

---

**From:** Adam Rytenskind  
**Sent:** 24/09/2023 9:40:13 AM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2023/1289 objection

Please lodge 25/9/2023.

### **We object to DA2023/1289 in the strongest possible terms.**

This is far worse than the existing design (approved in 2010) which is already arguably too big for the area, but at least in a relative sense made an attempt to fit in by having wider setbacks at all levels and less height, bulk and scale. If the new developer wants to apply for such material changes, it should be under a new DA and works should not have commenced.

This proposed design would result in gross overdevelopment in a sensitive location. It's another crude example of trying to overdevelop a sensitive site for commercial gain in this sensitive Palm Beach village streetscape and natural landscape. Palm Beach village is one of the most naturally sensitive and beautiful areas in the state. Turning into a Gold Coast strip is not in keeping with Council's own mandate for a local seaside village feel and would be detrimental to the area long after the developers have banked their profits and moved on.

We're surprised by Koichi Takada's approach to the scale of this design and question if he has personally visited the site and taken time to absorb the natural environs that he prescribes to be at one with. I'm sorry Koichi, decorating with plant sketches and curved timbers doesn't soften or excuse the sheer mass of this building.

We object on the following terms:

1. **Too High!** The building has a highest point of 18.65 RL from a ground floor level of 2.4 RL. That's 5 levels above ground and over 16m high! This is 1.5m higher than the already approved design (approved when standards were less strict), which is 17.1m RL at its highest point.
2. **Too Bulky!** 36+ metres wide, 16+ metres high, 25+ metres deep. The block form and size of this apartment block is enormous! The front levels of the building should have a deeper setback, be no higher than the form of Barrenjoey House and be stepped in from the sides to be sympathetic with Barrenjoey House.
3. **Scale!** Vs Barrenjoey House and 1118 Barrenjoey Road (and all other neighbours) is hugely disproportionate. It dwarfs everything around it, including the Heritage Barrenjoey House. We need to protect Barrenjoey House as the hero in the streetscape in this area.
4. The design is **not in keeping with the local area** and is not sensitive to heritage listed Barrenjoey House. Barrenjoey House should be the most prominent and celebrated building in this immediate location. The streetscape drawings conveniently leave out Barrenjoey House, which would be dwarfed by this development.

5. **Setbacks** Vs the approved design have reduced enormously. The front setback has reduced from approx. **11m to 4.4m**. The approved design further increases its setback for levels 2 and 3 ... this proposal does not. The site is deep and wide enough to provide for substantial front and side setbacks, which would assist to soften its impact on the streetscape.

6. There aren't enough **carparks** provided to meet requirements. The already busy carpark across the road isn't an adequate excuse to not comply. Reduce the number of proposed apartments to match what is already approved and hence reduce pressure on car parking.

7. The proposed driveway location would substantially increase traffic congestion around Barrenjoey House, which would cause safety issues in this already congested area.

8. Where is the bus stop proposed to move to? It implies this has already been agreed with council.

9. This is a monstrosity on our northern street entry boundary. Increase the green barrier, reduce the bulk and increase the setback on our boundary.

10. The impact on neighbours to the rear is pronounced and the approved dwelling at 1110B is missing. They will have a material view and amenity impact. **Reduce the height** by removing the top levels.

11. The proposal marks a Heritage Protection zone at the front of the site. What is this and what are the protections and sensitivities? I can't see any substantial detail on it in any of the reports.

12. The amount of **landscaping** and permeable space seems to be inadequate for such a large site. Increase permeable landscape areas with requirement for substantial foliage and trees on the side barriers.

We implore you to reject this proposal. If they want to apply for such material change it should be a new DA and works should not have already commenced. This proposal is obviously way too big, too high and too bulky on the street.

Please note that we will also join with neighbours to engage an expert to submit a more detailed objection.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond.

Adam and Amanda Rytenskild