

①

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from rod jeffery (object) -

Online Submission from rod jeffery (object)

rod jeffery<jeffchat@bigpond.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

I object to this submission for 400 extra apartments because.

1. The time given for public to review, analyse and submit is totally inadequate. This is not in the public interest. I submit that the time should be extended for another 8 weeks.
2. The application has totally inadequate detail for an average person to fully understand what is proposed/ what will be built etc. To say the detail will be sorted out later is remiss.
3. The extra apartments are not in the public interest.
4. The extra apartments will greatly cause loss of amenity to Breakfast Point residents. The supporting environmental report is by Mr J Perica, an ex DPI senior officer who has had dealings with and signed on behalf of the Director General regarding submissions for Breakfast Point by the same applicant. There is a clear conflict of interest and not even a disclosure of this conflict.
5. The traffic report is not of an acceptable standard. It does not consider traffic growth of about 30% generated by B. Pt. due to buildings to come on line. It only considers immediately local Streets and intersections. It does not consider traffic growth due to other approved and potential further residential developments in the Mortlake Peninsula. It does not consider the 'choke' points such as Tennyson Road further away nor traffic impost on Parramatta or Concord Roads etc. It is clearly a biased advocacy document that would not stand the test of scrutiny even of a recent Traffic Engineer graduate.
6. The parking provision is inadequate.
6. Community consultation was left by applicant to end of exhibition period and did not allow sufficient time or options of alternative dates. IE one event only.
8. The applicant is attempting to disguise that the Aged development previous proposal transferred the original Seashores units to elsewhere at B. Pt and now he wishes to add an extra 400 units as deleting the Aged Units did not count as residential units.
9. Extra units place an excessive burden on the other B. Pt. residents/ communities as no extra community fees are raised yet infrastructure demands are noticeably increased.
10. The applicant has submitted no offer to the community to substitute for the cost impost of extra units.
11. Visually the proposal of flat roofs and an extra storey on the building is in conflict with the B. Pt quality and consistent architectural standards i.e. a huge loss of amenity.
12. The application should not be considered unless it is in conjunction with unbiased reports of a professional standard. Hence new environmental and traffic and parking reports are necessary.

Yours faithfully, Rod Jeffery.

Email Details

| | |
|------------|-----------------------------|
| Created | 11:01 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 16, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | Object |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |

②

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from (object) -

Online Submission from of (object)

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Demolition of the Plumbers Workshop building previously identified to be adaptively reused.

The Plumbers Workshop is one of very few remnants of history and heritage in Breakfast Point. The appreciation and preservation of such historical building has been included as part of the original concept plan for the area. On this basis, many residents of Breakfast Point and contributors to the community have settled in Breakfast Point. The demolition of such building will not only result in change of character and intensification of the monolithic and homogeneous nature of the area but would also signifies, an act of disrespect to the identity and history of the suburb in lieu of a theoretical economic viability. Please note the applicant's Heritage Statement stating that "Demolition of the Plumbers Workshop will result in the loss of a building which contributes to an understanding the history of the Breakfast Point site. However, given that the possible identified uses are either impracticable or economically unviable, there appears to be no other option". It should be noted that such Statement should have been prepared by an independent heritage conservation specialist and not by the applicant's architect. Therefore any conclusion on economic viability is purely based on financial maximisation and not for the good of the community and preservation of the area's unique features. Such notion appears to contradict with Rose Group's ethos as they have consistently shown that "a sense of a place" is an important element for the community. This has been demonstrated in their original plan for the area. Therefore, any departure from the original idea is not only an act of broken promises but also resonates the restructuring of the place, its characteristics and function; the very same thing that has brought us, the residents, to Breakfast Point.

Email Details

Created 9:00 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Anonymous Object

Tags

Visibility All

③

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Cynthia Wearne (object) -

Submission Details for Cynthia Wearne (object)



Cynthia Wearne<c_wearne@yahoo.com.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Cynthia Wearne
Email: c_wearne@yahoo.com.au

Address:
106/10 Peninsula Dr

, NSW
2137

Content:

I object to the changes as outlined in the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 for the following reasons:

1. Additional units increases the numbers of people with cars impacting the roads which were only designed for the amount of units proposed in the original concept plan (prior to 2005)
2. More 1 and 2 bed units of a smaller size than originally designed, increasing the number of units and therefore the number of cars
3. Only allow 1 car space for a 1 bed unit which often has two occupants with two cars. This was not such a problem in the original design as there were not many 1 bed units. Now overwhelming number of smaller units exponentially expanding problem
4. Visitor parking all on streets as well as the residents parking on the street as they don't have enough car spaces is already over capacity in many of the streets in Breakfast Point with people parking dangerously to try and fit in a space. With more unit there will be more visitors but size of streets not growing to accommodate this as this is not possible
5. Roof line, should keep in line with other buildings and not change to flat roof to try and squeeze more units in impacting the streetscape and overall consistency of the buildings in Breakfast Point
6. Plumbers Workshop was going to be redesigned for resident use. This change takes away more communal property promised to the residents, again to squeeze in more units to crowd more people into a defined area
7. Since reducing the internal size of all units since 2011, this has meant a huge increase to traffic and infrastructure which has already caused significant parking issues in the streets
8. Whilst I understand it is a business trying to maximize it profits, this new plan does not consider the impact it will make on the streets which were originally designed for a lot less people and cars. These earlier changes have already started impacting the residents since the decision in 2011 that the company made to squeeze in smaller units. Even though the footprint of the buildings were not increased, the increase in population has impacted the residents in a negative way.

IP Address: - 153.107.97.164

Submission: Online Submission from Cynthia Wearne (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72459

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 3:47 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

(4)

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for (object) -

Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

>

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

I object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

There will be further issues with parking within Breakfast Point due to the continued practice by the developer to assign designated visitor parking spaces to the streets of Breakfast Point which have not changed from the original master plan. There are already significant issues with parking on the streets of Breakfast Point without considering the impact of the apartments currently approved or being constructed.

The demolition of the Plumbers Workshop, which is considered to be of local cultural significance, will result in only five heritage structures being retained from the nine included in the Breakfast Point Master Plan.

The original master plan had a total of 1650 residential apartments and with the current application, if approved, the total will increase to over 2460. With this significant increase in apartment numbers there has been no increase in the community facilities within Breakfast Point.

