

PART A – LETTERS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS / PROPERTY OWNERS

No.	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Relevant Issues	Response
1	18.01.06		Concerns	- Tree planting along streets should create clear separation between low level foreshore development and high rise development deeper into the site. - Heritage items such as Powerhouse and Blacksmiths Shop should remain visible from Parramatta River.	- Landscaping - Heritage items - Views from water	1.1.1
2	18.01.06		Concerns	- Maintenance of public access rights to open space including Village Green, Waterfront Park, Silkstone Park and Waterfront Walk. - Public access should be clearly defined and confirmed. - Public access rights should remain along length of pathway through Waterfront Park from foreshore walkway to Admiralty Drive. - The 15 metre wide foreshore walkway should extend to the waters edge to avoid future restrictions to water access.	Public access	1.1.2 1.2.1
3	23.01.06		Support	- Supports Minister's decision to assume approval role. - Strongly supports the ongoing development of Breakfast Point by Rosecorp.	n/a	1.2.2 1.3.1
4	24.01.06		Support	- Concept Plan is consistent with 2002 Master Plan. - Minister should reject City of Canada Bay Council's attempt to have its DCP adopted as the Concept Plan. - The Concept Plan complies with the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) by providing public access to and along the foreshore. - Visual quality of the development when viewed from the River will be maintained. - Breakfast Point community resents the adoption of the DCP. - The Concept Plan provides adequate public thoroughfares and through-site links including public access. - Supports the Concept Plan restricting public use of open space created and maintained under the Breakfast Point Community Management Plan. - Breakfast Point is within 5 minutes walking distance to adequate transport connections on Tennyson Road and/or Cabarita Road. - Road network within Breakfast Point can accommodate public transport vehicles. - Concept Plan should not be required to duplicate existing ferry and charter vessel	- Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Relevance of Breakfast Point DCP - Public access - Views from water - Public transport connections - Provision of waterfront activities - Building heights - Approval role	1.4.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			terminal located in Kendall Bay at the eastern end of Breakfast Point. - The existing ferry wharf is modern, supported by car parking, serviced by Sydney Ferries and bus services. The Concept Plan provides adequate access and connections to the ferry wharf. - The Concept Plan does not exclude waterfront activities by virtue of specifically not providing them. Appropriate landowners consent must be obtained from NSW Waterways. - Proposed varying building heights is commendable as they will provide variety in built form and attractive and interesting streetscapes when viewed from outside the site or waterway. - The Minister should approve all future project applications which consistent with the Concept Plan.		
5	25.01.06		Concerns - Supports Premier's recent announcement about provisions of adequate infrastructure requirements with new residential developments. - Increase in dwelling numbers will increase car numbers, therefore placing additional pressure on existing road networks. - Local suburban roads do not have the capacity to handle proposed traffic loads particularly during peak times. - Road networks reflect the past industrial uses of Cabarita/Mortlake and are not conducive to the current and future frequency/intensity of private vehicle trips. - Extra traffic will exacerbate traffic issues associated with trying to access the Mortlake Ferry Wharf. - The area is not well serviced by public transport with buses providing limited services. - No commitment from STA to increase its services. - The Rivercat service is limited as a means of commuting due to the limited capacity, low frequency of service (hourly) and return services cease before people finish work. Concept Plan does not commit to improving existing services. - City of Canada Bay Council's DCP should be adopted as the new Concept Plan. - Department of Planning should enforce traffic management in surrounding suburban streets to accommodate the load of expected traffic.	- Infrastructure provision - Density (increase) - Capacity of existing road infrastructure - Traffic - Public transport connections - Relevance of Breakfast Point DCP	1.5.1 1.5.2 1.5.3 1.5.4 1.5.5 1.5.2
6	30.01.06		Support in principle but issues - Supports increase in commercial and shop facilities to balance residential uses. - Increases in density not supported. - Need to consider adequacy of integrated	- Commercial uses on site - Density (increase) - Traffic	1.6.1 1.6.2 1.5.3

