



Mr Mark Adamson - 97100623
File Ref: DA14/0602

4 December 2014

Dr John Roseth
Chairman
Sydney East Region Joint Regional Planning Panel
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Dr Roseth

**Council Submission: JRPP Reference No. 2014SYE074
Development Application No. 14/0602 Demolition of 6 Dwellings and Construction of
18 Townhouses at 4 - 8 Hopman Avenue, Menai and 4 - 8 Bromwich Place, Menai.**

I refer to the subject application which is to be determined by the Joint Regional Planning Panel on 11 December 2014.

At its meeting held on 17 November 2014 Council resolved as follows:

1. *That the report by the Director Planning and Environment regarding the proposed 18 townhouse development under the SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 at 4-8 Hopman Avenue Menai and 4-8 Bromwich Place Menai (DA14/0602) be received and noted.*
2. *That Council prepare a submission to be presented to the Joint Regional Planning Panel recommending refusal of the DA14/0602 under Section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act on the following grounds:*
 - (a) *That the development is of a scale and intensity that is inconsistent with the character of the locality, and in particular the cul-de-sac nature of Bromwich Place*
 - (b) *The proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking for residents of the proposed dwellings*
 - (c) *The overspill of parking will result in significant parking and traffic problems in Hopman Avenue and Bromwich Place*
 - (d) *The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and inappropriately located, given the limited access to public transport and town centre*
 - (e) *The proposal is poorly designed and does not provide adequate amenity for future residents*
 - (f) *The loss of amenity to adjoining and surrounding residents.*

Hopman Avenue and Bromwich Place are characterised by low density housing in a landscaped setting.

The proposal introduces a new form of development into the locality with a notably different density and form. Six dwellings are being replaced with a total of 18 townhouses with parking for 13 vehicles.

The locality is characterised entirely by single storey housing sitting in a landscaped setting. The dwellings are separated by generous landscaped areas and there is a particular rhythm of open space between dwellings in the locality.

Conversely the proposal presents as a very apparent form of denser living, and dwellings that struggle to sit comfortably within the constraints of the site. The proposal includes buildings that contain both 3 and 4 separate dwellings within each of them on lots that currently contain 1 single dwelling house. The design is such that the bulk of these buildings will be visually obtrusive from the street and neighbouring properties. The design is unable to provide the minimum 3m setbacks to side boundaries.

This form of development is an unexpected outcome in this locality that is unlikely to be repeated, as development of this nature will be prohibited under the provisions of Draft Local Environmental Plan 2013. On this basis, its incompatible form will be more apparent, as the surrounding neighbourhood will not evolve into a density of this nature in the future.

It is therefore critical that any development on this site respects both the existing and future desired character of the locality, and the constraints of the site. The proposal cannot be supported on the grounds of density, form and design.

The proposal also fails to provide adequate amenity for future residents. The private open space for most dwellings is insufficient to provide adequate amenity. This is of particular concern as most of the townhouses are large enough to accommodate families. The spaces are also compromised by level changes, are disjointed, and incorporate fencing between units that result in very narrow long spaces with poor utility. Council's Architectural Review Panel also concluded there are numerous shortcomings with the proposal, including the design and placement of entries and frontages to Hopman Close, inefficient floor plans, and poor resolution of solar aspect and natural ventilation.

The proposal will also result in negative amenity impacts on adjoining and surrounding residents. First floor windows of the proposal overlook the neighbouring properties to the north, to an extent that first floor windows will have a line of sight across the property boundaries.

The visual bulk of the development will be most apparent from the rear yards of the adjoining properties and the street, and given the minimal separation between buildings will read as one continuous form from most angles.

The apparent lack of garaging is also unusual in this locality both in terms of presentation and function. The proposal requires 34 car parking spaces in accordance with Council's DCP yet provides only 13 off-street spaces. There is a significant shortfall in onsite parking, and 5 of the dwellings have no off-street parking.

services are limited. It is anticipated that car ownership rates for future residents will be relatively consistent with the rest of the surrounding area, and on this basis there will be overspill of parking onto the street system.

There are very limited spaces in the Bromwich Place cul de sac. Aside from the ongoing problems created for residents, there will be issues associated with evacuation and access for emergency vehicles. Whilst the site is not identified as bush fire prone itself, it is within close proximity to mapped Bushfire Prone Land. Consequently, the issue of impacts on access in terms of evacuation should be given significant weight. The street will not be able to legally accommodate vehicles on both sides of the carriageway due to its very limited width. This may also result in serious issues in the event of evacuation for bushfire.

In general planning terms, this is an inappropriate location for a development of this nature given the poor access to facilities and transport, and the threat of bushfire. This is an overambitious proposal and the design is severely compromised by the attempt to maximise yield. This results in poor design and amenity, an inability to provide adequate functional open space, and car parking for future residents. Subsequently, these shortcomings will impact on the neighbours in the immediate vicinity and the visual character of the locality.

All of these issues are symptomatic of an overdevelopment of the site and it is for these reasons the application should not be supported.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Barber', followed by a horizontal line.

Peter Barber
Director Planning & Environment
for J W Rayner
General Manager