IP Address:

1

Submission: Online Submission number

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72455

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 3:11 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details


Tags

Visibility All

5

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Brian McDonald of Private (object) -

Submission Details for Brian McDonald of Private (object)

 Brian McDonald<bcmcdonald@bigpond.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Brian McDonald
Organisation: Private ()
Email: bcmcdonald@bigpond.com

Address:
79 Peninsula Drive

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:

- There is insufficient time for a detailed submission so a time extension is sought.
- The new Application (Seashores) is compared with a withdrawn Application (Seniors) so the occupancy numbers quoted are irrelevant. The Seashores Applic should be referenced to the original Application.
- Real increase in residences has risen from around 1750 to over 2400 since Estate commencement
- Despite these increases the Developer has provided no improvement to facilities eg. Clubhouse, Parks,
- Original Plans offered 9 heritage preserved items. The proposal to demolish the Plumbers Building must be rejected.
- Traffic within the Estate and surrounding access roads is already at excessive levels. No proper traffic impact study has been completed
- The application for one-bed apartments must be rejected. These were not part of the original Plan and are at excess numbers over the Estate.
- Parking provisions are inadequate. There must be more on-site parking and rejection of application to plan parking in Open Access Ways

IP Address: - 101.175.4.5

Submission: Online Submission from Brian McDonald of Private (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72449

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 2:27 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

6

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for

Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (4 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

,

/

Content:

The provision of seniors living was a positive addition to the community by providing an option for the ageing population of Breakfast Point and also to accommodate elderly family members of current & future residents of Breakfast Point. I would prefer the seniors living concept to remain.

Under the seniors living proposal of single bedroom dwellings, there would probably be only one car per dwelling - or even none. By changing to residential dwellings, with more bedrooms and therefore more possible occupants, the number of cars per dwelling would increase to probably two, or even three.

The addition of 400 apartments and an increase in the dwelling cap will put further strain on the local infrastructure (public transport and roadways) both within Breakfast Point, around Tennyson Road and farther afield.

I believe the traffic study submitted by the developer is too narrow and only assesses 2 intersections close to the Seashores development, ignoring the traffic pressure on roads within Breakfast Point and as far as Concord Road and Parramatta Road, as the increased traffic attempts to access other areas of Sydney.

Demolition of the Plumbers Workshop removes yet another building which was considered under the initial concept plan as having historical significance.

IP Address: c

22

Submission: Online Submission from

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72446

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 2:19 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All



- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Frances Morgan (object) -

Submission Details for Frances Morgan (object)



Frances Morgan<fmorgan@gtlaw.com.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Frances Morgan
Email: fmorgan@gtlaw.com.au

Address:
41/17 Orchards Avenue

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:

I object to the proposed changes on the basis that this brings the number of residences in Breakfast Point to approximately 2,450 as opposed to the original plan of 1650 residences. It is disappointing that Rosecorp is no longer committed to having a provision for seniors living within BP as I know this was an attraction for a lot of older residents. There seems to be a dearth of seniors living in the inner west and this would have been a great opportunity. I also object on the basis of there being no provision for additional facilities to cope with the proposed number of residents that this increase would bring to BP and the increased traffic it will bring to the local area.

IP Address: - 203.20.79.230

Submission: Online Submission from Frances Morgan (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72444

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 1:39 PM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All



- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Denis Osborne (object) -

Submission Details for Denis Osborne (object)



Denis Osborne<denis.osborne@bigpond.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Denis Osborne
Email: denis.osborne@bigpond.com

Address:
23/5 Juniper Drive

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:

I strongly object to the proposed modification to the approved Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005.

My chief objection to the proposed DA (Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4) is what I term "creeping growth " in the number of dwellings from 1189 to 1589 within the Seashores Precinct.

When I purchased an apartment in the Mornington building (off the plan) in 2008, I did so on the understanding that the Breakfast Point suburb would have a certain number of apartments and therefore, residents.

Since that date I have witnessed a massive growth in the number of proposed apartments. There have also been important changes in the size of those apartment. There are now many more one bedroom and two bedroom apartments than was originally proposed.

The proliferation of these smaller apartments has led to greater numbers of residents placing increasing pressure on the amenities within the suburb. In particular, this pressure applies to road use, parking and recreational space.

What if every future resident of the new dwellings in Breakfast Point has 2 + cars as is the current trend? The traffic and parking situation will be a total nightmare!

It is worth keeping in mind that hundreds of people who reside outside Breakfast Point also use the suburb for recreation, shopping, and sightseeing, further exacerbating the pressure on amenities.

I also note that the heritage Plumbers Workshop is destined for demolition as part of the proposed modification. I object to the demolition of this building as one of the selling points to me ,as a purchaser, was the preservation of such buildings.

In conclusion, I believe that the issues surrounding this Development Application are sufficiently serious enough to warrant a PAC being appointed.

IP Address: cpe-58-166-120-101.lnse5.cht.bigpond.net.au - 58.166.120.101

Submission: Online Submission from Denis Osborne (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72435

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

⑨

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Doug and Nancy Tear (object) -

Online Submission from Doug and Nancy Tear (object)



Doug and Nancy Tear<nancy.tear@bigpond.com.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

As long term residents in the area we strongly disagree with the proposal put forward and remind the developer "RoseCorp" of his initial marketing proposal of 1500 doors.

This proposal is not in the interest of the residents of Breakfast Point and surrounds due to:

- * extra 400 apartments
- * extra proportion of 1 bedroom apartments and the extra parking they require
- * parking
- * traffic in Woodlands Ave
- * 5 story buildings becoming 6 story with flat roof
- * demolishing of plumber workshop and replacement with 5 story block
- * no additional amenities for extra residents, the Community Centre and its facilities are over stretched as it is
- * 9 story building moved closer to Spyglass Hill

Email Details

Created 9:58 AM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Object

Tags

Visibility All

10

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Online Submission from Colin Cooksey (object) -

Online Submission from Colin Cooksey (object)

Colin Cooksey<cln.cooksey@gmail.com>
 to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

I object to the Modification Request as it does not provide sufficient information to fully determine the impact on Breakfast Point. It lacks any detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes.

This request:

 breaches the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences.

o The original approval in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This was increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of approximately 50%.

 breaches the Minister's Determination of the Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination to:

o maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings:

 The Developer was required to make a significant special levy (approximately \$1.4m) when an earlier approval was given for an additional 200 apartments. This was to provide community facilities in the suburbs of Concord, Mortlake, Cabarita and Breakfast Point. That contribution has not lead to any enhancement in community facilities in Breakfast Point beyond what was specified in 1999. The current proposal does not include a commitment to provide for any additional community facilities.

o maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas

 this plan appears to put the developer in breach of sales contracts with many existing residents who purchased apartments under current LEP 91 conditions.

The plan as it has been presented, appears to:

 breach conditions regarding the number of storeys in buildings across the whole development which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 breach the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 breach all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Originally nine, the Minister's Determination of 2006 referred to seven. This plan reduces that figure to five.

The plan in its present form:

 presents an inadequate traffic report that only shows traffic at access points to the site as at June 2013. It does not recognise that additional traffic will be generated from the increase in approved apartment numbers in developments yet to be finalised: in The Point (128 to 305), Woodlands North (138 to 195), Augusta (40 to 60) and previously Plantations (269 to 358). When you then include the additional 400 apartments in Seashores, the increase in traffic movements would be 350, not 170, vehicles per hour two way at peak time.

 Does not address the internal traffic to be generated by 2469 residences on roads designed for 1650 residences

 does not attempt to address the impact of the 400 residences in Seashores, together with the 400 previously approved for Mortlake, on the roads on the Mortlake peninsula.

 fails to address parking which, since the increase from 1650 to 2073 residences, has already become an issue across the site.

 does not include sufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements, nor

 provide details on how it will address parking either onsite or offsite.