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			transport plan.		
7	30.01.06		- Existing and future Breakfast Point residents should have certainty as to how the site will be developed. - Prospective buyers should be fully informed of the future development which is not possible at this stage, particularly in relation to the Manors Precinct. - Clarification sought as to why the Concept Plan indicates the Ferry Wharf and Waterfront Activities have been deleted. - Deleted wharf was heritage listed and should not have been removed if a replacement is not to be provided. - What action will be taken to reinstate the wharf? - Have discussions been undertaken regarding law and order – does the size of the development warrant a police development warrant a police shopfront/station?	- Certainty in form of future development - Provision of waterfront activities - Public safety	1.7.1 1.7.2 1.7.3 1.7.4
8	31.01.06		- Exhibited Concept Plan deviates from 2002 Master Plan, particularly building orientation and additional floor space (15 000m²). - Concept Plan does not cover the entire site and should apply to the same area as the 2002 Master Plan, particularly regarding provision of community facilities, heritage buildings & "Waterside Precinct". - Significant concerns in relation to density of development, particularly regarding parking and traffic flows.	- Consistency with 2002 Master Plan. - Limited concept plan area - Density (increase) - Car parking - Traffic	1.8.1 1.8.2 1.5.2 1.6.2
9	01.02.06		See Proforma Letter #1.	n/a	
10	02.02.06		- Any approved Concept Plan should be consistent with the 2002 Master Plan. - Proponent should commit to undertaking waterfront activities as per 2002 Master Plan, particularly a public wharf/pontoon in the vicinity of Hunter's Wharf. - Unfinished landscaping should be completed. - Concept Plan should restrict FSR to 0.6:1. - Maximum bedroom numbers for entire Breakfast Point site should not exceed 4950. - Dwelling mix should restrict one bedroom units to 12.5% in any one buildings. 1.5 car parking spaces/one bedroom. 2 car parking spaces/two bedrooms. 1 visitor car parking space/4 dwellings. - No short term lettings of residential dwellings (ie: < 3 months). - Style and standard of buildings to be consistent with existing development. - Plumbers Workshop façade to be preserved to	- Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Provision of waterfront activities - Landscaping - FSR - Density (increase) - Dwelling mix - Car parking - Lease arrangements - Architectural standards - Heritage - Limited Concept Plan area - Provision of Waterfront Activities - Water access - Provision of open space	1.8.1 1.7.3 1.10.1 1.6.2 1.10.2 1.10.3 1.10.4 1.10.5 1.10.6 1.10.7

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			- acknowledge site's past uses. - Object to increases in density and population numbers. - Concept Plan does not indicate the likely dwelling mix – Minister should require proponent to identify maximum number of 1 and 2 bedroom units. - Concept Plan does not address car parking and infrastructure upgrades that may be required as result of increase in population. - Concept Plan should be extended to include Kendall Bay & Parramatta River. - Minister should require proponent to complete waterside improvements as a condition of any concept approval. - Access (ramp and pontoon) to Parramatta River north of the Riverfront Precinct should also be provided. - Reductions in FSR will reduce open space areas. - The Concept Plan area will contain the highest concentration of units within the Breakfast Point site. - Concept Plan does not provide adequate parking – cars will be forced to park on-street. - Clarification required as to what is meant in Section 6.08 of the Concept Plan – previously understood that open space would be provided adjacent to heritage buildings. - Future landscaping should replicate existing landscaping at a minimum. - Concept Plan understates the visual impact of the development from Parramatta River, particularly Hunters Wharf and five storey development immediately behind. - Concept Plan supported as proposed in Vineyards Precincts North and South. - Concept Plan should require variety of colour and style in buildings to minimise monotonous scheme. - Powerhouse should be reused as museum, library or commercial use but not general community activities. - Any restoration project should also provide for construction of public toilets to better facilitate public use of foreshore and open space areas.	Provision of public facilities	1.10.8 1.10.9 1.10.10 1.10.11 1.7.3 1.10.12 1.10.13 1.10.14 1.10.4 1.10.15 1.10.1 1.10.16 1.10.17 1.10.18 1.10.19
11	03.02.06	Objection	- Increases in residential floor space. - Increases in amount of commercial floor space areas. - Increases in building height. - Increases number of dwellings. - Increases in traffic flow. - Additional pressure on local infrastructure and public access.	- FSR - Commercial uses on site - Height - Density (increase) - Traffic - Infrastructure - Public access	1.6.2 1.11.1 1.11.2 1.11.3 1.5.6 1.5.1 1.2.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

