
From: Oriana Garcia [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 6 April 2023 4:55 PM
To: Planning Panels - Northern Beaches
Cc: Adam Rytenskild; Jorge Hrdina; Jordan Davies
Subject: DA 2022/0469 NBPP Submission Adam Rytenskild
Attachments: Adam NBLPP Response.pdf

Categories: NBLPP

Dear Heidi,

Please find attached letter from Adam Rytenskild regarding the updated plans for DA 2022/0469 1102 Barrenjoey Road.

Please contact the office should you have any queries.

Kind Regards,

Oriana Garcia

JORGE HRDINA
A R C H I T E C T S

Double Bay Studio 10/38 Manning Road, NSW 2028 Australia
Palm Beach Studio Waratah Road, NSW 2108 Australia

+61 2 9929 9490 | jorgehrdina.com.au | [Instagram.com/jorgehrdina.architects](https://www.instagram.com/jorgehrdina.architects)

CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGE NOTICE

This email is intended only to be read by the addressee. It is confidential and may contain legal privileged information subject to intellectual copyright. As the intended recipient you may only view the contents privately. Any use, distribution, disclosure or copying of this email or any attachment is strictly prohibited.

NOMINATED ARCHITECT JORGE HRDINA 6014

6 April 2023

To: NBLPP

From: Adam Rytenskild

Re: 1102 Barrenjoey Rd

Dear Panel

On 13 March I submitted a letter outlining a range of further recommendations to help address the excessive height, bulk and scale of the proposed development at 1102 Barrenjoey Road Palm Beach. At that time I was unaware of the Panel's closed meeting with senior council personnel on 8 March.

I now refer to the updated plans which have been submitted to the Panel.

The developer has received much feedback throughout the process and has chosen to ignore the feedback and fundamental issues. The building does not fit the character of the local area, is too high, is too bulky, dwarfs and pays no respect to the heritage listed Barrenjoey House. All of these issues continue to be ignored.

Unfortunately the tweaked updates to the plans fail on all fronts so I continue to oppose the development.

It's apparent that the applicant hasn't made any real effort to reduce the height and bulk of the roof, which was one of the more serious concerns highlighted during the Panel meeting of 15 February 2023. Whilst the pitch roof may be preferred by the panel members, the applicant should demonstrate that this style of roof and the three storeys can fit within the maximum height envelope as outlined in the Pittwater LEP. It is evident that they are reluctant to change their generous ceiling heights or even alter the roof pitch or make any meaningful attempt to lower the overall height.

The fundamental issue is that 3 full above-ground storeys are being squeezed into a site which can only comfortably cater for 2 storeys.

In light of the above I believe this application should be refused as it fails on every level and if approved it would make a mockery of the planning controls.

However, if the NBLPP chooses to approve this application then I believe that, at a minimum, any consent should include the following conditions,

1. Reduce the overall height of the building by 1.4 metres to RL 12.35 which would match the roof ridge level of Barrenjoey House. This could be achieved by
 - a/ Reducing the height of the perimeter roof parapet by 800mm. This height reduction would still allow the "hip roof look" that the panel prefers especially if the underside height of the flat roof areas over the terraces was reduced to 2.4m .
 - b/ Reducing the distance between the ceiling height of the ground floor and the floor height of level 1 and similarly between the ceiling height of level 1

and the floor height of level 2 from 600mm to 300mm in both cases would provide a further 600mm of height reduction.

2. Remove the machinery, hot water systems and screen planting from the roof so that the visual and acoustic impacts are removed both for the public and the surrounding neighbours. These could be easily relocated to the rear of the building behind the hallway/lift area on level 1 without compromising the terrace areas for apartments 1 and 3 .

3. Remove the stairs which provide pedestrian access from level 2 to the roof so that the roof cannot be used for recreation or as a party area which is a major concern to me and my neighbours due to the potential loss of visual privacy and noise. Access for any rooftop maintenance could be easily achieved by a service hatch located in the roof at the top of the stairwell.

4. Require the developers to provide detailed plans to demonstrate how the retaining walls on their eastern boundary can be safely built and supported with the provision for those plans to be independently reviewed before any consent is finalised. As I have stated previously, on multiple occasions, I am extremely concerned about this proposed 13 metre deep excavation, which is in a high slip zone right up against my Western boundary. I am about to commence construction of my own approved residence and I don't see why I should be exposed to the risk of a possible collapse of my land during the construction phase of this retaining wall (or at any other time) which would stop my building program, seriously devalue mine and my neighbours' land and most likely force us into litigation which could take years and be very costly. I feel sure that if any of the panel members owned my land they would have the same concerns and I believe that it is the panel's responsibility to do everything possible to mitigate this risk.

Yours Sincerely,

Adam Rytenskild