

Bronte Precinct Meeting

11 November 2013

Bronte Public School

Convenor: Alma Douglas

Councillors present: Tony Kay, Bill Mouroukas

Apologies: Carlu Carter, Sally Betts.

Meeting commenced at 7pm

1. Welcome to all attendees.

2. **Guest speaker**, Mitchell Reid Divisional Manager-Development Assessment, Waverley Council-the new Waverley Development Assessment Panel.

Mitchell stated he would welcome questions relating to his position in Council. Many questions were asked by residents, particularly regarding The "Waverley Development Assessment Panel". E.g.

- Who is on the panel?
- Who appoints the Panel?
- How many DA's go before the panel.
- Who approved \$750,000 to Tamarama surf club?

These questions and many more were answered hopefully to resident's satisfaction.

A vote of thanks was given to Mitchell for attending our meeting.

3. Minutes of previous meeting accepted

Proposer: Grant Heard

Seconder: Jean Dyer

4. 2013 Sculptures by the Sea feedback

This event started off many years ago as a small art exhibition but over a period of time has grown beyond residents expectations.

- One way in Thompson Street honoured by residents but a stricter enforcement should be made regarding visitors. Bayview Street always blocked
- Suggestion made that this event should be moved to another coastal municipality.
- What benefits does it bring to our area?
- Residents input to this event should be canvassed more fully this does not happen at the moment.
- **Motion 1.** Could signposting for the "One Way" system in Mirimar Ave and Thompson St for future Sculpture by the Sea period revert to that employed in 2012 as it was more effective than this year?
- Proposer: Michael DONNAN Seconder: Alma Douglas

:Rationale :While the continued use of water filled plastic barriers is to be applauded the sign posting at Ashley St Thompson St intersection and at the southern end of Mirimar Ave did not seem to be as clearly visible as in the previous year.

Motion 2. Could road closures for building purposes be suspended during Sculpture by the Sea period in temporary designated "One Way" streets?

Proposer: Michael DONNAN Seconder: Les Dudman

Rationale. Botany Cranes had permission to narrow Thompson St for building work carried out at 2 Mirimar Ave. on Monday, October 28. Unfortunately a parked vehicle outside No 17 Thompson St meant that only small vehicles headed in a westerly direction in Thompson St could negotiate the gap between crane and car. Driving south on Mirimar Ave to exit the area was not an option because as of 12.00 p.m. that day Mirimar Ave was "One Way" northbound.

5.Reports;

A. Traffic.

- "No name lane" Hewlett & Read st.

Observers feel that a Police presence at this site for a period of time would make people more aware of this new Stop sign

- Murray & Belgrave Street

Motion 3. Could consideration be given to making a small change to the "5 minute" parking zone in Murray St adjacent to the south eastern corner of its intersection with Belgrave St. Currently the 5 minute limit starts at 0800. Could this be changed to 0700?

Proposer: Michael DONNAN Seconder: Alma Douglas

- *Rationale: This zone was created to provide a loading area for commercial vehicles servicing adjacent small businesses. However for 2 of the 3 businesses service vehicles are in evidence at 0700 or earlier.*

B.DA,s.& Building

- 14 days to make a submission in regard to developments is not enough and should be extended.

Statement lodged by Michael DONNAN.

quote: "Suburbs are being transformed by once adequate homes being demolished, blocks cleared from fence to fence and replaced with huge monuments to bad taste and excess.

No gardens, no trees, no wildlife. The few remaining trees, mostly on the footpath under the wires, are routinely hacked back to grotesque shapes to conform to some regulation or other.

Nothing harmonises with anything and we seem to have lost any sense of aesthetic that was often evident in streetscapes of a generation or so ago". (Sydney Morning Herald, Friday, Sept 27, 2013, Letter to editor, p 21, Rod Hughes, Epping).

Would the SMH publish such a letter if it was not (a) accurate, and (b) reflecting a widely held opinion?

This observation by Mr Rod Hughes about his local (Epping) area is also a very accurate depiction of streetscape change in the Waverley Council area over the past decade. It could be argued that the owner of any home has a right to build on their block what they desire. However there is a lot of evidence that these "monuments to bad taste" are actually designed (I use the term loosely) and constructed by builder/developers who then offload their eyesore after 2 years. These people are not long or even medium term residents. They despoil, move on and despoil again. The Ghenghis Khan management model.

Recent "despoil" examples in the Bronte Precinct area, Waverley Municipality.

- A. Monument to bad taste: 97 Hewlett St., Bronte (Photo A)
- B. Blocks cleared from fence to fence: 2 Mirimar Ave, Tamarama (Photo B)
- C. Harmony voided: 10 Thompson St., Tamarama (Photo C)
- D. Levels regulation avoidance. 4 & 4A Mirimar Ave., Tamarama (Photo D)
- E. Trees vandalized. 8 Cross St., Waverley (Photo E)

Motions directed to Council

Rationale - Motions

The photograph of 4 & 4A Mirimar Ave is only included to highlight that the "despoil" model developer is not a recent phenomena. Residents of Harlowe Place had a great deal to say about the height of this development at the time. This building was approved for a certain height and numbers of levels.