The developer's contention that this approval is only for an additional 173 residences is wrong by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. He is therefore not in a position to now argue that the 227 residences have been previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400 apartments.

The developer conducted an open day as part of the community consultation process. As no detail had been provided on the proposal to change the roof line on the five story buildings to allow a sixth floor and additional apartments, I asked for design sketches to show how the lift services and the mechanical ventilation could be accommodated with the flat roof. The response I received was "I have sought advice from the developer and can inform you that the lift shaft and services will all be incorporated into the future building design in an attractive manner. Detailed building designs will be available for public comment and feedback at the development application stage of the project (should the proposed Concept Plan amendment be approved)."

I ask that development consent be withheld as

 insufficient information has been provided on the design of the buildings with flat roofs

 the replacement for the plumbers workshop does not have a street address as required under the concept plan as previously varied

 the traffic report does not address both the internal and external impacts of the additional dwellings.

 There is insufficient information on occupant parking, vehicle entry and exit from existing streets, and visitor parking in the red area of the concept plan

 The floor space ratio in the red area of the concept plan exceeds that approved in the original concept plan. (While the FSR for the whole development and the allocated parking spaces are within the tolerances of the 1999 master plan, every application since 2006 refers to the red area as the area within which changes are to be considered.)

I recognise that the developer has the right to apply for variation of the concept plan but ask that any approval be identical to that given in the 1999 Concept Plan.

1 attachment

Objection to Seashores plan.pdf
 239.3 KB

I object to the Modification Request as it does not provide sufficient information to fully determine the impact on Breakfast Point. It lacks any detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes.

This request:

- breaches the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences.
 - The original approval in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This was increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of approximately 50%.
- breaches the Minister's Determination of the Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination to:
 - maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings:
 - The Developer was required to make a significant special levy (approximately \$1.4m) when an earlier approval was given for an additional 200 apartments. This was to provide community facilities in the suburbs of Concord, Mortlake, Cabarita and Breakfast Point. That contribution has not lead to any enhancement in community facilities in Breakfast Point beyond what was specified in 1999. The current proposal does not include a commitment to provide for any additional community facilities.
 - maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas
 - this plan appears to put the developer in breach of sales contracts with many existing residents who purchased apartments under current LEP 91 conditions.

The plan as it has been presented, appears to:

- breach conditions regarding the number of storeys in buildings across the whole development which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006
- breach the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.
- breach all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Originally nine, the Minister's Determination of 2006 referred to seven. This plan reduces that figure to five.

The plan in its present form:

- presents an inadequate traffic report that only shows traffic at access points to the site as at June 2013. It does not recognise that additional traffic will be generated from the increase in approved apartment numbers in developments yet to be finalised: in The Point (128 to 305), Woodlands North (138 to 195), Augusta (40 to 60) and previously Plantations (269 to 358). When you then include the additional 400 apartments in Seashores, the increase in traffic movements would be 350, not 170, vehicles per hour two way at peak time.
- Does not address the internal traffic to be generated by 2469 residences on roads designed for 1650 residences
 - does not attempt to address the impact of the 400 residences in Seashores, together with the 400 previously approved for Mortlake, on the roads on the Mortlake peninsular.
 - fails to address parking which, since the increase from 1650 to 2073 residences, has already become an issue across the site.
 - does not include sufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements, nor
 - provide details on how it will address parking either onsite or offsite.

The developer's contention that this approval is only for an additional 173 residences is wrong by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he argued that Seniors Living did

not result in any increases in residences. He is therefore not in a position to now argue that the 227 residences have been previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400 apartments.

The developer conducted an open day as part of the community consultation process. As no detail had been provided on the proposal to change the roof line on the five story buildings to allow a sixth floor and additional apartments, I asked for design sketches to show how the lift services and the mechanical ventilation could be accommodated with the flat roof. The response I received was "I have sought advice from the developer and can inform you that the lift shaft and services will all be incorporated into the future building design in an attractive manner. Detailed building designs will be available for public comment and feedback at the development application stage of the project (should the proposed Concept Plan amendment be approved)."

I ask that development consent be withheld as

- insufficient information has been provided on the design of the buildings with flat roofs
- the replacement for the plumbers workshop does not have a street address as required under the concept plan as previously varied
- the traffic report does not address both the internal and external impacts of the additional dwellings.
- There is insufficient information on occupant parking, vehicle entry and exit from existing streets, and visitor parking in the red area of the concept plan
- The floor space ratio in the red area of the concept plan exceeds that approved in the original concept plan. (While the FSR for the whole development and the allocated parking spaces are within the tolerances of the 1999 master plan, every application since 2006 refers to the red area as the area within which changes are to be considered.)

I recognise that the developer has the right to apply for variation of the concept plan but ask that any approval be identical to that given in the 1999 Concept Plan.



- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from XIAO LI (object) -

Online Submission from XIAO LI (object)

XIAO LI<joel_li1202@hotmail.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

t represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.

- It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.
- Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences
- It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:
 - o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)
 - o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and
 - o Not result in a significant loss of open space

Email Details

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| Created | 9:10 AM - Fri Aug 16, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 16, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | Object |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from

12

Online Submission from

to Simon Truong

Aug 16 (5 days ago)

I object to the Modification 4 of Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 for the following reasons:

i) Unacceptably high increase in density since initial 1999 proposal. Modifications represent an increase in dwellings of approx 50% since the 1999 Master Plan. Originally 1650 dwellings were approved with the current proposal now seeking a total of 2469 dwellings (1589+880 already completed).

This proposal should consider the FSR within the proposed area rather than across the entire Breakfast Point development as this amendment further increases the already high density of a small section of Breakfast Point. This has resulted in very unbalanced development, with the eastern side being low rise and lower density than the western side.

The high density of the western side already greatly affects the amenity of surrounding Concord residents due to crowded streets, limited local parking and loss of visual amenity resulting from the high rise structures. Permitting a further increase in dwelling numbers would have a further negative impact on the amenity of residents dwelling in surrounding streets.

ii) Increased traffic volume to local streets. The increased dwelling numbers will result in additional cars garaged in Breakfast Point. All proposed construction is concentrated within a small section of the site with limited egress. Traffic generated from the proposed section of Breakfast Point will be funnelled onto Tennyson Rd and local streets connected to Tennyson Rd, resulting in unacceptably high traffic congestion to local surrounding streets.

iii) Demolition of Heritage Items - Plumbers Workshop and the Powerhouse. Throughout all previous community consultations and early submissions, these buildings were recognised as being historically and culturally significant, which is why they have been consistently allocated for "adaptive re-use".

They are the only 2 remaining structures that depict the industrial heritage of the site - the majority of the other "heritage" buildings are single story administration/office buildings and are concentrated around the Tennyson Rd entrance.

The Powerhouse and Plumbers Workshop are historically and culturally significant as both demonstrate the range of skilled workers employed as well as the scale of the former gasworks site. The wider Concord community has always been of the understanding that these buildings would be restored for commercial or retail use and it would be unacceptable for the many people with connections to the site for these buildings to be demolished.

