
Sent: 31/08/2021 9:50:37 AM
Subject: Online Submission

31/08/2021

MR David Loomes
- 6 Marina PL
Belrose NSW 2085
loomesd@hotmail.com

RE: DA2020/0393 - 28 Lockwood Avenue BELROSE NSW 2085

31 September, 2021

Dear Sir,
Re: No 28 Lockwood Avenue, Belrose. DA2020/0393.
Amended Plans.

Having viewed the new plans that have been submitted recently I still have considerable concerns with the proposed development.

Although Level 1 of the building has been moved back from Lockwood Avenue which improves the appearance from that street and that two residential units have been deleted I note that no significant reduction in the bulk of the building is being proposed.

My Continuing Concerns Are:

Height.

The building will exceed the allowable height by up to 44%.

This excess height occurs near to the Child Care Centre on Ashworth Avenue. This will overlook the Child Care Centre with a 9.935 building about 8 metres from their boundary and an 11.65 metre high building about 19 metres from their boundary both with windows overlooking the adjoining properties.

The recent decision by the Planning Panel to support Council's refusal of the Forestway Development (DA20118/1924) on the grounds that it would exceed the allowable height by up to 41.5%.

If a development fronting Forestway is not appropriate to exceed the allowable height by this amount then it should definitely not be allowed at a site such as this which is far more residential in character. This decision of refusal of the Forestway proposed Development sets a precedent for this and other items.

Set Backs.

This proposal proposes minimal set back of about 700 millimetres of the building along the whole of the Lockwood Ave and Glen St frontages but with dividing wing walls up to the street boundary.

The applicant claims, on page 6 of the Amended Design Statement, that "The proposed development complies with ADG set back requirements to most of its boundaries,"

Existing buildings fronting these streets have set backs of 8 or 9 metres. This minimal set back at the corner of Lockwood Ave and Glen St will affect vehicle sight distance and create a traffic hazard.

.../2

-2-

In the case of the Forestway proposal Council's assessment, supported by the Planning Panel, stated that: "The significantly reduced pedestrian paths, circulation zones and landscape treatments along the Forestway frontage will result in a hostile environment. The reduction in planting to the Forestway Russell Street alignment have all been significantly reduced to the point one would question the ability to achieve and buffering. Significant tree canopy or relatively decent interface between building, circulation and roadway."

These rulings must be considered to this proposal. The previous use of the site with its considerable unrestricted open space allowed for very safe pedestrian connectivity in addition to the defined pedestrian paths.

Within the surrounding area the following commercial and shop top developments have the following setbacks from the road alignment.

54 Glen Street 8 metres
26 Yindala Street 4 metres to Pound Ave
5 metres to Yindela St
115 Ralston Avenue 6 metres (road widening for parking)
53 Myoora Avenue 7 metres to Myoora Rd
7 metres to Tepko Rd
4 Booralie Road 6 metres
14 Frenchs Forest Road East 6 metres (road widening for parking)

The applicant also claims, on page 6 of the Amended Design Statement, that "The proposed development is compatible with the built form context of the site"

I fail to see how a two storied new building with ground floor 700 millimetres from the street boundary will be compatible with the existing one and two storied housed set 8 or 9 metres back from the street.

Trees and Landscape Planting

Due to the proposal to construct basements up to the street boundary there will be no deep soil for the planting of any significant trees or shrubs to soften the appearance of the building along any of the three street frontages.

The lack of deep soil planting was also a reason for the refusal of the Forestway proposal.

Tree planting within the public footpath areas of Lockwood Avenue and Glen Street would further decrease the pedestrian amenity and create vehicular hazards if planting is too close to the kerb. It would appear that it is proposed to have a full width, building to the kerb, concrete paving at least in Lockwood Avenue so street tree planting may not be an option.

.../3

-3-

Car Parking.

This appears to have been resolved with additional car parking spaces being provided.

Traffic.

Apart from the obvious increase of traffic on Glen St, Blackbutts Rd and Lockwood Ave due to the increased number of residences proposed in this development there will be an unacceptable increase in traffic in Glenrose Place. At present Glenrose Village has over 500 car spaces with access at 4 points 2 of which are in Glenrose Place. Assuming Glenrose Place takes 50% of these vehicles the 158 car spaces provided in this proposal will increase use by vehicles by over 60%. Entry to and exit from Glenrose Place from Glen St is already compromised by the proximity of the service station driveways and large trucks proving good to Woolworths.

Council have recognised the need to provide extra traffic calming devices on surrounding roads with existing traffic flows as per the "Pedestrian Safety Improvements" being implemented by Council in November 2020 to February, 2021. This proposed development of 28 Lockwood Avenue will increase the traffic flow into and out of the area. The redevelopment of Glenrose Village by Stockland was refused because of the increase of traffic the larger proposal would have generated. We are now looking to go back to these numbers of traffic movements considered unsuitable with that proposal.

I request that Council, the Planning Panel and Land and Environment Court carefully consider these points when assessing this Development Proposal.

Yours faithfully,

David Loomes.