

# **West Pittwater Community Association**

**Representing the communities of McCarrs Creek, Elvina Bay, Lovett Bay, and Morning Bay PO Box 289 Church Point NSW 2105**

The General Manager  
Pittwater Council,  
PO Box 882  
Mona Vale  
NSW 1660  
Fax No 9970 7150

**Re Pasadena 1858 Pittwater Road Church Point NSW 2105**

**DA No N0051/05**

Please find following the submission by the West Pittwater Community Association regarding the amendments to the Pasadena redevelopment: In reviewing this proposal a major concern of the committee is that there are obvious inconsistencies with the currently developed Church Point Draft Plan of Management. The revised application should be coordinated with the draft plan of management.

Of great concern is that the POM identifies land currently leased by the Pasadena that is to return to public use on the point to the north of the Pasadena, no reference to this is made in the proposal and it is essential to ensure that the intention of the POM prevails.

The proposal also identifies changes marked on the landscape plan that are of significance to the POM. In particular the parking configuration to the south of the Pasadena, proposed tree locations adjacent to this parking and a kerb reworking to Thomas Stephen Reserve.

Again it is essential that decisions made in the POM process on the detail of these areas prevail. Our opposition to a number of the proposed amendments is outlined below: These key issues are:

- 1) The Thomas Stephen Reserve is compromised by having the podium to the western edge of the Pasadena built on public land. The impact of this podium as public amenity is completely spurious as it alienates public space. This podium area that is proposed upon public land must cease to be assumed by the proponent as a part of their approved design. The podium that is proposed within their boundary on the western elevation is the total extent of the podium that can be countenanced.

2) The enlargement of the retail space doors to the western podium/walkway is not supported. The existence of any openings on this western facade to the Thomas Stephen Reserve is viewed as compromising the integrity of the public space of the reserve. Any openings in the western facade should not assume direct access to the Reserve. It is hoped that the detail of the Church Point POM will deal with the current visual, (and in the case of the proposed podium), the physical appropriation of public space that results from the Pasadena plans.

3) The proposed landscape changes alter the existing road curtilage. Public entry to the Thomas Stephen Reserve is severely compromised being reduced to about 1/3 of the current size, this proposal is not supported in any way. The very necessary drop off area as currently exists is already under pressure and is a minimal workable size. The proposal reduces the public amenity and is totally unacceptable.

4) The proposed landscape changes also indicate tree planting at either end of the southern side of the new building 'bookending' the car parking on the roadway. In this revised landscape plan that realigns the existing street/kerb alignment to create the western tree planting area, crepe myrtle is proposed as the tree species ... this is a totally inappropriate multi-limbed shrub-like plant ... not as the drawing suggests a large spotted gum. This proposed suggestion cannot be supported. The realignment of the kerb is totally opposed, and the planting as such offers little public amenity, nor is it appropriate species choice.

5) The recycling facilities that currently exist within the Pasadena's boundary are a necessary part of the Reserves use and no provision has been made for their relocation. The POM will need to ensure that adequate provision for this is made.

Further more the revised application should take into account the revised lease area in the POM and modify the landscape plan and external works to reflect this. We feel that the retail cannot be allowed to privatize Thomas Stevens reserve by assuming access or by extending the building footprint in the form of a podium onto public land and the Reserve.

All openings need to be acoustically rated to ensure that public activities are not diminished from what currently exists by the changes in layout and use.

Kind Regards,

Karen Lambert