Listed above are my 3 main objections, although I also have concerns regarding the lack of uniformity of rooflines between the proposed and existing structures on the site- although it may be useful in denoting "the ghetto" as well as the limited parking already evident within Breakfast Point.

I hope that my points raised will be given full consideration by your department.

Yours sincerely

Email Details

Created 8:11 AM - Fri Aug 16, 2013

Logged for Aug 16, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Anonymous Object

Tags

Visibility All

(13)

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Laurie Ihnativ (object) -

Online Submission from Laurie Ihnativ (object)



Laurie Ihnativ<lozza1950@hotmail.com> Aug 16 (5 days ago)
to Simon Truong

I object to the development on the grounds outlined in my attachment.

1 attachment

SEASHORES SUBMISSION.pdf
16.17 KB

Email Details

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| Created | 7:12 AM - Fri Aug 16, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 16, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | Object |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |

Attachments

SEASHORES SUBMISSION.pdf
- 16.17 KB

This objection is lodged on behalf Laurie and Cheryl Ihnativ. We reject to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

- There will be further issues with parking within Breakfast Point due to the continued practice by the developer to assign designated visitor parking spaces to the streets of Breakfast Point which have not changed from the original master plan. There are already significant issues with parking on the streets of Breakfast Point without considering the impact of the apartments currently approved or being constructed.
- The traffic study included with the submission is inadequate and fails to deal with the increased traffic on the Mortlake Peninsula with developments such as the recently approved increased apartments associated with the Hilly Street development.
- Whilst the study focuses on traffic within the Breakfast Point community, the baseline for the study fails to take into account the current apartments under construction or not sold. It also fails to deal with the potential impact of traffic if a commercial marina is constructed in Kendall Bay. This continues to be an option for developer while they retain ownership of Lot 55 of DP 27034 which is required to 'attach' a marina to the foreshore.
- Some of the architectural changes, including the use of a flat roof design to incorporate a 'complete' top floor on some of the buildings, will impact view lines and vistas and is inconsistent with existing buildings
- The demolition of the Plumbers Workshop, which is considered to be of local cultural significance, will result in only five heritage structure being retained from the nine included in the Breakfast Point Master Plan.
- The original master plan had a total of 1650 residential apartments and with the current application, if approved, the total will increase to over 2460 this is an increase of 50%. With this significant increase in apartment numbers there has been no increase in the community facilities within Breakfast Point; in fact there has been a reduction in community facilities from the original master plan.

14

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Rona Tranberg (object) -

Online Submission from Rona Tranberg (object)

Rona Tranberg<rn@northandsouth.no>
to Simon Truong

Aug 15 (5 days ago)

I am the owner of lot 33 in 21 Peninsula Dr, Breakfast Point, NSW 2137.

It is my opinion that the Modification Request would lead to a considerable decrease of the quality of life for the people living in Breakfast Points if approved, and it should more specifically be denied for the following reasons:

- An increased number of apartments would worsen the street parking situation of the entire area. There are already too many cars compared to parking spaces, which causes danger on a daily basis. It does not help us who lives here that such parking is illegal, as such parking will continue to take place as long as the indoor parking is not taking into account the actual average cars of each household.

- o The modification request plan of increasing the car spaces with 251 is not sufficient to avoid increased pressure on street parking. This is because the increased number of apartments will have a much higher number of cars among the households. Therefore it is not important whether the gross floor area (GFA) is increased or not.

- The difficult parking situation also makes some caretakers move garbage bins to the street up to 48 hours before emptying time, in order to make sure that there is space for the bins in the street. In addition to the smell, it may cause health hazard.

- Breakfast Point is already more densely populated than the surrounding living communities, and it would therefore be unreasonable if it should be to contain even more apartments than what is already approved. It is a fact that the planned number of apartments are already increased with approximately 50% compared to the initial plan approved.

- The plan of preserving the exterior of the Plumbers Workshop by reuse should be maintained for the same reasons that it was originally adopted. It is of no importance that the Plumbers Workshop was not planned for reuse in the initial plan approved.

- o Regardless that it has not yet been heritage listed it has important cultural value to show for the future generations that Breakfast Point was originally an industrial area, and a preserved Plumbers Workshop will also add importantly to the beauty of the community given all the new buildings with modern exteriors.

- Based on the above, it is not correct when the Supporting Environmental Assessment states:

- o That the quality of services and amenity will not suffer.

- o That the traffic impacts associated with the proposal are acceptable.

- o That appropriate parking is provided.

- Lastly, it should also in my opinion be taken into account that the lot owners at Breakfast Point have made their huge and hugely important investments based on the plans that the developer has presented, and the politicians should therefore in my opinion protect the lot owners' interest that the number of apartments are not increased.

Email Details

Created 7:09 PM - Thu Aug 15, 2013

Logged for Aug 15, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Object

Tags

Visibility All

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| Created | 6:56 PM - Thu Aug 15, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 15, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | General Details |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |



- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Submission Details for Robert Kennedy (object) -

Submission Details for Robert Kennedy (object)



Robert Kennedy<lyn.bobk@bigpond.com>
 to Simon Truong

Aug 15 (5 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Robert Kennedy
 Email: lyn.bobk@bigpond.com

Address:
 Apartment 206

Breakfast Point, NSW
 2137

Content:

We object to this latest request for modification to the Breakfast Point concept plan and the proposed increase in the number of residences that it will add to this community.

Currently approved and under construction increases in the number of residences, approved under previous modifications, are yet to come on stream yet we are already experiencing traffic and on-street parking problems throughout the whole community.

The traffic plan that accompanies this request suggests that there will be no effect on on-street parking, we can only assume that the writer has not tried to park of an evening in the community. This plan does not take into account that some residences have more cars than allocated in-building car parking spaces, hence they park in the street. And this is the problem.

Frankly, the traffic plan looks like the plan that one would have to justify an objective, considering it's conclusions on parking and it's scope is too limited as it has not considered the effect of extra traffic on the Mortlake Peninsula.

The developer has so far been able to assign visitor parking to on-street rather than provide the required visitor parking within a building, perhaps with these new precincts they should be forced to provide visitor parking, in-building.

We also note that the proposal is to increase the number of levels for the development from five (5) to six (6) and that architectural changes include altering the roof structures from pitched roofs to flat roof. This drastically changes the roof line that has been used so far throughout the community and we object to this. We suspect that these two changes are interlinked and designed to increase the overall number of residences.

It seems to us that the history of modifications to the Breakfast Point concept plan is one of increasing the number of residences at each stage. No doubt that this is good for profits. The original concept plan had a total of 1650 residences, this modification seeks approval for an extra 400 residences which will increase the total residences to 2460, an increase of 49%.

However the community infrastructure would have been designed around earlier plans that contained fewer residences, so while the developer can take his profits, the community is left with the infrastructure problems.

We note that the information circulated to Breakfast Point residents via a letterbox drop claims that the increase in the number of residences is just 2%, we find that number rather odd.

