

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

41

## Submission Details for kevin Guest (object)

Kevin Guest<[kevinguest@hotmail.com](mailto:kevinguest@hotmail.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 12 (8 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: kevin Guest  
Email: [kevinguest@hotmail.com](mailto:kevinguest@hotmail.com)

Address:  
70/5 WOODLANDS AVE

BREAKFAST POINT, NSW  
2137

Content:  
I wish to complain for two reasons, the building envelopes have changed and Woodlands Ave is not designed for this many apartments. See attachment

IP Address: 124-170-213-32.dyn.iinet.net.au - 124.170.213.32  
Submission: Online Submission from kevin Guest (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71960](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71960)

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

### 1 attachment

Complaints and Comments letter Kevin.pdf  
638.3 KB

## Email Details

Created 3:39 PM - Mon Aug 12, 2013  
Logged for Aug 12, 2013

Priority Medium  
Class General Details  
Tags  
Visibility All

## Attachments

Complaints and Comments letter Kevin.pdf  
- 638.3 KB

- Site: Breakfast Point -- Job: Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 -- Annex: EA - Website Submissions -  
- Activity: Submission Details for James Dewberry of self (object) -  
Loading..

(42)

## Submission Details for James Dewberry of self (object)

James Dewberry<jim.dewberry@virginbroadband.com.au>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 12 (9 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: James Dewberry  
Organisation: self ()  
Email: [jim.dewberry@virginbroadband.com.au](mailto:jim.dewberry@virginbroadband.com.au)

Address:  
12/16 Admiralty Drive

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 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.

Furthermore I am irritated by the misleading letters delivered to each Breakfast Point addresses by JEREMY SPINAK, Man Dir, Landuse Consulting, Clearly these letters contain a misrepresentation of the proposal in many aspects. This approach has no place in our Society.

IP Address: 79-141-134-159.static.unassigned.as8607.net - 79.141.134.159

Submission: Online Submission from James Dewberry of self (object)

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71814](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71814)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 1:14 PM - Mon Aug 12, 2013

Logged for Aug 12, 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

43

## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Aug 11 (20 hours 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.

## Email Details

Created 8:07 PM - Sun Aug 11, 2013  
 Logged for Sun Aug 11, 2013

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



to Simon Truong

Aug 11 (23 hours ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Address:

Content:

re: additional apartments in Breakfast Point.

I oppose the changes to the Breakfast Point concept plan proposed by Rosecorp .

These changes will impact on traffic flow with increased traffic movements in a small peninsular, which is currently the subject of overdevelopment of apartments approved by the Department of Planning. Members of the PAC don't have drive around this area in peak hour and hence don't understand the congestion. There is a significant number of families with children who now reside on the estate and it is becoming quite dangerous moving about the estate with the traffic volume as young children play on the green verges and on and near the village green and other verges.

In addition, I oppose the destruction of the heritage plumbers workshop. Rosecorp have restored the blacksmith quarters and it is a beautiful building, and reflects the heritage of the area and of an industrial working river. It is a shame to destroy such heritage which adds to the beauty of the estate, for the sake of some extra boxes on the hillside. In my view the estate is already been overdeveloped, and you need to take into consideration the proliferation of apartment buildings in nearby mortlake, only just recently approval was given for an extra 400 apartments in Hilly street, please don't give in to greed on the apartment of the developer. I also express concern about the fact that the person who prepared the latest traffic plan by the developer is a former DOP staff member and hence there is a conflict of interest.

IP Address:

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71496](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71496)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 5:17 PM - Sun Aug 11, 2013

Logged for Sun Aug 11, 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 Don McKenzie (object) -

45

## Submission Details for Don McKenzie (object)



Don McKenzie<[dcm\\_edim@bigpond.net.au](mailto:dcm_edim@bigpond.net.au)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 11 (1 day ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Don McKenzie  
Email: [dcm\\_edim@bigpond.net.au](mailto:dcm_edim@bigpond.net.au)

Address:  
41/25 Market Street

Breakfast Point, NSW  
2137

### Content:

Since the Breakfast Point Master Plan 1999 we have seen a continuing degradation of our community with constant expansion of residences without associated amenities- It is time to hold the Developer accountable for aligning the number of community facilities with the proposed population. Major issues that have been treated without substance by the developer are, traffic inside and external to Breakfast Point, changing vistas and views by increasing building heights, a disregard for current residents who bought into the community with a clear understanding as to vistas and amenities for 1650 residences. Community consultation has been woefully inadequate and we continue to learn about further changes that advantage the Developer and disadvantage residents. It is time to refuse further changes.

IP Address: - 101.161.63.175

Submission: Online Submission from Don McKenzie (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71476](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71476)

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 2:06 PM - Sun Aug 11, 2013

Logged for Sun Aug 11, 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 Bonnie McKenzie (object) -

## Online Submission from Bonnie McKenzie (object)



Bonnie McKenzie<ppm\_aust@bigpond.net.au>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 11 (1 day ago)

I object to the modification(4) to the concept plan 2005 as it is misleading (there really are 400 new residences proposed with no increase (in fact a decrease) in overall amenities for residents. As residents we stand to lose, available parking, heritage buildings (from 9 to 5) increased and unplanned traffic, new flat roof structures which add another floor (from 5 to 6) a degradation of existing vistas, a significant loss of open space. This development was for 1650 residences and we are now asked to accept residences of 50% more without any increase in community facilities.

### Email Details

Created 1:57 PM - Sun Aug 11, 2013  
Logged for Sun Aug 11, 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 :

(47)

## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Aug 9 (2 days ago)

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the Concept Plan 2005 Mod 4 at Breakfast Point.

1. The changes suggested would make Breakfast Point Community significantly larger than the original Concept plan with related traffic and parking issues which would be impossible to resolve due to the overcrowding these changes would cause.
2. I understand that any new development should maintain or improve the vista of other residents. The changes will not comply with this condition.

## Email Details

Created	5:33 PM - Fri Aug 9, 2013
Logged for	Fri Aug 9, 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 Ralf Barschow (object) -

(48)

## Online Submission from Ralf Barschow (object)



Ralf Barschow <Ralfkbarschow@yahoo.com>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 9 (2 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.

## Email Details

Created 4:42 PM - Fri Aug 9, 2013  
Logged for Fri Aug 9, 2013

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

(49)

## Submission Details for Karin Barschow (object)



Karin Barschow <Kbarschow@yahoo.com.au>  
 to Simon Truong

Aug 9 (2 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Karin Barschow

Email: [Kbarschow@yahoo.com.au](mailto:Kbarschow@yahoo.com.au)

Address:

10 breakfast point blv

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 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.

