

---

**Sent:** 6/09/2019 12:06:04 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

06/09/2019

MRS Jessica Train  
2 / 53 Queenscliff Road RD  
Queenscliff NSW 2096  
jess\_train@outlook.com

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

#### Parking & Traffic

The application fails to provide adequate off-street car spaces which, under Council planning requirements, is required to provide 13.5 spaces however the proposed development has grossly reduced the available off street parking to only 6 spaces falling short of Council's planning controls by 7.5 car spaces.

The Traffic Impact Statement prepared by Traffix attempts to address the shortfall in parking provisions by incorrectly stating the current development is of a comparable size and scale to the proposed development. This is a completely false assumption as the proposed development greatly exceeds both the existing floor area and building envelope. The Traffic Impact Statement also fails to address the imposition of a higher demand on on-street parking due to the failure of the proposal to provide sufficient off-street parking. This is particularly important given the development includes 2 commercial properties with no provision for visitor parking. The proposed development also fails to provide any accessible car spaces which is a requirement of the BCA for class 2, 5, 6 and 7 buildings where Councils planning controls require the development to provide a total of 13.5 car spaces.

#### Building Height and bulk

The application smacks of a blatant disregard for Council planning controls which set a maximum height limit of 8.5m height limit. The proposal exceeds the 8.5m height limit by up to 3.3 metres with a proposed maximum height of 11.8m as calculated from drawings. The development proposal must be either rejected as a result of the height limit exceedance or amended to adhere to the 8.5m limit. Any development proposal for this property must adhere with the 8.5m height limit planning control and must be designed to prevent:

- The current poor design with excess bulk and scale
- Excessive floor space outside of the maximum building envelope
- Rooftop lift overrun, lift motor and plant room structures
- Rooftop plant
- Rooftop terraces

#### Affordable Rental Housing

The exceedance to Council planning controls in regard to the bulk and scale of the previous Development Application (DA2015/1079) was considered in light of the development being limited to Alterations and Additions to an Existing Shop Top Housing Development and Strata Subdivision of low rental dwelling under SEPP 2009 (Affordable Rental Housing)'. This new proposal seeks to leverage from the previous proposal and far exceeds Council planning controls in regard to the bulk and scale without the benefits to the community. This new proposal makes no such provision or allowance for low cost housing and instead actually increases the number and size of the units.

## Views

The application shows a complete disregard for the rights of existing residents as the proposed development fails to adequately consider the principal of view sharing. It attempts to show that it has demonstrated reasonable view sharing from surrounding properties however the view analysis incorrectly identifies both the 53 and 55 Queenscliff Rd buildings and shows incorrect heights and numbering of apartments.

This Application dramatically blocks out significant beach and ocean views enjoyed by a number of residents over many years as a result of its height limit exceedance and poor design and fails to demonstrate the view loss compared to the actual views - instead it references a previous development application.

The loss of view to actual views resulting from the proposal is considerable and not consistent with the principals of view sharing. Furthermore, alternate elevator systems are available which do not require view obtrusive rooftop lift overrun structures and lift motor rooms which dramatically exceed the 8.5m height limit.

## Neighbourhood Character

The application does not provide a design which adequately considers the character of the neighbourhood with a proposal that does not attempt to sympathise with the local beach environment.