They also claim that 227 seniors living dwellings will be removed from the plan to give a net additional number of dwellings of 173. It seems odd to us that these seniors dwelling do not appear in earlier plans. They seem to have been "beds".

We chose to live here since it was less crowded and more spacious than most other apartment complexes and we paid a premium for this. We can see this attribute of the community being downgraded in the developer's interest of extra profits.

This is not proper community planning and we object in the strongest terms.

Yours sincerely,
 R J & E N Kennedy

IP Address: cpe-110-147-167-137.nhl8.cht.bigpond.net.au - 110.147.167.137

Submission: Online Submission from Robert Kennedy (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72397

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

(16)

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for

Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

Aug 15 (6 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

1. I object to the extra 400 apts. due to overcrowding of given area.
2. Parking already at a premium for existing residents.
3. This is a beautiful suburb which is changing character as more 1 bedroom apts. are added, which usually are for renters and investors.
4. Heritage buildings will be lost, when renovation would give an attractive asset to the area.
5. Extra community facilities not added for all the extra people coming to the area.

IP

Submission: Online Submission from

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72369

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 11:39 AM - Thu Aug 15, 2013

Logged for Aug 15, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Submission Details for Dorothy Artis (object) -

20

Submission Details for Dorothy Artis (object)

Dorothy Artis<cartisc1@bigpond.com>
 to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Dorothy Artis
 Email: cartisc1@bigpond.com

Address:
 11/2-4 Woodlands Ave

Breakfast Point, NSW
 2137

Content:

I have been a resident of Breakfast Point for the past 4 years and am 88 years old. My daughter is kindly submitting my objection to this proposal.

I was delighted with the previous concept of a Seniors dwelling, and so strenuously object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest :

 It represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.

 It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.

 Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences

 It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:

- o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)
- o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and
- o Not result in a significant loss of open space

 It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7

 As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.

 It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines

 It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.

 The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.

 It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public caf  facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

 The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre,

Festivity Gathering Place, Playground , Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

 The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Kind Regards

Dorothy Artis

IP Address: cpe-58-164-80-78.ins1.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.164.80.78

Submission: Online Submission from Dorothy Artis (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72297

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 9:43 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Online Submission from Fiona Campbell (object) -

21

Online Submission from Fiona Campbell (object)

Fiona Campbell<howzat_007@hotmail.com>
 to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

I object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

 It represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.

 It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.

 Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences

 It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:

o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)

o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and

o Not result in a significant loss of open space

 It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7

 As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.

 It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines

 It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.

 The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.

 It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public café facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

 The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground, Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

 The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Regards,

Fiona Campbell

Email Details

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Carolyn Artis-Campbell (object) -

22

Submission Details for Carolyn Artis-Campbell (object)

Carolyn Artis-Campbell<cartisc1@bigpond.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Carolyn Artis-Campbell
Email: cartisc1@bigpond.com

Address:
14/6-8 WOODLANDS AVE

BREAKFAST POINT, NSW
2137

Content:

I object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

 It represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.

 It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.

 Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences

 It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:

- o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)

- o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and

- o Not result in a significant loss of open space

 It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7

 As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.

 It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines

 It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.

 The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.

 It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public caf  facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

 The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground , Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already

inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

 The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Yours truly,
Carolyn Artis-Campbell

IP Address: cpe-58-164-80-78.lns1.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.164.80.78

Submission: Online Submission from Carolyn Artis-Campbell (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72293

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 9:22 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Stephen Matthews (object) -

23

Online Submission from Stephen Matthews (object)

Stephen Matthews<stephen.m.matthews@gmail.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

I wish to lodge an objection to this application and request the following issues be considered in any assessment process.

(1) There has already been a significant increase in dwelling numbers over that included in the original concept plan. This increase in dwellings has not included a commensurate increase in community facilities. The developer is now planning to resume residential development on the site previously allocated for seniors living. At the time of the seniors living approval the developer was granted, approval was given for additional dwellings in other buildings that have now been developed. These earlier approvals for extra dwellings should be included in assessing the impact of the current request.

(2) There needs to be a comprehensive traffic study undertaken that includes the impact of both increased traffic levels and overflow parking of the access roads to Breakfast Point. The current traffic study would appear to only have covered roads within Breakfast Point. It should be carefully assessed whether even the current parking within Breakfast Point meets requirements particularly with respect to the proximity to buildings for disabled and visitor parking.

(3) The developer is proposing changes to Building profiles that appear inconsistent with the general architectural standards that the developer has insisted all residents are required to observe. High rise buildings throughout the estate have maintained a consistent pitched roof appearance and the proposed changes in roof profile to a flat roof would appear to be driven by financial factors and not architectural merit.

(4) A feature of the estate was to be recognition of the history of the site and a number of heritage items were identified as worthy of preservation. The Power Station site has already had its heritage status changed and the original proposal that it be dedicated as a community facility has been replaced with the construction of additional dwellings. It becomes even more important that the Plumbers Workshop be retained and developed by Rose as a community facility in recognition of the greatly increased dwelling numbers that have been approved prior to this latest application.

(5) Many residents purchased in this Estate on the understanding that the original concept plan provided some confidence that the nature and scale of the estate had been defined by the Planning Authorities. Originally there were not to be any one bedroom apartments in Breakfast Point and the reduction of three bedroom apartments with two off street parking spaces and the introduction of one bedroom apartments with one off street parking space has resulted in increased pressure on parking. (Couples with two cars would appear to be the predominant Apartment dwellers across the estate) The overall planning department guidelines for parking allocation for developments would appear to need reassessing to reflect reality

I would suggest that if the planning authorities are to deal with this application in a manner that is consistent with their original approval of the concept plan they in fact should be looking for a reduction in dwelling numbers in the seashores precinct to offset the additional dwelling numbers allocated when this precinct was approved for seniors living.

Email Details

Created 6:33 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Object

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission

24

Submission Details for

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

My submission can be broken up into 5 points:

- 1) An extra 400 apartments is too great an increase and will lead to over crowding and all the 1 bedroom apartments will lower the tone of Breakfast Point (now mainly 2 and 3 bedrooms).
- 2) 1 bedroom apartments, usually appeal to couples and they mostly both have cars. The developer only provides 1 car space. Where will the other car park? Probably on the street in one of the few visitor car spaces. There will be no parking left in Peninsula Dr and we will have a large increase in traffic.
- 3) Turning 5 storey buildings into flat roofed 6 storey buildings also lowers the tone of the suburb.
- 4) There are no new amenities built for these extra (400 +) residents. The Country Club is already overflowing in the peak times.
- 5) The heritage building (the plumber's workshop) should be kept and restored appropriately. This would keep the history of the area alive in modern Breakfast Point.

IP Address: c

Submission: Online Su

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72273

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 5:35 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Submission Details for (object) -

25

Submission Details for

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

I am a resident of Breakfast Point, and have concerns regarding the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4. Firstly, since I initially became interested in living at Breakfast Point, I have seen the concept change with each stage, and the numbers of residences increasing above the original master plan. The alterations to the configuration of buildings has seen a substantial increase in the number of one bedroom apartments, and the dramatic decrease in 3 bedroom apartments. There has been a substantial increase in the number of investors, not necessarily first home buyers, and the reduction in 3 bedroom apartments has precluded "empty nesters", retirees, and families with children.