IP Address: 178-83-230-60.dynamic.hispeed.ch - 178.83.230.60

Submission: Online Submission from Karin Barschow (object)

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71217](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71217)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 4:40 PM - Fri Aug 9, 2013  
Logged for Fri Aug 9, 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 Lois Wilson of NA (object) -

(50)

## Submission Details for Lois Wilson of NA (object)



Lois Wilson<[Lwilson@bigpond.net.au](mailto:Lwilson@bigpond.net.au)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 9 (3 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Lois Wilson  
Organisation: NA (NA)  
Email: [Lwilson@bigpond.net.au](mailto:Lwilson@bigpond.net.au)

Address:  
111/14 Fairwater Close

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 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.

IP Address: cpe-58-173-73-28.cqzc1.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.173.73.28

Submission: Online Submission from Lois Wilson of NA (object)

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=71087](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=71087)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 12:59 PM - Fri Aug 9, 2013

Logged for Fri Aug 9, 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 Patricia Allen (object) -



## Online Submission from Patricia Allen (object)



Patricia Allen<[trish.spyglass@gmail.com](mailto:trish.spyglass@gmail.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 7 (5 days ago)

As a resident of Breakfast Point for seven years i have resided in Spyglass Hill apartments which overlooks the Woodlands North and seashores sites.

Apartments in the area are predominantly 2 or 3 bedroom but the proposed developments provide for some 240 single bedroom units. I am not opposed to single bedroom apartments but believe there must be an equal ratio of apartments, not a majority of one bedroom units because:-

- i a greater mix of population type.
- ii variety of age groups
- iii a larger proportion of owner occupiers as opposed to renters.
- iv a mix of population increases community vitality and wellbeing.

The footprints of the proposed buildings have been altered from previous approved developments as has the style of building, eg flat roofs as opposed to gable. This change alone will materially alter the outlook for the other units in Breakfast Point.

An increase in height is proposed viz 5 to 6 stories, this plus a flat roof with facilities such as airconditioning units placed on the roof establishes an effective height of 7 stories.

The Plumbers workshop building should remain and be restored into community facilities, it has significant heritage value and could be adapted for many uses. The proposal also increase both the height of the existing building and its envelope, to the detriment of the residents of Spyglass Hill.

Traffic is a major issue, Woodlands Avenue is very narrow and allows for parking on one side only otherwise the entrance of emergency vehicles is curtailed. any increase in traffic on Woodlands Avenue will affect the amenity of current residents. The proposal suggests that two 9 story buildings plus the apartments in the unit replacing the Plumbers Workshop will exit onto Woodlands Avenue.

Parking will be an ongoing problem. It is highly probable a majority of the one bedroom units will be couples with 2 cars, and the ratio of 1.5 car spaces per 2 bedroom unit has been proved to be inadequate as regards the residents of Breakfast Point.

The increased population will also affect traffic flows on Tennyson road and out of the Mortlake peninsular, as well as affect public transport particularly Parramatta River ferries which are already at maximum passenger load during peak periods.

The current proposal does not provide for enough open space between buildings, and more underground parking for visitors is required to avoid congestion.

The proposed development is an overdevelopment of the site and will detrimentally affect the amenity of the residents of Breakfast Point including those who are introduced because of this development

## Email Details

Created 10:59 AM - Wed Aug 7, 2013

Logged for Wed Aug 7, 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 t) -

## Online Submission from

:t)

52



to Simon Truong

(6 days ago)

I am objecting about

- \* extra 400 apartments
- \* extra proportion of 1 bedroom apartments (and extra parking they require
- \* parking impact
- \* traffic in Woodlands Ave
- \* 5 story buildings becoming 6 story with flat roof
- \* demolishing of the plumber workshop and replacement with 5 story block
- \* no new amenities for extra residents
- \* 9 story building moved closer to Spyglass Hill

## Email Details

Created 12:51 PM - Tue Aug 6, 2013

Logged for Tue Aug 6, 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 I (object) -

## Online Submission from I



to Simon Truong

Aug 6 (6 days ago)

53

I disapprove the changes made to "Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4".

## Email Details

Created 12:30 PM - Tue Aug 6, 2013

Logged for Tue Aug 6, 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 ZHAOHUA WANG (object) -

## Submission Details for ZHAOHUA WANG (object)

54



ZHAOHUA WANG<[stevenwang@atrip.cc](mailto:stevenwang@atrip.cc) Aug 6 (6 days ago)  
to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: ZHAOHUA WANG  
Email: [stevenwang@atrip.com.au](mailto:stevenwang@atrip.com.au)

Address:  
86/5 WOODLANDS AVE

BREAKFAST POINT, NSW  
2137

Content:

I am opposing to the below changes:

- \* 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
- \* 9 story building moved closer to Spyglass Hill

I am also strongly demanding a playground for all kids living in Breakfast Point.

IP Address: 203-206-172-161.perm.iinet.net.au - 203.206.172.161

Submission: Online Submission from ZHAOHUA WANG (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70358](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70358)

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 9:34 AM - Tue Aug 6, 2013  
Logged for Tue Aug 6, 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

## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Aug 5 (7 days ago)



- 1-The main problem with this development is traffic problem in the area .It will add to existing problem of traffic.
- 2-The area is going to be more congested (I mean more populated).

## Email Details

Created	3:13 PM - Mon Aug 5, 2013
Logged for	Mon Aug 5, 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 robin amm (object) -

## Submission Details for robin amm (object)



robin amm<[robin.amm@bigpond.com](mailto:robin.amm@bigpond.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 5 (7 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: robin amm  
Email: [robin.amm@bigpond.com](mailto:robin.amm@bigpond.com)

Address:  
63/5woodlands ave

breakfast point, NSW  
2137

### Content:

\* The concept plan content and pictures with reference to space, landscaping, views from the river of trees etc is about the eastern end NOT the western end which will become like a railway station hub where there is justification for greater density. The buildings just finished and being finished are virtually on the road with little landscaping and a meanness about them. The rooflines are too large just to squeeze in a two storey or another apartment. The pitch of the roofline should be kept to a minimum. This impacts on residents who already live there.

\*The readaptive use of the Plumbers Workshop should not be allowed. and if it is it should be the same height as it is currently. It was said in the heritage report that it possessed "uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Canada Bay's cultural history ' Why pull it down - minimal work can be done to make it safe and let it stand as a reminder of our industrial past - such buildings are rare.

