
Sent: 7/09/2019 2:08:21 PM
Subject: Online Submission

07/09/2019

MR Mark Robinson
1 / 55 Queenscliff RD
Queenscliff NSW 2096
markrobinso@gmail.com

RE: DA2019/0845 - 68 A Queenscliff Road QUEENSCLIFF NSW 2096

The Assessing Officer, David Auster
Northern Beaches Council
MANLY, NSW, 2095
ATTENTION: The Assessing Officer, David Auster

Dear David,
RE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO: DA2019/0845
APPLICANT: Coulits Family
PREMISES: 68A Queenscliff Road Queenscliff NSW 2096

We are the owners of 1/55 Queenscliff Road. We object to the development application submitted to Council for the property located at 68A Queenscliff Road Queenscliff.

Objection to Development Application DA2019/0845

The proposed development at 68A Queenscliff Road (Proposed Development) is located to the South East of our property and would, if approved, have a significant adverse impact on the views and amenity of my property at 1/55 Queenscliff Road, which has views to Manly Beach, Ferry Bower and the ICMS College Manly. These views have not been recognized in the DA. The DA contains factual errors in this regard and should be updated accordingly.

We currently use and rely on on-street parking along this stretch of Queenscliff Road and enjoy the shared amenity of the area. The proposed development would significantly increase the competition for parking in an area already burdened as one of the last unrestricted parking areas within walking distance to Queenscliff-Manly beaches.

The reasons for our objection to the Proposed Development are further outlined below with reference to the Northern Beaches Council's Development Control Plan and the relevant Local Environmental Plan.

Objection - 4.3 Height of Building

Clause 4.3 (2) imposes a maximum building height of 8.5m in respect of the subject site. The proposed development has designed maximum heights of 12.4 and 12.7m, breaching the development standard. We oppose the development on this basis. Furthermore, the justifications provided in the Exception to Development Standards claimed are refuted on the basis that the development will be inconsistent with the goals of the Development Standard as follows:

a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby

development

- This does would not be an exception for 68A Queenscliff Road, which is bounded by a house (21A Bridge Street) and 70 Queenscliff Road to the immediate west, which is also under the 8.5m limit and is significantly set back from the road, reducing impact to the street. Therefore, the proposed development would not be compatible with the height and scale of the surrounding buildings. This justification must be rejected.

b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access

- The visual impact of the proposed development is noted to be significant, even by the applicant. A lift housing on the top of the building is proposed, would extend an already non-compliant development even higher. The purpose of the lift access appears to be roof access, which is a luxurious amenity not necessary for the use and function of the proposed dwellings and shops. This egregious proposal is wholly inconsistent with the principle of view sharing and would destroy views from our home. On this basis, this justification must be rejected.

c) to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments.

- The proposed rooftop area and lift housing would be visible from numerous public areas and private dwellings in the area. This feature is inconsistent with the design, colour and shape of the Queenscliff coastal and bush environment and should be rejected on this basis.

d) to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.

- The proposed development would result in a reduction of views from Queenscliff road and an increase in the built area visible from the road outside and nearby to the proposed development. On this basis, this justification must be rejected.

Objection - Siting Factors - DCP C3 Parking

The proposed development does not meet the requirements for parking set out in the DCP. This is a critical issue for the area as the Queenscliff peninsula is one of the last unrestricted parking areas in close proximity to Manly-Queenscliff beach. The area suffers from high traffic demand year round and extreme competition for parking during the summer months. The proposed parking facilities under the development are inadequate and will rely on public on-street parking, placing further and unnecessary burden on the available street parking. This is inequitable and places a burden on the neighborhood instead of investing sufficiently in parking spaces within the proposed development. The proposed development falls short of parking spaces by a significant 45%.

The DA justifies the "restrained" parking on site as encouraging the use of public transport. This is an unrealistic proposition that is not based in reality or fact. Queenscliff is poorly served by public transport with few bus routes. Residents of neighbouring buildings that also have insufficient parking already use the on-street parking for their commuter vehicles. The proposed development would in all likelihood place further reliance on on-street parking.

On this basis the proposed development application should be rejected.

Objection - D3 Noise

The proposed development includes a roof top terrace for entertainment and recreation. This feature will result in noise being generated and transmitted directly into the surrounding apartments. The rooftop terrace design also includes decoration and shade features that have not been incorporated or considered in the building height assessment, which would further increase the actual height of the building and further block the views of neighboring homes. On this basis we oppose the proposed development.

Objection - D7 Views

The View Analysis report prepared for the development is factually incorrect, confusing the building and views of 53 and 55 Queenscliff Road.

The View Analysis report uses as its comparative basis the previous DA 2015/1079 building design. We object to the use of this as the basis for the view impacts as the development of DA 2015/1079 was abandoned and never undertaken. Therefore, the View Analysis should be re-executed based on the existing building only.

The proposed development includes the extension of the building over the existing carport/balcony feature at the west end of the existing building on the site. This extension would destroy 100% of our homes remaining water views. These views are used and enjoyed daily by our family and represent a valuable part of our lives. The view allows us to view the ocean condition from all areas of our dining room and lounge room. These views would be wholly destroyed by the proposed development. In addition, the proposed development would destroy our view of Ferry Bower, the ICMS college building and North Head Reserve. This is wholly inconsistent with the principles of "View Sharing" as set out in the DCP. On this basis we strongly object to the development.

On the basis of the factually incorrect View Analysis Report, the proposed development being wholly inconsistent with the DCP objective of reasonably sharing views and the inequitable loss of views from our home, the Proposed Development should be rejected.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the bulk, scale and design of the Proposed Development should be materially amended to minimise the adverse impacts on the amenity of 1/55 Queenscliff Road. Specifically the Proposed Development should be modified so that it:

- Does not extend out over the existing carport area of 68A Queenscliff Road;
- Does not include a rooftop terrace or lift housing on top of the building, and;
- Includes 11 off street car parking spaces (or reduces the number of apartments accordingly to comply with the DCP and The Australian standard for parking is 2980.1: 2004).

The adverse impact of the Proposed Development on the neighbouring property of 1/55 Queenscliff Road and the provisions of the relevant Development Control Plan should result in Council denying development approval.

Regards,

Mark Robinson and Alexandra Hodges