12	03.02.06		Objection • The proposed loss of Plumbers Workshop without adequate justification. • Deletion of Plumbers Workshop will result in loss of open space and devalue the amenity of adjacent buildings. • Deletion of Plumbers Workshop is inconsistent with LEP 91 Clause 41B and Breakfast Point DCP which indicates adaptive re-use. • Should Plumbers Workshop be replaced by residential building as proposed, the building footprint should be limited to extremities of the Workshop. • Proposed 5 storey building will be inconsistent with SEPP 65 provisions and result in overshadowing, unacceptable overlooking, decreased privacy, and loss of open space. • Riverfront Precinct and proposed development on Woodlands Avenue and Peninsula Drive will result in loss of water views from public space of village centre. • Loss of identified views and vistas is inconsistent with site planning objectives within the 2002 Master Plan. • Existing vista to Parramatta River from Magnolia Drive/Market Street/Woodlands Avenue be included in the Concept Plan. • Concept Plan should be amended to show the two buildings on corner of Woodlands Avenue and Peninsula Drive clear of the view corridor. • Riverfront Townhouses be modified and relocated to minimise loss of views. • Consideration be given to individual pitched roofs on town houses to improve articulation and enhance views.	• Heritage • Amenity • Loss of open space • Views and vistas	• 1.10.7 • 1.12.1 • 1.12.2 • 1.10.7 • 1.12.3 • 1.12.4 • 1.12.5 • 1.12.6 • 1.12.7 • 1.12.8 • 1.12.9
13	06.02.06		Objection • Inconsistent with 2002 Master Plan. • Increases floor space. • Increases population density. • Increases building height. • Lowers standards of design and space. • Changes in dwelling type and mix will lead to increased traffic and parking problems. • Car parking spaces are currently inadequate and will be exacerbated by increased dwelling numbers. • Increased traffic will place further pressure on surrounding road network. • Loss of amenity to existing and future residents. • Car parking requirements should be increased to 2 spaces/unit. • Better public transport connections required.	• Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • FSR • Density (increase) • Architectural standards • Traffic • Car parking • Capacity of existing road infrastructure • Amenity • Public transport connections	• 1.8.1 • 1.6.2 • 1.10.8 • 1.11.2 • 1.13.1 • 1.10.4 & 1.5.2
14	06.02.06	Support development of Breakfast Point on basis	• Seeks recognition through formalisation of consultative relationship. • Departures from the 2002 Master Plan represent a variation from what owners	• Public consultation • Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • Limited Concept Plan	• 1.14.1 • 1.8.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

		It is consistent with 2002 Master Plan	believe they have bought into. - Planning at Breakfast Point should be holistic. Concept Plan divides site into parcels. - Unclear as to why Concept Plan applies to only some parts of the site while plans within the document indicate the whole of Breakfast Point. - Increases in density. - Maximum dwelling number should be 1865. - Change in dwelling mix will result in over 50% of "small units", change in mix of residents and mix between owner/occupiers. - Increase in units will increase traffic and place greater pressure on existing parking shortages. - Parking provisions required by 2002 Master Plan are inadequate and largely on-street which is not supported. Concept Plan should address parking issues, particularly regarding commercial and Silkstone Precinct. - On street parking in narrow streets such as Vineyard Way is not supported. - Building envelope, footprint, density and setback maximums as prescribed in 2002 Master Plan should be reflected in the Concept Plan to avoid diminishing of lifestyle.	area - Density (increase) - Dwelling mix - Traffic - Car parking	1.8.1
15	06.02.06	Objection	- Concept Plan only applies to limited portion of the Breakfast Point site. - Waterfront facilities as proposed by 2002 Master Plan will not be provided. - Proposed increase in units will result in population increases and therefore impact on quality of life and increase demand of facilities. - The proposed boat shed appears to be without approval and does not have access to the water. - Reduction in facilities will become the burden of the Breakfast Point community (future and existing landholders). - Almost 50% increase in commercial space as proposed by Concept Plan is not supported and will diminish the residential quality. - See Proforma Letter #1	- Limited Concept Plan area - Provision of waterfront activities - Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Commercial uses on the site	1.8.1 1.7.3 1.6.2 & 1.10.8 1.15.1 1.15.2 1.11.1
16	06.02.06	Support in principle but issues	See Proforma Letter #1	n/a	
17	13.02.06	Concerns	- Concept Plan deviates from the 2002 Master Plan. - Concept Plan will result in different planning authorities. One authority should be responsible for Breakfast Point. - Proposed increased densities will increase population and diminish availability of facilities. - Proposed changes in dwelling mix will	- Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Approval authority - Density (increase) - Dwelling mix - Traffic - Car parking	1.8.1 1.10.8 1.5.2