\*The western end will be crowded with buildings and cars - parking is a problem now and Tennyson Road will be used as an overflow - but there is multi-storey development so the increase in traffic will result in damage to the roads .

\*Public transport is available but only up to a certain time - Also the buses meet much traffic on the incoming roads into the Mortlake Peninsula and towards Burwood. The roads are already overused into the city and they will become more so.

IP Address: cpe-121-218-148-156.inse3.cht.bigpond.net.au - 121.218.148.156

Submission: Online Submission from robin amm (object)

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70323](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70323)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 3:09 PM - Mon Aug 5, 2013

Logged for Mon Aug 5, 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 Mason Allen (object) -



## Online Submission from Mason Allen (object)



mason ALLEN<mason020@gmail.com>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 5 (7 days ago)

I object to the Proposal to amend the Breakfast Point concept Plan 2005 on the grounds that the proposed development would materially affect the amenity of the residents of Breakfast Point (SP270347) and surrounding communities. Grounds upon which it is submitted that the amenity of the area is detrimentally affected include the following but are not exhaustive.

1 the 2005 Concept provided for the provision of 1189 dwellings. The current proposal is to increase this number by 400. Of the proposed 1589 dwellings over 240 are single bedroom units. This is in stark contrast to the rest of Breakfast Point (BP), where dwellings are predominantly 2 and 3 bedroom. indeed no single bedroom units were constructed prior to 2012. Currently less than 17% of BP residents are in the 25 to 34 years age group. A large majority of the population of BP are couples who have "downsized" after children have left home. the increase in single bedroom units will change the demographics of BP. The developers argument that the number of bedrooms has not changed is facile. As stated a large majority of the 2 and 3 bedroom units are occupied by mature age couples.

2 The increase in population will place a strain on the facilities of BP. The proposal does not suggest that the developer intends to provide any additional community facilities to compensate for the increased population.

3 Substantial changes are sought regarding the height and appearance of the proposed buildings. An increase in height is sought viz from 5 stories to 6 and in direct contrast to the rest of the buildings in BP it is proposed that gabled roofs be abandoned and the structures have flat roofs. If flat roofs were permitted two results follow:-

- i) The lines of sight from existing dwellings is compromised;
- ii) Facilities will be located on the roofs in effect adding another story.

A representative of Rosecorp the developer when questioned about this at an information session held on 3 August did not deny that placing facilities on the roof was a distinct probability. Apart from the above the concept of a flat roof is totally out of character with the rest of BP.

4 The proposed destruction of the Plumbers Shed is a departure from the 2005 Concept and all other proposals made regarding BP. when purchasing our own particular unit the sales representative for Breakfast Point developers made the representation that the Plumbers Shed was a heritage feature and would be retained. it is now proposed to rescind from this representation. The proposed height of the replacement for the Plumbers Shed is contrary to the 2005 concept plan. In that plan the Plumbers Shed was shown as being of 3 stories. The proposed new building is of 4 stories (5 with rooftop equipment). The argument that 4 stories include a basement still does not address the replacement of 3 stories with 4 as the 3 stories obviously also included a underground component due to the slope of the land. In combination 4 (really 5) stories plus a flat roof envelope will decrease the lines of sight compared with the existing Plumbers shed.

5 Parking:  
Although the developer state parking is provided in accordance with Australian Standards the reality is totally different. Already due to guest parking and residents who now park on the street parking at BP is at a premium. Although the Australian standard may allow 1 car space per 1 bedroom unit or 1.5 per 2 bedroom unit the reality in BP is that most couples, particularly younger couples have 2 cars. This fact will no doubt apply to the residents of the proposed developments effectively creating a need for more than one parking space per 1 bedroom unit.

6 Traffic  
Although the traffic report accompanying the development proposal addresses traffic in and around BP it does not address traffic on the Mortlake peninsula nor, in a glaring oversight, does it address traffic attempting to exit Mortlake peninsula on to Burwood, Parramatta or Lyons roads.

IN CONCLUSION:  
the proposed development is an over-development of the site and materially affects the amenity of the current residents of Breakfast Point.  
the proposed development should be rejected and the developer required to resubmit a proposal more in keeping with the rest of the Breakfast Point.

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

58

## Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

Aug 4 (7 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

### Content:

I can not believe this another 400 units are they joking. We bought some years ago on the basis of a quality medium density development. In the last several years the density has increased and our property value in real terms decrease as the developer crammed more and more development on the site and squeezed every last dollar they can out of the development. The developer has an approval I want the Department to simply tell them to stick to the approval, an approval that formed the basis of our purchase.

Also the plumbers workshop we love the old building if we all had the attitude of this developer we would not have the QVB standing today. Again tell the developer to stick to his approval and spend some money on an adaptive reuse for the benefit of the residents of Breakfast Point as he told us they would and not just another money grab by a developer who has lost all credibility with the BP community.

IP Address: -

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70289](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70289)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 5:45 PM - Sun Aug 4, 2013

Logged for Sun Aug 4, 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 Zarlenga (object) -

59

## Submission Details for

Aug 3 (8 days ago)



to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Content:

To: NSW Department of Planning

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the Breakfast Point Concept Plan, 2005 (Amended 2013) for a number of reasons. I live directly adjacent to the Seashores precinct in Spyglass Hill strata # SP77399. Contrary to the environmental impact statement submitted, this proposal will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

When assessing this application it is incumbent of the Department of Planning to look at the historical plans of the Breakfast Point redevelopment as originally planned in 1999 until now. The original master plan in 1999 had the number of dwellings on the redevelopment site at 1650. This number has increased over time to a current number of permitted dwellings of 2069.

The planned increase will bring that total to 2469, an increase of 819 dwellings from the original master plan, an increase of 49% on the original 1999 master plan, with no corresponding allowances for an increase of community facilities or community contributions. The developer is currently advertising to residents and I quote, 'Just a 2% increase in the number of apartments' and this statement is grossly mis-leading.

Woodlands Ave Breakfast point is probably the smallest/narrowest street in Breakfast Point and yet it will carry the traffic of three 9 storey buildings, two of which are possibly the largest in Breakfast Point. Lighthouse Hill in the Woodlands North precinct with some 100 apartments and then the 9 storey building in the Seashores precinct with the proposed 110 apartments, up from around 80 in addition to the 9 storey Spyglass hill and a couple of other lots. The traffic scenario through Woodlands Ave may become a disaster and I suspect accidents and injury will occur. The proposed increase should be denied on this basis alone or have the developer widen Woodlands Ave first and then re-submit the application.

