



# RESPONSE TO PRE-LODGEEMENT ENGAGEMENT

## 1.1. PRE-LODGEEMENT MEETING NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL

A Pre-lodgement Meeting was held on 30 April 2024 to discuss the proposal. The discussions had within this meeting have informed the final design of the proposal. The key issues and how they have been responded to in the preparation of this DA are summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 11 Pre-Lodgement Meeting 30 April 2024

| Key Issue  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <b>Built form, scale and setbacks</b>  |   |
| Council was supportive of the single-storey built form and the integration of the development with the topography/ landscape of the site. The gable roof form and the proposed materiality of the development were also supported.   | Noted. This has been retained.  |
| Council did not consider the proposed development to be low intensity.   | The application proposes a range of management measures to ensure the intensification of the site does not have an adverse impact on surrounding land uses or the overall rural character of the area. The site provides a suitable scale of development on site, as the building footprint at finished ground level is only 12.9% of the site area (2,060sqm) and approximately 9,710m <sup>2</sup> , equating to 60.8% of the site, is provided as landscaping. |
| Council was of the opinion that the proposal has limited, if any characteristics which associate themselves with the primary production elements as part of LOS or as a smaller scale operation could retain elements of rural use / primary production that complements the food and drink premises.  | The proposal does not include any primary production / industry; however, it is not considered this is the only pre-requisite to maintain the rural setting of the land in applying the objectives of the zone. The proposal provides a compatible land use that is permissible by Schedule 1 of the LEP.   |
| Council commented that the extensive car parking and driveway lengths that encroach into the front and side setbacks compromise the landscape setting and building complex and detract from the rural setting that is trying to be achieved.   | The application achieves a balance between the provision of parking, servicing, landscaping and facilities to achieve a reasonable level of site coverage. The proposal provides an acceptable use of the site that is consistent with existing and approved built form within this locality.   |
| The eastern lawn indicates that a significant portion significant potential for peak intensification (highly usable "outdoor experience" area especially in fair weather) that can be serviced from the bar/restaurant area. This would mean carparking impacts are unlikely to be contained wholly within the site if this auditorium style space is concurrently used for customers to maximise site capacity. | This is not the intended use of the space. The southern area is used as landscaped open space and will accommodate overflow parking spaces during peak capacity times. This will be monitored by the onsite manager.  |
| <b>Landscaping non-compliance and Site coverage</b>  |   |
| Council advised that there is further opportunity to provide spaced canopy trees (native) across the 30m setback area to partly screen the building complex.   | The site will be densely landscaped with 8326 plants in a variety of planting types, including trees, shrubs, climbers, groundcovers, of which 90.2% are native species. The landscaping will provide a substantially improved landscaped outcome for the site and the surrounding precinct that will enhance privacy and the character of the streetscape.   |

| Key Issue   | Response   |
|---|--|
| <b>Use and operation, Restaurant / Café uses</b>  |  |
| Council commented that the combined scale of the proposal is not representative of a low intensity use and the proposed development is not conducive with the sites zoning.   | Section 4 of the SEE discusses the consistency of the proposed development with the surrounding character.   |
| Council were of the opinion that the proposal does not include any primary industry / primary production to retain the rural setting of the land in application of the objectives of the zone.  | As above.  |
| Further detail is requested regarding the proposed use of the stage at the northern boundary, with Council noting that Function centres and entertainment venues are prohibited at the site.  | The stage will be used to accommodate external music performances that are ancillary to and will support the restaurant. The stage will only be used between from midday – 10pm and is surrounded by an acoustic barrier.  |
| <b>Carparking, traffic and access:</b>  |  |
| Council commented that the need to encroach across the 20m setback to Myoora Road and along the northern and southern 7.5m side setbacks is a result of the high intensity use of the site which necessitates extensive carparking, basement access and formed driveway and vehicle turning circle which displaces what should otherwise be retained as landscape buffer (and would ensure LOS compliance). | The proposal provides an acceptable use of the site that is consistent with existing and approved built form within this locality. The site balances the provision of parking, servicing, landscaping and facilities to achieve a reasonable level of site coverage.<br>Refer to justification in <b>Section 6.2.1</b> of the SEE. |
| Council commented that the layout of the car parking areas is confusing and should be rationalised to reduce on-street parking.   | Internal wayfinding signage will be provided on site during detailed design to support wayfinding for car parking and pedestrians.<br><br>The access to the overflow parking spaces will be opened during peak times, managed by the site operator.  |
| Council advised that the combined capacity of the three restaurants would likely require the provision of 411 car spaces.   | The proposed maximum capacity of the site is 794 patrons. Justification for the proposed provision of 223 parking spaces and 74 overflow parking spaces is provided in Section 6.3 of the SEE.   |