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

				disproportionately increase vehicles, impacting on traffic conditions. - Increases in vehicles will reduce availability of car parking spaces. - Visitor car parking should be provided off street.		1.10.4
18	13.02.06		Concerns	- Increase in density will increase local traffic. - Existing car parking is inadequate and will be under further demand. - Passive and active open space is being minimised. - Surrounding residents will suffer from increases in density.	- Density (increase) - Traffic - Provision of open space - Amenity	1.5.2 1.10.4 1.10.13 1.6.2
19	14.02.06		Objection	- Does not support privatisation of public space. - Foreshore walkway should remain in public ownership. 2002 Master Plan should not be departed from.	- Public access - Consistency with 2002 Master Plan	1.19.1 1.19.2 1.8.1
20	14.02.06		Objection	- There should be no change to the existing 2002 Master Plan. - Canada Bay Council's DCP should be adopted as the new Concept Plan.	Consistency with 2002 Master Plan	1.8.1 1.5.5
21	15.02.06		Concerns	- Objects to high-rise development. - The Concept Plan area will have a greater density than 40 dwellings/ha. - The proposed increase in one bedroom apartments should be incorporated into the 1865 dwelling maximum proposed by the 2002 Master Plan. - Proposed increases in density will increase traffic, strain amenities, and increase demand on existing services/facilities.	- Height - Density - Bedroom increase - Traffic - Capacity of existing infrastructure	1.11.2 1.10.14 1.11.3 1.5.2, 1.10.8
22	15.02.06		Concerns	See Pro Forma #2	n/a	
23	15.02.06		Concerns	- Removal of the marina/wharf - Bulk, scale, height of proposed buildings – C 5C, 5B2, 5B1, 7A and 6F. - Blocking of views. - Loss of privacy. - Excessive traffic.	- Water access - Built form - Views - Loss of privacy - Traffic	1.7.3 1.23.1 1.12.3 1.5.2
24	16.02.06		Objection	- Adoption of the Concept Plan will result in 2 different planning authorities on the site. - Development on the site should be assessed by Canada Bay Council. - Increase in FSR from 0.6:1 to 0.7:1. - Increased maximum FSR (max gross) of 51 820m² - Proposed increase of 208 dwellings with no additional resident or visitor car parking. - An additional 232 bedrooms. - FSR calculations should not be based on areas outside the concept plan. - Concept Plan will result in residents have	- Approval authority - FSR - Car parking - Bedroom increases - Amenity - Provision of community facilities - Capacity of existing infrastructure	1.8.1 1.6.2 1.10.4 1.10.2 1.10.14 1.24.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			fewer use rights and therefore amenity will be decreased.	• Concept Plan does not propose additional community facilities to compensate for increased building development. • Community facilities not completed are proposed to be diminished (i.e. Only half of Powerhouse will now be publicly available. Pump house is removed from the Plan.) • Existing community facilities will be placed under greater pressure. • Developer argued that 2002 Master Plan should remain and not be replaced by DCP with Council.	• 1.24.2 • 1.24.3 • 1.10.8
25	17.02.06				
26	17.02.06		Concerns Objection	• See Pro Forma #2. • Increase in density. • Increase in commercial uses. • Right of public access to foreshore is at risk. • No change to existing 2002 Master Plan. • Canada Bay Council's DCP should be adopted as the Concept Plan.	• n/a • Density (increase) • Commercial uses on the site • Public foreshore access • Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • 1.6.2 • 1.11.1 • 2.1.8 • 1.8.1 • 1.5.5
27	17.02.06		Concerns	• Increase in residential dwellings will increase pressure on existing facilities (including health, sports, commercial, education, transport, place of worship, external parking areas). • Cumulative impacts of Breakfast Point and other developments – Cape Cabarita, Liberty Grove – needs to be considered. • Visual impact of 9 storey buildings particularly from foreshore areas. • Heights of buildings need to be confirmed. • Increased traffic flow resulting from increased residential, commercial and business uses. • Heritage buildings have not been included in the Concept Plan (pg 22 indicates 5 storey building instead). • Public foreshore access should not be restricted.	• 1.10.8, 1.10.4, 1.5.2 • Density (increase) • Capacity of existing community facilities • Cumulative impacts • Visual impact • Height • Heritage • Public foreshore access • 1.10.8 • 1.11.2 • 1.5.2 • 1.27.1 • 2.1.8
28	17.02.06		Objection	• The Traffic Consultant's report does not consider the proposed 4400m² increase in commercial uses or 4211m² increase in Schedule 11 uses. • Inconsistencies between Concept Plan and Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes November 2005 Report – ie. Pg 2 states that retail areas will be reduced, yet Concept Plan proposes increases in commercial and Schedule 11 uses. • All calculations should be based on prescribed maximums in the Concept Plan. • Concept Plan traffic generation is inconsistent with LEP 91 Clause 41(G)(4). • Concept Plan will increase traffic in existing	• Traffic • Inconsistencies in submitted documentation • Public access • Permeability • Built form • Heritage • Public foreshore access • Density (increase) • 1.11.1 • 1.5.2

