
Sent: 5/09/2021 1:11:46 PM
Subject: Online Submission

05/09/2021

MR Geoff Davidson
43 Aranda DR
Davidson NSW 2085
gsd1969@optusnet.com.au

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

Proposed development of 28 Lockwood Avenue

I am writing in regards to the supposed 'changes' to the old Belrose Library redevelopment. There is mention that "the Planning Proposal will deliver additional housing and an appropriate variety of housing types to assist different needs and affordability". How will this be achieved? Where will be the restrictions on the selling price of these new apartments? I'm sure none of them will be under \$1.7 million, and as the current market on the NB is on the rise, they most likely will go over the \$2m mark.

This development is not being driven to provide low/medium income people with a sustainable way to live in the area. It is being driven by developers to make a maximum profit by providing flat accommodation at a premium location, for a premium price.

While we have benefited from the new build of the Glenrose shopping centre and its associated restaurants, we are still missing the type of commercial offerings that Glenrose used to offer. What community consultation has taken place from the applicant to the surrounding occupants on what they would like to see in the commercial space, not just dumping 'more restaurants' to get a quick buck?

Where is the allocation of traffic spaces for parking for this development. If they are to put in new restaurants in this space, where will the customers park?

The proposed height of this building is 44% higher than the allowable height. If I was to put a submission in for a home renovation, I would not be able to get past this restriction, how are developers allowed to bend, change, or ignore the rules? The height is not in keeping with the appearance of Belrose and the surrounding suburbs. If approved, surely this could set a precedent.

This proposed development of 28 Lockwood Avenue will increase the traffic flow into and out of the area. The Stockland redevelopment of Glenrose was refused because of the traffic increase the bigger proposal would have generated. With this development, it would increase the numbers of traffic movements that has already been considered unsuitable for the stockland development.

I request that Planning Panel and Land and Environment Court and the Council carefully consider all of the submissions, especially where they are to set a precedent for future development Proposals on the Northern Beaches.