When the last modification was approved allowing for the seniors living precinct, the proponent applied to reallocate the number of dwellings from the Seashores precinct to the Woodlands North precinct and therefore the units in the seniors living precinct effectively ceased to be 'dwellings', and were not counted as such. At the time I did not object, as I considered that people occupying the seniors living precinct would be retirees and older people. I thought that such a demographic would have a relatively minimal impact on the area and would be quiet. If I had thought this new proposal was a possibility, I would have lodged an objection at the time.

The last modification was only approved some two or three years ago. The proponent has justified their new proposal on financial grounds without any explanation. Considering the relatively short time between the last change approving the seniors living precinct and the new proposal to remove it, it may lead to perceptions this was the original intention of the proponent, being a way of increasing the number of dwellings. The proponent is a large corporation and would have done due diligence regarding the economic feasibility of the seniors living precinct before making the application to modify the concept plan in 2009/2010. It should be incumbent on the proponent to show that when they applied for the change of use at that time they were acting in good faith. The proponent should also be asked to justify why it considers that the seniors living precinct has now become not economically viable in such a short period of time.

It should also be noted that when the seniors living precinct was approved, the Plumbers Workshop had been proposed to be retained and re-adapted for use of the residents in the seniors living precinct. The new proposal proposes to demolish this building and build an apartment building with no additional community facilities. It can be argued that the adaptive re-use of this building in the seniors living precinct was a community facility for the residents living in that precinct, alleviating the impact on other Breakfast Point community facilities. Withdrawing this adaptive re-use of the Plumbers Workshop and building another apartment building with around 100 or so dwellings in its place, will put extra strain on the BPCA community facilities, such as the swimming pools and recreation facilities in the Breakfast Point country club not to mention the problems with local and intra local road congestion.

Finally, the proposed changes also allow for an increase in the number of stories of the buildings from five to six, by changing the previous 'attic' rooms connected internally to the apartments below to whole floors independent of the apartment below. The proposal states the height of the buildings will not change, but the extra story will be accommodated by changing the roof style from sloping to flat roofs. All the buildings both completed and under construction in Breakfast Point follow a common architectural theme, with all apartment buildings having sloping roofs with gabled attic style upper bedrooms on the top floor. The proposed changes to the roof style in the Seashores precinct would be out of keeping with the current architectural style of Breakfast Point. Such a change in design in the last four or five building to be built in the Breakfast Point development, which occupy a central part of the site, would have a negative aesthetic impact.

Considering the significant impacts this proposal would have on the current residents of Breakfast Point, I would request that an independent Planning Assessment Commission be convened as was done with the recent Hilly Street, Mortlake proposal. The developer should also be asked to provide detailed information on how the 'view corridors' for residents of Spyglass Hill and other nearby buildings will be affected by the increased size of buildings proposed in the Seashore precinct when compared to the promised 'view corridors' that most people in the Spyglass Hill precinct purchased their properties in good faith based on the proponents own data in 2002. It's my understanding that since 2002, the proponent has said that view corridors would never be affected. They need to show that this is still the case with these proposed changes, and especially how it affects the Spyglass Hill building.

In the event that the proposal to change the master plan from the Seashores precinct being a seniors living precinct to a standard residential area is approved, I ask that certain conditions be required of the proponent. I suggest such conditions include:

- \* In respect to the number of apartments and bedrooms in the dwellings in the Seashores Precinct, any approval is substantially in line with what was approved in the previous change of the Concept Plan allowing for the seniors living precinct.
- \* The Plumbers Workshop is retained, as was provided for in the previous change, and re-adapted for community use.
- \* The proponent increase the levies payable to the BPCA for the proposed new dwellings in line with what is currently paid by existing owners in the BPCA area.
- \* In consultation with the BPCA the proponent provide additional community facilities to Breakfast Point residents, commensurate with the proposed increase in dwellings and population.
- \* No increase in the number of floors in the buildings in the Seashores precinct from five to six stories is permitted, that the proposal to allow for a flat roof design on these buildings be rejected, and that any building incorporates a sloped roof design compatible to the current built form of Breakfast Point.

Sincerely

Resident  
Spyglass Hill Breakfast Point.

IP Address

Submission: Online Submission from .

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70258](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70258)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 7:52 PM - Sat Aug 3, 2013

Logged for Sat Aug 3, 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 Sonali Chaudhuri (object) -

60

## Submission Details for Sonali Chaudhuri (object)



Sonali Chaudhuri<[sonalic1@bigpond.com](mailto:sonalic1@bigpond.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 1 (10 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Sonali Chaudhuri  
Email: [sonalic1@bigpond.com](mailto:sonalic1@bigpond.com)

Address:  
21/25 Market Street

Breakfast Point, NSW  
2137

### Content:

- \* Increase in number of cars by many hundreds probably in thousand will cause extreme inconvenience for Breakfast point residents during peak- hours
- \* Many fold increase in apartments and households would affect the use and performance of the recreational facilities such as country club, gyms and swimming pools
- \* Removal of seniors accommodation would create the demographic imbalance. In fact, lot of elderly residents have already planned to move to senior accommodation at an advanced age. Now these residents will have to move out of Breakfast point because of lack of seniors accommodations planned in the estate
- \* The 2005 Breakfast point Concept plan provides a forward looking distribution of apartment buildings, recreational facilities, car parks and sideways, which have been the key motivating factor for purchasing properties by many residents at Breakfast point. Any changes to the plan are unwarranted now, given this is a violation of psychological contracts between the developers and purchasers .
- \* Limited visitor car park facilities with rising households would create major inconvenience for all the residents
- \* Significant Increase in environmental pollution from household wastes, high noise levels from cars and recreational activities of large number of people assembled at the parks and beaches
- \* Residents will find difficult to enjoy river walks because of large crowd, pets from unsustainable growth in resident numbers from the proposed amendment
- \* Finally, Breakfast Point property prices could fall significantly because the estate will lose its exclusive upmarket status because of uncontrollable high rises and apartments.
- \* Water views from number of apartments will be blocked causing potential grief for many residents from drop in property price

IP Address: - 129.192.208.15

Submission: Online Submission from Sonali Chaudhuri (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70130](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70130)

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 7:16 PM - Thu Aug 1, 2013  
Logged for Thu Aug 1, 2013