			- surrounding road network. - Concentration of dwellings within the area will impact on road infrastructure. - Concept Plan does not propose two off street car parking areas previously proposed under 2002 Master Plan. - Powerhouse and Blacksmith's Shop are proposed for commercial/retail use however there is no designated parking areas proposed. - On street parking is inadequate – street signage currently restricts on street parking. - Off street car parking should be provided within the development. - Concept Plan only proposes off street car parking associated with Country Club which has restricted access. - Visitor car parking should be publicly accessible. - Proposed nine storey buildings in Woodlands Precinct North and Seashore Precinct have larger footprints than other none storey buildings on the site. - Approval of the nine storey buildings in Woodlands Precinct North and Seashore precinct would be inconsistent with LEP 91 which required the positioning of taller building away from existing residential development (which by de facto were lower parts of the site). - Two nine storey buildings are also inconsistent with remaining 2-5 storey development on Tennyson Road. - Two nine storey buildings will create unnecessary visual bulk and loss of amenity. - Pgs 18 & 19 of the Concept Plan suggest that while a nine storey height limit applies, provision is being sought for further increases. - Clear guidance regarding building maximums is required. - Plumbers Workshop has consistently been identified as having heritage significance, however the Concept Plan indicates potential removal of the Plumbers Workshop. - Proponent has indicated car parking for commercial retail facilities would be located on waterside of Powerhouse and Blacksmith's Shop. This contradicts former PlanningNSW's comments regarding 2002 Master Plan which stated there should be an extension to the Foreshore Open Space Transition Zone to limit development in front of the Powerhouse and Blacksmith's Shop. - Provision of public access through the site lacks clarity.	• 2.1.5 • 1.28.1 • 1.10.4 • 1.28.2 • 1.28.3 • 1.28.4 • 1.11.2 • 1.10.7 • 1.28.5 • 1.2.1
--	--	--	--	--

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

29	17.02.06			- Unclear whether links indicated in Plan 5.01 are for public or private use, particularly through Wharf and Riverfront Precincts. - Perceived changes to definition of "Community" could result in an enclave. 2002 Master Plan and LEP 91 Open Space objectives should be adhered to. - Proposed density of 0.7:1 should be applied only to the Concept Plan area. - Cumulative impact of other development in surrounding suburbs should be considered. - Concern that densities and building heights will set a precedent for future development on the Mortlake Peninsula. - Community expressed unanimous support for 2002 Master Plan. - There is negligible support for the Concept Plan.	1.2.1 1.28.6 1.28.7 1.10.14 1.10.8 1.8.1
				- Density (increase) - FSR - Height - Built form - Limited Concept Plan area - Consultation - Provision of waterfront activities - Provision of open space	1.6.2 1.29.1 1.6.2 1.29.2 1.28.3 1.11.2 1.8.1 1.14.1 1.7.3, 1.10.13
30	17.02.06			- Fully supports the Breakfast Point Residents Coordination Group Submission dated 1 Feb 06. - Return to density provisions in Master Plan 1999 is more appropriate than density proposed under Concept Plan. - Densities proposed under Concept Plan are too high. - Proposed FSR increase from 0.75:1 to 1:1 (35%). - Proposed floor space area increase by 51 820m² (34%). - Dwellings/ha increase from 50 to 60 (20%). - No FSR increase should be supported, however small increase in number of dwellings would be supported. - LEP 91, 1999 Master Plan and 2002 Master Plan require taller buildings to be located in the centre of the site. - Support proposed increase in height of 2/3 storey buildings in Vineyards Precincts and southern end of Woodlands North Precincts to allow reduction from 5 storey in Point, Seashore and Woodlands North Precincts. - Should be a single planning document to apply to the site. - In absence of single planning document, should be comprehensive consultation approach. - Emphasise Coordination Groups comments regarding Waterfront Activity Precinct, maximising open space, rejection of 6 project approvals.	- n/a - Density (increase) - Traffic
31	17.02.06			- See Pro Forma #1. - Proposed increase in density and resulting traffic impacts.	1.5.2, 1.6.2