The proposal for an additional 400 additional dwellings within 5 buildings indicates that there will no doubt be many more 1 & 2 bedroom apartments and fewer 3 bedroom apartments.

The most contentious issue of parking is as a result of more people living in the buildings, with more motor vehicles than car spaces provided. May I firmly remind you that Visitor parking is allocated to on street parking, and ALL onstreet parking is supposed to be visitor parking. The reality is that residents are using these spaces exclusively, and that apartments with one car space allocation, are using visitor parking for their personal use, for any additional vehicle, some being large vans. There is absolutely no spaces for visitors in the weekend and any evening. Rosewater Circuit and Peninsular Drive is always full, and we have instances of cars being parked on the footpaths. So, the parking arrangements are totally inadequate, and the allocation for Visitor Parking simply hyperthetical.

The Plumbers Workshop, it appears, is to be demolished, despite it's in the past being considered of some significance. Yet another building with some history and considered worthy of adaptation, to be lost, as have others on site. How sad that we have no regard for past history, and are reluctant to retain any heritage.

The Seashores Precinct sits alongside "The Hamptons", "Lighthouse"(9 storeys), and the overall population in these adjacent precincts will be very high. Breakfast Point is a Community, and promoted as such, but there are no extra facilities, it appears, to add to the Community, and I wonder how the existing amenities will be able to accommodate the huge increase in population. I refer to the Country Club with its facilities, ie, tennis courts, gym pool etc. and parking at the Village shopping centre.

Reference is made to some internal and external design changes. Obviously internal changes relate to the configuration, and I have already expressed concern regarding the numbers of 1 bedroom apartments with 1 car space, and the problems which are already evident in Breakfast Point. Do the changes externally relate to the aesthetic architecture, and the roof line? It is noted that on one of the drawings, markings which indicate a flat roof. Is this an attempt to increase the height of the building from 5 to 6 storeys?

Mention is made of effects on traffic, but only within the streets of Breakfast Point. I suggest you spend some time looking at traffic congestion on Broughton Street, Wellbank Street, Tennyson Road, Parramatta Road, Concord Road, where all the traffic in Breakfast Point, as well as the residents of neighbouring streets head towards. Perhaps Saturday morning after 10am would be an ideal time, as well as peak hour, to really experience the density. Remember, as well as the increase in Breakfast Point, the Hilly Street development should also be taken into the calculation.

I understand that we have an ever increasing population, and housing is required, but it would be reassuring to know that problems which already exist are acknowledged, and attempts made to address and to overcome these, and to also prevent the exacerbation of these same problems. Large numbers of people bring problems, and the amenity of any development on the existing residents, and neighbouring residents should be considered.

The original concept of Breakfast Point was visionary, and it has proven to be a very successful enterprise. It has become a community in many ways, with a good mix of age groups, ethnic groups, and a great deal of pride amongst its residents, but, sadly it is changing, along with changes to the Concept Plan.

In summary, the proposal as presented, has too many apartments for the precinct, inadequate number of available car spaces for the number of apartments, and totally unrealistic allocation for Visitor Parking.

I would love to see quality, not quantity, and the Community of Breakfast Point continue as it was intended in the Master Plan.

IP Address: 113.113.113.113

Submission: Online Submission from

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=12263

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for

25

Submission Details for

Aug 14 (6 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Name:
Address:

Content:

My wife and I wish to lodge our strong objection to this development on the grounds that it represents a massive over-development of a suburb which we were led to believe was never intended to accommodate anything like that number of residents. If approved, the development will be some 45 per cent larger than the 1,850-dwelling complex which we were informed was planned when we originally decided to buy an apartment in Breakfast Point. More importantly, it would have a dramatically adverse impact on the ambience and character of the suburb and, we believe, ultimately affect the resale value of our properties. We agree entirely with the Breakfast Point Residents who have raised numerous objections to this proposal. which would mean an increase of some 1,000 in the population. It would very clearly exacerbate the traffic and parking problems which have already become a major concern. It is also clear that little or nothing has been done to improve the infrastructure to anything like the extent that would be necessary to accommodate this hugely increased population.

IP Address: 123

Submission

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=r2229

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 1:53 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Valerie Roberts (object) -

26

Submission Details for Valerie Roberts (object)

Valerie Roberts<valroberts@tpg.com.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (7 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Valerie Roberts
Email: valroberts@tpg.com.au

Address:
14/5 Juniper Drive

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:

It was because of the style and ambience of Breakfast Point that convinced my husband and I to leave our home on acreage in the Blue Mountains and buy an apartment here. We have never been disappointed in that decision, perhaps until now.

Our dismay at the proposed Seashore Estate has prompted this protest to the construction changes (and destruction of the Plumbers building).

My protest is as follows:

- (a) The removal of the approved Seniors living concept (509 beds)
- (b) With design changes the addition of 400 extra residential apartments
- (c) The increasing of the dwelling cap from 1189 to 1589 coupled with increased car spaces in the Seashore Precinct will put great stress on the road congestion.
- (d) The Plumbers Workshop should not be dismantled. It has heritage status , much of which has been lost already. Adapt it for public use.

We strongly object to these variations to the original plans.

IP Address: 60-240-213-233.static.tpgi.com.au - 60.240.213.233
Submission: Online Submission from Valerie Roberts (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72223

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 1:28 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Roberto ADONCELLO (object) -

Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

days ago)

(27)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

1 object to
extra 400 apartments
extra proportion of 1 bedroom apartments (and extra parking they require parking
traffic in Woodlands Ave
5 story buildings becoming 6 story with flat roof
demolishing of plumber workshop and replacement with 5 story block
no new amenities for extra residents

IP Address:

Submission:

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_submission&id=16607

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 12:01 PM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for John Small (object) -

(28)

Submission Details for John Small (object)

John Small<johnwsmall@iinet.net.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 14 (7 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: John Small
Email: johnwsmall@iinet.net.au

Address:
14 Breakfast Point Bvd

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:
Please attached objection letter.

In addition, I object because residential apartments in the Plumbers Workshop building breaches a long-standing BP design principle that all dwellings will have a street address. This building does not.

IP Address: 124-169-154-5.dyn.iinet.net.au - 124.169.154.5
Submission: Online Submission from John Small (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72201

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

1 attachment

Breakfast Point CP Mod 4_ Submission to Dept Planning & Infrastructure_ August 2013.pdf
40.66 KB

Email Details

| | |
|------------|-----------------------------|
| Created | 11:46 AM - Wed Aug 14, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 14, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | General Details |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |

Attachments

Breakfast Point CP Mod 4_ Submission to Dept Planning & Infrastructure_ August 2013.pdf
- 40.66 KB

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Online Submission from

29

Online Submission from .

Aug 14 (7 days ago)

to Simon Truong

 I object because:

Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences

 It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:

- o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)
- o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and
- o Not result in a significant loss of open space

 It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7

 As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.