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

**61**

## Online Submission from Rajiv Chaudhuri (object)



Rajiv Chaudhuri<[rajivchaudhuri@bigpond.com](mailto:rajivchaudhuri@bigpond.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Aug 1 (10 days ago)

object the modification request to amend Breakfast point Concept Plan on the following reasons :

- 1.Increase in number of cars by many hundreds probably in thousand will cause extreme inconvenience for Breakfast point residents during peak- hours
- 2.Many fold increase in apartments and households would affect the use and performance of the recreational facilities such as country club, gyms and swimming pools
- 3.Removal of seniors accommodation would create the demographic imbalance. In fact, lot of elderly residents have already planned to move to senior accommodation at an advanced age. Now these residents will have to move out of Breakfast point because of lack of seniors accommodations planned in the estate
- 4.The 2005 Breakfast point Concept plan provides a forward looking distribution of apartment buildings, recreational facilities, car parks and sideways, which have been the key motivating factor for purchasing properties by many residents at Breakfast point. Any changes to the plan are unwarranted now, given this is a violation of psychological contracts between the developers and purchasers .
- 5.Limited visitor car park facilities with rising households would create major inconvenience for all the residents
- 6.Significant Increase in environmental pollution from household wastes, high noise levels from cars and recreational activities of large number of people assembled at the parks and beaches
- 7.Residents will find difficult to enjoy river walks because of large crowd, pets from unsustainable growth in resident numbers from the proposed amendment
- 8.Finally, Breakfast Point property prices could fall significantly because the estate will lose its exclusive upmarket status because of uncontrollable high rises and apartments.
- 9.Water views from number of apartments will be blocked causing potential grief for many unsuspected residents due to drop in property price

## Email Details

Created	7:13 PM - Thu Aug 1, 2013
Logged for	Thu Aug 1, 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

(62)

## Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

1>

Aug 1 (11 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

Content:

Dear Sir,

I strongly object to the modification. Since living in Breakfast Point the builders have been modifying their submission to increase the numbers of units. It is unacceptable, the roads which are used to be wide are now narrower. Parking space have become lesser and lesser which make the area though expensive has become a cheap and crowded estate. Majority who lives in the estate depend on private cars. Every family has a car each due to not having train station in close vicinity of the estate. We do not need more units in Breakfast Point as many more units has been approved for building out side of Breakfast Point. They should keep to their original plan, it is not acceptable that they are allowed to changed and increase the number of units they are building. The ratio is way to high compared to when it was first proposed.

Regards,

IP Address:

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=70050](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=70050)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 11:22 AM - Thu Aug 1, 2013

Logged for Thu Aug 1, 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 Diwei Wang (object) -



## Online Submission from Diwei Wang (object)



Diwei Wang<diwei.wang7@gmail.com>  
to Simon Truong

Jul 29 (13 days ago)

I do believe the surrounding areas are over developed. Any increase in development or that volume increased would not be welcome. I strongly opposed to any modification or changes to what was already approved.

Regards,  
Diwei

## Email Details

Created	8:38 PM - Mon Jul 29, 2013
Logged for	Mon Jul 29, 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 Janet Griffin (object) -

(64)

## Submission Details for Janet Griffin (object)



Janet Griffin<[janet.eg@bigpond.com](mailto:janet.eg@bigpond.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Jul 29 (14 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Janet Griffin  
Email: [janet.eg@bigpond.com](mailto:janet.eg@bigpond.com)

Address:  
16/22 Admiralty Drive

Breakfast Point, NSW  
2137

### Content:

I do not agree with the removal of the approved senior living use. We are an aging population and will find it most convenient to stay in Breakfast Point as we become older.

I do not agree with the demolition of the Plumbers Workshop, it is an architecturally pleasant heritage building and adds interest to the area.

I do not agree with the addition of yet more apartments on the site. Parking is already a problem with not enough underground parking allocated to each building, so that residents are forced to park on the streets which reduces visitor parking.

We certainly do not need or want another 400 apartments.

IP Address: - 101.175.161.242

Submission: Online Submission from Janet Griffin (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=69629](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=69629)

Submission for Job: #6044 Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 10:49 AM - Mon Jul 29, 2013

Logged for Mon Jul 29, 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 nick marval (object) -



## Online Submission from nick marval (object)



nick marval<[nickmarval@hotmail.com](mailto:nickmarval@hotmail.com)>  
to Simon Truong

Jul 28 (14 days ago)

This is massive development creep. It increases the number of dwellings from the original Master 1999 Plan. Issues are significant to the:

- amenity, ie facilities, infrastructure, etc, of BP but in particular that of the adjacent stratas
- existing lot owners (current DP270347 lot owners will in effect be subsidising the extra dwellings as there will be no adjustment to existing unit entitlements)
- traffic (internal and external to BP)
- parking ( existing roads will be further burdened with parking issues as the proposal is for visitor parking on streets)
- local council infrastructure
- local Council amenities
- nearby suburbs
- public transport

If approved, will the developer be required to contribute towards overcoming any of the above problems?

Why does the developer continue to promote on street parking when they know of existing problems?

Will there be added contributions to the proposed Community enhancement Fund? ( there is already projected to be \$1.4 m in the Fund as a result of the last increase in numbers by 200. It must now at least treble. Council is soon to commence a consultation process re these funds which, after approval by the Minister, are to spent on approved projects in the suburbs of Breakfast Point, Mortlake, Cabarita and Concord)

Residents argued strongly against the over development and potential development creep of Hilly St and its impact on infrastructure. Where was this increase factored into that decision.

## Email Details

Created 8:13 PM - Sun Jul 28, 2013

Logged for Sun Jul 28, 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 Alexandre Da Silva (object) -

**Online Submission from****(object)**

to Simon Truong

n&gt;

Jul 28 (14 days ago)

Removal of the approved seniors living use to build an additional 400 residential apartments is a profitable and nonsensible decision in which will upset me and most of the residents that bought and settled in Breakfast Point under the concept plan from 2005.

Having 400 additional residential apartments and increasing the dwelling cap from 1189 to 1589 will affect the traffic and overcrowd our community and facilities in Breakfast Point.

I bought my unit under the concept plan from 2005 and I paid for the view I have, however with this modification my unit as well as most of the west facing units from my building will have their view blocked by the new building.

I'm also against having a building in our community that does not follow the pattern for internal and external design adopted by Breakfast Point.