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

				• Cumulative impacts of nearby developments. • On street car parking is inadequate. • Parking provision requirements are inadequate. • An additional 60 car spaces should be provided behind approved Stables building to service the Oval. • 40 car spaces should be required to service the Powerhouse. • All 9 storey buildings should be required to have 50% of their required parking underground or on site.	• Car Parking	• 1.10.8 • 1.10.4
32	17.02.06		Concerns	• Need to ensure public legal access to the foreshore. • Multi storey buildings should be graduated away from the water. • Concept Plan does not meet public access and permeability principles of Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment). • Concept Plan does not address the increase in traffic. • Increase in dwellings will exacerbate existing traffic.	• Public foreshore access • Built form • Permeability • Traffic • Density (increase)	• 1.2.1 • 1.11.2 • 1.2.1 • 1.5.2 • 1.10.8 • 1.33.1
33	17.02.06		Support in principle	• Construction phase has been longer than residents were led to believe. • Concept Plan is generally consistent with 2002 Master Plan.	• Construction • Consistency with 2002 Master Plan	
			Submissions 20 Feb			
34	20.02.06		Objection	• Increase number of dwellings.	• Density (increase)	• 1.11.3
35	20.02.06		Objection	• Increase in density is inconsistent with 2002 Master Plan. • Public access to the foreshore should be maintained.	• Density (increase) • Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • Public foreshore access	• 1.6.2 • 1.2.1
36	20.02.06		Objection	• Proposed 3 nine storey buildings will exacerbate existing traffic issues. • Roads within Breakfast Point are not wide enough to accommodate traffic, garbage collection services and removalists. • Woodlands Avenue cannot cope with more than one nine storey building. • Visual amenity of Cottonwood and Buttonwood buildings needs to be considered, as well as overshadowing impacts. • Proximity of nine storey buildings at Woodlands Ave/Spyglass Hill in relation to each other needs to be considered as they are too close. • Old Pump house in Seashore Precinct should be retained rather than replaced by 5 storey building. Alternatively, open space should be provided.	• Traffic • Capacity of existing road infrastructure • Built form • Amenity • Heritage • Provision of open space	• 1.11.2, 1.5.2 • 1.36.1 • 1.11.2 • 1.11.2 • 1.11.2 • 1.10.7
37	20.02.06		Objection	• Open space should remain in public	• Privatisation of public	• 1.37.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			ownership – preferably by City of Canada Bay Council.	space	
38	20.02.06		- Do not support the increase in density - Do not support the privatisation of open space	- Density (increase) - Privatisation of public space	1.6.2 1.19.1
39	20.02.06		- Increase in dwellings by 11% leading to an increase in population. - Increase in the intensity of land uses on the site. - Increased traffic.	- Density (increase) - Traffic	1.6.2, 1.10.8 1.5.2
40	20.02.06		Increased density	Density (increase)	1.6.2
41*	20.02.06	Objection	See Submission #13	n/a	
42*	20.02.06	Objection	See Submission #21	n/a	
43*	20.02.06	Concerns	See Submission #11	n/a	
44*	20.02.06	Concerns	See Submission #18	n/a	
45*	20.02.06	Objection	See Submission #19	n/a	
46*	20.02.06	Objection	See Submission #20	n/a	
47*	20.02.06	Concerns	See Pro Forma #2	n/a	

PART 2: PRO FORMA LETTERS (SEE TAGGED COPIES)

