
From: MVRA Sydney
Sent: 17/04/2023 7:15:57 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: Objection to DA 2022/0469 1102 Barrenjoey Rd Palm Beach - Shop Top Housing Proposal - Northern Beaches Planning Panel
Attachments: Objection DA 2022-0469 1102 Barrenjoey Rd Palm Beach.pdf;

Planning Assessments and Northern Beaches Planning Panel
Please find objection from Mona Vale Residents Association attached.
Kelvin Auld MPIA
Mona Vale Residents Association
Coastal Environment Group
M [REDACTED]



MVRA PO Box 62 Mona Vale 1660 NSW Email: [REDACTED]

TO: Northern Beaches Local Planning Panel

RE: DA 2022/0469 Shop-top Housing proposal at 1102 Barrenjoey Rd Palm Beach - Objection on the grounds of excessive building height non-compliance and poor application of Clause 4.6 PLEP 2014

DATE: 17 April 2023

We have examined the current revised plans and agree with the range of community objections to the proposal. In particular we object to the excessive building height non-compliance of over 30% when considering the objectives of the zone, PLEP 2014 and DCP requirements and place context adjoining the two storey heritage building. Refer to Attachment 1.1 Issues Relating to Building Height non-compliance.

It is considered that the Clause 4.6 variation of the 8.5 metre building height standard sought by the applicant is excessive and not well founded, appears too legalistic and weak on actual consideration of environmental planning merits and place context.

Kelvin Auld MPIA

Urban and Environmental Planner

Mona Vale Residents Association

Coastal Environment Group

M [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

ATTACHMENT 1.1 Issues relating to Building Height non-compliance

1.1 Issues relating to Building Height non-compliance

The permissible height of the building application the site is 8.5m as referenced in LEP clause 4.3, which the proposal exceeds by approximately 3 metres. This is a substantial variation in the order of 35%. This means that most of the second storey and roof level is almost entirely above the LEP height limit. This additional height is a breach of a development standard. The proposal is also materially higher than the previously approved development application and hence this cannot be used as a reason to provide such a gross exception to the LEP.

The additional height is not consistent with the objectives for Height of Buildings which include 'to ensure that any building, by virtue of its height and scale, is consistent with the desired character of the locality,' 'to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,' and 'to minimise the adverse visual impact of the development of the natural environment, heritage conservation areas and heritage items'. We would contend the proposal is not compatible with the desired future character of the area and surrounding buildings, as the proposal has not minimised the adverse effects of bulk and scale. Instead, it will be overbearing bulk adjacent to Barrenjoey House, a heritage item. When compared to Barrenjoey House, the proposed roof is almost double in size and height making it its most dominant visual feature.