**Email Details**

Created 7:58 PM - Sun Jul 28, 2013

Logged for Sun Jul 28, 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

## Submission Details for



to Simon Truong

1>

Jul 26 (16 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email: [\[redacted\]](#)

Address:

### Content:

We we early purchaser in the Breakfast point Development. We bought in after considering in some detail the style quality and the relatively low density proposed for the site particularly when compared with other master plan development sites in the nearby area eg Meriton and Walkers. And for this we paid a premium.

Since we purchase the density has been increased on a number of occasions and now the developer wants and additional 400 dwelling ,and some 250 additional parking spaces ARE YOU JOKING

We only have the Department to stick up for the little guy. All we ask is that the developer stick to the original approved plan .They have already been given more that was originally approved. This is nothing more than a greedy grab for money by the developer. When is enough enough .Please Department you are our only hope .

Breakfast point owner

IP Address: -

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=69557](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=69557)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 6:33 PM - Fri Jul 26, 2013

Logged for Fri Jul 26, 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 /

68

## Submission Details for

1)



to Simon Truong

Jul 26 (17 days ago)

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: /

Email: /

Address:

2

Content:

I am concerned about the increase in the dwelling cap from 1,189 to 1,589. This will impact on traffic, parking (even with the planned additional spaces), infrastructure and local roads. Will there be additional services to accommodate these extra dwellings? Will traffic flow be examined prior to this?

I strongly object to this increase.

IP Address: /

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=69538](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=69538)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 3:38 PM - Fri Jul 26, 2013

Logged for Fri Jul 26, 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

(69)

## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Jul 22 (21 days ago)

resident breakfast point

### 1 attachment

Department of planning and infrastructure.pdf  
171.6 KB

## Email Details

Created	2:00 PM - Mon Jul 22, 2013
Logged for	Mon Jul 22, 2013
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object
Tags	
Visibility	All

## Attachments

Department of planning and infrastructure.pdf  
- 171.6 KB

## **Department of planning and infrastructure - planning submission Breakfast Point**

I object to this request as follows

1. We purchased this property on the very clear understanding that a lower density seniors accommodation was planned nearby. This increase in density will create additional crowding and devalue our investment.
2. Parking in the estate is now generally underprovided and street parking is often impossible. This increase in ratio will significantly affect an already unsatisfactory outcome.
3. Road access to and from the estate is becoming clogged with much more development than the traffic system can accommodate.
4. Generally the area is becoming overcrowded and the quality of life in the estate is deteriorating.

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



## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Jul 21 (22 days ago)

We have bought off the plan at Breakfast Point and have a property interest with a contract of sale and stamp duty paid.

Firstly, we would make the point that people make major decisions based on approved Master Plans and when these are changed they dramatically adversely impact on that decision. It, in fact, makes a mockery of the planning and expectations process.

We oppose the proposed changes on the basis that:

- the overall development is incompatible with the character of the foreshore and the remainder of the Breakfast Point development.

- the road system will not support this and other developments within Breakfast Point and the Mortlake Peninsula.

- the community facilities are inadequate to support the additional residents.

- insufficient parking is available.

- It has been the experience that where 1 bedroom units are approved and built, they are usually occupied by couples with two cars and who are active users of the facilities. This means that there is a disproportionate demand on parking facilities with the huge increase in one bedroom units which results in a loss of amenity for existing and future residents.

The development has already been expanded from it's original plan and further expansion will ruin the development forever.

## Email Details

Created 9:53 AM - Sun Jul 21, 2013

Logged for Sun Jul 21, 2013

Priority Medium

Class Anonymous Object

Tags

Visibility All

Steven De Wit  
Unit 20, 9 Woodlands Ave  
Breakfast Point. NSW. 2137

(71)

July 20, 2013

**Mr. Truong**  
*Contact Officer, Industry, Social Projects and Key Sites, Development Assessment Systems & Approvals*  
*NSW Government Department of Planning & Infrastructure*  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney. NSW. 2001

Dear Mr. Truong,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my submission pertaining to the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 (2013).

#### **INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

As a resident of Breakfast Point whose property in the existing Woodlands South Precinct borders one of the Concept Plan Areas, this correspondence outlines my objections to components of that specific Concept Plan Area; (being the proposed Seashores precinct), from a residential amenity (personal) perspective, together with objections from a building height, proportion and location (local Woodlands Avenue residents neighbourhood) point of view.

#### **OBJECTIONS; (SPECIFIC TO THE SEASHORES PRECINCT CONCEPT PLAN AREA)**

1. Residential Amenity – Solar Access, Light & Privacy: When I purchased my property in Woodlands South precinct, it was on the understanding Seniors residential dwellings would be built nearby in the Seashores precinct. That is, sunlight and privacy would be maintained at my property. The proposed 9 storey residential building 7D1 negatively impacts sunlight reaching the primary living quarter's side of my apartment, thereby reducing natural light during the daytime hours.
2. Residential Amenity – Design: Should building 7D1 be progressed in its currently proposed location, then I would at least request a solid wall alongside existing property solid wall at 9 Woodlands Avenue, i.e. If this is not at least done, then privacy of myself and my family, together with that of our downstairs neighbour, will be negatively impacted as our living areas and bedrooms would be viewable from the proposed neighbouring building.
3. Building Height, Proportion & Location: The size and 9 storey height of building 7D1, if located as proposed, will have a negative impact on existing dwellings in the Woodlands South precinct; specifically the 2 / 3 storey dwellings located facing onto Woodlands Avenue (including number 9), primarily due to the fact that in the proposed location, building 7D1 does not aesthetically fit the streetscape. That is, existing neighbourhood dwellings facing both sides of Woodlands Avenue are of a relatively uniform size and height and placing a 9 storey building close to and, next to those dwellings, will simply look out of visual proportion given the size and scale of existing and proposed buildings will be extremely disparate in size and height when in such close proximity to each other. Hence, there will be a negative amenity impact if building 7D1 is built in its proposed location fronting onto Woodlands Avenue.
4. Building Height, Proportion & Location: The divergence in height and size of building 7D1 if placed in its proposed location would not be of an appropriate scale in relation to the existing street width. This would also have a negative aesthetic impact.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SEASHORES PRECINCT CONCEPT PLAN AREA FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. The objections noted in the section above can be addressed by consideration, please, of the following proposed amendment:
  - Within the Seashores Concept Plan Area; switch 9 storey residential building labeled 7D1 with that of the adaptively reused (formerly Plumbers Workshop) 4 storey residential building 7D6. That is to say, the Seashores Concept Plan Area design remains as proposed with the location of buildings 7D1 and 7D6 simply switched around – 7D1 to be located in the proposed 7D6 location and 7D6 to be located in the proposed 7D1 location (with solid wall alongside existing property solid wall at 9 Woodlands Avenue).