No.	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Relevant Issues	Response
1	01.02.06		Support in principle but issues	GENERAL - Exhibited Concept Plan deviates from 2002 Master Plan. - Residents do not support use of LEP 91 as planning controls where there are inconsistencies with 2002 Master Plan. - Six project applications should be rejected until Concept Plan issues are resolved. - Concept Plan applies to a portion of the site – should apply to 2002 Master Plan area including Kendall Bay and Parramatta River. - Should be a single planning authority responsible for Breakfast Point. - Residents support principal's in Council's likely submission (resulting from Council's meeting on 31 January 2006). - Need for inclusive consultation process. SPECIFIC CONCERNS - Concept Plan ignores the Breakfast Point Community Plan DP 270347 (registered with Land Titles Office on 18.08.03). - Concept Plan should be consistent with 2002 Master Plan, particularly site planning objectives, principles, FSR (0.6:1), floor space area (310,920m²), Schedule 11 uses (12,300m²), commercial/shops (3000m²), dwellings (max 36/Ha), dwellings (max 1865), and bedrooms (max 4950). - Additional dwellings proposed by Concept Plan will generate additional traffic, particularly	- Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Limited Concept Plan area - Approval role - Consistency with Breakfast Point Community Plan DP 270347 - Traffic - Car parking - Public access - Density (increase) - Building heights - Heritage - Phasing	1.8.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 1.10.11 1.8.2 2.1.3 1.14.1 2.1.4 1.8.1, 1.6.2, 1.11.1, 1.11.3, 1.10.2 1.5.2

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

				around Village Green and Village Centre. • Unchanged visitor car parking requirements and increased dwelling numbers will result in increased on street parking. • Silkstone Precinct should be deleted to provide parking for Waterfront Activity Precinct. • Land use principles within 2002 Master Plan should be reflected in the Concept Plan, particularly relating to waterfront activities. • Concept Plan fails to identify public access easement adjacent to Kendall Bay and Parramatta River (as per Breakfast Point Community Plan DP 270347). • Need to distinguish between Breakfast Point Community (governed by Community Plan DP 270347) and broader Canada Bay community. • Foreshore land is not subject to public easement and not within the foreshore lot owned by Council and therefore should not be publicly accessible. • Residents would be willing to consider public/private access subject to acceptable maintenance costs, etc. • Strongly oppose larger buildings, increased footprints – therefore less open space, decreased views and impacts to privacy. • Object to continuous 5 storey buildings immediately behind 2 storey waterfront lots around northern foreshore. • Residents support retention of Fitters Machinists, Carpenters Workshops in "Seashore Precinct". • Phasing should be consistent with 2002 Master Plan. • No comment regarding Sections 9 (Service Infrastructure), 11 (Heritage Conservation), 12 (Remediation) and 14 (ESD Principles).	• 1.10.4 • 2.1.5 • 1.7.3 • 2.1.6 • 2.1.7 • 2.1.8 • 1.11.2, 1.10.13 2.1.9 • 2.1.10 • 1.10.7 • 2.1.11		• 1.10.4
2	15.02.06	Concerns	Local roads do not have capacity for existing traffic movements. Proposed increase in densities and resulting traffic will compromise the safety of residents in the area. Increased densities will increase existing traffic problems. Existing and proposed car parking requirements are inadequate. Visitor car parking provisions are inadequate. Visitor car parking located on the street is being used by residents as there is inadequate resident car parking. Inconsistencies in the Concept Plan between the area to which the Plan applies and the base figures used to calculate densities, car parking spaces, etc – misleading.	Capacity of existing road infrastructure Density (increase) Traffic Car parking Inconsistency in submitted documents Consistency with 2002 Master Plan. Height Visual impact Cumulative impacts Provision of open space Heritage	• 1.5.2 • 1.6.2 • 1.10.4 • 1.8.1		

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

			• All proposed buildings are at the prescribed maximums rather than the range indicated in the 2002 Master Plan. • All buildings propose an "attic" further increasing the height within the roof space. • Height will compromise aesthetic of Breakfast Point. • Concept Plan should be considered in context of entire Breakfast Point area and surrounding areas. • Open space should be maintained rather than being developed for open space purposes. • Open space is limited in the concept area. • Heritage buildings should be restored only and not used for commercial purposes as proposed.	• 2.2.1 • 2.2.2 • 1.11.2 • 2.2.3 • 1.10.15 • 2.2.3 • 2.2.4	