 It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines

 It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.

 The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.

 It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public café facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

 The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground , Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

 The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Email Details

Created 11:41 AM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Anonymous Object

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Submission Details for

30

Submission Details for

Aug 14 (7 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: '

Email: '

Address:

Content:

 I object because this submission is not in the public interest because:

- Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences

 - It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:

o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)

o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and

o Not result in a significant loss of open space

 - It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7

 - As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.

 - It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines

 - It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006

 - It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.

 - It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.

 - The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.

 - It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public café facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

 - The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground, Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

 - The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors

Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

- Including residential in the Plumber's Workshop is a breach of the long-established Breakfast Point design principle that all dwellings shall have a street address. There is no street address for this building.

IP Address: '

Submission: Online Submission from I

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72196

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 11:38 AM - Wed Aug 14, 2013

Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for N

(31)

Submission Details for

Aug 14 (7 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

It will have a serious impact on the traffic and the traffic report does not consider the traffic going out of breakfast point in any direction namely towards city, western suburbs, northern area and south. Since the time, i have been living here, there is already such a growing negative impact on the impact that to move out of the area in peak time is becoming a nightmare. Added to this increase, there is already a massive construction is happening in Mortlake area.

IP Address:

Submission: Online Submission

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=7...

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 9:56 AM - Wed Aug 14, 2013
Logged for Aug 14, 2013

Priority Medium
Class General Details
Tags
Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Susan White (object) -

(32)

Online Submission from Susan White (object)

Susan White<susan.m.white@bigpond.com23/5>
to Simon Truong

Aug 13 (7 days ago)

I strongly object to the provision of 400 additional residential dwellings/apartments in the Seashores Precinct at Breakfast Point.

This latest attempt by the developer to maximise the number of apartments beyond what is reasonable and manageable within the limited boundaries of Breakfast Point should be refused because:

Amenity.

The pleasant quality and attractiveness of Breakfast Point, including the desirability of the current lifestyle of the area, will be forever downgraded by an oversized and overcrowded development.

Parking

The increase in the number of car spaces from 304 to 555 underestimates the influx of cars that will come with the proposed development. Many established buildings already have excess cars to parking spaces. Modern families often have a car for each individual. Add to this the work car for some and the formula for car spaces becomes inadequate. On street parking cannot accommodate the overflow from the above estimate of spaces needed for this proposed modification. Parking and traffic flow are already major issues within Breakfast Point.

Traffic Flow

Traffic flow in and out of Breakfast Point will be significantly affected by the proposed overdevelopment. This traffic then affects other main exit routes once outside Breakfast Point. Traffic from the previously approved seniors living buildings where elderly residents were to live in single room accommodation would not have generated the same volume of traffic as numbers of vehicles would be reduced in this population.

Streetscape and Architecture

The modification includes building designs that do not follow the accepted and awarded design style that has given Breakfast Point its unique character and appeal. Among these differences is the plan to have flat roofs and more levels. Various service structures may be visible from these flat roofs.

Excess Pressure on Facilities

Many hundreds of owners bought into Breakfast Point after carrying out legal searches that showed the future development limits set out in the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005.

Over time there has been an insidious development creep across the community from 1650 dwellings to 2469.

Overcrowding of any type always causes problems. Too many people using facilities and infrastructure leads to both a social and physical deterioration of the community.

The Residents of Breakfast Point deserve, at the very least, to have a PAC appointed so that the real consequences of the proposed modification can be heard and addressed.

Email Details

Created 10:54 PM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Object

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for Maria Plater (object) -

33

Submission Details for Maria Plater (object)

Maria Plater<m2plater@bigpond.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 13 (7 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Maria Plater
Email: m2plater@bigpond.com

Address:
41/67

Breakfast Point, NSW
2137

Content:

As a resident of Breakfast Point for 5.5 years I have watched the development grow far beyond the original concept plan. While I wish to see the complex completed, I would like to see it done to the high quality with which it began. I object to the modification request on the following grounds:

1. The provision of 400 additional residential apartments is far too high for the complex, given the increased apartment numbers that have already occurred. The original concept plan had a total of 1650 apartments and if the current application is approved it will increase the total to more than 2460. This is an increase of 50%!
 2. Parking in Breakfast Point is already a significant issue and this will only exacerbate it as all designated visitor parking is on the streets.
 3. The Hilly Street development has been approved and this allowed for a further increase in apartments adjacent to Breakfast Point by 300. This alone will add considerable pressure to the existing infrastructure eg roads let alone a further 400 apartment increase in Breakfast Point.
 4. Many of the proposed apartments will include 1 bedroom apartments. It is naïve to expect that all people who live in 1 bedroom apartments have 1 car and will thus be allocated parking in their building. They too will vie for the limited street parking available.
 5. Demolition of the Plumbers Workshop building. This should not be allowed and should be considered for adaptive reuse. It is 1 of only 5 heritage structures left in the suburb and should be maintained. Having travelled extensively overseas I have seen what can be done with such structures and strongly suggest that this building be maintained and, in fact, be used as a centrepiece for the precinct.
 6. The proposed site is where the workmen currently park their cars and I see no provision in the application for parking for the workers. Are they going to park on the already crowded streets and in the designated visitor parking spaces?
- In summary, the development application is far too big given all the amendments that have already been made to the master plan over the years. It needs to be smaller, not larger.

IP Address: cpe-58-168-71-107.lns3.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.168.71.107

Submission: Online Submission from Maria Plater (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72167

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 5:14 PM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from Elizabeth Oliver (object) -

34

Online Submission from Elizabeth Oliver (object)

Elizabeth Oliver<theolivers@comcen.com.au>
to Simon Truong

Aug 13 (7 days ago)

I object to this concept plan. The apartments proposed exceed the Master Plan by approx. 50% and will exacerbate existing traffic & parking problems as well as overstretch community facilities which were designed to cater for the Master Plan numbers. The Heritage building should be retained as recognition of the site's history.

Email Details

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| Created | 4:32 PM - Tue Aug 13, 2013 |
| Logged for | Aug 13, 2013 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Class | Object |
| Tags | |
| Visibility | All |

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from James McFarlane (object) -



Online Submission from James McFarlane (object)

James McFarlane<jmcf2006@gmail.com>
to Simon Truong

Aug 13 (7 days ago)

This application by the developer is yet another example of incremental changes to the original Breakfast Point Concept Plan which detract from the amenity and heritage values of the estate: changes which have been ongoing between 1999 and 2013.

Plans to increase the number of dwellings by another 400 should be rejected because the suburb, along with the surrounding Mortlake peninsular, are getting too crowded.

Provision of visitor parking across the estate is inadequate.

Plans to demolish the heritage buildings of the plumbers workshop and the powerhouse are strongly opposed by the community because it represents a loss of our history, and they are attractive buildings in their own right.

In my opinion, the community would simply prefer the developer to finish the construction of the estate to the original concept plans and as soon as practicable without introducing more congestion, destroying heritage assets or by changing the architectural standards of the buildings (for example, adding an additional floor by removing the gable roof and making the building flat-roofed, as per this current application).

