
From: Kevin Tuckey
Sent: 15/02/2025 1:31:15 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Submission Regarding DA2025/0077

To Whom It May Concern

The following are my concerns regarding DA2025/0077 (10 28 Lawrence St)

* Recent developments in the Freshwater CBD have been fraught with substantial delays. Of the three major developments since 2015 only the northern side of Lawrence St housing Bendigo Bank and Freshwater Medical Centre (15 19 Lawrence St) has progressed in a timely manner. The builders for this construction have, however, gone broke during the development on the corners of Oliver/Lawrence/Dowling Streets. This construction was due to have been completed June 2024.

The site with a serious delay (and undergoing repairs as we speak), is the building occupying IGA and Bakers Delight at 22-26 Albert St.

Freshwater locals were unable to purchase local foodstuffs for several years due a number of issues, which included several builders going broke during construction.

Question for Council - Given the spate of building companies going broke, is Council considering receipt of a substantial deposit from the developers/builders to ensure the work will continues on the site of DA2025/0077 in a timely manner?

Such a deposit will give comfort to tradesmen regarding timely payments for their work, and to small - medium sized businesses operating in Freshwater.

I believe the project should not proceed unless Council receives a substantial cash reassurance to prevent lengthy delays occurring.

* Height (part 1) - the current Northern Beaches Council restriction is one level of shops plus two levels of residential (11 metres).

With the Affordable Housing exemption another level of residential is permitted (bringing total height to 13.45m).

The Affordable Housing exemption means the allowable structure is now one level of retail, plus three levels of residential.

This proposal is one level of retail plus three levels of residential.....and, an entertainment area on top.

Surely this entertainment area counts as another level as well.

The inclusion of an entertainment/recreation level means there are too many levels proposed in DA2025/0077. As a result, I protest the number of levels in the plan.

* Height (part 2) - the numbers don't seem to add up.

When the Caville Building (6 8 Lawrence St DA 2001/0393) was constructed the natural ground level appears to be approximately 21.33m (as listed at the back boundary's north

western corner of 20 Undercliff. A height of 22.1m is also stated for the top of a low concrete wall.)

* Panel 4 of the current proposal has drawings of the current arcade. The arcade floor is at 21.8m, a duct is listed at 21.47m, and the car park level at 25.62m.

There is no specific natural ground level line, but if a duct is listed at 21.47m isn't it reasonable to assume the natural ground level is closer to 21.5m than 25.6m?

If we assume there's no landfill and the natural ground level where the property meets the back boundary of 14 and 16 Undercliff is 21.5m then the maximum height allowed under DA2025/0077 is 34.95m (addition of 13.45m allowable Affordable Housing height to natural ground level of 21.5m).

The maximum heights mentioned in the current plan are not 34.95m, or below.

Panel 13 of DA2025/0077 has a height of 36.1m adjacent to the 11m building height line. It also the 13.45m building height line near 38.8m.

This implies the architects/surveyors believe the natural ground level is at least 25m where the eastern boundary of the proposal meets the rear boundary of 18 Undercliff Rd.

I don't believe the natural ground level rises 3m from the measurement provided in the Caville (6-8 Lawrence St) DA to the south eastern corner of the current proposal (aka from the north west corner of 20 Undercliff to half way along the rear boundary of 18 Undercliff).

Is it possible that these plans have used the height of the existing car park, not the natural ground level, at the rear of the Lawrence St arcade to determine building height levels for the current proposal?

If there is a measurement error in the south eastern corner does this have implications for the slope of the proposed carpark entrance?

I believe an independent surveyor should be selected (with costs funded by the developer) to provide an accurate measurement of the natural ground level along the rear boundaries of 2 20 Undercliff Rd.

I don't believe this proposal should proceed until there is confirmation that the proposed height of the building does not exceed the legal limit as measured against the natural ground level.

Yours sincerely,
Kevin Tuckey

15 Undercliff Rd
Freshwater 2096

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]