PART 3: PETITIONS

No.	Date	Primary Submitter	Nature	Comment	Relevant Issues	Response
1	17.02.06		Concerns	• Deviations from the 2002 Master Plan. • Concept Plan dissects the Breakfast Point site and therefore there are different planning authorities. • Increases in FSR for residential and commercial uses will reduce pedestrian walkways, increase building heights and increase building footprints. • Increase in commercial uses will increase car usage. • Inadequate parking for commercial uses. • Proposed links should be provided (e.g. pedestrian access at bottom of Tennyson Road adjacent to River Quays marina).	• Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • Approval authority • FSR • Height • Public access • Commercial uses on the site • Car parking	• 1.8.1 • 3.1.1 • 1.11.1, 1.5.2 • 1.10.4 • 1.2.1
2				•	•	•

PART 4: KEY STAKEHOLDERS (COPIES HAVE BEEN TAGGED TO THIS DOCUMENT)

No.	Date	Primary Submitter	Nature	Comment	Relevant Issues	Response
1	20.01.06	Stephen Montgomery General Manager NSW Maritime Locked Bag 5100 CAMPERDOWN NSW 1450	No indication	• Minutes of Foreshores and Waterways Planning and Advisory Committee (held on 21.01.06) attached. • Noted that the Concept Plan is generally similar to the 2002 Master Plan with the exception of car parking and dwelling mix. • Recommended that Concept Plan address relevant provisions of Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005, particularly as they apply to the foreshores and waterways area.	• Consistency with 2002 Master Plan • Consistency with SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	• 4.1.1
2	23.01.06	Andrew Jackson	No in principle	• Understood Concept Plan is indicative of what the foreshores and waterways area.	• Infrastructure capacity	

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

		Manager, Strategic Market Analysis Sydney Water PO Box A53 SYDNEY SOUTH NSW 1232	objection subject to following comments.	may be developed. - Increases in density may require amplifications to Sydney Water infrastructure. - Conditions of approval should require Section 73 Compliance Certificate from Sydney Water. - Noted that remediation of former AGL site has been undertaken. However some areas may contain low-level residual contamination. - Design and construction of water and wastewater infrastructure must make provision for (and mitigate against) any potential risks from soil or groundwater contaminants. - Proponent will be required to develop a Work Method Statement (WMS) relating to earthworks and site preparation in the vicinity of on site Sydney Water assets. - WMS to be approved prior to commencement of earthworks/soil preparation works. - A trade waste permit to discharge into sewers is required prior to commencement of discharge. - Requested that subsequent development applications and project approvals be referred to Sydney Water for comment.	- Certification and compliance - Remediation - Earthworks - Waste - Consultation	4.2.1 4.2.1 4.2.1 4.2.1 4.2.1
3	06.02.06	Vincent Sicari Principal Heritage Officer NSW Heritage Office Locked Bag 5020 PARRAMATTA NSW 2124		- Noted that 3 heritage items fall within the Concept Plan area. - Approval not required under the Heritage Act 1977 however site has been identified as being of heritage significance. - Noted that breaching the Tennyson Road perimeter wall has been approved by the Master Plan approval. - Noted that Concept Plan proposes adaptive reuse of Blacksmiths Shop and Powerhouse – future use and proposed conservation works not proposed as part of current application. - Timing of approvals is important to avoid “mothballing” of heritage items. - Recommended conditions be imposed to require conservation of heritage items prior to occupation of completed project. - Alternative is to require financial guarantee be required to fund their conservation. - Unclear from Concept Plan whether further development will encroach on curtilage of Blacksmiths Shop. Should be clarified and conditioned appropriately. - If further excavation is undertaken (additional to that already undertaken) a condition should be imposed requiring consultation with Heritage Office in accordance with Section 146 of the Heritage Act in the event that archaeological relics are discovered during construction.	- Heritage - Consistency with 2002 Master Plan - Adaptive reuse of heritage items - Earthworks	4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.1
4	17.02.06	Lucinda Rigby	Concerns	Concept Plan does not provide enough built	Built form	4.4.1

BREAKFAST POINT CONCEPT PLAN EXHIBITION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FEBRUARY 2006

	Planner – SRE Department of Planning Level 3, 23-33 Bridge Street SYDNEY NSW 2000		form guidance, particularly with respect to visual impact from Parramatta River. - Views from the River, specifically massing and bulk. - Development appears unbroken and not well articulated. - Concept Plan does not offer sufficient control to gradation of buildings.	- Height - Views from water - Architectural standards	4.4.2 4.4.2 4.4.3
--	--	--	---	---	---