## 1.2. DESIGN AND SUSTAINABILITY PANEL MEETING

A meeting was held with the Northern Beaches Council Design Sustainability Advisory Panel (**DSAP**) on the 23 May 2024. The Panel was supportive of the proposal overall. The Panel requested further detail and resolution of the proposed traffic management strategy be provided, to confirm that the development can be delivered at the scale proposed and to ensure that the prominence of the landscape is maintained and realised. The feedback received from the DSAP and how this has been responded to in the proposal has been outlined below.

Table 2 DSAP Meeting 23 May 2024

| DSAP Recommendation  | Response   |
|--|--|
| <b>Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character</b>  |  |
| The DSAP commented that in the context of the environment, the proposal is acceptable in terms of land use and scale. However, the panel requested that further information is provided on the rationale behind the layout and siting of the buildings and recommended that an | The Urban Design Report prepared by H&E Architects provides an analysis of the site and justification for the site design. |

| DSAP Recommendation   | Response   |
|---|--|
| <p>urban design analysis/ site context analysis is prepared to support the application.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Scale, built form and articulation</b></p>  |  |
| <p>The DSAP expressed their support for the proposed scale and built form of the development, however requested that traffic advice and a plan of management is provided to confirm that car parking numbers will be able to satisfy the operational requirements and assess the impacts of parking to the surrounding streets. Council's planner noted that there appeared to be a shortfall of 250 spaces provided.</p> | <p>A Traffic Impact Assessment and Plan of Management is appended to the SEE to demonstrate the acceptable operation of the site.<br/>Refer to <b>Section 6.3</b> and <b>Section 4.3.6</b>.</p>  |
| <p>The DSAP identified that there was some non-compliances with the side setback control and recommended that this is resolved, or that an alternative solution was proposed.</p>   | <p>Alternative solutions are proposed to the required setback control along the north-eastern boundary. Refer to <b>Section 6.2.2</b>.</p>   |
| <p><b>Access, vehicular movement and car parking</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Council have identified that the scheme presents a substantial shortfall of parking spaces compared to the DCP requirement. The DSAP requested the preparation of a Plan of Management and Traffic Report to address the parking shortfall.</p>  | <p>A Traffic Impact Assessment and Plan of Management is appended to the SEE to demonstrate the acceptable operation of the site.<br/>Refer to <b>Section 6.3</b> and <b>Section 4.3.6</b>.</p>  |
| <p>The Panel also recommended that the entry to the car park and loading dock is rationalised to ease movements to and from the access road and to minimise/ avoid car cross over with pedestrians.</p>   | <p>Justification for the site design and location of pedestrian pathways is provided in the Urban Design Report prepared by H&amp;E Architects. Clear signage and wayfinding indicators will be developed during detailed design to ensure there is no conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.</p>  |
| <p>The Panel identified that the site falls at a gradient of 1.16:5m towards Myoora Road, therefore accessibility at the site needs to be carefully designed to enable accessible paths of travel through the development. It is recommended that lift access is provided along the central walkway of the site to enable a continuous and accessible path of travel from Myoora Road.</p>                                | <p>An Accessibility Report is appended to the SEE to demonstrate the suitable design of the site.</p>  |
| <p><b>Landscape</b></p>   |  |
| <p>The Warringah DCP requires that 70% of the site be provided as Landscaped Area. The DSAP recommend that the 70% landscaped open space is achieved at the site.</p>   | <p>The proposed landscaped site coverage is approximately 9,710m<sup>2</sup>, equating to 60.8% of the site. While this is less than the DCP, the numerical non-compliance is mitigated through the superior quality of the proposed landscaped spaces which will significantly enhance the site's existing character and biodiversity value.<br/>Refer to <b>Section 6.2.2</b>.</p> |
| <p>The Panel also requested that a full set of landscape plans, including sections and elevations are submitted as part of the DA package. The sections and elevations should explain the design response to the topography and how the landscape design considers all the site constraints and opportunities.</p>  | <p>Landscape Plans are provided at Appendix C and discussed in <b>Section 4.3.3</b>.</p>   |
| <p>The Panel notes that the extended entry drive, parking and passing bay provide a significant portion of hard paved area at the site, which should be reduced. The Panel recommended that this could be achieved by reducing the number of car parking spaces.</p>  | <p>The application proposes a significant area of permeable paving at ground plane to mitigate the provision of hardstand, which is required to support the suitable access and servicing of the site.</p>   |

