has a Neighbourhood Centre zoning).

Exhibit 1. Denied Bilgola 3 level shoptop apartments



**3. Privacy is a serious issue and the proposed “modification” is a significant threat to our privacy.** The addition of 2 wrap-around balconies on our boundary overlook the most used areas of our house - the middle/upper levels look into our open dining and lounge room, sun room and balcony and our spa and outdoor area are totally exposed to onlookers. Floor to ceiling windows in the bedrooms also pose a risk to our privacy and amenity on the balcony, where we entertain often. **Overall, the proposed is an unacceptable level of privacy impact and a significant deviation from the original plans.** These had no wrap around balconies and were more sympathetic to our privacy. We don't subscribe to the efficacy of the very unattractive louvres or immature shrubbery.

**4. The design, materials and feel are not fitting for a coastal area and are inappropriate for the location.** Pittwater park as an amenity for the public offers a relaxed and inviting feel, that respects the local surroundings and features, and this design is not in keeping with the seaside village area. It has the same bulky look and concrete elements as the refused Bilgola and Whale Beach developments. We argue the design be modified to reflect the coastal seaside village nature of the area and surrounding homes.

**5. Heritage impacts - Barrenjoey House looks small and insignificant compared to this development,** which is an issue given it's one of the most grand and oldest buildings in Palm Beach and a key tourist attraction. In the previous heritage report, the guidance was that this development shouldn't detract from BJH in height or character, and this proposal is taller than BJH and negatively detracts from BJH. **Any lessening of the appeal of BJH would negatively affect the desirability and utility of the area for tourists/ ferry trippers as well as all neighbouring properties. This development should attempt to enhance the appeal of the area, not detract.**

**6. The number of car spots are non compliant and insufficient for the proposed number of apartments.** Parking is already a serious issue and this will add to the number of permanent residents parking on the street and the already packed car park.

**7. The garbage facilities are non-compliant:** Design requirements state that Council's collection staff have access to the proposed development's bin room. The proposed design does satisfy this requirement, and instead the applicant proposes that the Owners Corporation moves the bins from

the bin room to Barrenjoey Road on collection days - and is not required to remove them from Barrenjoey Road until the evening of the collection day. With 6, 3 bedroom apartments and 410 square metres of commercial space proposed, this non-compliance does not seem reasonable and poses significant risk to the public using Barrenjoey Road and its footpaths and shoulders.

**8. We object to cutting into the large sandstone boulders that are on our shared southern boundary**, due to structural issues and concerns around the visual appeal for our property. The last iteration built around them, and they are a coastal feature of the area.

Another thing to note, this DA has been running for many years, starting with the withdrawn proposal that was quite sympathetic looking. It featured a pitched roof much like Barrenjoey House.

I understand that original design with the pitched roof was deemed unsatisfactory partly due to its imposing height vs Barrenjoey House. Hence, the pitched roof was deleted to rectify that, and the building became a flat structure.

The current proposal is asking for more height, and the proposed development now dwarfs BJH - which is what council was trying to avoid in the first place. We seem to have gone full circle given this development proposes a flat structure that: 1) is taller, 2) dwarfs Barrenjoey house yet again, and 3) is less sympathetic than the one that council was originally unsupportive of?

Also, for such an important area of Pittwater, I am concerned about the lack of knowledge/awareness of this development in the community. How did that happen?

The town planner will submit the formal report as soon as it is ready.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Prue Rydstrand