
Sent: 13/01/2020 6:03:13 AM

Subject: DA2019/1280 - 60 & 62 Beaconsfield Street and 7-13 Queens Parade Newport

Dear Ms Haidari

Thank you for notice of the above development application. As I am not aware of the standard period allowed for submissions on development applications I would be grateful if you could advise whether additional time has been allowed in this instance to account for the holiday period in seeking public comment on such a significant development.

I reside in Queens Parade opposite the proposed development site and wish to raise several objections to the development as it is currently proposed. In summary these are:

1. The disproportionate scale of the development
2. Excessive tree removal
3. Exacerbation of traffic problems in Beaconsfield St
4. Public facilities not keeping track with increased residential density

1. Scale of development

Most significantly, I find the scale of the proposed buildings to be disproportionate to the land size and inconsistent with adjoining and nearby residences.

The great attraction of residing in this area is the verdant nature of the streetscape and the, generally, considerate positioning of residences within their boundaries so as not to overly impose on the streetscape.

The proposed development clearly seeks to build to a footprint and to a height that are at, or in excess of, the maximums with only minimal regard to the impact on the existing streetscape.

The statement of environmental effects accompanying the application claims that, at 1 dwelling per 218 sq mtrs of site area, the development betters the required minimum building-to-land ratio for medium density housing of 1 dwelling per 200 sq mtrs. However, this appears to have been achieved at the expense of meeting the standard boundary setbacks for both the front and side boundaries. The standard front setback of 6.5 mtrs appears to only be met by 4 of the proposed townhouses with most of the others being setback by only 3-4 mtrs.

The effect of building so close to the front boundary in particular is exacerbated by each of the proposed townhouses exceeding the height limit. I am not persuaded by the arguments presented with the application that exceeding the height limit would be in the public interest.

While efforts have been made to break up the bulk of the frontage of the development, the result would still appear to be one of storied townhouses intruding on the streetscape.

The only softening of this proposed development would be by virtue of the existing trees on the deep road verge in front of 9, 11 and 13 Queens Pde.

The impact of building to an exorbitantly large footprint and to, or in excess of, the height limit would seem to be most intrusive at:

- the front of 7 Queens Pde where the proposed building is set back only 3 metres from the front boundary, exceeds the height limit, requires the removal of a healthy mature brushbox

tree close to the front boundary and is not currently screened by any trees on the narrowing road verge at the front boundary; and

- the rear of 7 Queens Pde (or 64 Beaconsfield St) and 62 Beaconsfield St where the proposed buildings are similarly set back approximately only 3-4 metres, consistently exceed the height limit and do not have the benefit of a deep road verge and/or screening trees on that verge.

The resulting change to the streetscape would be dramatic and, I believe, more closely resemble inner city terraces.

While the need for higher density living is accepted I don't accept that it cannot be achieved within design consistent with the best aspects of the existing neighbourhood. It appears to me that the proposed development makes insufficient effort to build in sympathy with the existing verdant streetscape.

I am concerned by both the impact the scale of the development as it is currently proposed would have on the streetscapes and the precedent it would establish for further, similarly inconsistent developments.

2. Excessive Tree Removal

To facilitate the oversized scale of this development it is proposed to remove an extraordinary number of trees from the site and adjoining road verge. No detail appears to have been made available to the public in relation to any plans to re-plant trees on the site or adjoining verge (although I note a reference to such detail in the Council's Landscape Referral Response).

Eighty five of 115, or 74%, of existing trees will be removed. Of the 75 trees on the site, 73 (95%), will be removed. These will include six trees assessed in the arborist's report as having high landscape significance.

On the adjoining road verge 12 (55%) of the existing 22 trees on the road reserve (most on Queens Pde) will be removed.

The removal of so many trees will clearly have a pronounced effect on this corner of Newport in many regards. Given the Council's expressed policy on the importance of trees in the urban environment (<https://www.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/environment/trees>) I can't see how it could be described as anything but detrimental to the local area.

3. Exacerbation of Traffic Problems in Beaconsfield St.

I am not persuaded that the traffic report accompanying the application has sufficiently closely considered the impact of the development in Beaconsfield St.

The traffic report appears to be inconsistent or deficient in at least the following respects.

- The report states that its conclusions are arrived at following "observations" of traffic in the area but gives no indication of the timing or extent of these observations.

- It is not made clear that there is no exit onto Barrenjoey Rd (northbound or southbound) from Bardo Rd. This can only be done, circuitously, via Seaview Ave and is a cause of funnelling much southbound traffic to access Barrenjoey Rd via Beaconsfield St.

- Beaconsfield St is designated as a collector road in Fig 3 (which would appear to correctly describe its function) but otherwise just referred to as a local street (which would indicate a lesser function). It is a busy road.

- At 6.1 the report states that the width of Beaconsfield St will allow cars backed up behind vehicles waiting to enter the development to "overtake easily and safely". But, as the report notes, Beaconsfield St provides one through lane of traffic and unrestricted kerbside parallel parking in each direction. This parking is consistently heavily occupied and I don't understand how a vehicle waiting to turn could be overtaken by vehicles behind it.

- the report compares peak hour vehicle trips per hour as currently estimated for the site and as estimated for the completed development and projects a net decrease during these periods. However, as child care centre traffic outside peak hour would be negligible and traffic from 18 three bedroom units would continue throughout the day, surely the net daily impact would be a significant increase.

Additionally, there is no provision made for loading activities on site in the proposed development with these consigned to using on-street parking, which will be particularly difficult in Beaconsfield St.

I am not confident the traffic report accompanying the application has accurately assessed the impact of the development on Beaconsfield St. It is the only safe exit to the southbound lanes of Barrenjoey Rd in Newport other than the lights at the intersection of Seaview Rd and Barrenjoey Rd at the southern edge of Newport Beach. Traffic and parking on this road are already congested and will be exacerbated by increased traffic generated by the proposed development.

4. Public facilities not keeping track with increased residential development

There is no plan for a pedestrian footpath on the northern side of Queens Pde opposite the development site despite the long established medium density housing there. Requests to install a footpath in at least one hazardous section of that road verge have been refused. It would not make sense to me to further increase residential density in the immediate area without providing such elemental public facilities for current residences.

In addition to these concerns with the development as proposed there appears to have been slight detail provided on the number of trucks visiting the site during the excavation stage and the impact their queueing, entry and exit will have on the local roads. Similarly, there seems to be insufficient detail on where construction workers will park in an area where unrestricted parking is limited and highly contested.

Yours sincerely

Manus McFadyen
4 Queens Pde
Newport