Email Details

Created 2:16 PM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Object

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Submission Details for

(36)

Submission Details for !

Aug 13 (8 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email: r

Address:

Content:

I object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

- It represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.
- It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.
- Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences
- It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:
 - o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)
 - o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and
 - o Not result in a significant loss of open space
- It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7
- As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.
- It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines
- It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006
- It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.
- It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.
- The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.
- It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's

Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public café facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)

- The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground , Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.

- The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Thanks

IP Address: .

Submission: Online Submission from .

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72151

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 1:16 PM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Submission Details for

37

Submission Details for

Aug 13 (8 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email: _____

Address:

Content:

400 additional apartments will stretch the current infrastructure to its limit eg roads, parking, Community facilities, Country Club
no extra parking with the proposed increase 1 one bedroom apartments will result in a hazardous driving environment with additional parking in streets affecting safe vision and narrowing the streets
5 storeys with flat roof PLUS a/c and lift shafts will result in a virtual six storey building
replacing pitched roof with flat roof destroys the aesthetics of the entire development
no open space, park areas have been provided for

IP Address: -

Submission: Online Submission from I

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=72144

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 10:33 AM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
 - Activity: Online Submission from .

38

Online Submission from .

Aug 13 (8 days ago)

to Simon Truong

I object to the Modification Request as it is clearly not in the public interest because:

- It represents a gross breach of faith by the developer with existing residents of Breakfast Point, the Mortlake Peninsular and the City of Canada Bay more generally.
- It will put the developer in breach of contracts for sale with many existing residents.
- Contrary to the developer's representations, it is in breach of the original Council LEP 91 for the site which specifies a maximum 2073 residences
- It is clearly and substantially in breach of the Minister's Determination of Breakfast Point Concept Plan dated 7th April 2006, in particular Condition 7 of that Determination in respect of its failure to:
 - o Maintain or improve the amenity of existing residents and approved buildings (see also below on Community Facilities)
 - o Maintain and not obstruct existing view corridors and vistas, and
 - o Not result in a significant loss of open space
- It is in breach of the Determination both in isolation and in conjunction with other approvals and proposals, including and in particular with its proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings on the Powerhouse lot, which is itself grossly in breach of all aspects of Condition 7
- As the DG's approval of Condition 7 was not subject to public consultation and consequently illegal, it calls into question the legality all subsequent approvals which rely on it, including any purported approval of this proposal.
- It contains insufficient information to fully determine the breaches above due to its complete lack of detail beyond conceptual outlines for the buildings it proposes, however see below on storeys and roof lines
- It breaches conditions regarding numbers of storeys in buildings which have been consistent since original approvals in Master Plans 1999, 2002 and the Minister's Determination of 2006
- It is in breach of the requirement that buildings will have predominantly hipped and gable style roofs.
- It contains insufficient detail to determine compliance with visitor parking requirements. Given that the developer's own requirements are that visitor parking will be onsite if offsite parking is not available within 100m, and that the developer's own parking plans show conclusively that there are insufficient spaces offsite, for compliance it would need to have a detailed plan of how all residences and resident parking together with visitor parking can be accommodated onsite.
- The traffic report is grossly inadequate as it shows only traffic at access points to the site and fails to address the significant traffic issues around the site and the Canada Bay area more generally, including the already grossly choked areas of access on Lyons Rd, Burwood Rd and Broughton St across Parramatta Rd, Hospital Rd onto Concord Rd and Homebush Bay Dve, and Correys Ave onto Concord Rd, Centenary Dve, the M4 and Olympic Park. And the report also fails to take account of traffic generated by other developments in the Mortlake area, including Part 3A approval by the PAC in Mortlake, which is itself non-compliant on traffic impacts.
- It is in breach of all previous approvals concerning retention of heritage and historical aspects of the site. Original heritage aspects of the site covered 9 specific structures and, if this were approved that would be reduced to 5, despite the Minister's Determination covering 7. In particular, the developer's Statement of Heritage Impact finds the Plumbers Workshop to be of significant historical value, yet then proposes to demolish it as adaptive reuse is either impracticable or uneconomic. This claim is clearly false: it is contrary to the developer's previous proposals for the site; and particularly given the objection below concerning inadequate community facilities, could easily be put to a use such as an annex to the Country Club with public café facility and heritage display (an area similar to but smaller than the excellent facility established in the public area at the northern end of Garden Island Sydney, containing cafeteria and Naval Museum, comes to mind)
- The developer contends that community facilities on the site are adequate. This is clearly and substantially false. Original approval for Breakfast Point in Master Plan 1999 allowed for 1650 residences. This has already increased by 25% to 2069 and this proposal would increase it by a further 400 residences or 24% giving a total increase of 50% (rounded to nearest integer). At the same time, community facilities proposed for the 1650 residences included Village Green, Multipurpose Chapel (Meeting Hall), Village Centre, Club, Skiff Rowing Facility (Boatshed), Marina (private) as part of a Waterfront Precinct, Wharf, Amphitheatre, Festivity Gathering Place, Playground , Rotunda and Shelter (on the Point), Function Centre (Powerhouse), Fishing Access/Public Jetties and Energy Park and Museum. Consequent on the considerable reduction in the number of community facilities now proposed, and those remaining having been designed for a population contained in 1650 residences, facilities are already inadequate and becoming overcrowded despite only partial occupancy of the site at present. Approval of this proposal would see them as ultimately grossly inadequate.
- The developer's contention that this approval is really only for an additional 173 residences is patently false by his own admission. In seeking approval for the 227 Seniors Living units he now relies on for this proposal, he clearly argued that Seniors Living did not result in any increases in residences. Therefore he is not in a position to now argue that such residences were previously approved. This proposal is clearly for an increase of 400.

Email Details

Created 7:50 AM - Tue Aug 13, 2013
 Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority

Medium

Class

Anonymous Object

Tags

Visibility

All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -
- Activity: Online Submission from

(34)

Online Submission from:

Aug 13 (8 days ago)

to Simon Truong

I object to any additional apartments as it is already extremely congested and there are valid reasons why the current cap was legalised. Moving the 9 story building closer to Spyglass Hill is a major decrease in quality of life for residents of both buildings. Changing to a flat roof to add another story is visually shocking.

There are constant amendment applications so, as we are near the end of finishing Breakfast Point can we legally lock it all in and save the NSW taxpayer,s money.

Email Details

Created 12:29 AM - Tue Aug 13, 2013

Logged for Aug 13, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Anonymous Object

Tags

Visibility All

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions
- Activity: Submission Details for Anne Guest (object) -

40

Submission Details for

Aug 12 (8 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name

Email

Address:

Content:

The extra apartments will generate more traffic and create greater parking problems in an already crowded, narrow street, Woodlands Ave.

IP Address:

2

Submission: Online Submission from

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71990

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543

Email Details

Created 4:02 PM - Mon Aug 12, 2013

Logged for Aug 12, 2013

Priority Medium

Class General Details

Tags

Visibility All