
From: Miranda Korzy
Sent: Monday, 13 December 2021 11:33 AM
To: Planning Panels - Northern Beaches
Subject: Submission regarding DA2020/1756

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: DA2020/1756

**Submission regarding DA2020/1756
to Northern Beaches Council Local Planning Panel
for consideration at its meeting on Wednesday December 15, 2021**

To whom it may concern -

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Northern Beaches Council DA2020/1756, regarding a proposed development at 251 Barrenjoey Road. I make this submission as a Pittwater resident, candidate at the recent Northern Beaches Council election and frequent visitor to Robertson Road.

I believe this development should not go ahead in its current form for the following reasons:

The **council is currently in caretaker mode** awaiting results of the recent Local Government Election.

Furthermore, **less than two weeks before Christmas, many residents will be unaware** that the planning panel is sitting or of the opportunity to make a submission to the panel regarding the proposed development.

The amended proposal fails to adequately address the main objection, contained in the 262 submissions regarding the DA, to its use of Robertson Road as an entry and exit for its car park. If this DA was to be approved, it would make a mockery of the process of public consultation - given the large number of submissions concerning it.

No height variation should be allowed because it is not in the public interest - contrary to the opinion of the Northern Beaches Council Manager of Development Assessment. Increasing the height limit from 8.5 metres to 10 metres will create extra bulk and scale to the building, in order to create extra internal space in units to be sold for the developers benefit.

Pittwater Council went to great lengths to create a Local Environment Plan and Development Control Plan that would protect and enhance the character of the area's environment and villages nestling amongst the trees.

Whilst property owners have a right to develop their land, they also have a responsibility to abide by community standards as laid out in the LEP and DCP. The community should be able to rely on the intent and letter of planning regulations and the developer should be expected to design the building within those bounds. The extra bulk and scale will have a real impact - apart from overshadowing, in potentially increasing the number of units and residents in the building. Therefore, the 8.5 metre height limit should be enforced.

The council claims that the development would not have any **social impact**, however, it provides no evidence to back this up, ignoring aspects such as provision of open space, affordable housing and importantly, heritage - when a heritage listed church is sited diagonally opposite the proposed development.

Neither does the council provide evidence for a lack of **economic impact** as described in the DCP. It does not measure the economic impact of such a large building on the current human-scale of Robertson Road; nor the input of an increased number of residents in the heart of Newport. It also fails to gauge the impact of further shops - including their size and design - on the village. It would be appropriate if the council engaged a **retail economist** to study the situation of existing shops and businesses, many of which are struggling due to the Covid pandemic, before approving the development of further shops.

Similarly I **oppose the removal of the mature Lemon-scented gum tree** straddling the property boundary and road reserve along Robertson Road. In recent years, the highest rate of tree removal around Australia has been on private land and Pittwater is no exception. With relatively few trees growing in the centre of Newport, local wildlife, including birds, cannot afford to lose these. A more creative design, by respecting the existing natural environment, could turn this tree into an asset rather than an obstacle - which would also help preserve the character of Robertson Road. Replacing a mature tree with young street trees does not have the same environmental and social effect.

I **oppose the placement of the garage entrance** for this proposed development on Robertson Road because it will destroy the character of the street. This is not just about the future use of Robertson Road and potential for diverting traffic to another exit. The council should take into account the current use of the street - which in normal times is frequently closed to vehicle access for markets and festivals. It is also a quiet, cafe and restaurant precinct with a collection of quirky shops that would be impacted by extra ongoing traffic - and traffic during construction. The address of the site is on Barrenjoey Road and that is where the garage entrance should be located for now. If this is regarded as inconvenient, it could be relocated to Foamcrest Avenue at a later time if there is an opportunity.

However, I also note the **council's inconsistency on its treatment of the car park exit and development of other sites in the vicinity** of the proposed development. The council relies on the future development potential for an alternative car park exit via Foamcrest Avenue to that proposed for Robertson Road to justify the current proposal. However, there is no development planned by the federal government for the Newport Post Office site where the alternative driveway would be located.

Yet the council dismisses "a consolidated approach" to planning for Robertson Road on the basis that it has contacted other property owners in the vicinity, not all of whom say they are in a position to develop imminently alongside the subject site.

In the interests of the whole community, the current DA should be considered as part of a coordinated approach, involving urban designers and property lawyers, who could produce a framework for development of the whole vicinity - to be built over time.

Yours faithfully,
Miranda Korzy