If agreed and implemented, this proposed amendment would address all (of my) noted objections to the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 with specific regard to the Seashores precinct.

**CLOSING**

As noted at the beginning of this submission, I note my appreciation for the opportunity to comment on the Breakfast Point Concept Plan 2005 Modification 4 (2013). I look forward to receiving reply information, as may be applicable, specific to my submission, as well as further information about the status and outcomes regarding the overall Concept Plan.

Sincerely,

**Steven De Wit**

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

72

## Online Submission from Steven De Wit (object)



Steven De Wit<[stevenandhelen@optusnet.cc](mailto:stevenandhelen@optusnet.cc) Jul 20 (22 days ago)  
to Simon Truong

My submission is provided as an uploaded PDF format attachment (provided).

### 1 attachment

Breakfast Point CP 2004 Mod 4\_ Submission\_ Steven De Wit\_ 2013-07-20.pdf  
261.7 KB

## Email Details

Created	4:34 PM - Sat Jul 20, 2013
Logged for	Sat Jul 20, 2013
Priority	Medium
Class	Object
Tags	
Visibility	All

## Attachments

Breakfast Point CP 2004 Mod 4\_ Submission\_ Steven De Wit\_ 2013-07-20.pdf  
- 261.7 KB

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

**(73)**

## Online Submission from



to Simon Truong

Jul 20 (23 days ago)

I object to the described proposal to remove the (509) beds of seniors living use.

(1) With the ageing demographic of Canada Bay local council area and the Inner West, the socially conscious decision to include in Breakfast Point the provision for aged care living is to be applauded and should be a mandatory inclusion in all urban planning.

To remove or modify this from the Concept plan 2005 would be a travesty. We need to cater for our ageing population, giving choice perhaps to those who already live in Breakfast Point and the local areas to relocate to a senior's facility.

(2) There is no need to increase the dwelling cap. We have seen this happen already. Breakfast Point already is increasingly congested with people and traffic.

(3) Plumbers workshop should be adaptively reused as previously identified to retain some historical integrity to the site.

## Email Details

Created 2:12 PM - Sat Jul 20, 2013

Logged for Sat Jul 20, 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

**74****Online Submission from**

to Simon Truong

Jul 19 (23 days ago)

I personally believe the proposed changes to remove or reduce the number of senior living residences is a bad idea and one that removes one of the clear benefits from Breakfast Point Concept plan.

A significant number of people who have purchased in Breakfast Point have done so with a view to settling into an area that has a plan to provide senior living accommodation options.

This has been a significant draw card in attracting people to the estate who have been looking to down size from a house to an apartment. Many people who have been doing this have done so on the understanding that if they reached a stage where they were not willing or able to manage an apartment, future stages of the development would offer additional senior living options.

Continuity of location is important to many aging residents as it allows continuity of health care with many medical specialists in the surrounding suburbs.

**Email Details**

Created 8:15 PM - Fri Jul 19, 2013

Logged for Fri Jul 19, 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 Paul Nix (object) -

(75)

## Online Submission from Paul Nix (object)



Paul Nix<paulnix@tpg.com.au>  
to Simon Truong

Jul 19 (24 days ago)

This is massive development creep. It increases the number of dwellings from the original Master 1999 Plan number of 1650 to now, if approved, to over 2469! Issues are significantly adverse to the amenity of existing residents in respect of facilities, infrastructure, etc, of BP but also to those in surrounding areas.

Moreover, existing lot owners (current DP270347) will in effect be subsidising the extra dwellings as there will be no adjustment to existing unit entitlements within Breakfast Point. Traffic inside and outside of Breakfast Point will be exacerbated as will parking, local infrastructure & amenities already further exacerbated by the recent development approvals in Hilly Street. Public transport and the vehicular ferry will be unable to cope with this progressive development creep.

If approved, will the developer be required to contribute towards overcoming any of the above problems?

Why does the developer continue to promote on street parking when they know of existing problems?

Will there be added contributions to the proposed Community enhancement Fund? ( There is already projected to be \$1.4 m in the Fund as a result of the last increase in numbers by 200. It must now at least treble. Council is soon to commence a consultation process re these funds which, after approval by the Minister, are to spent on approved projects in the suburbs of Breakfast Point, Mortlake, Cabarita & Concord).

Residents argued strongly against the over development and potential development creep in Hilly St and its impact on infrastructure. This already approved increase must be assessed in relation to this further development creep.

## Email Details

Created 3:43 PM - Fri Jul 19, 2013

Logged for Fri Jul 19, 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 (support) -

(76)

## Online Submission from (support)



to Simon Truong

Jul 18 (24 days ago)

I wish to support the change in the concept plan back to residential. I feel the seniors living concept never belonged in Breakfast Point as placed 227 properties all of which belonged to only one demographic, in the middle of an otherwise diverse group of owners.

The higher number of 1 & 2 bed dwellings will add to a more youthful mix and allow more purchasers to take advantage of government first home owner grants.

### Email Details

Created 4:34 PM - Thu Jul 18, 2013  
Logged for Thu Jul 18, 2013

Priority Medium  
Class Anonymous Support  
Tags  
Visibility All

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

(77)

## Online Submission from

ct)



to Simon Truong

Jul 18 (25 days ago)

There are already too many apartments built in this area already, we do not need more high rise apartments as this will only add to the congestion problems.

## Email Details

Created	3:19 PM - Thu Jul 18, 2013
Logged for	Thu Jul 18, 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

## Submission Details for

ject)

(78)

Jul 18 (34 days ago)

to Simon Truong

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name:

Email:

Address:

### Content:

I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the Breakfast Point Concept Plan, 2005 for a number of reasons. I live directly adjacent to the Seashores precinct in Spyglass Hill strata # SP77399. Contrary to the environmental impact statement submitted, this proposal will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

When assessing this application it is incumbent of the Department of Planning to look at the historical plans or the whole of the Breakfast Point redevelopment as originally planned in 1999 until now. The original master plan in 1999 had the number of dwellings on the redevelopment site at 1650. This number has incrementally increased over time to a current number of permitted dwellings of 2069. The planned increase will bring that total to 2469, an increase of 819 dwellings from the original master plan, an increase of 49% on the original 1999 master plan, with no corresponding allowances for an increase of community facilities or community contributions.