The latter was exceeded by the expediency of a floor being installed above the garage level after the building was apparently completed.

The 3 photographs of the 10 Thompson St development illustrate that site coverage and setback appears to be problematic compared to the adjacent dwellings (No 8 & 12 Thompson St).

Cannot it be a condition of a DA that IF soil area on the redeveloped block is to be minimal then:

- (a) Adjacent street power poles and cables be relocated underground,
and
- (b) Small/medium indigenous trees be planted between the footpath and the kerb?

The development at 4/4A Mirimar Ave apparently included these conditions.

Clearly the removal of cables given the impact on the view would serve to enhance the sale value for the developers of 2 Mirimar and 10 Thompson as it no doubt did for the 4/4A Mirimar Ave property.

The photo of the tree adjacent to the development at 8 Cross St speaks for itself. Please do not let this be passed off as an over zealous Ausgrid sub contractor. This development required use of a crane and the tree had been limiting access.

I again draw Councils attention to the penalty of \$19,000 imposed by Sutherland Shire Council in October, 2009 for destruction of an 80 year old 14 metre "Blackbutt tree" on the property resident. How does this compare with the \$500 fine imposed by Waverley Council on the developer at 265 Birrell St at about the same time? Similarly in February 2006 Council was alerted to the removal of indigenous trees and shrubs from parkland adjacent and immediately to the south of the property at 6 Wonderland Ave. We were assured that appropriate vegetation would be reintroduced and the offender warned. As of today, November 11, 2013 that ground is as bare of trees as it was in 2006.

Can you expect residents and ratepayers to take Waverley Council seriously on environmental issue - green or built!!

Motion 4. In brief, simple English devoid of ill defined acronyms (or necessary acronyms be defined clearly & concisely) could Council provide an explanation as to if regulations on building height, number of building levels, boundary set back and site coverage still apply to individual house construction?

Proposed: Michael Donnan Seconded: Grant Beard

Motion 5. Could Council provide an explanation as to how trees on or adjacent to these sites are vandalized or disappear without any meaningful penalty being imposed on the builder/developer or provision made for their equivalent replacement? Example 265 Birrell St.; 8 Cross St (Photo E)

Proposed: Michael Donnan Secunder:Les Dudman

Motion 6. Could Council please advise how, should they wish to, could future residents develop a "green footprint" while living at 10 Thompson St given that soil and subsoil have been completely removed. Native plants, particular eucalypts are extremely sensitive to soil movement during "settlement". (See Photo B) DA approval should be conditional on the "green footprint" of any site prior to redevelopment be the minimum required post development. Freeing up green space on the footpath "verge" by the removal of power poles (at the developer's expense) could assist in achieving this

Proposer:Michael Donnan Secunder:Grant Heard

Motion 7

Can Council advise residents and ratepayers if there is a policy of preserving "streetscapes" other than only by heritage listing?

Proposer Michael Donnan Seconder: Les Dudman

Rationale;While "aesthetics", like beauty is in the eye of the beholder even an architectural dinosaur (like me) can see that replacing a 1920s California style bungalow in a street of such bungalows with these "huge monuments to bad taste and excess" is a revisit to the 1970s when the replacements were 3 storeyred brick unit blocks.

Proposer Michael Donnan Seconder: Les Dudman

Motion 8

What assurances can Council provide to existing dwelling residents that thorough analysis of the impact on ground water flows of such deep excavations has been conducted?"

Proposer Michael DONNAN Seconder; Alma Douglas

Preamble.*Traditionally dwellings in Waverley were constructed on "footings" or off a concrete slab at ground level with minimum disturbance to subsoil level. Current common practice appear to be to excavate as far as possible below existing ground level to maximize the gross floor area of the final building*

No 10 Thompson St is opposite and towers over No 9 Thompson St on its southern side.

No 9 Thompson St currently is experiencing water pooling to a depth of 25mm in its lowest level. Can we all be absolutely assured that the excavation construction method employed by the developer at No 10 Thompson St is totally unrelated to the ground water penetration at No 9 Thompson St.

Motion 9. Can Council advise what was the result about concerns raised at previous meetings of illegal parking at and near the intersection of Belgrave and Murray Streets most Saturday and Sunday mornings between 0700 and 0830?

Proposer Michael Donnan Seconder; Alma Douglas

General Business:

Les Dudman proposed a vote of thanks be given to Council regarding their presentation of the 2013 Remembrance Day services. This suggestion was endorsed by the entire meeting.

Meeting closed at 9.10pm.

With thanks to all who attended