| DSAP Recommendation  | Response  |
|--|---|
| The panel commended the provision of a variety of experiences and outdoor/ gathering opportunities provided at the site. Further information regarding the DDA Compliance and accessibility for carers with prams should be provided.  | An Accessibility Report is appended to the SEE to demonstrate the suitable design of the site.  |
| The Panel recommended that the installation of retractable awnings to provide temporary relief from the sun/ rain be explored in the outdoor areas associated within the restaurants and play areas  | Refer to Design Statement prepared by H&E Architects.   |
| The DSAP also recommended that a significant amount of upper storey and mid storey canopy trees be included within the landscape scheme to provide shade, habitat and year round architectural interest that can help reinforce the "farmhouse" theme.   | The landscape design is a central and celebrated component of this project. The landscape design, prepared by Dangar Barrin Smith, drives the site design and seeks to provide native vegetation across the site in a range of high density, deep soil and canopy zones. The development provides 8326 plants, including trees, shrubs, climbers, groundcovers. |
| The Panel emphasised that a balance can be struck between complying with the Planning for Bushfire Protection and the objectives of the DCP, to provide good canopy coverage and habitat for endemic fauna.  | Noted. The proposal is supported by a bushfire statement which confirms the development is greater than 160 metres from the nearest bushfire hazard and there is insufficient bushfire risk to warrant specific bushfire protection. The landscape design responds to the constraints of the site and provides an improved outcome.                             |
| An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Report should be undertaken to identify the trees to be retained and protected as well as the trees that can be removed. The AIA should also identify opportunities for tree planting that is sympathetic to the area and in keeping with the desired future neighbourhood character.                        | An Arborist Report is provided at Appendix O. Whilst some tree removal is required, this is mitigated by the significant planting proposed.   |
| <b>Amenity</b>   |   |
| The DSAP recognised the importance of balancing the relationship between the landscape and the built form of the proposal in providing greater amenity. The Panel suggested that the design team explore opportunities to increase building separation to improve the relationship of the built form with the outdoor spaces.                        | The Urban Design Report prepared by H&E Architects provides an analysis of the site and justification for the site design.  |
| The Panel also recommended that the arrival experience from the basement is improved. Some of the panel recommendations to improve this includes, providing open stair access from the basement, integrating landscaping elements into the arrival experience, and seeking out opportunities to enable natural light to enter into the lower levels. | The basement comprises a car parking area and the lower ground comprises the ancillary office space for the Boathouse operation. Landscaping has been integrated throughout the car park and site circulation.  |
| <b>Façade treatment/ aesthetics</b>  |   |
| The Panel commended the architectural design, which successfully integrates with the landscape through interstitial spaces and materiality. The panel supports the proposed materiality of timber and stone which, when combined with corrugated metal, creates a richly detailed well-considered and atmospheric proposal.                          | Noted.  |
| <b>Sustainability</b>  |   |
| The Panel requested further detail is provided on the features of the development that will improve sustainability. This includes opportunities for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rainwater recycling</li> </ul>   | An ESD Report has been appended to the SEE which explores the sustainability initiatives incorporated into the proposal.  |

| DSAP Recommendation  | Response |
|--|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Alternative transport</li><li>▪ Solar panels</li><li>▪ EV charging</li><li>▪ Onsite organics management</li><li>▪ Timber construction at restaurant 1 (instead of steel)</li></ul> |          |