Most of the common areas of the Breakfast Point site, which includes the areas covered by this proposal, are managed by the Breakfast Point Community Association (BPCA). Lot holders, either in strata lots or freehold, pay levies to the BPCA for the maintenance of community infrastructure, including roads, parks and gardens, and community facilities including the Breakfast Point Country Club. Lot entitlements were allocated in the 1999 master plan. Since that time, no reconsideration has been given to adjusting the lot entitlements taking into account the increase, either actual or proposed, in the number of dwellings. This has the direct effect of putting a greater burden on the cost of maintaining BPCA community infrastructure on owners who purchased earlier. Basically longer-term residents would be subsidising the cost of maintaining community infrastructure for newer residents.

When the last modification allowing for the seniors living precinct was on exhibition, and the proponent applied to reallocate the number of dwellings from the Seashores precinct to the mainly the Woodlands North precinct, the units in seniors living precinct effectively ceased to be 'dwellings', and were not counted as such. At the time I did not object, as I considered that people occupying the seniors living precinct would be retirees and older people. I thought that such a demographic would have a relatively minimal impact on the area and would be quiet. If I had thought this new proposal was a possibility, I would have lodged an objection at the time.

The last modification was only approved some two or three years ago. The proponent has justified their new proposal on financial grounds without any explanation. Considering the relatively short time between the last change approving the seniors living precinct and the new proposal to remove it, it may lead to perceptions this was the original intention of the proponent, being a way of increasing the number of dwellings. The proponent is a large corporation and would have done due diligence regarding the economic feasibility of the seniors living precinct before making the application to modify the concept plan in 2009/2010. It should be incumbent on the proponent to show that when they applied for the change of use at that time they were acting in good faith. The proponent should also be asked to justify why it considers that the seniors living precinct has now become not economically viable in such a short period of time, more than just as a way of maximising profits.

The proponent has stated that the gross floor area will not change, but has increased the number of both dwellings and bedrooms substantially for the Seashores precinct. This means each individual dwelling and bedroom will be substantially smaller than is the norm at Breakfast Point. Also, about half the numbers of dwellings in the proposed changes to the Seashores precinct, over 240, are one-bedroom apartments. While I accept a need to cater for different demographics by providing a range of apartment sizes, having such a large number of one bedroom apartments of a small size will lead to a significant change in the overall demographics of Breakfast Point. One-bedroom apartment sales are aimed at investors and younger people. Having such a large number of one-bedroom apartments in a single precinct would reasonably lead to the concern that the resident population would be mostly young renters. According to the 2011 census, over 70% of dwellings in Breakfast Point are owner occupied. Less than 17% of the resident population is in the 25 to 34 year old age group. With the large increase in the number of one bedroom apartments both already approved in the last modification of the concept plan and in the proposed modification, this demographic is sure to change. Such a change would be unreasonable for people who purchased in the area based on the 2005 concept plan, which allowed for predominantly larger, two and three bedroom apartments.

It should also be noted that when the seniors living precinct was approved, the Plumbers Workshop had been proposed to be retained and re-adapted for use of the residents in the seniors living precinct. The new proposal proposes to demolish this building and build an apartment building with no additional community facilities. It can be argued that the adaptive re-use of this building in the seniors living precinct was a community facility for the residents living in that precinct, alleviating the impact on other Breakfast Point community facilities. Withdrawing this adaptive re-use of the Plumbers Workshop and building another apartment building with around 100 or so dwellings in its place, will put extra strain on the BPCA community facilities, such as the swimming pools and recreation facilities in the Breakfast Point country club.

Finally, the proposed changes also allow for an increase in the number of stories of the buildings from five to six, by changing the previous 'attic' rooms connected internally to the apartments below to whole floors independent of the apartment below. The proposal states the height of the buildings will not change, but the extra story will be accommodated by changing the roof style from sloping to flat roofs. All the buildings, both completed and under construction in Breakfast Point follow a common architectural theme, with all apartment buildings having sloping roofs with gabled attic style upper bedrooms on the top floor. The proposed changes to the roof style in the Seashores precinct would be out of keeping with the current architectural style of Breakfast Point. Such a change in design in the last four or five building to be built in the Breakfast Point development, which occupy a central part of the site, would have a negative aesthetic impact on the overall visual built form of the area.

Considering the significant impacts this proposal would have on the current residents of Breakfast Point, I would request that an independent Planning Assessment Commission be convened as was done with the recent Hilly Street, Mortlake proposal.

In the event that the proposal to change the master plan from the Seashores precinct being a seniors living precinct to a standard residential area is approved, I ask that certain conditions be required of the proponent. I suggest such conditions include:

&#61623; In respect to the number of apartments and bedrooms in the dwellings in the Seashores Precinct. any approval be substantially in line with what was approved in the previous change of the Concept Plan allowing for the seniors living precinct.  
&#61623; The Plumbers Workshop be retained, as was provided for in the previous change, and re-adapted for community use.  
&#61623; The proponent increase the levies payable to the BPCA for the proposed new dwellings in line with what is currently paid by existing owners in the BPCA area.  
&#61623; In consultation with the BPCA the proponent provide additional community facilities to Breakfast Point residents, commensurate with the proposed increase in the number of dwellings and population.  
&#61623; No increase in the number of floors in the buildings in the Seashores precinct from five to six stories be permitted, that the proposal to allow for a flat roof design on these buildings be rejected, and that any building incorporates a sloped roof design compatible to the current built form of Breakfast Point.

IP Address:

Submission: Online Submission from

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=69190](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=69190)

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

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=6044](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6044)

Site: #543 Breakfast Point

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=543](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=543)

## Email Details

Created 1:47 PM - Thu Jul 18, 2013

Logged for Jul 18, 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 (object) -

(79)

**Online Submission from****(object)**

Jul 18 (34 days ago)

to Simon Truong

There is already too much development in breakfast point, and there is insufficient parking now adding more will only make the place worse.  
The Plumbers building should be retained.

**Email Details**

Created	12:47 PM - Thu Jul 18, 2013
Logged for	Jul 18, 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 ( ) -



## Online Submission from ( )



to Simon Truong

&gt;

Jul 17 (34 days ago)

When we purchased our property at Breakfast Point, we were told the heritage buildings on the site would remain. We do not want them to be removed as the history of the site would be lost.

The roads around Breakfast Point are already congested, and the increase in dwellings would make parking and traffic a concern.

## Email Details

Created	8:11 PM - Wed Jul 17, 2013
Logged for	Jul 17, 2013
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object
Tags	
Visibility	All